

# CoDesign of Learning Analytics Dashboards

...

---

## 1. Introduction

The design and evaluation of learning dashboards is a major area of inquiry in learning analytics research. Learning analytics dashboards are designed to use learners' traces to present the computed indicators and other visual elements in a clear and intuitive way [11]. They have emerged as applications for visualizing and interacting with data collected in a learning environment in various forms [44]. Steiner et al. [57] referred to them as “visualizations of learning traces”. For Yoo et al. [67], a learning dashboard is “a display which visualizes the results of educational data mining in a useful way”. Schwendimann et al. [52] identified a lack of an agreed and shared definition and thus proposed the following:

*“A learning dashboard is a single display that aggregates different indicators about learner(s), learning process(es) and/or learning context(s) into one or multiple visualizations. ”* [52]

Learning dashboards provide interactive, historical, customized and analytical displays that are based on the results of analyzing learning data [39, 30]. By implementing visual and interactive analytics, they amplify human natural abilities to detect patterns, establish connections and make inferences. The produced visual outputs can significantly highlight aspects of interest from the mined and discovered knowledge [18].

Learning dashboards are suitable for online, face-to-face, and blended learning [60]. They can target different stakeholders: administrators, instructors, learners or all of them. Within a single display, indicators and visualizations about learners, learning processes and contexts are rendered using different shapes, from plain text to visual

elements (e.g., tables, spreadsheet charts, scatterplot, 3D representations) to complex artifacts such as alerts and notifications that prompt interventions [21, 40, 52]. Currently, they are increasingly deployed as a meaningful component in learning analysis systems. For instance, they are currently used in studying progression through courses [37], learners level of attainment [25], and learners’ engagement from the cognitive and behavioral perspectives [12]. Despite being fairly recent educational tools, the research found many benefits of using learning dashboards to improve learning performance [4] and to increase learners’ motivation [60, 64].

...

According to Bennett and Folley [7], we can distinguish three types of learner dashboards: predictive, modeler and descriptive.

- Predictive types use machine learning based on computer algorithms that rely on a series of trace data to predict the likelihood that the students outcomes. Many works in this category (i.e, [5]) use these algorithms to produce at risk rating for individual students.
- For example, aspects of a student’s online behaviours such as communication, initiative, presence that have been derived from the number of messages, the number of comments in response to others’ messages, time spent online, etc., are not included in this section.
- The third type of dashboard is descriptive and displays past learning behaviours

## 2. Designing leanring analytics dashboards

There is a growing body of literature on learner dashboard design, and several literature reviews covering the field. A comprehensive literature review by Bodily and Verbert [9] involved identifying and analyzing 93 papers with respect to functionality, data sources, design analysis, student perceptions, and measured effects. They found that the clear majority of the papers focused on technical features such as data sources, functional aspects (e.g., visualization data, what the dashboard was intended to do)

while only two papers reported on how students' behaviours were changed as a result of using the Learner Dashboards and only one-third (34 of 93) focused on students' perceptions of the design.

### *2.1. General design principles*

Due to the recent emergence of learning analytics dashboards, there is still a scarcity of studies on their design principles [19]. Yoo et al. [67] argued that, since dashboards are an instrument of communication, effective design is tied to several theoretical foundations, such as human cognition and perception, situational awareness and visualization technologies. In other words, their conceptualization must be based on an understanding of how humans see and think.

Based on a number of theoretical principles in addition to his practical experience, Few [22] outlined some good and bad examples of dashboard design. He claimed that the essential characteristics of a dashboard are: 1) to be visual displays; 2) to display the information needed to achieve specific objectives, 3) to fit on a single computer screen, and 4) to be used to monitor information at a glance. In terms of human perception, due to the limited working memory of humans, only three or four pieces of visual information can be stored at a time. Therefore, for more effective memory perception and retention, it is essential to incorporate graphic patterns such as graphs rather than individual numbers. In addition, there must be a proper and reasoned use of pre-attentive attributes such as colour, shape, spatial position and movement. From Few's principles, Yoo et al. [67] drew three main implications:

1. the most important information should stand out from the rest in a dashboard, which usually has limited space to fit into a single screen;
2. the information in a dashboard should support one's situated awareness and help rapid perception using diverse visualization technologies; and
3. the information should be deployed in a way that makes sense, and elements of information should support viewers' immediate goal and end goal for decision making.

*Situational awareness* deals with disclosing the type of information that is important for a particular purpose or task [20], and thus constitutes another design principle related to dashboards. Three levels can be distinguished:

1. perception of the elements in the environment;
2. comprehension of the current situation; and
3. projection of future status.

*Situational awareness* is commonly understood in terms of people being consistently aware of what is going on, in order to predict what will be happening as well as to prepare what must be done.

## *2.2. Principles of Students' dashboards*

Draws on an interpretive lens of student agency and empowerment [55], Bennett and Folley [7] identified four principles to inform the design of learner dashboards. The key point of these principles is that they shift attention from the technical features of dashboard design to the forefront, rather than to how they are interpreted by students. In doing so, the principles emphasize the values of student engagement and empowerment that Prinsloo and Slade [43] propose as a key principle for the ethical adoption of learning analysis. The four principles are:

1. *designs that are customisable by students*: this suggests practical ways that the function and form of dashboards might be designed so that students can tailor the displays to suit their particular needs which would reflect their aims and aspirations, their personal dispositions
2. *foreground students sense making*: suggests making available the data sources so that students are able to interrogate these, and not aggregating sources so that their provenance is lost. It suggests enabling students to contextualise the displays to their particular programme and circumstances
3. *enable students to identify actionable insights*: this suggests that designs should help students to interpret the data rather than digesting it for the student. This might mean providing guidance to the student about what is on view and prompts to help them to identify what actions they could take next.

4. *dashboard use is embedded into educational processes*: this places attention on the ways that the tools are integrated into the educational systems and processes. We know that uptake of learner dashboards has been low [9] so a key focus in terms of the design is how it is embedded into student behaviours.

### *2.3. Limitation of the existing dashboards design approaches*

#### *2.3.1. Lack of theoretically informed design*

One obstacle to the adoption of dashboards is the often existing gap between visual analyses and the objectives of the study [47]. Sometimes, to represent the analyzed data from different angles, designers use complex representations and visualizations that are rather difficult for end users to interpret, especially "at a glance" [18]. According to the survey reported in [45], the existing dashboards generally have poor interface design and lack of usability testing. The selection of data to be visualized is generally not what the stakeholders in the analysis want or really need because they have not regularly been involved in the design process [27]. Bodily and Verbert [8] also noted the absence of design choice justifications in the conception of several learning dashboards.

A primary concern of dashboard designers must be the identification of what type of visual representations to implement, and what kind of interaction to offer. Gašević et al. [24] argue that, without careful considerations, the design of dashboards can result in the implementation of fragile and undesirable instructional practices by promoting ineffective feedback types and methods. In order to encourage adoption of learning dashboards, the design needs to be further informed by theories related to learning sciences and educational psychology. Holstein et al. [27] argued that the success of the dashboards depends on the degree to which its stakeholders have been involved in co-designing them.

#### *2.3.2. Selection of the input data and the computed indicators*

A rich variety of measured data and indicators are used and computed in existing dashboards. Dashboard solutions are heavily based on trace analysis, and little attention has been paid to use other data sources such as direct feedback or the quality of the produced artifacts. Moreover, as noted by Schwendimann et al. [52], there is

little work on comparing which indicators and which visualizations are most suitable for the different user data literacy levels. In most cases, the chosen visualizations are rather similar to those in other areas of dashboard applications (e.g., web analytics), which highlights the lack of specific visualizations and visual metaphors that address the activities of learning and teaching (another potential area for future research) [52].

### *2.3.3. Learners' aptitudes are not considered*

The review of Schwendimann et al. [52] revealed that current focus hugely falls on the information that can be extracted from the log data rather than how individual differences might affect the interpretation of the information presented to the learner in terms of reflection and taking actions [24].

Studies undertaken by Bodily and Verbert [9] and Viberg, Hatakka, Bälter, and Mavroudi [61] also point to the need to understand users' views of dashboards qualitatively and in use rather than as technical artefacts. This conception foregrounds the purpose of the tool in that it considers how students make use of information presented via the dashboard and how it might change their behaviour as a result. Dashboard conception needs also to focus attention on the perspective of the user, the learner, and on the purpose of dashboards as tools that provide feedback to students to encourage them to make more informed decisions about their study behaviours Howell, Roberts, and Mancini [29], Bennett and Folley [7].

## **3. CoDesign of learning analytics dashboard**

### *3.1. User-centered design*

The goal of designing data visualizations is to empower users to better understand the data presented by the visualization, so the user must be kept in mind when designing data visualizations. Two concepts are relevant in this context: human-centered design and user-centered design :

- *Human-centred design* focuses on creating systems that are easier to use by taking human factors into account.

- *User-centred design* involves users in the design process where design development is influenced by end-users. Model-based, story-based and scenario-based design are examples of user-centered design methodologies.

For Vilpola [62], user-centred design is an imperative part of creating products that ensures usefulness to users, and that allows creation of systems that fulfill users requirements. The authors highlight four principles of user-centred design: (1) user is actively involved; (2) user's tasks and technological function must be distinguished; (3) the design should be iterative; and (4) the design should be multidisciplinary. Vredenberg et al. [63], while recognizing that user-centred design improves product usefulness and usability, pointed out a lack of effectiveness measures to evaluate the success of a user-centred design effort.

### 3.2. *Participatory design*

The emergence of participatory design, according to Bannon et al. [6], was motivated by the need to involve users in the process of design, and to help mitigate situations of divergent ideas through democratic decision-making processes. Participatory design allows the involvement of the users of the system in the design process and gives stakeholders the opportunity to learn more about other stakeholders' views [59]. Often participatory design is referred to in discussions of user-centered design, so the difference between user-centered design and participatory design has become quite unclear [6]. Yet, participatory design is sometimes discussed alongside user-centred design, as a user-centred approach [32].

Dearnley and Mayhew [15] identified two main reasons why participation in design emerged: firstly, as a means of mitigating the problem of conventional approaches that do not work; and secondly, because of ethical issues, claiming that end-users should have some influence over the environment in which they work.

Arguing that the design paradigm of participatory design is constructivism, Spinuzzi [56] assumes that knowledge exists in a certain context, not just in a person's mind. The author identified three stages of participatory design research: initial exploration of work, discovery processes and prototyping.

- *Initial exploration of work*: this is the stage where users and designers meet to become familiar with how users work with each other. The used research methods are ethnographics and include observations, interviews and visits to the organisation.
- *Discovery processes*: during this stage, the design stakeholders use different techniques to improve their understanding, prioritize the organization of work, and construct a future vision for the workplace. The used methods include organisational games, role-play games, organisational toolkits, future workshops, storyboarding, and workflow models and interpretation sessions.
- *Prototyping*: Here, users and designers form technological artifacts in an iterative manner, to fit into the future vision created in the second stage. This is achieved using different methods including mock-ups, paper prototyping, and cooperative prototyping.

### 3.3. Participatory design

*Co-design* derived from user-centered design as a particular case of co-creation where designers who are trained in creativity work together with non-designers during the design process. [49] define it as a process where designers and non-designers work together creatively ideally in all stages of design. A main claim of codesign is that it remedies design's conventional exclusion of people from design outcomes that affect them [58].

[54] describes the co-design process as a facilitator that directs the level of end-user awareness of design choices, providing professional advice and guidance on the consequences of alternative choices while end-users provide advice and contribute to the contextual experience. Research suggests that including end-users in the design process ensures appropriate design responses that are aligned with end-user requirements [58].

To glean as much information as possible about the context and needs of users, a common strategy is to use participatory design techniques where end-users are directly invited to participate in the design process. Participatory Design for Learning



is a growing field with its own history, philosophies, and body of techniques and methods [16]. In practical terms, the LA researchers used a subset of techniques such as pre-interviewing end-users about their needs to derive design ideas [65], employing practitioner-partners as informant designers who give feedback on designs [23], and engaging teachers throughout the prototyping process itself to create classroom analytics [28].

Different methods and techniques are being used to apply participatory design. The most popular include brainstorming exercises, card sorting, group affinity diagramming, rapid paper prototyping, wireframe walkthroughs, preferences testing [1].

### *3.4. Human-centered design approach in LAD*

Within the learning analytics community, designers and researchers are increasingly turning to human-centred design methods to adopt practical design techniques and knowledge to explore the design cycle of a learning analysis project. In the current literature on learning analysis, there are calls for theory-based and participatory approaches. Alhadad [2] noted that data visualization design should be grounded in theories of cognitive learning. For example, attention to issues of cognitive loading, attention, human perception and data literacy has direct design implications, such as avoiding visual clutter and breaking down data into segments that can be interpreted on the screen. This perspective is consistent with what data visualization researchers understand to be visual coding and interaction design decisions [36], where choices regarding graphic types, interface components such as text and placement of visual markers, and interactive elements align with what is known about cognition and perception. However, as noted by Dollinger and Lodge [17], learning analytics researchers often work in applied contexts with real educators and educational settings, where it quickly becomes apparent that interface-level design decisions alone are not sufficient to productively promote effective use of visual dashboards.

### *3.5. CoDesign approaches of LADs*

In educational settings, designers and developers commonly rely on teams of visual designers, business specialists and educational theorists who produce educational inno-

vations (Herold, 2015). I McColl-Kennedy, Vargo, Dagger, Sweeney, and Kasteren [35] define cocreation, or codesign, as *the benefits realized from the integration of resources through activities and interactions with collaborators*. historicall, it is thus originally a marketing and management strategy, incorporating stakeholder and user resources into the design, process and analysis of services, breaking down the traditional boundaries between producers and users. Co-creation can benefit the current design of learning analytics in several key ways.

The benefits of co-designing a dashboard with the collaboration of multiple stakeholders with diverse perspectives are numerous. A dashboard design team should include education administrators, technology experts, data managers and, most importantly, learners. A co-design approach encourages alignment among multiple stakeholders with the purpose and main goal of the dashboard, and ensures consistent implementation by anticipating obstacles or potential difficulties in adopting the system, and increases innovation capacity and efficiency Boscardin et al. [10]. A participatory approach also facilitates opportunities for consensus building and the creation of shared mental models for key learner outcomes, as well as the appropriate interpretation and use of evaluation data by multiple stakeholders. As pointed out by Schuler and Namioka [51], a co-design approach reflects a participatory design movement that emphasizes mutual learning, with users learning about the opportunities and constraints of the technology while designers learn about user practices and perspectives.

### 3.6. Techniques for codesign in LA

## 4. Related Work

Co-design techniques have started to attract the attention of some researchers and practitioners within the learning analytics community, especially for learner consultation (Holstein, McLaren, Aleven, 2017; McPherson, Tong, Fatt, Liu, 2016; Roberts., Howell., Seaman., 2016), to understand privacy concerns (Slade Prinsloo, 2015), for tailoring support for learners (Madeline Huberth, Nicole Michelotti, McKay, 2013), for designing learning activities (Könings, Seidel, van Merriënboer, 2014) and for designing dashboards (Corrin Barba, 2015).

- 4.1. *LA-DECK: a card-based learning analytics co-design tool [3]*
- 4.2. *Prestigiacomio et al. [41]*
- 4.3. *Prestigiacomio et al. [42]*
- 4.4. *Ruiz et al. [48]*

The authors propose a method which consists in the application of two techniques.

#### *Technique to Capture the Mental Model of Domain Experts (CaM CaM2DET)*

This technique aimed to capturing the expert's mental model in relation to the domain data. The implementation of the method consists in first conducting a literary review by the design team and experts to construct taxonomies or visual frameworks that are then used for brainstorming to constrcut all the domain concepts. Once the experts have generated a list of concepts, the designers present the concepts resulting from the review. Then, the secondary concepts (attributes) that describe main concepts (entities) are grouped and a conceptual model is constructed from them by the experts indivisually. Later, they fill the instrument to establish the relationships between the main concepts. The concepts are organized in a tree in order to be able to identify "composition-aggregation" relationships.

Diverse types of resources can be used at this stage, including post-it notes, pens, pencils, erasers, a video-camera, and bond paper with the structures of different taxonomies according to the problem domain.

#### *Prototyping Technique for Conceptual Design (ProTCD)*

This technique is used by the design team and stakeholders participants for the structural design (layout) of the interface, taking into account the data from that domain. To very a scennario prepared the design team, participants use a set of cards reprseseting critea (interaction forms, how to perform a task, etc) and a configuration panelusede as an aid to delimit the set of criteria to be used and establish rules. This allows participants to discuss different options for the each criteria and select them accoriding to the sceranio thy wish to creaaate. Using the configuration, an outline taking into account the selected elements and operational concepts is designed, and the functionality and interaction of the interface elements is discussed. Each new idea is

written in a post-it note. The results are explained by group member(s) while they are being recorded with a camcorder.

4.5. *Prestigiacomio et al. [41]*

4.6. *Prestigiacomio et al. [41]*

4.7. *Prestigiacomio et al. [41]*

## **5. Paddle: Participatory Design of Learning Analytics Dashboards**

5.1. *Rationale and requirements for dashboard design*

5.1.1. *Study setting*

The ANR HUBBLE project (HUMAN Observatory Based on analysis of e-Learning traces) intends to capitalize on the different stages of the massive data analysis processes related to learning. On the user interface level, the preliminary proposal for this project was to feature the automatic, dynamic generation of learning dashboards, associating the results of different indicators derived from the learning data, as a result of the analysis process. The first efforts [14] have shown that the generation of such learning dashboards requires the definition of user needs models to allow a generation adapted to the intended use.

In this context, three interconnected research questions emerge around the capture of needs:

1. How can users of learning dashboards best express their needs in order to provide effective interfaces?
2. How to build on these needs in order to create a reference base of interfaces for the generation of learning dashboards?
3. Which models derived from user needs can be used to automatically generate effective dashboards?

This article focuses on the first question. It introduces a design space that serves as a basis for both the definition of the participatory design tool and the specification of models for capitalizing and generating learning dashboards. As the Hubble project is mainly oriented towards capitalization and reuse, the challenge is indeed to define models to organize the collected elements, following a knowledge engineering approach.

### 5.1.2. An iterative refinement process

We have conducted an iterative process to develop our needscapture method. First we carried out a study to assess needs based on questionnaires and semi-directive interviews, and then, after evaluating the findings of this first study, we organized a participatory workshop with the stakeholders.

*Phase 1: Questionnaires and interviews.* We carried out a study to assess the capture needs based on questionnaires and semi-directive interviews with stakeholders from 8 case studies out of the 13 identified by the Hubble project [14]. The objective was to develop an explicit understanding of the users' context, tasks, needs and environments in order to enable the dynamic generation of dashboards. This study included a survey and semi-structured interviews.

We adopt the framework proposed by Chatti et al. [13], which identifies four questions around the analysis of learning data. We supplement these questions with a fifth one, "When", which we felt was important for participants to better understand their interactions with learning dashboards. We thus list five questions where each refers to a contextual dimension "Who, why, what, how, when".

**"Who" dimension** dimension makes it possible to specify the users and their roles.

**"Why" dimension** concerns the identification of users' objectives. In other words, it is used to identify why it is important for the user to use a learning dashboard.

**"What" dimension** is devoted to identifying the context of the observation objective and the indicators that users wish to visualize in order to improve their learning process.

**"How" dimension** concerns the description of the most appropriate way (i.e. the most comprehensible by the user) to visualize the indicators. This dimension highlights the notion of user preferences in terms of visualization to facilitate the interpretation of these indicators.

**"When" dimension** makes it possible to specify how the dashboard should be used.

After this initial study, we realized that users find it difficult to clearly express their needs through simple questioning. Potential users have significant difficulty projecting themselves into use (when interviewing designers of indicators) or picturing what is possible (when interviewing teachers who often have little culture regarding the use of digital data). Therefore, as a second step, we decided to conduct a participatory workshop.

*Phase 2: Participatory workshop.* We conducted this second study with 8 primary and secondary school teachers who share the same objective of monitoring their students' activities. Teachers use the Tactileo Map [13] application available on the tablet that was created to guide students during a field trip. This tablet provides various tools for students such as a notepad, a camera, an audio recorder and allows to collect traces of their use. This workshop was delivered in an open manner, without tools other than paper and whiteboards. It was followed by a wireframe stage and the development of a model.

During this workshop, the wide range of needs, contexts of use and preferences led to a diversity of proposals that were difficult to formalize. To go further, an adapted tool was therefore necessary.

#### *5.1.3. A Design Thinking approach*

Design Thinking is a way of embedding the notion of iterative design into the design process. Coming up with ideas, building and testing in a short period of time is what Design Thinking brings to the table in comparison to other iterative processes (Ellingsen, 2016). In terms of innovation through iterations, Design Thinking specifies three main stages (Koh, Chai, Wong, Hong, 2015): understanding, creation and delivery (see inner square in Figure 1). The iterative process starts with creating empathy and defining goals/expectations from stakeholders. This first part of the process can be exploratory and in some cases may set the tone of the project for the next stages (IDEO, 2016).

#### 5.1.4. *Participatory design approach*

In order to be able to collect user needs in terms of dashboard usage, we have to overcome several difficulties:

1. Because users are not familiar with the use of dashboards, they have difficulty expressing their visualization needs. As in Xhakaj et al. [66], we consider that the decisional expression linked to the dashboard is structuring for its design.
2. Users have little knowledge of the existing opportunities provided either directly by certain tools or through the indicators proposed by the research. In other words, it is difficult to link user demand with research supply. We consider that an initial step is to build on current practices and therefore to allow users to express themselves.
3. The context in which the dashboard is used impacts its organizational structure. Therefore, it is necessary to be able to explicitly explain this context, both to help users think about it and to capitalize on these usages for the purposes of reuse.

Participatory design methods are still not widely used in the field of learning analysis [1]. Yet they allow for a better expression of user needs and the exploration of design alternatives. Mackay and Fayard [34] qualify the use of technologies in this context as "co-adaptive" in the sense that design and use are transformed simultaneously. Knibbe [31] also emphasizes the learning dimension for participants in this type of design, and consequently its impact as a process of appropriation of digital tools by teachers.

To be effective, a participatory design method needs to be properly instrumented [50]. We have therefore selected a series of tools to help dashboard users to better express their expectations and needs.

According to Lucero et al. [33], the use of maps can strengthen collaboration, reinforce combinatorial design, and facilitate the exploration of possible linkages between users' decision needs and the numerous proposals for indicators and displays available in design workshops. This feature allows us to address the first two challenges identified.

The use of a board to explore and share the options selected at the design stage allows us to meet our need to express the context and capitalize on it [38]. To design

their design support tool Hallifax et al. [26] use the notion of design space [53] to identify the different alternatives and the structuring decisions of their design.

As in [46], we seek to combine efficient needs capture tools with a progressive collection of these needs to build and enrich design models. The first phase of the project is to collect requirements and interfaces via paper wireframes to facilitate the production of relevant displays, followed by a proposal of mockups in the form of executable interface mock-ups. We focus here on the collection phase, knowing that the automatic generation of dashboards from a model resulting from the requirements remains our main objective.

## *5.2. Support for the participatory design of learning analytics dashboard*

In this section, we present details of the design space for a learning dashboard. This design space allows us to identify the tools that support the capture of these needs. It also serves as a basis for harnessing the expression of requirements and reference dashboards. The second part of this section is devoted to the actual translation of this framework into an adapted framework.

### *5.2.1. Design space for learning analytics dashboard*

The primary benefit of making a dashboard available to the intended users stems from the need to provide them with data and a representation of this data that is useful and most importantly, meaningful to them. These dashboards must therefore best meet the desired decision-making objectives of the learning process. We conceived our design space around the five dimensions described in 5.1.2. After the preliminary stages of our needs capture process, we have identified several elements that allow us to further characterize these dimensions, listed in 5.2.1.

*"Who?" dimension.* Answering the question "Who" may not be so straightforward because, depending on the perspective, dashboards can involve several people. However, setting the learning dashboard in relation to a specific user is essential in order to qualify how the proposed observations will be exploited. The different possible roles are known: Teacher, Learner, Tutor, but also administrator, politician, researcher, etc.



| Dimensions | Elements  |
|------------|---|
| Who?       | User  |
| Why?       | Objective / Decision<br>Level of analysis<br>Point of interest<br>Horizon |
| What?      | Learning Context<br>Data<br>Data Collection<br>Observed tools             |
| How?       | Visualization<br>Organization<br>Shared                                   |
| When?      | Usage<br>Observation time   |

The definition of this role is obviously fundamental for the exploration of solutions, as in any interface design process.

*"Why?" dimension.* The aim here is to explain the usefulness of the dashboard and to clarify the purpose of its design. As we stated previously, we finally chose to focus on the decision rather than the need for observation. Following the exchanges gathered during the interviews, it seemed preferable for users to indicate their intention to use the dashboard rather than directly express what they want to see on it. Within our design space, participants are asked to choose a decision type from those provided by us or define a new type. This choice is pivotal to the entire dashboard design. We have identified 6 decision types related to the field of pedagogy:

**Adaptation** Adaptation refers to changing a pedagogical sequence or a complete teaching program in response to an observation (factual, following an evaluation, an observation). The teacher remains within the framework of his teaching.

**Evaluation** Evaluation consists of using the traces and the learning session to assign a mark, to validate skills or to make an assessment.

**Evolution** Evolution concerns amendments made to a sequence or teaching as part of a reinvestment or renewal for the following session.

**Planification** Observation is used at this point to reorganize the activities of the current learning situation.

**Remediation** Remediation is a phase that immediately follows a formative assessment and is designed to help a learner address his or her shortcomings. It is often instantiated by support and personalized assistance in addition to instruction.

**Monitoring (tracking)** Monitoring refers here to observing actors during their learning session without intervention. These are typically active pedagogy sessions, or projects. Afterwards, the idea is to make a synthesis and/or a feedback to the actors.

*"What?" dimension.* This dimension specifies the context in which decisions are made, and defines exactly what the decision is being made about. It includes seven elements to qualify what the observation focuses on: the learning context, the level of analysis, the point of interest, the horizon (or term), the data required, the way it is collected and the tools from which it is derived:

**Analysis level/scope/perimeter** A decision can be made for an individual student, the entire class, or at the school, department (in the geographical sense), academy, or intermediate level.

**Point of interest** The point of interest qualifies what the observations focus on: the people, their activity, their results, the context, the content, the exchanges.

**Horizon** The horizon makes it possible to specify in which term the decision action is situated in relation to the observations: short, medium or long term. This information allows us to categorize the dashboards according to strategic, tactical or operational levels [11].

**Learning context** Observation and decision making can occur in a classroom, online, or outside the classroom. It can also be mixed, combining different contexts: use of online tools in face-to-face teaching, exploration outside the classroom, and in-class use . . . Participants can also specify how learning is organized (individual, group, . . .).

**Data** Participants clarify the data users need to make their decision. Since each specific dashboard is tied to a specific situation, the participants are free to express their own opinions on the dashboard. These data are expressed in the form of indicators, i.e. resulting from possibly complex processes.

**Data collection** Depending on the decision-making time and the capacity of the tools, data collection must/can be done synchronously for immediate availability, or on the contrary asynchronously, i.e. the data are available after the learning process. This is identified as a source of discrepancy between the expressed need and the technical possibilities, so it is important to highlight it. The resolution of the discrepancy can then be dealt with as soon as possible.

**Observed tools** It is necessary to specify which tools are used, either hardware (tablet, smartphone, camera, etc.) or software (Digital Work Environment, MOOC platform, social network, etc.). ) during the learning process. These tools typically put constraints on data collection.

*"How?" dimension.* The "How" corresponds to the most visual part of the space of design, here we are asking participants to consider the two following points view. Firstly, it is important that they specify the most appropriate graphical representation to depict the data they need, they can select from a predefined list of representations or draw their own personal vision of the most suitable graphical representation. Then, they are invited to think about the spatial organization of the dashboard according to the support used (tablet, smartphone, computer, ect.).

"When?" *dimnension*. This dimension aims to capture different aspects of the decision-making process, mainly three aspects: the sharing with other users, the time of use, and the observation time on which the decision is based.

- *Sharing*: The dashboard can be either used personally by a user, or shared between different users for a collective use, for example between a teacher and his students.
- *Usage*: A dashboard may be necessary in real time with respect to the learning situation or a posteriori, depending on the type of decision.
- *Time of observation*: At this point, we want to know over which period of time the observation takes place, is it a day, a semester, a session, a sequence, ... This allows to orient the type of dashboard and to filter the indicators.

"What" *dimnension*.

5.2.2. *Design*

5.2.3. *Design*

5.2.4. *Design*

5.2.5. *Design*

## 6. Conclusion

## References

- [1] Troy D Abel and Michael Evans. Cross-disciplinary participatory & contextual design research: Creating a teacher dashboard application. *Interaction Design and Architecture(s) Journal - IxD&A*, (19):63–76, 2013.
- [2] Sakinah SJ Alhadad. Visualizing data to support judgement, inference, and decision making in learning analytics: Insights from cognitive psychology and visualization science. *Journal of Learning Analytics*, 5(2):60–85, 2018.
- [3] Carlos Prieto Alvarez, Roberto Martinez-Maldonado, and Simon Buckingham Shum. La-deck: A card-based learning analytics co-design tool. In *Proceedings*

of the tenth international conference on learning analytics & knowledge, pages 63–72, 2020.

- [4] Kimberly E Arnold and Matthew D Pistilli. Course signals at purdue: Using learning analytics to increase student success. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on learning analytics and knowledge*, pages 267–270. ACM, 2012.
- [5] Kimberly E Arnold, Steven Lonn, and Matthew D Pistilli. An exercise in institutional reflection: The learning analytics readiness instrument (lari). In *Proceedings of the fourth international conference on learning analytics and knowledge*, pages 163–167, 2014.
- [6] Liam Bannon, Jeffrey Bardzell, and Susanne Bødker. Introduction: Reimagining participatory design—emerging voices, 2018.
- [7] Liz Bennett and Sue Folley. Four design principles for learner dashboards that support student agency and empowerment. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 2019.
- [8] Robert Bodily and Katrien Verbert. Review of research on student-facing learning analytics dashboards and educational recommender systems. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 2017.
- [9] Robert Bodily and Katrien Verbert. Trends and issues in student-facing learning analytics reporting systems research. In *Proceedings of the seventh international learning analytics & knowledge conference*, pages 309–318, 2017.
- [10] Christy Boscardin, Kirkpatrick B Fergus, Bonnie Hellevig, and Karen E Hauer. Twelve tips to promote successful development of a learner performance dashboard within a medical education program. *Medical teacher*, 40(8):855–861, 2018.
- [11] Francis Brouns, Marta Elena Zorrilla Pantaleón, Pedro Solana González, Ángel Cobo Ortega, Marta Collantes Viaña, Carlos Rodríguez Hoyo, Mariana

- De Lima Silva, Carmen Marta-Lazo, José Antonio Gabelas Barroso, Pilar Arranz, et al. Eco d2. 5 learning analytics requirements and metrics report, 2015.
- [12] Rubiela Carrillo, Clément Renaud, Yannick Prié, and Élise Lavoué. Dashboard for monitoring student engagement in mind mapping activities. In *Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT), 2017 IEEE 17th International Conference on*, pages 433–437. IEEE, 2017.
- [13] Mohamed Amine Chatti, Anna Lea Dyckhoff, Ulrik Schroeder, and Hendrik Thüs. A reference model for learning analytics. *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 4(5-6):318–331, 2012.
- [14] Inès Dabbebi, Sébastien Iksal, Jean-Marie Gilliot, Madeth May, and Serge Garlatti. Towards adaptive dashboards for learning analytic: An approach for conceptual design and implementation. In *9th international conference on computer supported education (CSEDU 2017)*, pages 120–131, 2017.
- [15] PA Dearnley and Pam J Mayhew. In favour of system prototypes and their integration into the systems development cycle. *The Computer Journal*, 26(1):36–42, 1983.
- [16] Betsy DiSalvo, Jason Yip, Elizabeth Bonsignore, and Carl DiSalvo. *Participatory design for learning: Perspectives from practice and research*. Taylor & Francis, 2017.
- [17] Mollie Dollinger and Jason M Lodge. Co-creation strategies for learning analytics. In *Proceedings of the 8th international conference on learning analytics and knowledge*, pages 97–101, 2018.
- [18] Erik Duval. Attention please!: learning analytics for visualization and recommendation. In *the 1st International Conference on Learning Analytics*, 2011. ISBN 9781450310574.

- [19] Vanessa Echeverria, Roberto Martinez-Maldonado, Roger Granda, Katherine Chiluita, Cristina Conati, and Simon Buckingham Shum. Driving data storytelling from learning design. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge*, pages 131–140. ACM, 2018.
- [20] Mica R Endsley. *Designing for situation awareness: An approach to user-centered design*. CRC press, 2016.
- [21] Stephen Few. *Information Dashboard Design: The Effective Visual Communication of Data*. O’Reilly Media, Inc., 2006. ISBN 0596100167.
- [22] Stephen Few. *Information Dashboard Design: Displaying data for at-a-glance monitoring*. Analytics Press, 2013.
- [23] Stefano Fiorini, Adrienne Sewell, Mathew Bumbalough, Pallavi Chauhan, Linda Shepard, George Rehrey, and Dennis Groth. An application of participatory action research in advising-focused learning analytics. In *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge*, pages 89–96, 2018.
- [24] Dragan Gašević, Shane Dawson, and George Siemens. Let’s not forget: Learning analytics are about learning. *TechTrends*, 59(1):64–71, 2015.
- [25] Sergio Gutierrez-Santos, Eirini Geraniou, Darren Pearce-Lazard, and Alexandra Poulouvassilis. Design of teacher assistance tools in an exploratory learning environment for algebraic generalization. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 5(4):366–376, 2012.
- [26] Stuart Hallifax, Audrey Serna, Jean-Charles Marty, and Élise Lavoué. A design space for meaningful structural gamification. In *Extended Abstracts of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pages 1–6, 2018.
- [27] Kenneth Holstein, Bruce M. McLaren, and Vincent Aleven. Intelligent tutors as teachers’ aides: Exploring teacher needs for real-time analytics in blended classrooms. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Learning Analytics & Knowledge*,

*Knowledge Conference*, LAK '17, pages 257–266, New York, NY, USA, 2017. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-4870-6.

- [28] Kenneth Holstein, Gena Hong, Mera Tegene, Bruce M McLaren, and Vincent Aleven. The classroom as a dashboard: Co-designing wearable cognitive augmentation for k-12 teachers. In *Proceedings of the 8th international conference on learning Analytics and knowledge*, pages 79–88, 2018.
- [29] Joel A Howell, Lynne D Roberts, and Vincent O Mancini. Learning analytics messages: Impact of grade, sender, comparative information and message style on student affect and academic resilience. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 89:8–15, 2018.
- [30] Jeonghyun Kim, Il Hyun Jo, and Yeonjeong Park. Effects of learning analytics dashboard: analyzing the relations among dashboard utilization, satisfaction, and learning achievement. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 17(1):13–24, 2015. ISSN 1876407X. doi: 10.1007/s12564-015-9403-8.
- [31] Cédric Knibbe. *Concevoir avec des technologies émergentes pour la construction conjointe des pratiques et des artefacts : apports d’une méthodologie participative à l’innovation technologique et pédagogique*. Theses, Conservatoire national des arts et metiers - CNAM, December 2016. URL <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-01635882>.
- [32] Hoo Yong Leng, Noris Binti Mohd Norowi, Siti Aisah Binti Atan, Azrul Hazri Jantan, and Rahmita Wirza OK Rahmat. Designing a natural musical interface for a virtual musical kompang using user-centered approach. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction and User Experience in Indonesia, CHIuXiD’18*, pages 38–42, 2018.
- [33] Andrés Lucero, Peter Dalsgaard, Kim Halskov, and Jacob Buur. Designing with cards. In *Collaboration in creative design*, pages 75–95. Springer, 2016.



- [34] Wendy Mackay and Anne-Laure Fayard. Radicalement nouveau et néanmoins familier: les strips papiers revus par la réalité augmentée. *Actes des journées IHM*, 97, 1997.
- [35] Janet R McColl-Kennedy, Stephen L Vargo, Tracey S Dagger, Jillian C Sweeney, and Yasmin van Kasteren. Health care customer value cocreation practice styles. *Journal of service research*, 15(4):370–389, 2012.
- [36] Tamara Munzner. *Visualization analysis and design*. CRC press, 2014.
- [37] Scott Nicholson. A user-centered theoretical framework for meaningful gamification. *Games+ Learning+ Society*, 8(1):223–230, 2012.
- [38] Alexander Osterwalder and Yves Pigneur. *Business model generation: a handbook for visionaries, game changers, and challengers*. John Wiley & Sons, 2010.
- [39] Yeonjeong Park and Il-Hyun Jo. Development of the learning analytics dashboard to support students’ learning performance. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 21(1):110–133, 2015.
- [40] V Podgorelec and S Kuhar. Taking advantage of education data: Advanced data analysis and reporting in virtual learning environments. *Elektronika ir Elektrotehnika*, 114(8):111–116, 2011.
- [41] Rita Prestigiacomo, Roger Hadgraft, Jane Hunter, Lori Locker, Simon Knight, Elise van den Hoven, and Roberto Martinez-Maldonado. Learning-centred translucence: An approach to understand how teachers talk about classroom data. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Learning Analytics & Knowledge*, pages 100–105, 2020.
- [42] Rita Prestigiacomo, Jane Hunter, Simon Knight, Roberto Martinez-Maldonado, and Lori Lockyer. Data in practice: A participatory approach to understanding pre-service teachers’ perspectives. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 36(6):107–119, 2020.

- [43] Paul Prinsloo and Sharon Slade. Big data, higher education and learning analytics: Beyond justice, towards an ethics of care. In *Big data and learning analytics in higher education*, pages 109–124. Springer, 2017.
- [44] Alejandro Ramos-Soto, Manuel Lama, Borja Vázquez-Barreiros, Alberto Bugarín, and M Mucientes S Barro. Towards textual reporting in learning analytics dashboards. In *2015 IEEE 15th International Conference on Advanced Learning Technologies (ICALT)*, pages 260–264. IEEE, 2015.
- [45] Gabriel Reimers and Anna Neovesky. Student focused dashboards. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Computer Supported Education-Volume 1*, pages 399–404. SCITEPRESS-Science and Technology Publications, Lda, 2015.
- [46] José Matías Rivero, Julián Grigera, Gustavo Rossi, Esteban Robles Luna, Francisco Montero, and Martin Gaedke. Mockup-driven development: providing agile support for model-driven web engineering. *Information and Software Technology*, 56(6):670–687, 2014.
- [47] Lynne D Roberts, Joel A Howell, and Kristen Seaman. Give me a customizable dashboard: Personalized learning analytics dashboards in higher education. *Technology, Knowledge and Learning*, 22(3):317–333, 2017.
- [48] Alexandra Ruiz, William J Giraldo, and Jose L Arciniegas. Participatory design method: Co-creating user interfaces for an educational interactive system. In *Proceedings of the XIX International Conference on Human Computer Interaction*, pages 1–8, 2018.
- [49] Elizabeth B.-N. Sanders and Pieter Jan Stappers. Co-creation and the new landscapes of design. *CoDesign*, 4(1):5–18, 2008. doi: 10.1080/15710880701875068.
- [50] Elizabeth B-N Sanders, Eva Brandt, and Thomas Binder. A framework for organizing the tools and techniques of participatory design. In *Proceedings of the 11th biennial participatory design conference*, pages 195–198, 2010.

- [51] Douglas Schuler and Aki Namioka. *Participatory design: Principles and practices*. CRC Press, 1993.
- [52] B. A. Schwendimann, M. J. Rodríguez-Triana, A. Vozniuk, L. P. Prieto, M. S. Boroujeni, A. Holzer, D. Gillet, and P. Dillenbourg. Perceiving learning at a glance: A systematic literature review of learning dashboard research. *IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies*, 10(1):30–41, Jan 2017. ISSN 1939-1382.
- [53] Mary Shaw. The role of design spaces. *IEEE software*, 29(1):46–50, 2011.
- [54] Kin Wai Michael Siu. Users’ creative responses and designers’ roles. *Design Issues*, 19(2):64–73, 2003.
- [55] Sharon Slade and Paul Prinsloo. Learning analytics: Ethical issues and dilemmas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 57(10):1510–1529, 2013.
- [56] Clay Spinuzzi. The methodology of participatory design. *Technical communication*, 52(2):163–174, 2005.
- [57] Christina M Steiner, Michael D Kickmeier-Rust, and Dietrich Albert. Learning analytics and educational data mining: An overview of recent techniques. *Learning Analytics for and in Serious Games*, 6:61–75, 2014.
- [58] Simone Taffe. ”the hybrid designer/end-user: Revealing paradoxes in co-design”. *Design Studies*, 40:39–59, 2015.
- [59] Russ Unger and Brad Nunnally. *Designing the Conversation: Techniques for Successful Facilitation*. New Riders, 2013.
- [60] Katrien Verbert, Erik Duval, Joris Klerkx, Sten Govaerts, and José Luis Santos. Learning analytics dashboard applications. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 2013.
- [61] Olga Viberg, Mathias Hatakka, Olof Bälter, and Anna Mavroudi. The current landscape of learning analytics in higher education. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 89:98–110, 2018.

- [62] I Vilpola. A method for improving erp impementation success by the priniples and process of user-centered design “. enterprise information systems (eis), vol. 2, issue 1, 2008.
- [63] Karel Vredenberg, Scott Isensee, and Carol Righi. *User-Centered Design: An Integrated Approach with Cdrom*. Prentice Hall PTR, 2001.
- [64] Alyssa Friend Wise, Jovita Maria Vytasek, Simone Hausknecht, and Yuting Zhao. Developing learning analytics design knowledge in the “middle space”: The student tuning model and align design framework for learning analytics use. *Online Learning*, 20(2), 2016.
- [65] Françeska Xhakaj, Vincent Aleven, and Bruce M McLaren. How teachers use data to help students learn: Contextual inquiry for the design of a dashboard. In *European Conference on Technology Enhanced Learning*, pages 340–354. Springer, 2016.
- [66] Françeska Xhakaj, Vincent Aleven, and Bruce M McLaren. Effects of a teacher dashboard for an intelligent tutoring system on teacher knowledge, lesson planning, lessons and student learning. In *European conference on technology enhanced learning*, pages 315–329. Springer, 2017.
- [67] Yesom Yoo, Hyeyun Lee, Il-Hyun Jo, and Yeonjeong Park. Educational dashboards for smart learning: Review of case studies. In *Emerging Issues in Smart Learning*, pages 145–155. Springer, 2015.