

Formative Evaluation Report

Formative evaluation of the “Course Tagging” Instructional Materials as a part of the Shared Competencies Project (Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Syracuse University)

Prepared for:
IDE 641 - Techniques in Educational Evaluation
Dr. Robert Tornberg

Prepared by:
Jacques Safari Mwayaona
Patricia Diane Mouboua
Violetta Soboleva

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our special thanks of gratitude to our professor Dr. Tornberg who helped us not only to understand the Evaluation process and its importance for Instructional Designers, but also contributed to our project directly: helped to find the Formative Evaluation users and took part in the project himself as a project target audience (SU Professor). We are very thankful to him.

1. Introduction	3
2. Overview of Instructional Materials	3
2.1 Status and scope	3
2.2 Audience Demographics	4
2.3 The URL for the materials	4
3. Formative Evaluation Framework	5
4. Expert Review	6
4.1 Goals for Expert Review	6
4.2 Expert Description	6
4.3 Expert Review Questions	6
4.4 Evaluation context and methods	6
4.5 Evaluation tools	7
4.6 Review Summary	7
5. One-to-one Evaluation	8
5.1 Goals for User Evaluation	8
5.2 User Description	8
5.3 Context and Tool Description	9
5.4 Data Summary	9
5.4.1. Data Collection Methods	9
5.4.2. Data Collected summary	9
6.Recommended Revisions	10
7. Self-Evaluation of Formative Evaluation	11
8. References	12
9. Appendix	13
9.1. Expert Logs	13
9.1.1. Expert Questions	13
9.1.2 Expert Review Log	14
9.1.3 Expert Review Close Questions Log	15
9.2. User Logs	18
9.2.1 User A	18
9.2.2 User B	22

1. Introduction

In order to meet the Middle States Commission on Higher Education accreditation and help students identify common connections among the variety of learning experiences in Syracuse University, the University Senate approved six Shared Competencies in December 2018. As a part of this Shared Competencies project, the University Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Competencies asked the faculty working on the university programs to map their learning outcomes to the Shared Competencies during AY 2019-20 and AY 2020-21. Throughout the AY 2021-2022, the university aims to apply a course tagging process to the university and map this strategy to the course level.

Course tagging project opens an opportunity for collaboration about course design and curricula and helps the university to reach a campus-wide set of undergraduate student learning goals. Throughout the learning process, undergraduate students develop different competencies and experiences. Using the course tagging technique, faculty can help students to connect dots between these experiences. Faculty must complete the process of course tagging by September 1, 2022, using the materials, prepared by the University Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Shared Competencies & the Office of Academic Affairs.

2. Overview of Instructional Materials

2.1 Status and scope

For the formative evaluation the Course Tagging Instructions as a part of the Shared Competencies project at Syracuse University have been chosen. The materials analyzed include a video, toolkit and website supplements for additional use and form submission.

The Syracuse University Senate started the implementation of the Shared Competencies program due to undergraduate students difficulties in choosing courses for the major. Shared Competencies program serves to help them to connect their various learning experiences from their major degree, liberal arts, and other electives using a common framework.

The materials are currently in the preliminary release status. The implementation of the Shared Competencies is now in progress, and they will be visible for students only in long term perspective, by 2024. At the same time, right now the main audience of the Course Tagging Instructions should be reviewed both by an expert (Instructional Designer) and users (Faculty Members) to verify its effectiveness.

Shared Competencies Timeline

Full Implementation of the Shared Competencies in 2024	
2013-17	✓ RESEARCHING GEN. ED. APPROACHES
2018	✓ COMMITMENT TO INTEGRATIVE LEARNING GOALS/SHARED COMPETENCIES APPROACH
2018-23	✘ PLANNING/PILOT TESTING
2019-21	✓ PROGRAM MAPPING
2021-23	✘ COURSE TAGGING
2023	□ TAG PUBLICATION
2022 onward	✘ LEARNING OUTCOMES REVIEW

Note. Timeline of the Shared Competencies project by IEA

All the resources IEA developed are available on their website, and, moreover, the workshop can be requested if the current instruction appears insufficient. However, in order to minimize such cases, review of instructional materials is an essential part of the instructional design process.

The instructional materials consist of the toolkit with step-by-step instruction and the video with more explanation and additional help to understand the instruction. Both of the materials can be found on the web. By the end of the instructions, faculty/staff are supposed to deliver the Course Tag Reflection form that includes the revision of the course objectives and tagging of the courses in accordance with the instructional materials.

2.2 Audience Demographics

Learners of this project are faculty/staff members who teach courses in different departments of Syracuse University. By the beginning of the next academic year, all the professors have to submit the Tagged Courses.

In order to understand how to do it, they will use the Shared Competencies Course Toolkit for Existing Courses, use an opportunity to join Course Tagging Working Sessions for additional faculty support in integrating the Shared Competencies into the curriculum, or watch the video prepared by IEA, Provost Faculty Fellow for Shared Competencies and High Impact Practices.

2.3 The URL for the materials

- The website with general information on Course Tagging:

<https://effectiveness.syr.edu/shared-competencies/course-tagging/>

- Pdf toolkit on Course Tagging:

<https://effectiveness.syr.edu/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Course-Tagging-Toolkit.pdf>

- Video-instructions on course tagging:

<https://effectiveness.syr.edu/shared-competencies/shared-competencies-pd/>

3. Formative Evaluation Framework

The evaluation team will conduct a formative evaluation utilizing two methods: subject matter expert evaluation and one-to-one user evaluation.

The expert review will help the team to understand how accurate the content of the instructional materials is; whether this information is up to date and easy to understand to expedite the learning process effectively for the best practical tasks achievement. The expert review method reveals the materials' strengths and weaknesses, which allow the University Senate Ad Hoc Committee to fend off the risk of designing inaccurate and superfluous materials for the project. The questions for an expert are available in the Appendix [9.1.1](#).

The one-to-one user evaluation will provide information about the instructional materials' usability, clarity, and value. It will also depict the feasibility of the project and learners' motivation. The questions prepared for the users are presented in the Appendix [9.2.1](#).

The evaluation team will collect data on the ease of understanding the content of the toolkit and video and to what extent the materials are valuable and useful for the faculty (learners). As the formative evaluation includes a specific sequence of questions for each method, several other questions could be answered regarding this.

The evaluation was conducted in person to help capture all feedback including those that are not spoken or written (such as facial expressions) from the user and expert. To increase the interactivity and keep the user comfortable, the evaluation team prepared mixed instructions resources : printed and digital. The conference room was neat and equipped with all necessary equipment in addition to the snacks proposed by the team.

The evaluation was composed in three major parts: printed materials (the toolkit) exploration, the online tutorial and the questions-answers. All the questions were composed based on the objectives and were printed in advance. The user and the evaluator have to follow that. To capture more feelings and impressions, the evaluation is designed to encourage the users

to pause the video any time to make comments and impressions. The comments made are logged in a document. Those are the standards and criteria used to conduct the evaluation.

The scope of the formative evaluation is discussed in the section [2.1](#) of this document.

The evaluation team might explore the fidelity aspect of the project implementation, whether the purpose or step-by-step practical tasks asked for learners align with the instructional goals of the materials.

4. Expert Review

4.1 Goals for Expert Review

The expert review phase is one of the four formative evaluation phases proposed by Tessmer(2013), whose purpose is to identify, locate and remove errors on the learning materials and provide the feedback on how effective the instruction would be (Calchoun, Sahay and Wilson, 2020). Stemming from the above, the goals of the expert review on this report are:

- to review the accuracy of the content;
- to check whether the information provided is up-to-date;
- to review the visual appeal, formatting, user-friendliness of the presentation.

4.2 Expert Description

The Subject Matter Expert is Yuri Pavlov, a doctoral student at Syracuse university. He has been working in the Instructional Design field since 2016, preparing seminars for his Belorussian colleagues. At the same time, after his graduation from IDD&E Master's degree he

was working for the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment (IEA), where the instructional materials for this evaluation project were prepared.

During his career he has taught several courses in the IDD&E department. He specializes in translation, linguistics, instructional design, instruction's assessment, and learning theory in general. With all his experience of working in IEA and studying background, he is a great candidate for the content review of the instructional materials.

4.3 Expert Review Questions

Given the Expert's qualification and the objectives of this interview the questions were split in two categories: to identify the problem and suggest following revisions. An Expert was asked about the accuracy and depth of the content for intended audience, visual and aural quality of the instruction, delivery method, instructional design principles and time spent on the instruction. The full list of questions is available in the Appendix [9.1.1](#).

4.4 Evaluation context and methods

An expert review was scheduled one week before the meeting time via Telegram chat. The review was conducted in person. Before the session started, the evaluator explained the purpose of the review, the status materials, and the evaluation method. The team decided to use a technique like the Think Aloud Protocol. The expert was asked to watch the video on Share competencies at first. Whenever he had an idea or a question or other comment about anything, he stopped the video and mentioned his thoughts or questions to the evaluator.

At the beginning of the evaluation session, the expert received the toolkit as a guide and gave his consent to the evaluator to record the session and use it for data collection. The expert

was actively engaged in carefully examining the instructional materials while watching the video and reading the toolkit, then commenting on the delivery method, the content, and the instructional strategies. After that, he was asked a series of questions to explain the previously mentioned information. The expert answered all questions in a one-hour interview. He had given donuts to encourage him- the expert was quite detailed in providing his understanding of the materials and other comments about the evaluation questions.

Apart from taking notes regarding the main goals, the evaluator observed the expert's reaction and recorded everything in the log. The log is presented in the appendix [9.1.2](#) of the report. The questionnaire with the expert's answers is provided in the appendix [9.1.3](#) of the report.

4.5 Evaluation tools

For this face-to-face interview a data recording tool has been prepared - Google Recorder. This tool has been chosen as the best mobile recorder that automatically creates captions from the Google Neural Networking System and uploads them to Google Drive. This tool is, however, available only for the Google Pixel cell users, but fortunately one person from the evaluation team has such a phone and proposed this recording tool for the project.

Also, for the interview all the paper-based instructional materials have been printed for an expert, so they could make notes during the evaluation, interview questions also have been printed.

For the video presentation a conference room in the IDD&E Department has been used, as it is equipped by a big TV where the video was presented. The expert could make pauses

during the video at any time in case of having any comments. The expert review logs can be found in Appendix [9.1](#).

4.6 Review Summary

The overall feedback of the instruction material presented is very positive however there are some points where the expert has given negative feedback. The expert describes the accuracy of the instruction material as perfect and rated with a 10/10 mark. The elements that accompany the instruction, such as the Qualtrics form for submission, examples and printed materials, made the instruction more richer and understandable. Beside that, the experts acknowledged that these elements made more complete and clear the instruction that there's nothing to be added to be complete. The completeness of the instruction in a very short time is very time saving for everyone (including professors) who would've spent a huge amount of time in a seminar or workshop to try to understand the content presented in such a short and effective way.

There are, however, some parts where the work has not been very effective. Among the points that the expert found not effective are : the visuals in the video and the materials that are being poorly mentioned in the presentation. The expert praises the presentation audio but slams the graphics which are not attractive. They are too static and not so rich that he could easily get distracted by anything around. Moreover, mentioning documents or pages of the toolkits or any other document while instruction running and without previously telling those readings will be needed to understand the instruction is a little disturbing. The expert said he felt lost for some time. For example, mentioning the instructional strategies and curriculum mapping without telling where to find these materials or letting him know that these are required reading at the

beginning makes it hard to follow the following section because the brain spends some minutes trying to make links.

In conclusion, the expert found the instruction and all the materials very interesting and effective despite some elements that need to be improved such as the visuals in the videos and linking additional reading materials. The instructional materials are judged by the expert as effective, time saving and complete.

5. One-to-one Evaluation

5.1 Goals for User Evaluation

The goal of one-to-one evaluation is to verify the effectiveness of instructional materials for the target audience - faculty members. The evaluation conducted was aimed to gain professors perspective on the quality of the instruction provided, whether all of the instructional materials are helpful, whether the video aligns with the toolkit, the effectiveness of the speaker, media resources used, and overall completeness of the instruction towards its purpose - faculty's ability to tag the courses and submit the tag reflections.

5.2 User Description

As users for the Course Tagging project were chosen knowledgeable professors from the school of education, IDD&E department with rich experience of working with different ages and also a background in evaluation. The reason behind this choice is additional contribution to the instructional evaluation and a deeper understanding of educational principles. Experienced educators are the most fastidious category of users, as they know how things have to be done.

When a new requirement (Course Tagging) is being introduced, the presenter needs to deserve their respect. Therefore, if any errors are made when introducing the content, the community of educators will not be sympathetic.

User A is currently an Evaluation Consultant, working at the Office of Professional Research and Development at The School of Education, Syracuse University, and he is also associated with The R/E/D (Research, Evaluation, and Development) Group, and Laura Payne-Bourcy Consulting. Additionally, he teaches Evaluation Studies in the Department of Instructional Design, Development, and Evaluation at Syracuse University. During his career he had a 40-year experience as a Jewish educational leader, lecturer and a mentor.

User B is an expert consultant with a rich experience in program research, evaluation, and professional development, community and human service organizations, and PK-12 education. For the last 23 years he has been working as a Director in an Office of Professional Research/Development and a Research professor. Since 2004, he has also been a Founding Partner/PI Consultant in a R/E/D Group. During his career he has taught several graduate level courses at Syracuse University.

5.3 Context and Tool Description

The context and tools were the same for both users, therefore, it is going to be described in one section. The interview with both users was scheduled over the Outlook mail and planned to take place in the IDD&E Conference room as it has the required equipment to show the video instructions. The users were informed prior to the meeting that he needed to evaluate the instructional materials developed by IEA and that it would take approximately one hour.

The paper materials were printed for a more comfortable use while watching the instructions. Questions were read by the users before starting to work with the instructional materials to understand what is going to be asked and what to pay attention to.

Both users approved the audio and video recording for a detailed analysis of the body language and their overall reaction on the instructional materials. As an audio recording tool Google Recorder was used due to its extension feature of automatic caption creation. For the video recording, one person from the evaluation team was making the video using a standard app for video recording while users were familiarizing themselves with instructions and commenting on them. The conditions were the same for both users, the content was presented in the same order from the benefits for the faculty/students.

5.4 Data Summary

5.4.1. Data Collection Methods

Data was collected using observation and feedbacks to questions that were asked to users. Additionally, we may have captured comments of the users which were not guided. Users were encouraged to pause the video anytime they had an observation to make a comment. All these constituted the data that are described in this report and especially in the following sections.

5.4.2. Data Collected summary

Both users have praised the instructional materials and the overall rating is very positive. Based on our observations, the interactions with the instructional materials both printed and

digital was satisfactory and rich. Users were a little bit confused at the beginning when interacting only with the printed materials until they watched the video.

After watching the video, all users reported to be very satisfied with the instructional materials, and increased understanding of the printed materials as well. During the listening session, they could come up with tags for their own classes and they reported an increased confidence at the end of the session.

Responding to the questions, all users agree that the training is beneficial to both faculty and students, and it was very effective for them since they were able to create tags for their own classes during the evaluation session. They rated the instruction as very clear and complete though the user A found that the introduction section of the video was too long and too detailed. The two users have raised one problem with the video part, where the voice was referring to a little different content than what was showing in the video and the link to reading materials was done poorly. They all suggested that to be improved.

The overall feedback was very positive and the participants to the evaluation were satisfied and confident that they learned useful skills to make tags of their own classes. They also find the instruction very useful.

6.Recommended Revisions

Both users and the expert have suggested some minor improvements to the instructional materials. They have been a little uneasy with the presentation in terms of the text that was not matching with what the voice was saying, giving their brains some extra work of processing and linking the voice to the content.

The expert suggested increasing visuals and interactivity in the video to capture the attention of the reader and the last page of the printed materials to be removed.

In more detail, his revisions were the following:

- To decrease the cognitive load by aligning the video with the audio;
- To increase the level of interactivity in a video, change slides more often, and, therefore, decrease the cognitive load by putting more information in more slides;
- To revise the information in the Toolkit and eliminate the unnecessary parts so as not to confuse the users (for example, the last page that is not related to the instruction directly and not being referenced at all - High Impact Practices).

The two users found the presenter too teacherless where user A finds the speaker too detailed, especially in the introduction. User A said he was feeling like he was being taught by a school teacher, not being explained a piece of instruction “on an equal footing”. User B finds the presenter’s voice a little aggressive and lacking humor.

Therefore, the users’ revisions were the following:

- For future instructions, work on the intonation of the presenter not to alienate users of the instructions;
- To revise the information in the toolkit and simplify/eliminate some of the pieces (for example, Conceptual Framework (p.4) or High Impact Practices (p.13));
- To revise the slides and/or language to make them aligned in order not to confuse the users with different language being used. (For example, the presenter says - “you should ask yourself these 4 questions” while on slides there are no questions).

7. Self-Evaluation of Formative Evaluation (Violetta Soboleva)

It has been an interesting project for me, as a person who likes qualitative research, conducting interviews and asking people's opinion on something. I believe that I have done my best during this project and learned a lot about evaluation and how to do it correctly. Asking questions and making experts/users speak was not difficult, even though I had thought I would be. With the background of an ESL teacher, I had to make questions for students in such a way that it would make them speak as much as possible. I honestly didn't think that such a skill would be helpful during the evaluation. It was a little challenging with no established networks to find professors that would be willing to participate, but Dr. T helped us to find users for the project.

I'm a little disappointed by my teammates and their attitude both to the interviews and transcripts. Even though they have done fair work on the project report in general, I would not allow myself to be late to any of the interviews, but at the same time one person from our team was always late (not the same person) which for me is a marker of disrespect to the expert/user time. Also, I was using the Google Recorder which is the best in terms of transcripts, but it doesn't capture 100% words accurately. Knowing that one team member didn't correct the user's log, and even after discussing the necessity of having a clear transcript, they didn't change the transcript before submission.

So, these minor problems I experienced working with a team made me understand that whether I was not a good leader for the project to escape these problems, or the team members don't suit my level of responsibility. Or maybe both.

Working in teams has always been a challenge for me, a person who prefers more control and solitude, however, I understand that this skill should be inevitably practiced and try to find room for personal improvement. Hope you like our project.

8. References

Calhoun, C., Sahay, S., & Wilson, M. (2020). *Instructional Design Evaluation*. In J. K.

McDonald & R. E. West, *Design for Learning: Principles, Processes, and Praxis*. EdTech Books.

Retrieved from https://edtechbooks.org/id/instructional_design_evaluation

Tessmer, M. (2013). *Planning and conducting formative evaluations*. Routledge.

9. Appendix

9.1. Expert Logs

9.1.1. Expert Questions

Questions to Identify the problem	To suggest revisions
1. What do you think about the accuracy of the content? Is it accurate and up to date?	If something is unclear, what would you change?
2. Does the content contain sufficient depth of information related to the needs of learners/users?	What do you think would make the content deeper?
3. Were the directions in the training in the toolkit clear?	What parts need to be rewritten?
4. Is aural and visual quality adequate?	What would you change?
5. Was there any section that seemed too difficult? Too easy?	Do you have any suggestions for improving the materials?
6. Do the instruction materials respect the principles of effective	What changes do you suggest ?

learning ?	
7. Given the audience, do you think the delivery method is appropriate?	Are there any other delivery methods that would work better?
8. Is the time allotted for the training appropriate?	Would you shorten it or make it longer? Why?
9. What was the biggest problem with the instruction?	If you could change three thing in this training, what would it be?
10. Is the instruction complete?	What would you add or remove?

9.1.2 Expert Review Log

Part of the instruction commented	Expert's comments	Evaluator's notes
Objectives presented on the website	“I think the language is complicated quite honestly...”, “If every bullet point was like the first one - simple, I would enjoy it a little more.”, “It is done easier for faculty but they made it complex for students...”	While looking at the objectives for students
Video (2:08)	“Why would tagging address the problem to me? That's a disconnect. If the problem is students, I don't see how it's all related.”	While trying to understand the motivation for faculty members

Video (5:12)	“The instructions are great, so far I like it.”	After the first step of tagging has been introduced
Video (10:11)	“That was my favorite part. I've never seen, I've never seen people do this. I love that. I think that was a nice way to reduce the cognitive load.”	The video instructor suggested that the listeners take a break and come back to the video when they are ready.
Video (paused)	“Before, she mentioned “did you answer yes to all four questions?” I think that was poorly done because by the time she was narrating already forgot what the four questions were, maybe that was those questions pertaining to those four points that were made on the slides. But again I didn't make that connection. A revision of these four questions would help me a lot because I already forgot what she was asking!”	<p>He was referring to this slide: (7:37 of the video)</p>  <p>STEP 2: Picking Your Tags</p> <p>Four things to think about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Course learning objectives and the Shared Competencies framing language 2. Grade apportionment (30% or more related to the Shared Competency?) 3. Instructional strategies. 4. Feedback mechanisms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The course has all of that!": THAT's a TAG! • “The course doesn't do all of that!": Consider making some revisions! <p>Where the slide was showing 4 steps, while the instructor was asking 4 questions that help to choose a tag.</p>
When the video ended	“Generally I think the material is easy to understand because as the audience is faculty obviously and so it's super easy for faculty to understand it was very detailed overall.”	Emotions right after the video finishes

Examples of submitted tags	“I like the idea of examples especially, because some people can look at it, and it's just two pages, sometimes almost one. With these examples, the anxiety about tags decreases.”	He was referencing to the availability to look at IEA website and find submitted tags examples
----------------------------	---	--

9.1.3 Expert Review Close Questions Log

Questions to Identify the problem	To suggest revisions	Expert's answers
1. What do you think about the accuracy of the content? Is it accurate and up to date?	If something is unclear, what would you change?	Pretty accurate, pretty detailed. The materials that are printed and the examples that you showed me with the Qualtrics and everything - it all aligns. Everything makes sense together. Nothing to change in terms of accuracy, 10/10.
2. Does the content contain sufficient depth of information related to the needs of learners/users?	What do you think would make the content deeper?	It's pretty detailed. Even though it's just 20 minutes if you think about it, they cover everything. It's a great supplement to the printed materials. I don't really know what would make it more detailed to me. Because all the questions that I had in the beginning - that I don't understand the 30%, I don't understand this and that - eventually they were responded to later. I think it was very thought out, done and presented. I really cannot think of anything that

		would make it deeper. I'm supposed to critique, but it's 10/10.
3. Were the directions in the training in the toolkit clear?	What parts need to be rewritten?	<p>I remember there was something on the website in the beginning about the Qualtrics. There were slides with arrows showing that this is where you can submit, so I think that they were clear.</p> <p>I don't think any parts need to be written, however, one thing would help me. I remember "If you go to that site, you would go to the Qualtrics form. I am more visual, and because the movie was pretty static. And I want it to be more dynamic, so the screenshot of the Qualtrics form would help, like "What does it look like?"</p> <p>What also would help me is some tools to grab more attention - a more dynamic screen during the presentation, like a, b, c, d changing, not one presentation slide for several minutes.</p>
4. Is aural and visual quality adequate?	What would you change?	<p>In terms of the pace of speech, I liked it, it was easy to follow. Audio was easy to follow as well, all the pauses, all the brakes, pace of speech again were very easy to follow, so I didn't have any problems understanding the material. The visual part, to me it was mostly what I previously said, it needs to be a little bit more exciting. It looks like "Why is it not a podcast? Why is it a video?" It's a very relevant piece of information, but the visual part... It's easy for me to cut out to get my gaze away from the screen. Just not enough visual sequencing, I would</p>

		say. Audio would be 10/10, but visual part 5/10 but because it's bad, just because it's not enough.
5. Was there any section that seemed too difficult? Too easy?	Do you have any suggestions for improving the materials?	<p>Picking tags is such an important section where I was a little lost but, again, because there were only a few points on the screen, and as I said she said "these 4 questions" - when the questions were not even presented on the slide, so I didn't make that connection. It was sometimes difficult because of too little information on the screen while audio was going on, so I could not encode it properly.</p> <p>At the same time it was kind of fun how she was referring to the toolkit, like "look at page 9" where I could see some parts and follow, she makes an effective use of materials. Because, otherwise, if it wasn't for that, I would never read it. So, when I know that I have to be looking at the document, that's great. However, in the beginning she said "you can look at the document", while she could better say "you need to look at the document because I will be referring to it" - it would motivate people more.</p> <p>The suggestion fully relates to the previous section where I already mentioned the possible revisions, 8/10.</p>
6. Do the instruction	What changes do you	Yes and no. The good part is that there were portions of information and there was a pause in

<p>materials respect the principles of effective learning?</p>	<p>suggest ?</p>	<p>the middle - it was great and aligned with the basic behavioristic principles. In terms of “No” part I am referring to the basic cognitivism principle, to cognitive load. When one channel is audio, the other channel is video, they should strongly align with each other. The text on the slides used different language compared to what’s been said. So, first I’m trying to read, because there’s text, while there's audio that doesn’t quite align with it, and you have to create two separate channels, which was quite challenging for me.</p> <p>The video was quite motivational, given the audience. If I was the faculty, I would think, “really? They want to waste my time on that?”, but there were certain keywords that were successful, because professors would like to think of themselves as those who provide richness to students, so it grasps the motivational aspect, so I think it was powerful.</p> <p>The suggestion would be to shorten the text and just talk, or put on the slides the same text you say and reduce the cognitive load, 9/10.</p>
<p>7. Given the audience, do you think the delivery method is appropriate?</p>	<p>Are there any other delivery methods that would work better?</p>	<p>Jokingly sticking kind of like professors in the face if professors give lectures and nothing else, please have some 20 minutes of lecture. Right? At the same time, it was not a lecture alone. SHe was referencing back and forth from the video to the toolkit. I don’t know what this technique is called, but it has been really effective. To me, I was almost in the class with the handouts that I followed. So, I think it is appropriate. I like this multiple ways of</p>

		<p>presenting materials.</p> <p>I think this is actually the fastest way to do it, so I'm not sure there is something that would make it better. Wait... I'm looking at the toolkit, and the only thing I'd suggest is to add the section number to the header to help navigating through the pages, some visual communication signs.</p> <p>One more thing is the last page of the toolkit. I'm familiar with the High Impact Status, but what does it have to do with the toolkit itself? It's not being referenced, it's just there for what? Everything should be purposeful, and I don't understand why this particular page should be there. But the rest is fine.</p>
<p>8. Is the time allotted for the training appropriate?</p>	<p>Would you shorten it or make it longer? Why?</p>	<p>At first I thought so, but actually no. I think that's actually shorter than, for example, if it was a workshop. Imagine, if it was a workshop, it would take an hour and half at least and here you have a 19 min of very distilled information presented with an opportunity for pause, especially if you don't have time to do a workshop. So what it does - it saves the time for faculty, and I think the training is appropriate. So, the density of information - it was amazing: they covered everything, referenced everything they needed, showed important information and the opportunity to have a workshop if somebody needed it. SI I think it is appropriate considering that the workshop would take much more time. So, I think the faculty will actually say thank</p>

		you. The answer is 9/10
9. What was the biggest problem with the instruction?	If you could change three things in this training, what would they be?	<p>1) Video sequence is number one for me because I was always distracted, I looked elsewhere</p> <p>2) There is a need to be a sendway to the things that they mention but they don't really talk about it. For example, there was a mention of the instructional strategies and curriculum mapping. People who've been here for many years know what it is, but curriculum mapping is new, from 2018, so a new faculty wouldn't understand the reference. My point is that there should be a resource that would say "if you're not familiar with the curriculum mapping..." instead of High Impact Status in the end of the toolkit for example.</p> <p>3) Review at the end of what's being studied: "in this video we did xyz...", however, it would add to the length, so I'm not sure about this one.</p>
10. Is the instruction complete?	What would you add or remove?	The way it is - it's complete. All the questions I had were answered. I wouldn't add anything, except for the things I suggested in a question #9. The only thing that was odd - was the last page of the toolkit. I don't understand why it was there.

Overall score is 9.25.

9.2. User Logs

9.2.1 User Questions:

Questions to Identify the problem	User's answers
Do you find the benefits of using Course Tagging motivating/efficient for yourself?	
Was there any part of the instruction that required more explanation for you?	
Do the examples relate to your own experience?	
Were there any really difficult/too easy parts?	
Did you feel challenged or bored during the instructional tasks?	
Is the information presented in instructional materials complete for you to finish the task?	
Is there any information missing, required to complete the task?	
Did the instructor speak clearly?	
Is the video lesson too long? Would it be better to break it into smaller pieces?	
To what extent does the toolkit help to understand the video? Are there any parts you find	

odd?	
If you could change three things in the training what would you change?	

9.2.2 User A:

	Questions to Identify the problem	User's answers/Comments	Evaluator's comments/ Observation
A	Comment 1 (11:14)	So I will say that I was a little bored by the long introduction. Okay she said a lot that she could have said more quickly. I'm used to that being the case with webinars.	If you have any comment, you can use the mouse to stop and say whatever you want. Any positive or negative comment.
B	Comment 2 (14:10)	I do think that the calendar was important. Hmm. So I understood that. The course tagging is not going to actually go into effect for a couple of years and it really is going to be a process. So, I think that was important to know now I think	
C	Comment 3 (15:50)	I could make a case for almost all of them, but as I think of what's really key to our work in the course, it seems to me critical and creative thinking would be a good candidate...and	The user is creating his own tags for his course.

		<p>creative thinking probably scientific inquiry and research skills and I'd say communication skills because a big part of the course, is the discussions.</p>	
D	<p>Comments 4 (19:00)</p>	<p>Yeah, I think I think the process of having to start there, then create the tags and then say, well, I really would like the tag of creative and critical thinking, maybe I have to go back and add something to the course to make sure that that happens because maybe it doesn't have 30% of the grade.</p> <p>30% seems high. Yes. I mean it really seems high. I would say 20% would allow you a bit more flexibility in bringing in other things that are important without rising to the level of the tag. So for instance, you know, because it's a survey course. We can't spend weeks on ethics, integrity, and commitment to diversity and inclusion, and yet I care about it...So I don't want to see the tags become a limit of what the professors covering in class, because clearly there are things that don't rise to the level of 30%, but they're still important.</p> <p>...And I would hate to have somebody not take the ethics part seriously because it's not a tag.</p>	<p>What's your general idea? Do you believe that looking through their assignments and rubrics can help to find their shared Competences? That aligns with a course.</p> <p>So, Your suggestion would be instead of having like, 30% can have like 20 or 10%?</p>

		Maybe there could be many tags or subtags that aren't major focuses, but are still touched on in the course.	
E	Comment 5: So overall did it become more understandable? (24:38)	Overall, I think I now understand it, and I think I would feel comfortable doing it.	The user shows confidence in doing the tagging after completion of the instruction
Q1	Do you find the benefits of using Course Tagging motivating/efficient for yourself? (25:32)	<p>Faculty benefits?</p> <p>Only after seeing the video not before, when I read them through the first time, they weren't very motivating.</p> <p>Watching the video motivated me. I now feel like I understand why faculty is being asked to go to this trouble to make sense to me.</p> <p>I do have a little bit of a question about whether undergraduates will actually pay attention to it, but that's another issue. But in terms of, would it help me as a faculty member to go through</p>	Yes, do you find them motivated and efficient for yourself as a faculty member?

		<p>this and think of my syllabus in light of the questions. They're raising absolutely. So the video was motivating.</p>	
Q2	<p>Was there any part of the instruction that required more explanation for you?</p> <p>(26:58)</p>	<p>I still want to talk to somebody about why it limits two things. Why is it limited to three? And why can't there be sub-competencies or less important competencies? And why does it have to be 30%? That seems like a high bar, right? I would probably want to see 25 or 20. It feels like it doesn't leave a lot of flexibility to do other stuff.</p>	
Q3	<p>Do the examples relate to your own experience?</p> <p>(27:24)</p>	<p>Was into it. I mean yeah I mean I'm not doing an undergraduate course but I could extrapolate from the course. I am teaching it. Made me think about how I tagged my course</p>	
Q4	<p>Were there any really difficult/too easy parts?</p> <p>(27:58)</p>	<p>Well I could do without the introduction. I told you, I mean, or at least, it could be a lot less. The word is pedantic (means teacherish) ... to a colleague talking to a colleague.</p>	
Q5	<p>Did you feel challenged or bored during the instructional tasks?</p> <p>(28:27)</p>	<p>I certainly was thinking about it, in terms of...I was not bored. And I certainly was thinking about it in terms of my course and if I had more than one course, I'd probably be thinking about it in terms of more than one course.</p> <p>So yeah, I felt challenged to apply for it.</p>	

Q6	<p>Is the information presented in instructional materials complete for you to finish the task?</p> <p>(30:01)</p>	<p>Yeah, I I do think sometimes when SU puts out these instructions and you have to do them online, I wonder if that's going to be an issue because I'm just probably because I'm going through it right now....So while they showed the page and it looked very simple how to upload the material, is it really going to be that simple?</p> <p>Or did they use a different, a different phrase there than it actually appears on the piece. So I just don't necessarily trust their instructions for how to use the technology.</p> <p>Yeah, it's getting to the right page that I worry about.I mean this seems pretty straightforward.</p>	
Q7	<p>Is there any information missing, required to complete the task?</p> <p>(31:31)</p>	<p>I guess what occurs to me is: how am I supposed to handle it if my college or department hasn't had its meetings yet gone into training and start implementing this]and I just have to wait till they finish before I do my work that is supposed to go ahead? It didn't say that.</p> <p>Let's look at research skills. They are the third one. ...so that's the way it looks, that's really helpful.</p>	<p>Yeah, actually, I'm sure if it answers your question, but at least they have a proof deck example, and you can look, which one do you want to look at?</p>
8	<p>Did the instructor speak clearly?</p> <p>(32:56)</p>	<p>Too clearly sometimes.</p>	
9	<p>Is the video lesson too long? Would it be better to break it</p>	<p>It was really helpful. I kept flipping through it as, I don't know if you noticed and, it was helpful to follow in the toolkit. ... frankly, probably given my generation,It's probably a good</p>	<p>I think that's for everyone because you either should have</p>

	<p>into smaller pieces?</p> <p>(33:12)</p>	<p>idea that you printed it instead of expecting me to just flip through on a computer. And that's a good idea. That was helpful to me. So if I were doing this, I would probably want to print this out in advance. And I think maybe they should even recommend that. I don't remember if they did. At least for people of a certain age, it's probably a good idea to print it out</p>	<p>two screens in order to have, like, the dual kit and one screen, and the video now.</p>
10	<p>To what extent does the toolkit help to understand the video? Are there any parts you find odd?</p> <p>(34:33)</p>	<p>Well, for starters they never mentioned this page [the last of the toolkit] and I'm wondering what it's about in the first person because, you know, I tried to scan it real quick while she was talking but the print was too small for me to scan it easily and I would have liked to have had some explanation why is this here? So that was a little off. This was a little dense [page 5], I would have wanted to spend a little more time ingesting. So maybe she should have said that at some point in the presentation. If you want a quick review of what I've said, look at the logistics page. The rubric was great. The worksheet was good. I'd like and have liked a little more explanation of this [page 9 on syllabus integration], because it obviously takes some study and she didn't even touch on it. Examples pages were good and helpful. Last page I don't know why it is there.</p>	
11	<p>If you could change three things in the training what would you change?</p> <p>(36:55)</p>	<p>The introduction, I would not have that wouldn't have been explained. It would've been nice, not necessary, but would have been nice if somebody other than the presenter who was a professor from a different department had talked about the benefits they had from doing this already. Mm-hmm. So quote, a real person who went through the process and wasn't part of</p>	

		the process to explain that.	
	So do you have overall? Any other comments overall? (37:44)	It's positive. I actually think it's a process that's worth doing. It makes sense to me. I think it will benefit faculty. Maybe even more than students. I'm still skeptical. Whether undergraduates will have the sophistication to use this appropriately unless advisors help them use it. And that's the, that's the other piece that I wonder if it's part of the project, you know?	

9.2.3 User B:

	Questions to Identify the problem	User's answers/Comments	Evaluator's comments/ Observation
A	01:20	I guess what I was taken by were certain keywords and then it'll be really interesting to see what degree the program focuses on. I mean it started out with the benefits of the	When he was looking at the benefits for students/faculty

		<p>students and certain skills that are in a program or a course pathway very important.</p> <p>Those are important words, okay? Pathways and navigations. So we'll see how that works. And then for the fact that I was, I'll be very interested to see how it does relate to collaboration. And I think and then intention of the course, objectives continuity is great.</p>	
B	01:49	I like the language. I like the potential and so, we'll see.	Referring to the language in the Benefits for the Students/Faculty
C	2:34	<p>When I'm reading this, I'm trying to think of myself as both a faculty member but also an undergraduate student. The language is very much aimed at Me, the adult faculty member I think. If this is part of a training, I think that there's some things that need to be done, if it's part of informing people and it's a marketing piece, not quite sure what the intent of this is, as I was looking at to see what this is and so not quite clear if it's an information piece or a training piece, I think. Hmm, one of the things that would be helpful here is just to make sure that the language kind of moves from one piece to another. So up here it says these are institutional learning goals so it probably wouldn't be a bad idea to have institutional learning goals like somewhere here or way up here.</p>	When he was looking at the Toolkit before watching the instruction
D	10:47	<p>Yep, I thought this would be difficult. That's probably true if it was a standalone there wasn't there. You're gonna take this and translate it into a framework, okay. And you're</p>	Talking about the Shared Competencies Framework (p.4

		<p>gonna tell me why it is? Why is there a framework needed? This is where I kind of got lost and I don't know where this is the first time of the word course tagging. I think it has been introduced and pages one through four and I don't know what it is. Okay. Now I may have known if I... even when I went through the first thing, it told me why and what the benefits, of course, tagging are, but so far. I have no idea what it is.</p>	<p>Toolkit) before watching the instruction</p>
Q1	<p>Do you find the benefits of using Course Tagging motivating/efficient for yourself? ((30:34)</p>	<p>I think it has great potential.</p>	
Q2	<p>Was there any part of the instruction that required more explanation for you? (30:45)</p>	<p>Yeah, I think that one page I showed you with the boxes, I didn't quite get. And then the other thing I think is that if I would have really been able to know how to do this so that it was more than just making it up.</p> <p>I would really then need to probably be working with someone who worked through an example with me, not to show me an example, but kind of work through the process. I take this, take that, read it, fill it out, do it, and hand it in. And I will hit the 30% because I'm smart enough. Do that. It's not coming back at me. Well they give me the criteria so you can't. I think it worked. I think I separate that thing I mentioned about</p>	<p>“One page I showed you with the boxes” - He was referring to p.4 Toolkit - the Framework.</p>

		<p>the wording and I think also it was something interesting even though it seems small but she said and the screen it said learning objectives. She said the “learning goals” you know from the courses you've taken are not the same thing. Yeah. And I'm sure when you heard it. You went blank. Wait a minute. It's not true. It isn't just so she can't afford to be as casual as that is. Otherwise people like me will not take the process quite seriously.</p>	
Q3	<p>Do the examples relate to your own experience? (33:47)</p>	<p>And yes, let's say they did. Yeah, I think being not alone in a room also helps.</p> <p>Okay great.</p>	<p>Actually, they also have an option of an online workshop, where they go through all of this information together with IEA. And if you have any problems with tagging your courses, they can also connect with you and help you check everything.</p>
Q4	<p>Were there any really difficult/too easy parts? (34:36)</p>	<p>I think I mentioned the part that I thought was confusing the boxes and all and no. None of it was too easy. I thought and I thought about the wording. The screen was obviously done by a professional in the sense that they're used. Very few words. Most words did</p>	

		not have more than two syllables, perfect. So, the presentation wording was good, you know, it's certainly less intimidating than the shared competency descriptions, which were pretty dense.	
Q5	Did you feel challenged or were bored during the instructional tasks? (35:35)	The answer to that is no but it may be because I'm doing it with interesting people.	
Q6	Is the information presented in instructional materials complete for you to finish the task? (36:13)	<p>I think it would be if I have some of these other complimentary materials and what you call them supports. So as is no but they did offer that you can get into more examples or so and that regard. Sure. If it looks like they've anticipated people like me who need to see it more visually.</p> <p>They were okay, they're good but I would want the additional one.</p>	So these examples that I showed you helped?
Q7	Is there any information missing, required to complete the task? (36:56)	<p>I didn't know till I got into it. I really couldn't say.</p> <p>I mean the paper itself... It looks logical. The five processes were logical.</p>	

Q8	Did the instructor speak clearly? (36:56)	Very...	
Q9	Is the video lesson too long? Would it be better to break it into smaller pieces? (37:44)	So I think the fact that the video is the video but they not only. Did she break it up herself once but anybody was doing it can stop anytime they want. You know, they can go back, they can go forward, not overwhelming.	
Q10	To what extent does the toolkit help to understand the video? Are there any parts you find odd? (38:05)	I think it compliments it well. I think there's some areas where there needs to be bridges between the pieces, the parts. And then I told you that the one part that I found odd, was that those four boxes, I still can't figure out what they have to do with.	“Four boxes” - he was referring to the Toolkit p.4
Q11	If you could change three things in the training what would you change? (39:08)	Consistency of some of the language. Just think a little more clarity and kind of help that one thing leads to another and what it is all about. And I think that way up front even before I look at any one, two or three, it'd be great... and maybe it is here, it may be here because they didn't read this part,... but just coming around and saying this is what this is what we're talking about here. We're talking about something called tagging and the reason why we apply it, the possibilities of what it's good for students and faculty. So you basically say here's what you will get in this training, okay? It's always good. You do a lot of work with instructional design development, so it's always good	

		to let the client know in advance. Unless it's a kind of presentation where you want to surprise somebody.	
--	--	--	--