SGET 700: Tools for the Development of Instruction Buddy Check #2: Educational Design

Name of Reviewer:	Rebecca Baucom	
Name of Site Author:	Dipal Patel	

1. Comment on Home Page effectiveness. Is the home page effective? Do the graphics engage the user? Do they reinforce the site's objectives? Is an overarching question or purpose evident when first entering the site. If a splash page is used, does it add value to the site. Do the graphics and layout draw you in? Is there any addition or change that would improve the page in these areas?

The homepage is effective with engaging graphics. The title of the unit is directly reflected in the graphics. All questions, graphics and layout draw you right in, with easy to follow language.

2. Comment on home page cognitive effect. Are site objectives clear? Based only on the home page, give a brief description of the sites objectives and purpose are. Is the content written in clear, concise, and age appropriate language? Is an attempt made to relate to user interests and goals. Is that effective? What changes would improve the home pages effectiveness in these areas?

On the homepage are all the site objectives, questions and descriptions. Everything is very clearly laid out and using age appropriate language to convey all aspects of the project.

3. Comment on the Learning Activities included in this site. Do they closely relate to the site's objectives and audience? Are they easy to locate? What do you feel are the requisite skills that must be addressed in order to reach the objective? Are activities developed to build on prior skills? Are they scaffolded to lead learners from basic to advanced skills? Will examples or a model be included? Would this benefit the site or be unnecessary?

All learning activities are closely related to the objectives set out by the site. They are easy to locate and all are building on prior skills. They are scaffolded within each lesson, with lots of opportunities to explore additional information and practice as needed. There are many graphics, but additional examples and models may be beneficial.

4. Comment on the Activity/Process of this site. Is each step of the process stated clearly and accurately defined? Are they sequenced so that so that needed knowledge/skills would logically be acquired by the user? Are directions accurate, explicit, clearly stated, and written in age-appropriate language. Does this site include references to an example or model? Would

SGET 700: Tools for the Development of Instruction Buddy Check #2: Educational Design

doing so improve the process? As a user of the site, give feedback as to improving directions or other verbiage.

Each step of the process is clearly stated and linked throughout the site-taking you from one page to the next easily. It is logically sequenced, and age appropriate. Students should have no problem navigating this site. I would have liked to see more defined examples throughout the site for what was being asked of the students.

- 5. Comment on the effectiveness of the site relating to desired outcomes. Are outcomes clearly stated. Is this done is a way that users will readily understand? Are outcomes closely related to learning objectives and activities. Do desired outcomes build from basic to more advanced?
 - The site is effective, outcomes are clearly stated in a way that any student at this grade level would understand. Outcomes are closely related to objectives and activities and build from basic to more advanced.
- 6. Comment on the evaluation instruments included in this site. Are evaluation tools easy to find? Is the language used clear and appropriate to the audience? Is evaluation criteria specific and easy to interpret? Are there additions or changes that would aide you as a learner? Are there alternate evaluation tools that might benefit you as a learner?

Evaluation tools have their own dedicated page, with rubrics and information that is easy to see and uses age appropriate language. I may add some more interactive elements to the site, perhaps games or more online and in person collaborative opportunities.