

Formal Evaluation and Subject Matter Expert Summary Report



DGD232

*Submitted to Maine is IT in fulfillment of the
TAACCCT grant requirements*

*By
Emporia State University*

EMPORIA STATE
UNIVERSITY
■ INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

June 2017

This workforce solution was funded by a grant awarded by the U.S. Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration. The solution was created by the grantee and does not necessarily reflect the official position of the U.S. Department of Labor. The Department of Labor makes no guarantees, warranties or assurances of any kind, express or implied, with respect to such information on linked sites, and including, but not limited to, accuracy of the information or its completeness, timeliness, usefulness, adequacy, continued availability, or ownership.

Developed by Anna J. Catterson, Ph.D., Emporia State University.

Course Review for: Maine is IT
Course: DGD201 Graphic Web Design
Reviewed by: Robert Gibson, EdD
Date: April 27, 2017

Part 1: Course Review

A. Course Review & Introduction (16 points total)		
1.1 Instructions made clear how to get started and where to find various course components.	3	3
1.2 Learners are introduced to the purpose and structure of the course.	3	3
1.3 Etiquette expectations (sometimes called “netiquette”) for online discussions, email, and other forms of communication are clearly stated.	2	1
1.4 Course and or institutional policies with which the learner are expected to comply are clearly stated, or a link to current policies is provided.	2	2
1.5 Minimum technology requirements are clearly stated and instructions for use provided.	2	1
1.6 Prerequisite knowledge in the discipline and/or any required competencies are clearly stated.	1	0
1.7 Minimum technical skills expected of the learner are clearly stated.	1	1
1.8 The self-introduction by the instructor is appropriate and is available online.	1	0
1.9 Learners are asked to introduce themselves to the class.	1	0
Total		11
Comments:		
<p>1.1: The instructor provided instructions regarding the location of resources through the Blackboard course site. The instructor also provided directions and information pertaining to the use of the Dropbox site. The Reviewer commends the inclusion of these resources.</p> <p>1.2: The purpose and structure for the course was clearly explained in the syllabus.</p> <p>1.3: Etiquette expectations (sometimes called “netiquette”) for any online discussions, email, and other forms of course communication should be covered. Some of this was referenced in the Codes of Conduct statement. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be sensitive to the fact that there will be cultural and linguistic backgrounds, as well as different political and religious beliefs, plus just differences in general. • Use good taste when composing your responses in Discussion Forums. Swearing and profanity is also part of being sensitive to your classmates and should be avoided. Also, consider that slang can be misunderstood or misinterpreted. • Do not use all capital letters when composing your responses as this is considered “shouting” on the Internet and is regarded as impolite or aggressive. It can also be stressful on the eye when trying to read your message. • Be respectful of your others’ views and opinions. Avoid “flaming” (publicly attacking or insulting) them as this can cause hurt feelings and decrease the chances of getting all different types of points of view. • Be careful when using acronyms. If you use an acronym, it is best to spell out its meaning first, and then put the acronym in parentheses afterward, for example: Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs). After that, you can use the acronym freely throughout your message. • Use good grammar and spelling, and avoid using text-messaging shortcuts. <p>1.4: Some course and institutional policies were covered in the syllabus: The Attendance Policy and Participation Policy was described, but the Reviewer was unable to locate the Academic Dishonesty Policy</p>		

that is common in other Maine courses. The Reviewer also recommends a link to these policies on the college web site.

1.5: Technology requirements (for either F2F or online) were implied, but not stated. The instructor notes that certain Adobe products are used in the course. The assumption is that the college will provide these technologies. The Reviewer recommends expressing any requirements provided by the college v. any that may need to be purchased by the student.

1.6: Prerequisite/co-requisite course knowledge and competencies were not listed.

1.7: See 1.5

1.8: The instructor's contact information placeholder is indicated in the syllabus. The Reviewer encourages a video introduction to the course as well – even if the course is F2F.

1.9: Access to the discussions in Blackboard were not available to the Reviewer. The Reviewer encourages use of asynchronous discussions outside of class. Student introductions and interaction build a learning community.

B. Learning Objectives & Competencies (15 points total)

2.1 The course learning objectives, or course/program competencies, describe measurable outcomes.	3	1
2.2 The module/unit learning objectives or competencies describe outcomes that are measurable and consistent with the course-level objectives or competencies.	3	1
2.3 All learning objectives and competencies are stated clearly and written from the learner's perspective.	3	1
2.4 The relationship between learning objectives or competencies and course activities is clearly stated.	3	1
2.5 The learning objectives or competencies are suited to the level of the course.	3	2
Total		6

Comments:

2.1: The course learning objectives are not clearly expressed using action-oriented verbs that support measurable activities, expectations, and competencies. The Reviewer encourages developing overarching learning objectives (3-5 are standard) with specific, measurable sub-objectives (3-5 for each first level objective is a good heuristic). The Reviewer understands that these could be in the Blackboard course, but access was unavailable. The syllabus only contains general "topics", an outline, and a course description. Objectives are commonly written in a bulleted format with language that can be aligned to course outcomes and assessments.

2.2: Again, specific learning objectives were not clearly identified. These should map to specific course activities and assessments. This is referred to as "alignment" of the objectives to the outcomes and activities. There is very loose language regarding the topics, but not nearly detailed enough to constitute a learning objective.

2.3: See 2.2

2.4: A general overview of projects and activities were indicated, but more detailed information relative to these course tasks would strengthen the course design.

2.5: The course topics appear to be suited to the level of the course. Again, the learning objectives should be strengthened following the aforementioned notations.

C. Assessment & Measurement (13 points total)

3.1 The assessments measure the stated learning objectives or competencies.	3	2
3.2 The course grading policy is stated clearly.	3	3
3.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of learners' work and are tied to the course grading policy.	3	3
3.4 The assessment instruments selected are sequenced, varied, and suited to the learner work being assessed.	2	2
3.5 The course provides learners with multiple opportunities to track their learning progress.	2	1
Total		11

Comments:

3.1: The assessments/activities for this course are well developed and include detailed language. The Reviewer recommends expressing a 'crosswalk' to course learning objectives. eg, map the activity/assessment to the course objectives more clearly. Obviously, this requires further development of the course objectives.

3.2: The grading policy/rubric is clearly stated in the syllabus.

3.3: The Reviewer found descriptive criteria associated with the grading policy for a variety of assignments. The Reviewer commends this level of detail.

3.4: There was an excellent variety of assessment strategies for this course. The application of the technology is well considered.

3.5: Reviewer was not able to locate any evidence of tracking learning progress. (e.g., Circle back activities, individualized learning pathways; mastery learning, etc.) However, course activities appear to build on one another - providing scaffolding.

D. Instructional Materials (13 points total)

4.1 The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course and module/unit learning objectives or competencies.	3	2
4.2 Both the purpose of instructional materials and how the materials are to be used for learning activities are clearly explained.	3	3
4.3 All instructional materials used in the course are appropriately cited.	2	2
4.4 The instructional materials are current.	2	2
4.5 A variety of instructional materials is used in the course.	2	2
4.6 The distinction between required and optional materials is clearly explained.	1	1
Total		12

Comments:

4.1: The instructional materials aligns with the course topics stated in the syllabus. However, further development of the learning objectives is critical. That is how learning achievement is measured. (eg, did the student learn what is expressed in the stated learning objectives?)

4.2: The purpose of the instructional materials in the course is explained and aligns with each unit assignment.

4.3: The instructional materials were properly cited. The Reviewer commends the use of hyperlinks to associating web sites.

4.4: The instructional materials are current.

4.5: The instructional materials by unit and assignment.

4.6: Required materials were expressed in the syllabus.

E. Course Activities and Learner Interaction (11 points total)

5.1 The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning objectives or competencies.	3	1
5.2 Learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning.	3	3
5.3 The instructor's plan for classroom response time and feedback on assignments is clearly stated.	3	0
5.4 The requirements for learner interaction are clearly stated.	2	2
Total		6

Comments:

5.1: Again, learning objectives need to be significantly enhanced and mapped to the course activities. These are implied. Each course activity should clearly indicate the competency/learning outcome.

5.2: There are opportunities for interactive learning. The applied final project is outstanding. The Reviewer applauds this application of the course content.

5.3: A plan for instructor feedback was not located in the syllabus. Even if this is a F2F course, the instructor's feedback policy should be expressed.

5.4: Participation/interaction expectations are clearly stated and account for 15% of the grade.

F. Course Technology (10 points total)

6.1 The tools used in the course support the learning objectives and competencies.	3	1
6.2 Course tools promote learner engagement and active learning.	3	3
6.3 Technologies required in the course are readily obtainable.	2	2
6.4 The course technologies are current.	1	1
6.5 Links are provided to privacy policies for all external tools required in the course.	1	0
Total		7

Comments:

6.1: The tools in the course appear to support the unit/weekly topics. No learning objectives were located.

6.2: The tools promote engagement and active learning. The assignments promote active student engagement by requiring interaction with the technology to build content for assignments.

6.3: It is assumed the tools will primarily be provided by the college and through independent resources.

6.4: The course technologies are current and up-to-date for the required work.

6.5: Certain policies (eg, ADA, Codes of Conduct, etc.) are provided via extracted policy wording. However, the Reviewer was unable to locate links to privacy policies (eg, HIPAA, FERPA, non-disclosure, etc.) Consider including that language or links in the course syllabus.

G. Learner Support (9 points total)

7.1 The course instructions articulate or link to a clear description of the technical support offered and how to obtain it.	3	0
7.2 Course instructions articulate or link to the institution's accessibility policies and services.	3	3
7.3 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's academic support services and resources can help learners succeed in the course and how learners can obtain them.	2	0
7.4 Course instructions articulate or link to an explanation of how the institution's student support services and resources can help learners succeed in the course and how learners can obtain them.	1	0
Total		3

Comments:

7.1: Providing students access to technology support is very important. Don't assume that students know how to obtain support from the institution. Provide instructions/links for students to access the technology help services available to them.

7.2: The syllabus contains an excerpt from the institution website pertaining to accessibility and a link to the Accessibility/Disability Policy. The Reviewer applauds the addition of that important information.

7.3: Access to the institutional academic support services is critical. Consider providing instructions/links to tutoring and other academic support services. These might include Tutoring Services, the Writing Center, Library Resources, etc.

7.4: As with academic support, student wellness and support is also critical. Consider providing instructions/links to the institutional student support services. These might include Career Services, Honors Programs, Health and Wellness, Advising, Co-Curricular resources, Student Organizations, etc.

H. Accessibility and Usability (12 points total)

8.1 Course navigation facilitates ease of use.	3	3
8.2 Information is provided about the accessibility of all technologies required in the course.	3	2
8.3 The course provides alternative means of access to course materials in formats that meet the needs of diverse learners.	2	2
8.4 The course design facilitates readability.	2	2
8.5 Course multimedia facilitate ease of use.	2	2
<i>Total</i>		11

Comments:

8.1: The Blackboard course navigation was unavailable. It is presumed to meet expectations.

8.2: This could be strengthened to include information specific to students with physical or learning disabilities. Has the course been checked with an Accessibility Checker? Is it compatible with JAWS and/or NVDA (screen readers)?

8.3: The Americans with Disabilities Act requires institutions to make accommodations for student who identify as having a disability. Work closely with your institution's office for disability services to identify resources to assist in making your course ADA compliant. The Reviewer assumes this has been considered. Adobe software includes compliancy features. Certain Learning Management Systems also include accessibility checkers.

8.4: Implied. Consider processing this course through an ADA checker. Webaim is one such option.
<http://wave.webaim.org>

8.5: Implied. Ensure content, such as videos, are easy accessed and include either 1) captioning and/or 2) a transcript. The Reviewer did not review any multimedia elements in this course, however.

Part II: Employment Data

Stakeholder Involvement and Employment Opportunities

Items Reviewed include:

- Internships, Job Shadowing Opportunities that exist with the outcomes and objectives with this course.
- Employment opportunities for these skills.
- Outcomes/Objectives are current and relate to job market.

Findings include:

- See Subject Matter Expert review for specific feedback relative to this finding.

Part III: Creative Commons

Items Reviewed include:

- All course materials presented in Creative Commons?
- Creative Common license (including graphic) is represented on course materials.

Findings include:

- This material is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
- Creative Commons graphic is included on the footer.

Part IV: Subject Matter Expert (SME) Findings & Review

Course: DGD232
Course Name: Advanced Digital Graphics
Date: June 1, 2017

Background

Funded by a \$13 million grant from the U.S. Department of Labor, *Maine is IT!* is building new educational and career pathways in information technology at all seven of Maine's community colleges. The programs funded by the grant are designed to support Maine workers eligible for the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program, un/underemployed adults, and workforce needs in Maine's growing IT sector. They have been built to serve individuals with a range of experience, from those interested in gaining basic IT skills to IT professionals looking to advance their careers through new industry certifications.

Overall Remarks and Reviewer Summary

In reviewing DGD232 several processes and data collections tools were noted and identified. This reviewer took in account the Dynamic Skills Audit conducted in 2014-2015. Both qualitative and quantitative data was identified in the report that provides the key elements:

1. Career opportunities do exist in Penobscot County for graduates from an AAS in Business or those completing a certificate program in computer technologies. It was also found by this Reviewer that the skills mastered in DGD232 relate to specific job openings.
2. Current job openings list specific duties that relate to DGD232
3. The current Advisory Board indicates DGD232 contributes to the labor market data.

The Dynamic Skills Audit outlined the following process, which this reviewer took into consideration when compiling this the formal SME report:

1. Local industry needs were assessed through the program Advisory Board. Minutes from those Advisory Board meetings were reviewed and suggestions from the partnerships were adopted into this summary.
2. Burning Glass data was reviewed to identify themes and trends in the current job market. The Burning Glass report helped identify skills demanded by employers to curriculum outcomes and learning objectives.

A formal SME was conducted with the above reports and compiled in the next section of this report.

A. Program and Course Overview and Objectives

Items Reviewed include:

- Dynamic Skills Audit Summary Report (Academic Years 2014-2015)
- Burning Glass Labor Market Data reports (Compilation)
- Advisory Board Minutes

Findings include:

The DGD232 course learning outcomes and objectives align with the program mission and goals. This reviewer found that the DGD232 course has listed measurable outcomes that can be stacked and latticed. The NAICS (Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services) industry sector for DGD232 has been categorized as: *541430 Graphic Design Services*. (See: https://www.census.gov/svsd/www/services/sas/sas_summary/54summary.htm#sectordescription)

Those completing this course would enter the Bureau of Labor Statistics occupation classification of *OES: 27:1024 Graphic Designers*. (See: <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes271024.htm>). The Reviewer finds that this classification is correct, as project management is one of the components. The job outlook for this classification is considered “Little or no change” with a projected annual increase of 1%: <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/arts-and-design/graphic-designers.htm>

The NCES CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) is referenced as *10:0301: Graphic Communications, General*. (See: <https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/CIPDetail.aspx?y=55&cipid=87236>) This is also an accurate classification.

This course was designed for 1st year community college level students or equivalent. This reviewer found that there is a prerequisite for this course.

Course objectives were not clearly articulated.

The reviewer finds a direct correlation to the Dynamic Skills Audit and Burning Glass baseline skills as listed in the labor market data.

Table: Standard Reviewed Standards for Course Outcomes

Standard Reviewed	N/A	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory
A.1 The learning outcomes are clearly stated and mapped to specific objectives and/or assignments.			X
A.2 Prerequisites and/or any required competencies are clearly stated.			X
A.3 Learning objectives for each course describe measurable outcomes.			X
A.4 Learning objectives are appropriately designed for the level of each of the course.			X
A.5 Instruction, activities, and assignments in courses are scaffolded from course to course, and throughout the program.		X	

A.1 – DGD232 does not articulate specific learning outcomes. *

A.2 - The course prerequisites/corequisites were not indicated. Given that this is an advanced course, the presumption is that there must be a prerequisite.

A.3 - Course objectives are not measurable nor well described.

A.4 – Because the learning objectives were not well expressed, the Reviewer had difficulty asserting that they were mapped to the level of the course

A.5 - Activities are scaffolded and appear to build on one another.

*Reviewer Note: learning outcomes need to be strengthened/rewritten for this course.

B. Relevancy

Items Reviewed include:

- Dynamic Skills Audit Summary Report (Academic Years 2014-2015)
- Burning Glass Labor Market Data reports (Compilation)
- Advisory Board Minutes

Findings include:

Course competencies are relevant to students, industry, and employers. Strong evidence was found in the Dynamic Skills Audit Summary Report. Direct ties were found through interviews with stakeholders and in Advisory Board minutes.

The table that follows is a clear matrix of how the course outcomes are relevant to students, industry, and employers:

Table: Matrix of evidence-based skills mapped to students, industry, and employers

Standard Reviewed	N/A	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory
B.1 Course competencies represent industry's expectation of the overarching knowledge, skills, and abilities that 1 st year college students should possess.		X	
B.2 Core course competencies are relevant to industry and employers .		X	
B.3 Instruction, activities, and assignment in individual courses are relevant and engaging to students .		X	

B.1 - Yes. The specific course activities clearly represent industry expectations and also are current and relevant.

B.2 - Yes. Core competencies are relevant to industry and employers and evidence of this was verified using the Burning Glass labor market data relative to STEM occupations (<http://burning-glass.com/research/stem/>) and the Dynamic Skills Audit Summary. This Reviewer took the interview summaries from Advisory Board members, current job openings and descriptions and matched them directly to all ten of the listed course objectives.

B.3 – Yes. Activities and instruction defined in the course outline offer real-world application in design and modeling that are required of any person seeking employment in this field.

C. Resources & Materials

Items Reviewed include:

- Dynamic Skills Audit Summary Report (Academic Years 2014-2015)
- Burning Glass Labor Market Data reports (Compilation)
- Advisory Board Minutes

Findings include:

Instructional materials being delivered achieve stated course objectives and learning outcomes. A formal course review was conducted that address more specifically course content and instructional design processes. However, in this SME report, specific findings in this section relate specifically to the overall instructional materials which contribute to the ten specific course outcomes.

Table: Instructional materials and their direct link to course outcomes

Standard Reviewed	N/A	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory
C.1 The instructional materials contribute to the achievement of the stated course learning			X
C.2 The purpose of the instructional materials is clearly explained.		X	
C.3 The instructional materials present a variety of perspectives and approaches on		X	
C.4 The instructional materials are appropriately designed for the level of the course.		X	

C.1 - No. The learning objectives are not clearly indicated. Hence, there is no way to map the instructional materials to the objectives.

C.2 - Yes. The purpose of the instructional materials was clearly explained.

C.3 - Yes. A variety of projects were identified. The Reviewer commends the variety of topics and activities.

C.4 - Yes. The rigor matches 1st year college entry students. Reviewer also noted the rigor would be acceptable for all students from all demographics.

D. Assessment & Measurement

Items Reviewed include:

- Dynamic Skills Audit Summary Report (Academic Years 2014-2015)
- Burning Glass Labor Market Data reports (Compilation)
- Advisory Board Minutes

Standard Reviewed	N/A	Satisfactory	Not Satisfactory
D.1 The course evaluation/criteria/course grading policy is stated clearly on each syllabus.		X	
D.2 Course-level assessments (those that can be delivered) measure the stated learning objectives and are consistent with course activities and resources.		X	
D.3 Specific and descriptive criteria are provided for the evaluation of students' work and participation and are tied to the course grading policy.		X	
D.4 The assessment instruments (that can be delivered) are sequenced, varied, and appropriate to the content being assessed.		X	

Findings include:

Assessment strategies use established ways to measure effective learning, evaluate student progress by reference to stated learning objectives, and are designed to be integral to the learning process. The Reviewer could not locate measurable learning objectives for DGD232.

Table: Measurement of effective learning

D.1 - Yes. Grading is broken into several components and provides opportunity for a variety of course activities, including a culminating capstone project. The Reviewer applauds this variety and balance in grading.

D.2 - Yes. This is somewhat implied. The assessments and activities appear to align with stated course-level objectives. This can be strengthened through describing this alignment/crosswalk and through improved learning objectives.

D.3 – Yes. Significant evidence was provided to support the evaluation of student work. This was very well developed.

D.4 – Yes. This Reviewer found sequenced and varied grading strategies, including assignments and self-directed activities. This Reviewer encourages this variety.

