

TAACCCT Voluntary Subject Matter Expert and Industry Partner Summary Template

To support grantees in documenting the fulfillment of the SGA requirements for using subject matter experts and industry partners for assuring the quality of materials developed and used for the grant, SkillsCommons has created a guide for grant project directors or designated project staff to complete and post within SkillsCommons that would aid in the documentation process. **The use of this template is voluntary.** The template the basic elements for describing the methodologies your project used to assure their compliance with subject matter expert and industry partner requirements. The SGA TAACCCT requirements for each round are provided at the end of this document.

SME: Describe the name, title, and type/amount of experience the subject matter expert(s) have in conducting reliable evaluations of the quality assurance of the materials content.

FT 125 Fish Pathology
Trenten Dodson
Production and Operations Manager
Kodiak Regional Aquaculture Association

14 years experience in aquaculture at four different hatcheries in Alaska
Experience training entry level fisheries technicians and biologists in aquaculture
Experience with strategic planning, organizational review, and outcomes assessment

SME: Describe the quality assurance rubrics used to conduct the evaluation of the quality of the content produced by the grant.

Attached

Industry Partner: Describe the employer(s) (name, industry area, # of employees, employment opportunities, workforce development priorities) and describe how it was actively engaged in the project in one or more of the following ways: defining the program strategy and goals, identifying necessary skills and competencies, providing resources to support education/training (such as equipment, instructors, funding, internships, or other work-based learning activities), providing assistance with program design, and where appropriate, hiring qualified participants who complete grant-funded education and training programs.

Caroline Cherry
Hatchery Operation Coordinator
Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association
30+ employees

Engaged by having Caroline sit on the UAS Fisheries Technology Advisory Committee, posting Fish Tech courses, coordinating field labs in region, hosting internships, and posting scholarship opportunities. Also asked Caroline to review course content and programmatic offerings.

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date

Print/Type Name of Principal Investigator

TAACCCT Project Name

SGA TAACCCT requirements by Round:

For Round 1:

“Successful applicants will be required to identify third-party subject matter experts to conduct reviews of the deliverables produced through the grant. Applicants should allot funds in their budget for the independent review of their deliverables by subject matter experts. Subject matter experts are individuals with demonstrated experience in developing and/or implementing similar deliverables. These experts could include applicants’ peers, such as representatives from neighboring education and training providers. The applicant must provide ETA with the results of the review and the qualifications of the reviewer(s) at the time the deliverable is provided to ETA.”

Retrieved 12/5/2014 from: <http://doleta.gov/grants/pdf/SGA-DFA-PY-10-03.pdf>. pg. 15.

Summary Review: Based on scoring from all rubric items

Review Scale Definitions

For each component (1.1 – 3.2), mark an X in the appropriate box.

Excellent: Represents a “best practice” and a model example

Good: Complete and effective.

Ineffective: Adequate but presents opportunities for improvement.

N/A: Not Applicable to this course review.

In your opinion, is this course:	Yes	No
Relevant	x	
Appropriate	x	
Measurable	x	
Engaging	x	

1. Course Outcomes and Activities	Excellent	Good	Ineffective	N/A
1.1 Course Outcomes are clearly stated.	X			
1.2 Course Activities are sequenced in a natural progression for effective learning.				X
1.3 Course Outcomes are relevant to industry.	X			
1.4 Course Activities are appropriate for the course level.	X			
1.5 Expectations for effort and participation are clearly stated.				X
Comments or recommendations:				
As a hands-on lab, it is obvious that participation is expected though not stated in the material provided.				

2. Instructional Materials (lectures, reading and writing assignments, projects)	Excellent	Good	Ineffective	N/A
2.1 Course Materials are relevant to stated course outcomes.	X			
2.2 Course Materials are relevant to industry and employers.	X			
2.3 Course Materials are engaging to students.	X			
2.4 Course Materials address/support one or more course outcomes.	X			
2.5 Course Materials show evidence of distance delivery strategies.				X
Comments or recommendations:				
Instructional materials for this course were not provided. However, as hands-on lab, the materials are minimal. ADF&G Common Diseases of Wild and Culture Fishes is cited in the syllabus and appropriate for this subject matter.				

3. Assessments (exams, surveys, quizzes, assignments)	Excellent	Good	Ineffective	N/A
3.1 Evaluation of activities and content supports achievement of course outcomes.				X
3.2 Course grading and evaluation policies are clearly stated.				X
3.3 Assessments provide options for multiple learning styles.				X
3.4 Assessments are appropriate for course level.				X
3.5 Student feedback solicited.				X
Comments and recommendations:				
How this class is assessed is not provided. Is it merely participation, successful completion of tasks and activities, etc.				

Additional Comments and Recommendations

A lab like this is extremely relevant to building the knowledge base of an individual moving into the fish culture field. The outcomes and tasks outlined in the syllabus are appropriate and measurable for this subject matter. The class activities are well thought out and engaging for students.