

# **EVALUATION RESULTS REPORT**

**Formative evaluation carried out during the development of the web-based Short Course  
Certificate in Preparing for and Enhancing your Career**

**Prepared by Debra Maddocks**

**10 July 2009**

Executive Summary .....	3
Introduction .....	4
Purpose .....	4
Questions .....	4
Methodology.....	5
Results.....	6
Expert Review .....	6
Peer Review .....	7
User Review .....	8
Summarized findings:.....	8
Discussion .....	10
Recommendations .....	12
References .....	14
Appendices.....	15
Appendix 1: Instrumentation.....	15
A: Expert Review Questions.....	15
B: Peer Review Questions .....	16
C: User Review Questions .....	17
Appendix 2: Responses from Questionnaires.....	20

**List of Tables**

Table 1 Expert Responses relative to sub questions (n=1) .....	6
Table 2 Peer responses relative to sub questions (n=3) .....	7
Table 3: User review responses as relative to sub questions (n=5).....	8
Table 4: Sub-question responses for ‘Is the design of the activities relevant to the learning outcomes?’.....	10
Table 5: Sub-question responses for: ‘Do the technologies employed successfully help the students participate and learn?’ .....	11
Table 6: Recommended improvements for engagement and support .....	13
Table 7: Recommended improvements for navigation, access, design and effectiveness .....	13
Table 8: User Review Questionnaire responses for Navigation and Access (% Frequencies, n=5) .....	20
Table 9: User Review Questionnaire responses for Interface Design (% Frequencies, n=5).....	20
Table 10: User Review Questionnaire responses for Effectiveness (% Frequencies, n=5).....	21

## Executive Summary

A **formative evaluation** was carried out to find out how effective and useable the online learning materials are for students in a web-based programme: *Short Course Certificate in Preparing for and Enhancing your Career, (Level 2)*. The programme has been designed to enhance the existing external programme process, traditionally delivered in a face-to-face environment (GETSET). Students discover the necessary skills and experiences that are important as a job seeker, while completing online curriculum vitae (QPASS CV). One of concerns noted during development of the online content was that the students may complete the GET SET content too quickly, and possibly not engage in the real learning aspects of the programme.

The purpose of the evaluation was to investigate whether the additional course material and assessment (with support) developed by the institution enhances the GET SET programme through the provision of online student engagement and material relevant to the learning context. The primary decision as a result of the evaluation will be based on changes to the delivery design and level of support, with the aim to identify areas for improvement.

The evaluation was planned around two e-learning guidelines:

**Is the design of the activities relevant to the [learning outcomes?](#)**

**Do the technologies employed successfully help the students participate and learn?"**

The evaluation model used was the mixed method-eclectic-pragmatic approach and the instrumentation comprised of an Expert Reviewer (interview), to evaluate design and support; three Peer reviewers (focus discussion group) to evaluate design of learning activities and User reviewers (five students completing questionnaires) to evaluate effectiveness of design and usability.

Limitations were noted regarding the sample size of the User reviewers and that they were not formally enrolled on the programme.

The results suggested that the reviewers all agreed the pedagogy was sufficient, that the learning activities were clear and justifiable for independent engagement, and with enhancement of the Activity guide and improved instruction (in terms of support and assessment), the online delivery of the programme would successfully meet the learning outcomes.

Recommendations included modifying the initial Welcome instructions, formatting improvements of the Activity Guide, plus providing paper-based copies of this and the study guide and improving the HELP links and general layout of the Moodle site.

## Introduction

A **formative evaluation** has been carried out to find out how effective and useable the online learning materials are for students in a web-based programme: *Short Course Certificate in Preparing for and Enhancing your Career (Level 2)*. The evaluation was carried out by Debra Maddocks, School of Business and Computing, Faculty of Humanities and Business, as part of the requirements for 906.704 Evaluation for Best Practice course (MIT). This report describes the Purposes, Questions, Methods, Results, Discussion and Recommendations (Decisions made).

The course, *Short Course Certificate in Preparing for and Enhancing Your Career* has been designed to enhance the existing external programme process, (GETSET). Students use a 'virtual visit' to a large Business, as a platform for discovering the necessary skills and experiences that are important as a job seeker. While students 'visit and observe' all the departments/levels in the Business and 'talk' to relevant people in each department, they are also completing their own online electronic QPASS Curriculum Vitae (QPASS CV), which is hopefully relevant and current. The institution has created further learning and assessment materials in order to deliver a 15 credit Level 2 on-line programme, with additional content such as Stress Management and Problem Solving, along with the necessary skills to prepare for an eventual Interview (embedded into the course are 3 NZQA Unit Standards, relating to Interview Skills, Problem Solving and Stress Management).

## Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation was to investigate whether the additional course material with support and assessment developed by the institution for the *Short Course Certificate in Preparing for and Enhancing your Career* would enhance the GET SET programme through the provision of online student engagement and material relevant to the learning context.

The underlying quality issues evaluated were:

*Is there enough interaction with the students- how will the tutors know when the students are struggling? (support)*

*How can we get them to engage fully with the tutors and with the online materials? (engagement)*

## Questions

The evaluation was designed around two eLearning guidelines for New Zealand (2005). The selected guidelines were re-worded to suit the purpose of the evaluation; to investigate usability and effectiveness.

1. [SD3](#): “Is the design of the activities relevant to the [learning outcomes](#)?”

Further sub questions were investigated for effectiveness of the design of the activities and learning material, carried out by peer and expert review discussion forums. Full details are appended in Appendix 1 (Instrumentation).

2. [ST9](#): “Do the technologies employed successfully help the students participate and learn?”

Further sub questions around usability (navigation, access, interface design etc.) and effectiveness for learning (design) of the programme were addressed by a user review questionnaire. Full details are appended in Appendix 1 (Instrumentation).

## Methodology

The model used for this formative evaluation was a mixed method-eclectic-pragmatic approach, (Reeves, 1996), chosen because of the appropriateness to e-learning in terms of being able to use multiple methods of collection for problem solving inquiry. Multiple methods allow for ‘triangulation’ of data, both qualitative and quantitative, from multiple observers, to validate the responses. If such inquiry is carried out during this 'development stage', then the sampling methods can be used to establish if the manner in which the students use the programme encourages the desired learning process and what is needed for improvement (Phillips, 2004).

- **Expert review** -Conversation/one-on one interview with semi-structured questions as prompts. The questions were given to the ‘expert’ in advance of the interview, with email and phone exchanges occurring after the questions were completed.
- **Peer review** -Face-to-face focus/discussion group with the evaluator, with semi-structured questions. The peers had access to the programme, and the questions (including the learning outcomes) prior to focus group discussions.
- **User review** -Questionnaires were completed online using Moodle in all but one case. Guest log -ons to the GET SET programme and Moodle were arranged, allowing individuals to complete the survey questions anonymously. Paper-based copies were also created in case of time restrictions.

Quantitative data arose out of the **user review questionnaire**, while the other two methods (**peer and expert**) provided qualitative data.

Reeves and Hedburg (2003) in Chapter 8 (Effectiveness Evaluation) discuss the need for deciding the acceptability, feasibility, reliability and/or validity of each of the data collection methods.

A peer review was chosen for feasibility. One of the peers was already familiar with the programme, however two peers had no prior experience. A moderate amount of time was needed to conduct this but there was low analysis time (Evaluation Cookbook, 1998). Interactions among the peer group participants did indeed enhance the answers given, as they were not restricted to just the

formal questionnaire.

An expert review was chosen for validity, needing a moderate time for preparation and analysis, and a high amount of time to conduct. However, there was only one interview to perform and the 'expert approach' avoided unacceptable support and learning approaches to the programme delivery. The expert would also be able to clarify or identify missing content.

A small user review with students was deemed feasible, and acceptable, at this stage of development. It needed moderate preparation time but only a low amount of time to conduct. Analysis time was moderate but, useful, quantitative data was produced, with carefully designed questions. Learner reactions are important at this development stage and are widely acceptable for this type of evaluation.

## Results

An interview was carried out with one Expert reviewer; a User review questionnaire was completed by a group of five 'students'; and a focus/discussion group review occurred with three Peer reviewers. The prewritten guiding questions were given out to the peers and expert reviewers and completed before the interview/discussions took place, enabling fuller discussions.

The questionnaire responses from the different methodologies were found to compliment each other. All three groups felt that the design of the programme met the Learning Outcomes and was adequate for independent engagement with some minor modifications to support and design.

The findings are reported grouped under the following instrumentation/sampling methods:

Expert review (discussion responses);

Peer Review (discussion responses);

User reviews (questionnaire .

### Expert Review

Both the expert and peer review responses answered the following guideline question (SD3):

#### ***Is the design of the activities relevant to the learning outcomes?***

The expert review responses answered the following sub-questions on effectiveness of the design of the learning activities and material (engagement (E) and support (S)):

**Table 1 Expert Responses relative to sub questions (n=1)**

Can the students potentially engage with the learning activities provided with no face-to face contact with lecturing staff?" (E)	Q1,2,6,
How appropriate are the activities in encouraging users to engage with the virtual tour? (E)	Q3,4,10,11,
How does the design of the instruction/support help or encourage students to interact with the course materials? (S)	Q5,7,8,9,10

The full list of questions is available in Appendix 2.

Summarized findings:

Overall, the design of the programme was said to be sufficient, in terms of the combination of the learning material and the GET SET content (Virtual Tour), in order to prepare participants for employment and to learn what is important to add to a CV. The Activity Guide was thought to substitute well compared to a face-to-face environment; it encouraged interactivity and was definitely the key to independent engagement. The expert agreed that the learning activities were appropriate (with good pedagogy employed), and that the learning outcomes would be met.

However, the expert reviewer suggested that the current format of the advice and guidance (Welcome Letter-Getting Started Information-for students) was confusing in places and duplicated information unnecessarily. On the Moodle site, the areas for seeking Help were not immediately obvious and the tutor will still need to play an important role, vital for student contact and support.

The expert review raised some points with regard to support and guidance in the absence of a face-to-face tutor, these will be explored further in the Discussion.

### Peer Review

The peer reviews answered a set of slightly different sub-questions to address the same issues in terms of engagement and support:

Table 2 Peer responses relative to sub questions (n=3)

Can the students potentially engage with the learning activities provided with no face-to face contact with lecturing staff?" (E)	Q1,2,3,4,7,8,11,
How does the design of the instruction/support help or encourage students to interact with the course materials? (S)	Q5, 6,8,9,12,13,
How will the tutors know when support is needed? (S)	Q10,11,14,

The full list of questions is available in Appendix 2.

Summarized findings:

The peer reviewers all agreed that in terms of engagement, the Learning Activities were clear and justifiable overall, and were appropriate for independent study. The content material within GET SET and the Study Guide were both felt to be important and worked together within a complimentary interactive design. While the design of the Activity guide made independent engagement possible, and its use was considered critical for directing the students, more instructional details were recommended for self guiding and summative engagement.

The reviewers also suggested that the Getting started instructions overall were confusing and

seemed to be repeated in places. More explanation was thought to be needed in terms of compulsory assessments ( Moodle), and some of the guidance on completing the assessments was unclear.

However, all the reviewers agreed that student tracking would be possible via assessment submission. Regular contact with students would be needed though, and monitoring progress would be possible due to the timing of the assessments and being directed to complete the QPASS CV in the Activity Guide (tutors can access student entries into their QPASS CV).

### User Review

The student user review questionnaire answered the following guideline question (ST9):

***Do the technologies employed successfully help the students participate and learn?***

The student user review answered the following sub-questions related to usability and effectiveness for design (navigation, access, interface design and effectiveness):

**Table 3: User review responses as relative to sub questions (n=5)**

How easy is it for users to find the material they need to complete the requirements of each of the topics (levels)? (Navigation)	Q1, 2, 3, 4,5,6, 11, 10
How do users interact with the content and is it relevant? (Access)	7,6,7,8,9,12,13
How does the design of the virtual business tour allow effective and meaningful engagement? (Interface Design)	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11
How do the instructions encourage independent study? (Effectiveness)	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8

The full questionnaire with tabulated responses is available in Appendix 2.

### ***Summarized findings:***

**Navigation/Access:**

Overall, the respondents agreed that navigation and access was clear and that the Activity guide was useful. There was general agreement that the organization of the content was appropriate and the learning materials were relevant, and the navigation prompts linking GET SET and the QPASS CV were clear for most of the respondents. However some aspects of the instructions to navigate *within* and *between* the GET SET programme and the Moodle site were unclear.

For example, 100% of the respondents agreed that the Activity guide was useful and the instructions for navigating and using the learning activities were clear. 100% of the respondents also said that the content organization was appropriate and 80% stated that the learning materials assisted with the completion of the QPASS CV. 60% of the respondents could match the learning material with the



assessments in each part of the building (level) and 60% were also able to use the materials without the help of a tutor.

While 60% of the respondents found the instructions for accessing the GET SET programme clear, 40% were ambivalent, and only 40% found accessing the support instructions clear, while 60% were ambivalent. 40% did not find it easy to switch *between* the material and the GET SET programme, but 60% did not have a problem. However, for 100% of the respondents, the navigation prompts *within* GET SET, linking GET SET and the QPASS CV were clear.

80% of the respondents said they knew how to get help from a tutor, but more help and guidance was needed by 40% of the respondents; 40% would also prefer to get their help from a tutor than work it out themselves.

Refer to Table 6 in Appendix 2 for percent frequency responses to questions.

### **Interface Design:**

Overall, the majority of the respondents were positive about the design of the Virtual tour and found it easy to use, interesting and relative to 'real world' situations. For example, 100% of the respondents said the design encouraged them to explore all of the levels in the building. All of respondents also stated that the roles of the staff and the narration/animations were appropriate to the objectives of the programme. 80% were encouraged by the design of the virtual tour to complete the QPASS CV. 60% of the respondents said that the timing of the assessments was useful and were motivated to try all of the learning activities.

Refer to Table 7 in Appendix 2 for percent frequency responses to questions.

### **Effectiveness:**

Overall, the majority of respondents were positive about aspects of the Virtual Tour in helping them study and complete the QPASS CV. There did not appear to be any aspects which they did not find effective for learning. For example, 100% of the respondents found that completing the Virtual tour and meeting the staff encouraged independent engagement, along with reading the study guide and 80% agreed that the learning activities encouraged completion of the QPASS CV. In terms of being able to take notes while online, 80% agreed and found the pre-written notes useful (Personal organiser).

The feedback received while engaging with the programme was found to be effective for learning for 60% of the respondents.

Only 20% of the respondents disagreed that the design of the Virtual tour and completing the learning activities encouraged QPASS CV completion.

Refer to Table 8 in Appendix 2 for percent frequency responses to questions.

## Discussion

A comprehensive range of responses has been possible from the different methodologies utilized, sufficient to answer all the guiding questions required from the evaluation. While the quantitative data obtained by the user review was limited by the sample size, noted as a limitation at the planning stage, it was felt that the data obtained was substantiated by the discussions which also occurred during the evaluation process. Reeves and Hedberg (2003) noted a similar concern when using small sample sizes for effectiveness evaluations carried out with prototype interactive learning systems. While not statistically significant, the quantitative data obtained in this review was enhanced by the qualitative comments and feedback-allowing a higher level of confidence. This experience has also been noted by Lockee et al (2002), in a formative evaluation of an early online course in Instructional Technology. They relied on a similar strategy for their review, using peers, experts and if possible, an instructional designer; concluding that changes could be identified at an appropriate development stage. This evaluation gained an unexpected opportunity, engaging with one of the peers as an 'expert', (Instructional Designer), highlighting further additional design modifications and those outcomes will be listed as Recommendations.

Qualitative data from the Peer /Expert review Interview discussions has been used to answer:

### ***Is the design of the activities relevant to the learning outcomes (SD3)?***

**Table 4: A summary of Sub-question responses for 'Is the design of the activities relevant to the learning outcomes?'**

Can the students potentially engage with the learning activities provided with no face-to face contact with lecturing staff?" (E)	<i>Yes, with use of the Activity Guide and the timing of the assessments throughout the programme, this is possible.</i>
How appropriate are the activities in encouraging users to engage with the virtual tour? (E)	<i>Clear and justifiable, sufficient to encourage users, but some further guidance needed. The virtual tour connected the QPASS CV requirements with the study guide material. The design of the Activity guide encourages completion of the Tour and the learning activities. A more comprehensive CV is achieved.</i>
How does the design of the instruction/support help or encourage students to interact with the course materials? (S)	<i>By guiding students through the activities and the assessments as they progress through the GET SET programme (the Activity Guide). A review of the initial guidance instructions was suggested.</i>
How will the tutors know when support is needed? (S)	<i>By monitoring assessment completion and QPASS CV completion. If the students don't engage initially extra help will be needed, and the areas for seeking HELP were not immediately obvious.</i>

The emphasis was on the use of the Activity guide for connecting and guiding through the GET SET content, the Study Guide material and the requirements for the QPASS CV, and to assist the students in completing the assessments in a timely manner. This made up for the lack of a tutor in a face-to-face situation. Overall the design and learning activities were favoured positively, with some modifications necessary in the initial advice and guidance for starting the programme (engagement), satisfying the evaluator that independent engagement was indeed possible. The benefits were seen as being able to complete in your own time and at own pace, and the drawbacks were commonly agreed to as being the amount of time needed to complete the Virtual tour, but as the aim was to slow down this process, with the inclusion of extra learning activities, this is not significant. The initial confusion with accessing three parts to the programme (e.g. if a student only wanted to complete the QPASS CV), could be off-putting. Clarification and addition of a Help feature would assist. An interesting comment was provided-if the students don't reply to the initial guiding email, then that could be the first opportunity for tutors to offer assistance. It was generally agreed, however, that regular contact with the students would be needed.

Quantitative data from the User review questionnaires and review discussions have been used to answer:

***Do the technologies employed successfully help the students participate and learn (ST9)?***

**Table 5: A summary of Sub-question responses for: 'Do the technologies employed successfully help the students participate and learn?'**

<p>How easy is it for users to find the material they need to complete the requirements of each of the topics (levels)? (Navigation)</p>	<p><i>Navigation prompts within GET SET, linking GET SET and the QPASS CV made it easy to access these features.</i> <i>Not so clear for navigating between GET SET and the Moodle site.</i></p>
<p>How do users interact with the content and is it relevant? (Access)</p>	<p><i>Yes, the content is relevant and users were able to interact by the use of the Activity guide.</i> <i>This can be substantiated by nearly all users agreeing to the effectiveness of the Virtual staff /learning activities on each level and the Study guide.</i></p>
<p>How does the design of the virtual business tour allow effective and meaningful engagement? (Interface Design)</p>	<p><i>All respondents considered the Virtual tour interesting and useful for meaningful engagement, and were encouraged to explore by meeting the staff. Completion of the assessments (their timing) throughout the tour assists with engagement but some improvement of the instructional wording in the Activity guide would help improve this.</i></p>
<p>How do the instructions encourage independent study? (Effectiveness)</p>	<p><i>By highlighting the positive features of navigation (using the Activity guide) but some users needed more help and guidance. Use of personal organiser notes helped.</i></p>

Navigation within the programme was certainly found to be sufficient; this was also confirmed by the positive responses (80%-100% of users) noted for ease of use, design and encouragement in using the Virtual Tour (Interface Design objective), in agreement with the peers-expert responses. In terms of navigating *between* the GET SET programme and the Moodle site, it was found that all three groups of reviewers indicated issues (60% of the User reviewers were ambivalent about whether the instructions for the material were clear and 40% did not find it easy to switch between the two) and most of the peer-expert reviewers all made comments on their initial confusion with the wording of the initial contact email.

Overall, accessibility was improved with use of the Activity guide and by listening to the different staff, reading the study guide and the learning activities available on each level of the building (design), also highlighted by positive effectiveness results.

Responses arising from discussions with the User reviewers highlighted a need for some re-wording of the Activity guide (see comments in Table 6) referring to a clearer link needed between the Moodle activities and the assessments. This is confirmed by the Peer and Expert reviewer's comments.

It's important to note here that 80% of the Users found the interface design of the Virtual tour helped with the completion of the CV and that result compliments with 80% of the Users being encouraged to complete the CV by the learning activities (effectiveness response). In terms of overall effectiveness, though, the responses from the navigation objectives helped identify a need to improve the HELP and guidance instructions (40% stating they needed that help and 40% saying they preferred help rather than working it out on their own). Both the Users and Peer-Expert discussion produced similar responses in terms of accessing any HELP features.

While 80% of the users found the online personal organiser notes useful, there was comment made that the instructions for this could be clarified.

The underlying purpose of the evaluation was to confirm if there was enough interaction with the students for independent engagement and would the Tutors know when assistance was needed. The responses received, when grouped under guidelines (with the sub-questions) demonstrate that the evaluation purpose was achieved positively. It appears that overall the design and pedagogy was a good fit to the "real world", the learning outcomes could be met and with modification to instructions and support, successful independent engagement is possible.

## Recommendations

The recommendations suggested are based on changes that can be made to the delivery design and level of support, aimed at improving the areas identified in the Discussion. As a result of the evaluation responses, it is recommended that the approach used for online learning in the *Short Course Certificate in Preparing and Enhancing your Career* be re-designed to ensure best practice-optimal interaction with tutors and content. The evaluator believes this can be achieved through improving overall engagement and support as in the following table:

**Table 6: Recommended improvements for engagement and support**

Objective	Recommendations
Engagement	Redesign initial welcome letter (email) and Introduction on the Moodle site Redesign essential information block presented on the Moodle site Re-word Activity Guide explanations to clarify and explain the links to resources on the Moodle site Change the wording in the initial Welcome email so students have to reply to get their access code Improve formatting in Activity Guide (instruction layout)
Support	Improve the HELP and Support links on the Moodle

The following changes to the online materials, navigation and support instruction for students of the GET SET programme are also recommended for improving independent engagement as outlined in Table 7.

**Table 7: Recommended improvements for navigation, access, design and effectiveness**

Objective	The Recommendations
Navigation/Access	Provide study guide and Activity guide in paper format as well as 'online' format Navigation in GET SET could include a "log out" link Provide a fast forward button to skip parts of the GET SET tour
Interface Design	Provide more explanation of the relationship between the Virtual tour and Moodle resources (what is required at each level)-Essential Information Block on Moodle.
Effectiveness	Clarify Assessment instructions (Activity Guide and Moodle)- explanation that they are compulsory Clarify use of the personal organiser notes in initial instructions

Three of Nielsen's heuristics for useable design were identified at the planning stage as appropriate for addressing in this type of programme evaluation (Mehlenbacher et al, 2005). The questions designed were aimed at evaluating usability in terms of meaning "is the e-learning environment useful (it does what is wanted) and effective (allows the users to perform tasks proficiently and quickly)?

(2) Match between system and real world- *the content was relevant to the learning outcomes*

(3) User control and freedom-*navigation and access was acceptable with some improvements*

(6) Recognition rather than recall-*the activity guide and study guide (and the associated suggested improved instruction) allowed the user to move from one part of the programme to another.*

The evaluator believes that the responses received provided the developers with the information needed to eliminate the issues and address via the three heuristic tools (usability principles).

As mentioned in the Discussion, one of the peer reviewers also acted as an expert reviewer in terms of instructional design (for the Moodle site). The recommendations that resulted were parallel to other responses relating to interface design, as follows:

- Suggested changes design of Topic Blocks on Moodle (use of iconic labels);
- Suggested using Moodle Quiz instrumentation rather than Hot Potatoes;
- Improve design of HELP and Tutor contact details on Moodle site;
- Standardize FONT size and layout;
- End of course evaluation on Moodle;
- Possible inclusion of a participant Blog- for recording progress throughout the journey;
- Provide the same User review questionnaire to an early cohort of enrolled students (during the Implementation phase of the programme).

The next steps for the programme include a release to a larger group of students once the recommended changes have been made. These modifications are considered to be very achievable and once completed, the programme has the potential to be very successful.

## References

- E-Learning Guidelines for New Zealand (2005). *Guidelines for teachers, support staff and managers*. Retrieved 14 May 2009 from [http://elg.massey.ac.nz/index.php?title=E-Learning\\_Guidelines](http://elg.massey.ac.nz/index.php?title=E-Learning_Guidelines)
- Learning Technology Dissemination Initiative. (1998). *Evaluation Cookbook-a practical guide to evaluation methods for lecturers*. Retrieved 3 May 2009 from <http://www.icbl.hw.ac.uk/ltdi/cookbook>
- Lockee, B., Moore, M., and Burton, J. (2002). *Measuring Success: Evaluation strategies for distance education*. Educause Quarterly, 1, 2002. Retrieved from <http://net.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/EQM0213.pdf>
- Mehlenbacher, B., Bennett, L., Bird, T., Ivey, M., Lucas, J., Morton, J. and Whitman, L. (2005). *Useable e-Learning: a conceptual model for evaluation and design*. Retrieved 29 March 2009 from <http://www.pedagogy.ir/images/pdf/usable-e-learning05.pdf>
- Phillips, R. (2004). *We can't evaluate e-learning if we don't know what we mean by evaluating e-learning!* Retrieved 29 March 2009 from <http://www.tlc.murdoch.edu.au/staff/phillips/PhillipsV2Final.doc>
- Reeves, T. C., and Hedburg, J.G. (2003). *Interactive Learning Systems Evaluation*. Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology Publications. (pp 173-203 Chapter 8 Effectiveness Evaluation)

# Appendices

## Appendix 1: Instrumentation

### *A: Expert Review Questions*

#### **Overview:**

**“Is the design of the activities relevant to the learning outcomes?”**

Sub questions to investigate effectiveness of the design of the activities and learning material.

- Can the students potentially engage with the learning activities provided with no face-to-face contact with lecturing staff?
- How appropriate are the activities in encouraging users to engage with the virtual tour?
- How does the design of the instruction/support help or encourage students to interact with the course materials?

#### **Questions:**

1. Are the learning activities appropriate for independent engagement and completion of the CV?
2. Are the learning activities appropriate to accompany the Virtual Tour? Do they complement the existing GET SET content? (E)
3. If compared to delivery via a face-to-face classroom, do you think the students will fully engage with the content before completing the CV? (E)
4. Do the learning experiences gained by completing the Virtual tour align with the additional learning outcomes? (E)
5. Does the design of the programme encourage students to further engage/align with concepts that they would already be familiar with (e.g job seeking skills-CV completion-prior experience)? (E)
6. Is there enough interactivity in the programme to encourage reading of the Study Guide text, in addition to material covered by the Virtual Tour
7. Do you think the additional content and design of the support mechanisms can help the students meet the relevant learning outcomes more effectively with minimal tutor support? (S)
8. Do you think the instructions supplied and the Activity Guide contains sufficient information to guide the students? (S)
9. Can you see where there are opportunities for students to seek help? (S)
10. Do you think the design of the Activity Guide encourages interaction with the course material? (E/S)
11. Do you think a more comprehensive CV is produced by engaging with all the learning activities? (E)
12. Do you wish to make any other comments with respect to usability and effectiveness?

Finally, please give us your views on using the GET SET program to complete an online CV in an independent environment?

- a) What drawbacks (or disadvantages) do you see in using this program independently?
- b) Can you suggest ways of overcoming these drawbacks (if any)?
- c) What benefits do you see for using GET SET in this independent online format?
- d) If you could change anything what would it be?

### ***B: Peer Review Questions***

#### **Overview:**

#### **“Is the design of the activities relevant to the learning outcomes?”**

Sub questions: to investigate effectiveness of the design of the activities and learning material relating to engagement (E) and support (S):

- Can the students potentially engage with the learning activities provided with no face-to-face contact with lecturing staff?” (E)
- How does the design of the instruction/support help or encourage students to interact with the course materials? (E/S)
- How will the tutors know when support is needed? (S)

#### **Questions:**

1. Are the learning activities clearly identifiable and justifiable? (E)
2. Do you believe the students will use the activities to fully complete the CV? (E)
3. Are the learning activities appropriate for independent engagement and completion of the CV? (E)
4. Do you think the Virtual tour will motivate students to investigate the learning materials? (E)
5. Do you think the students will engage with the summative activities before completing the CV and assessments? (E)
6. Do you think the students will engage with the assessments at the recommended stage of the programme (in the Activity Guide)? (E )
7. Are the types of assessment consistent with the course content and learning outcomes?
8. Do you think there is enough instruction to prompt engagement with the learning material? (E/S)
9. Are there sufficient learning activities to match the content at each stage of the virtual tour? (E)
10. Is there sufficient interaction with the students to establish when support is needed? (S)
11. Are there appropriate mechanisms for tracking student progress? (E/S)
12. What do you think of the Activity Guide (What you need to do?) (S)
13. Do you think the design of the Activity Guide encourages interaction with the course materials?
14. Are the support mechanisms appropriate for this type of learning? (S)
15. Do you wish to make any other comments with respect to engagement and support?



Finally, please give us your views on using the GET SET program to complete an online CV?

- a) What drawbacks (or disadvantages) do you see in using this program independently?
- b) Can you suggest ways of overcoming these drawbacks (if any)?
- c) What benefits do you see for using GET SET in this independent online format?
- d) If you could change anything what would it be?

### *C: User Review Questions*

#### **Overview:**

**“Do the technologies employed successfully help the students participate and learn?”**

Sub questions:

- How easy is it for users to find the material they need to complete the requirements of each of the topics (levels)? (Navigation)
- How do users interact with the content and is it relevant? (Access)
- How does the design of the virtual business tour allow effective and meaningful engagement? (Interface Design)
- How do the instructions encourage independent study? (Effectiveness/Design)

<b>Objective: Navigation and Access</b>	1 ———   ———   ———   ———   5 ——— Strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neutral (3), agree (4), strongly agree (5).
1. Instructions for accessing the GET SET programme are clear	
2. Instructions for accessing support and learning materials are clear	
3. Instructions for navigating and using learning materials are clear	
4. The Activity Guide (What you need to do) is clear and useful	
5. The navigation prompts clearly link the learning material to the requirements for the QPASS CV	
6. It was easy to switch between the GETSET program and the Moodle Site	
7. I could always match the learning material with the assessments and activities as introduced at each building level	
8. I am able to use the learning materials without help and guidance from the tutor	
9. I know how to ask for help from a tutor	
10. I prefer to get help from a tutor than try and work out how to use the online materials	

11. The organization and order of the content is appropriate to the subject matter	
12. Learning materials are relevant to help me complete my QPASS CV	
13. Learning materials are relevant and help me with my assessments	
<b>Comments:</b> Do you have any other comments relating to Navigation and Access?	

<b>Objective: Interface Design</b>	<p>1 — 5   —   —   —   —</p> <p>Strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neutral (3), agree (4), strongly agree (5).</p>
1. The virtual business tour is easy to use	
2. I could relate to the study guide material better if I engaged on the virtual business tour	
3. The virtual business tour is interesting and relative to 'real world' situations	
4. I was motivated to try all the activities in the virtual business tour	
5. The design of the virtual tour encouraged me to explore all the levels in the building	
6. The design of the virtual tour encouraged me to complete the QPASS CV when prompted	
7. The timing of the assessments (availability) throughout the course was useful	
8. The assessments were completed at the time recommended in the Activity Guide	
9. I was well informed of the objectives for the programme	
10. Narration and animation during the virtual tour is appropriate to the objectives of the programme	
11. The roles of the staff on the virtual business tour are appropriate to guide my learning	
<b>Comments:</b> Do you have any other comments relating to Interface Design?	

--	--

<b>Objective: Effectiveness</b>	<p style="text-align: center;">1 — 5          </p> <p style="text-align: center;">Strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neutral (3), agree (4), strongly agree (5).</p>
1. The staff on the Virtual tour encourage completion of the QPASS CV when prompted	
2. Learning Activities on each Building Level encourage completion of the CV	
3. Meeting the different staff on the Virtual Tour encouraged me to read the study guide material	
4. The online materials encourage me to study independently and explore	
5. The activities and study guide material enhance my previous experiences (work and study related)	
6. Feedback is effective for learning and promotes completion of the QPASS CV	
7. The ability to take notes online was useful (GET SET)	
8. The PDF notes were useful and relevant to the learning material	
<b>Comments:</b> Do you have any other comments relating to Effectiveness?	

**General Additional Comments:**

Overall, can you think of anything in the course that could be improved generally?

What were the main difficulties that you encountered during the course?

## Appendix 2: Responses from Questionnaires

Table 8: User Review Questionnaire responses for Navigation and Access (% Frequencies, n=5)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
<b>Navigation Results</b>					
1. Instructions for accessing the GET SET programme are clear	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%	0.0%
2. Instructions for accessing support and learning materials are clear	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%
3. Instructions for navigating and using learning materials are clear	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
4. The Activity Guide (What you need to do) is clear and useful	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
5. The navigation prompts clearly link the learning material to the requirements for the QPASS CV	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%
6. It was easy to switch between the GETSET program and the Moodle Site	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%
7. I could always match the learning material with the assessments and activities as introduced at each building level	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%
8. I am able to use the learning materials without help and guidance from the tutor	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%
9. I know how to ask for help from a tutor	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	60.0%	20.0%
10. I prefer to get help from a tutor than try and work out how to use the online materials	20.0%	20.0%	0.0%	60.0%	0.0%
11. The organization and order of the content is appropriate to the subject matter	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
12. Learning materials are relevant to help me complete my QPASS CV	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
13. Learning materials are relevant and help me with my assessments	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%
<p><u>Extra Comments:</u>                      -I found difficulty with some of the font sizes.                      -Provide hardcopies of activity, quick start, study guides. More instructions needed on Moodle when to use additional resources (link with activity guide). Redesign welcome letter, reorder information. Confusion between voucher number &amp; release activation code?                      -A little more explanation at the beginning linking the documents for each level sitting on Moodle with the QJumpers site, plus clearly outlining that there are compulsory assessments for each level as well sitting on Moodle. Also maybe a bit clearer which docs to look at when first are logging on - clearer info in the getting started letter maybe</p>					

Table 9: User Review Questionnaire responses for Interface Design (% Frequencies, n=5)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
<b>Interface Design results</b>					

1. The virtual business tour is easy to use	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
2. I could relate to the study guide material better if I engaged on the virtual business tour	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
3. The virtual business tour is interesting and relative to 'real world' situations	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%
4. I was motivated to try all the activities in the virtual business tour	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%	0.0%
5. The design of the virtual tour encouraged me to explore all the levels in the building	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
6. The design of the virtual tour encouraged me to complete the QPASS CV when prompted	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	60.0%	20.0%
7. The timing of the assessments (availability) throughout the course was useful	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%
8. The assessments were completed at the time recommended in the Activity Guide	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%
9. I was well informed of the objectives for the programme	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
10. Narration and animation during the virtual tour is appropriate to the objectives of the programme	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0%	20.0%
11. The roles of the staff on the virtual business tour are appropriate to guide my learning	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.0%	40.0%
<u>Extra Comments:</u> -Fonts too small -Some of the voices were annoying (not clear pronunciation). Scrolling difficult when following the words/speaking -No - interface design is good - easy to follow -The clothing that the characters wore was a bit 'retro'! The tour was quite motivational, and encouraging, better than just reading the material. The roles of the characters were relevant.					

Table 10: User Review Questionnaire responses for Effectiveness (% Frequencies, n=5)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
<b>Effectiveness Results</b>					
1. The staff on the Virtual tour encourage completion of the QPASS CV when prompted	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	40.0%	40.0%
2. Learning Activities on each Building Level encourage completion of the CV	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%
3. Meeting the different staff on the Virtual Tour encouraged me to read the study guide material	0.00%	0.00%	20.00%	60.00%	20.00%
4. The online materials encourage me to study independently and explore	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%
5. The activities and study guide material enhance my previous experiences (work and study related)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	80.00%	20.00%
6. Feedback is effective for learning and promotes completion of the QPASS CV	0.00%	0.00%	40.00%	60.00%	0.00%

7. The ability to take notes online was useful (GET SET)	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%
8. The PDF notes were useful and relevant to the learning material	0.00%	20.00%	0.00%	60.00%	20.00%
<p>Extra Comments:</p> <p>-no</p> <p>-N/A</p> <p>-Lots of encouragement to complete the CV- but still need self motivation. Time was a factor - if I don't complete assessments will I get feedback? There was no extra information to use the Note Facility- learnt how to by accident, however they were fairly easy to follow.</p>					