University Internal Reviewer: KM Smith, PhD

Course: HRB XXX

General Standard 1 - Course Overview and Introduction: The overall design of the course is made clear to the learner at the beginning of the course.

Review Standard 1.1 – MET

- A "Start Here" module is available. Learners are directed to the syllabus at the beginning of the course.

- I would also recommend, based on Standard Review 1.1, a "Course Tour" to be included on the "Start Here" page.

Review Standard 1.2 – NOT MET

- Based on QM's Review Standard 1.2, this course would benefit from "Structure" guidance, such as a "Course Map". The most common way to provide instructions is to do it all up front - seen in most courses that I review. Generally, you share what needs to happen and when. Depending on the complexity, you may provide some details and screen shots. Another option is to provide Instructions at the point of need. Lastly, you can provide instructions as a practice activity. This entails asking learners something similar to, "Do you need guidance?" the downside to this last approach is the time it takes to build guidance with variables to create an adaptive path, but on the other hand it disarms new learners and provides confidence and allows tenured learners to ignore. A good place for this would be the Welcome and Course Overview or Start Here page.

- Side Note: Keep in mind how you consistently use verbs or point of view; in the Welcome and Course Overview page, you refer to students as "**students**" and other times as "**you**".

Review Standard 1.3 – NOT MET

- I was unable to locate "Netiquette" expectations. According to Review Standard 1.3, this should be included as, "*Since learner behavior is culturally influenced, it is important to be explicit about standards for communication that apply in the course.*" A good place for this would be the syllabus or discussion board instructions.

Review Standard 1.4 – MET

- This is adequately addressed in the syllabus.

- You may want to consider including a policy on "Confidentiality" in the virtual classroom.

Review Standard 1.5 - MET

- Great job on including link to "Minimum Technical requirements" and including information regarding speakers and headsets. Learners are provided with detailed, clearly worded information regarding the technologies they will need throughout the course.

Review Standard 1.6 – MET

- Prerequisite knowledge requirements are clearly stated on the "Welcome and Overview" content page.

Review Standard 1.7 – NOT MET

- I was unable to identify "Minimal technical skills" in the course. Review Standard 1.7 suggests, "*General as well as course-specific technical skills learners must have to succeed in the course*..." as clearly stated. For example, how to use Canvas, submitting documents to the course, accessing videos, etc. This could be incorporated into the Syllabus or Welcome and Overview page.

Review Standard 1.8 – MET

- As these students most likely are familiar with one another, it would be beneficial to remind them of the "Virtual Café". This builds a sense of community.

Review Standard 1.9 - NOT MET

- To meet this review, provide an opportunity where "*Learners are asked to introduce themselves and given guidance on where and how they should do so*." It is also suggested, "*Instructors may ask learners to respond to specific questions (such as why they are taking the course, what are their strategies for success, what concerns they have, what they expect to learn, etc.) or may choose to let the learner decide what to include*".

General Standard 2 – Learning Objectives (Competencies): Learning objectives or competencies describe what learners will be able to do upon completion of the course.

Review Standard 2.1 – MET

- Measurable course learning objectives or competencies precisely and clearly describe what learners will learn and be able to do if they successfully complete the course.

Review Standard 2.2 – NOT MET

- Weeks 1, 7, and 9 Modular outcomes state, "*This week you will get an orientation to the course and the subject matter*." Review Standard 2.2 states "*Learning objectives or competencies at the module/unit level align with and are more specific than course objectives or competencies*." In order to meet this standard, I would recommend specifying these modular outcomes.

Review Standard 2.3 – NOT MET

- To meet Review Standard 2.3, the learning objectives or competencies are *"written in a way that allows learners, including non-native speakers, to easily grasp their meaning and the learning outcomes expected".* Based on this recommendation, I have outlined a few examples below of language usage that may pose difficulty for some learners.

    - Week 10 Introduction

        o Based on Review Standard 2.3, convert "idiosyncratic vs. intrinsic reactions" to laymen's terms

    - Week 4 Introduction

        o This is the first time you are using the term "*monographs*". Review Standard 2.3 states, "*The use of educational or discipline jargon, unexplained terminology, and unnecessarily complex language is avoided.*" To meet this standard, I suggest you replace "*monograph*" with "study" or something similar. Once you introduce the term, it is more clearly understood when used again.

    - Week 1 Myth or Reality? and Myth & Reality Wrap-Up Week 1

        o The instructions that state, "*Back up your conclusion using at least one quality reference in APA citation and a thorough explanation and rationale.*" Change "*back up*" to word such as "support" or something similar as "back up" may be misinterpreted.

    - Week 1 Policy Exercise

        o For the instructions stating "*In the Policy Exercise weeks (odd weeks) of this course,…"* replace "odd" with "Weeks 1, 3, 5, 7, etc." This may be unclear to some learners.

Review Standard 2.4 – MET

- Linked chart is located on Welcome and Overview content page.

- I would suggest learning objectives or competencies are integrated throughout the course and are not just listed in one location.

Review Standard 2.5 – MET

- It may be beneficial to add descriptive taxonomies, describing the levels of learning, to the weekly learning objectives introduced on each weeks "Introduction" page. This addition would categorizes learning objectives and helps reviewers decide whether the objectives or

competencies correlate to the course. Review Standard 2.5 recommends that "*upper-level or graduate course would include objectives or competencies high in the cognitive realm and use verbs such as "differentiate," "design," or "justify," with assessments such as critiques, flow charts, or original research*".

General Standard 3 – Assessment and Measurement: Assessments are integral to the learning process and are designed to evaluate learner progress in achieving the stated learning objectives or mastering the competencies.

Review Standard 3.1 – MET

- I liked the way you displayed this alignment on the Welcome and Overview content page. From the types of assessments chosen, it is clear that learners can successfully complete the assessments if they have met the objectives or competencies stated in the course materials and learning activities.

Review Standard 3.2 – MET

- The points, percentages, and weights for each component of the course grade are clearly stated in the syllabus.

Review Standard 3.3 – MET

- For improved clarity and consistency, I would recommend updating **"***Rubric for Conducting Peer Reviews*" to "Assessment Rubric for Conducting Peer Reviews" for consistency.

    o For example: Week 1 Policy Exercise and [Week 1 Myth or Reality?](#)

- Additionally, as a side note in [Myth & Reality Wrap-Up Week 1](#), learners may be less confused when viewing their grades and assignments this content is placed on a Canvas "content" page, instead of an assignment page.

Review Standard 3.4 – MET

- Assessments require learners to apply what they learn and utilize critical thinking. Assessments are sequenced to promote the learning process and to build on previously mastered knowledge.

Review Standard 3.5 – MET

- Feedback provided from Peer reviews and discussion forums provide learners with a method of tracking their progress.

General Standard 4 – Instructional Materials: Instructional materials enable learners to achieve stated learning objectives or competencies.

Review Standard 4.1 – MET

- Nice use of digital texts: [Botanical Safety Handbook Introduction (Links to an external site.)](#) This instructional material aligns with the course and module learning objectives or competencies

Review Standard 4.2 – NOT MET

- According to Review Standard 4.2, "*Learners are provided with an explanation of how the instructional materials…. are used in the course, and how each will help them achieve the stated learning objectives or help them prepare to demonstrate course competencies.*" A good place for this would be in each modular "Lecture" content page.

Review Standard 4.3 – MET

- Sources for materials used in the course are clearly identified and cited. Citations are found in weekly resources.

Review Standard 4.4 – MET

- The online textbook is up to date, as this is the 2nd edition and was published in 2013.

Review Standard 4.5 – MET

- The weekly resources tab provides evidence that learners are given a variety of options for how they consume content, such as reading the texts, viewing a video, listening to audio.

Review Standard 4.6 – MET

- The syllabus (page 3) provides a clear explanation to learners regarding which materials and resources are required and which are optional.

General Standard 5 – Course Activities and Learner Interaction: Course activities facilitate and support learner interaction and engagement.

Review Standard 5.1 – MET

- Awesome job at displaying this alignment on the Welcome and Overview content page.

Review Standard 5.2 – MET

- Activities promote learner-learner, teacher-learner, and learner-content engagement with use of discussion boards, peer reviews, and online text.

Review Standard 5.3 – NOT MET

- The communications policy is clearly outlined in the syllabus as it pertains to "instructor response to emails". However, I was unable to locate information regarding when learners will

receive **instructor responses** to discussion postings, feedback on assignments, and grades. In agreeance with Review Standard 5.3 suggestion, "*This information typically appears in the course syllabus.*" To meet this standard, place this information in the syllabus.

Review Standard 5.4 – MET

- Detailed in assignment rubric. You may also want to consider placing expectations for learner participation in the course information page or syllabus.

General Standard 6 – Course Technology: Course technologies support learners' achievement of course objectives or competencies.

Review Standard 6.1 – MET

- The tools selected for the course align with the course and module objectives or competencies

Review Standard 6.2 – MET

- Discussion boards prompt active learning. Additionally, another great mechanism suggested by Review Standard 6.2, "*Automated self-check exercises requiring learner responses*". This presents an ideal scenario for use of interactive learning objects, such as a Captivate or Storyline activity.

Review Standard 6.3 – MET

- This is appropriately defined in the syllabus.

Review Standard 6.4 – MET

- In addition to the e-text used in the course, it may be helpful to explore if there are any complimentary apps that you can suggest to students.

Review Standard 6.5 – NOT MET

- Review Standard 6.5 states, "If the learner is required to create an account with a username and password to access a tool, the privacy policy is available for learners to read and use to safeguard their accounts." I am recommending you include this link with the weekly "Resources". If applicable, it is also appropriate to state that no privacy statements are available. Specifically, for the portions of the e-text that requires the student to login.

General Standard 7 – Learner Support: The course facilitates learner access to institutional support services essential to learner success.

Review Standard 7.1 – MET

- Canvas support contact is in the Communication Policy of the syllabus. In addition to Canvas phone number, it may be valuable to provide a hyperlink as well.

Review Standard 7.2 – NOT MET

- In the syllabus, there is a link for "Disability Services", which guide users to an "Accommodations" request form. Accessibility and Accommodations are not the same. Review Standard 7.2 recommends, "*Accessibility policies or accommodation statements state that services and accommodations are available for learners with disabilities and inform the learner how such services may be obtained*." To meet this standard, place accessibility and accommodations information, statement, and resources in the course syllabus.

Review Standard 7.3 – NOT MET

- The syllabus has a link called "Standards & Practices", which guide learners to a list of resources including "Academic Affairs". Once users click on ""Academic Affairs", they are taken to a list of institutional policies pertaining to academic freedom, faculty appointment, intellectual property, etc. However, I was unable to locate "*evidence that learners have access to academic support services and resources from within the course or the learning management system*". To meet this standard, Review Standard 7.2 recommends including "*Links to academic support services and how to obtain these services (e.g., location of testing center and/or proctored test sites, hours of operation, phone numbers, and email addresses for key personnel)*". It is ideal if this information is located within the syllabus or on the "Welcome" content page.

Review Standard 7.4 – NOT MET

- The syllabus has a link called "Standards & Practices", which guide learners to a list of resources including "Student Affairs". Once users click on "Student Affairs", they are directed to a list of institutional policies on emergency student loans, grades, schedule adjustments, holidays, credits, and tuition. In reviewing the policies, there is no mention of how students can obtain support services (including email addresses and phone numbers for key personnel). There is also no guidance on when and how students may obtain a particular support service or resource. It is customary to place this information within the Syllabus or on the "Welcome" content page.

General Standard 8 – Accessibility and Usability: The course design reflects a commitment to accessibility and usability for all learners.

Review Standard 8.1 – MET

- Navigation throughout the course is consistent, logical, and efficient.

Review Standard 8.2 – NOT MET

- In order to meet this standard, the course should include "*links to the accessibility statements for all required technologies. If an accessibility statement does not exist for a particular technology, a statement is included that explains that the accessibility statement does not exist.*" A good place for this would be in close proximity of where you placed the privacy policy for external links.

Review Standard 8.3 – NOT MET

- Week 1 Lectures – Need supplementary textual representation (few sentences) of video content

- Weekly Myth or Reality "Prompt" font color should be converted to an accessible color, dark blue, or black.

  - For example, in Week 1 Myth or Reality, you will see the prompt: "**Herbs are mostly safe because they are natural**".

- Weekly Myth and Reality Wrap up need supplementary textual representation of audio content.

  - For example: Myth & Reality Wrap-Up Week 1

- It would be helpful if Weekly lecture had a quick summary (few sentences), outlining what the video is about.

  - For example: Week 2 Lecture, Week 4 has a brief summary. It would be useful to do something similar for videos 1, 2, 3.

Review Standard 8.4 – MET

- Your course facilitates readability and minimizes distraction by grouping together headings, using simple font styles, and fonts that are distinguishable from the background.

Review Standard 8.5 – MET

- The course multimedia is easy to view, operate, and interpret with clear video and audio quality are clear, and users can control video navigation