

Reviewer: KM Smith, PhD

Project: Virtual Course Manager Candidate Pool

*NOTE: Candidates will not see search committee members reviews or comments regarding their submissions. These reviews are solely for the search committee's use in determining candidacy for the position of **Virtual Course Manager**.*

Candidate 65530: (ADVANCE)

Course Writer Feedback

- Candidate recognized inconsistencies among “we” and “you” noun usage throughout the module
- Provided specific recommendations regarding where the CW could integrate models or provide examples
- Candidate acknowledged the summary as incomplete and suggested the CW set expectations for upcoming modules and complete modular summary
- Displayed an attempt to balance feedback, but instead offered specific feedback. I recommend highlighting essential components in the introduction to promote rapport-building prior to providing constructive feedback
- Feedback could have been presented textually and visually to allow the CW a variety of ways to access the information
- Candidate queried CW regarding a “hook” for the module, yet, provided no rationale for questioning. Although, a good recommendation, it was not succinctly supported by the literature or best practices
- Candidate focused heavily on replacing one word with another. Missed the opportunity to provide feedback regarding immeasurable objectives (page 1 and 2), the use of unnecessary and complex language, chances for student engagement, content flow consistency, and several additional grammatical errors
- Missed the grammatical errors and lack of description for the table on page 7, missed the required citation for verbatim text on page 8 and grammatical errors throughout the storyboard

Course Builder Feedback

- CB feedback was slightly more balanced than CW's feedback
- Candidate noticed content redundancy
- Candidate performed well at recognizing unclear instructions and provided specific guidance
- Some of the feedback lacked rationale to support recommendations. For example, “*Is there a way to more clearly separate the content piece (read aloud intro) from the reflection piece (related to the video)?*” This feedback calls for reasoning to support the question. As the CB, I would ask “why”. Moreover, this question needs to be posed to the CW with supporting rationale

- The Candidate mentioned misalignment of the “modular objective” for page 1, however, made no mention of the “lesson objective “on Page 4
- Missed opportunities to provide feedback on ADA compliance issues, storyboard and LMS course mismatch

CANDIDATE 52049: (DO NOT ADVANCE)

Course Writer Feedback

- Provided great rationale in the first paragraph of the email
- Nice reference to organizational guidelines
- Candidate recognized objective misalignment
- Provided very high-level and broad feedback regarding use of infographics, course engagement (Discussion boards), and group learning. To provide context, the candidate’s feedback should be “specific” and offer guidance on where these items could be included within the course
- Missed several opportunities to clarify unclear instructions (for example, pages 4 and 11)
- Missed the table on page 7 grammatical errors, the tables lack of description, required citation for verbatim text on page 8, and grammatical errors throughout the storyboard
- Missed the opportunity to provide feedback on the use of unnecessary and complex language, content flow consistency, chances for student engagement, setting expectations for upcoming module , and incomplete modular summary

Course Builder Feedback

- Feedback was mostly balanced
- Provided rationale and examples for recommendations
- Made reference to ADA compliance issues
- Missed several inconsistencies between the course and actual storyboard, even though the candidate specified that was their primary focus. For example, items on page 2, 3, 6, 7 do not match the storyboard, as the LMS version added verbiage on page 2, bold fonts and language on page 3, underlined text on page 6, and bold headings on page 7
- Missed unclear instructions and major spacing errors
- Recommended, “Chunking” for content on page 7 (in error, candidate stated page 6); however, the example is not considered chunking. The information on Page 7 is chunked appropriately. Essentially, the candidate is suggesting that the course builder present the information in a variety of ways by offering a graphical representation of the text. That is not content chunking. The difference between these two concepts is important to know when evaluating online courses.

CANDIDATE 65935: (DO NOT ADVANCE)

Course Writer Feedback

- Initiated feedback with positive commendations

- Provided textual overview of recommendations and attached visual markup
- Nice use of supporting suggestions by referencing the literature, for example the Candidate stated, *“Lastly, our Online Learning and Design Guidelines remind us how importantly writing impacts the learning outcomes....”*
- Candidate provided specific suggestions regarding an appropriate location for the discussion board
- Identified unclear instructions on page 9
- Provided a recommendation regarding “chunking” modular “objectives”, by use of defining “Backward Design”, the definition of “backward design” is conveyed accurately; however, it is not clear how backward design, chunking content, and meeting objectives triangulate
- Missed unclear objective that stated, *“Now that you know...”* (Page 6), this is implied; unless you are assuming an assessment took place (?) If so, when, considering this is newly introduced content
- Missed the table on page 7 grammatical errors, the tables lack of description, required citation for verbatim text on page 8, and grammatical errors throughout the storyboard
- Missed the opportunity to provide feedback regarding header issues, content flow consistency, chances for student engagement, setting expectations for upcoming module, and incomplete modular summary

Course Builder Feedback

- Candidate provided positive feedback regarding the use of “color” to convey important messages as acceptable. This is not correct, federal ADA guidelines succinctly state to *“AVOID the use of color to convey essential information in online”* environment, as not all learners can see “color”
- Suggested inappropriate workaround for textual presentation in stating, *“... the use of some animation and fly-ins would also decrease the amount of text on the screen at one time”*; this suggestion is a violation of ADA section 508
- Missed several inconsistencies between the course and actual storyboard, accurate feedback on ADA compliance issues, objective misalignment, storyboard and LMS course mismatch, and a multitude of grammatical errors
- Missed the grammatical errors and lack of description for the table on page 7
- Missed the required citation for verbatim text on page 8 and grammatical errors throughout the storyboard

CANDIDATE 24278: (ADVANCE)

Course Writer Feedback

- Feedback was balanced and incorporated rapport-building language in the email
- Good job on recognizing objective misalignment
- Suggested specific feedback on ways to improve

- Candidate only provided one example of a typographical error. It would be best to identify all typographical errors, as it generally known the difficulty in recognizing one's own typographical and grammatical errors when closely associated with the product
- Feedback is vague, for example the Candidate stated, *"use less words"*, with no specifications, examples, or rationale
- Missed the opportunity to provide feedback regarding header issues, unclear instructions, proper citations, content flow consistency, chances for student engagement, setting expectations for upcoming module, and incomplete modular summary
- Missed the table on page 7 grammatical errors, the tables lack of description, required citation for verbatim text on page 8, and grammatical errors throughout storyboard

Course Builder Feedback

- Candidate acknowledged storyboard and LMS alignment
- Provided complimentary feedback, however, it is vague in nature, for example *"I like how certain instructions and/or information is presented in a way that calls extra attention so that the reader does not miss it."* If this were specific, it may encourage the CB to implement/utilize (whatever it was) in another course. Particularly considering that not all instructions were clear
- Provided only one recommendation, it was specific and appropriate feedback regarding content chunking. However, many more items needed addressing by the CB.
- Missed opportunities to provide feedback on ADA compliance issues, a multitude of grammatical errors, lack of APA citation where necessitated, additional unclear instructions, and major spacing errors

CANDIDATE 75807: (DO NOT ADVANCE)

Course Writer Feedback

- Candidate stated reasonable assumptions
- It would have been helpful to include a graphical markup, as visuals and narratives speak to different type of learners, so to include both with feedback is optimal
- Feedback is slightly "imbalanced". Candidate acknowledged what the course writer has done correctly once, and the remainder of the message contained recommendations. There were several missed opportunities to provide positive commendations
- Feedback narrative is non-linear and difficult to follow. I would suggest the Candidate provide feedback that parallels the order of course pages. For example, feedback initiates on topics related to page 10, concluding with topics related to page 5 and 6
- Missed several important elements to include alignment, measurable objectives, language use, header issues, incomplete modular summary, unclear instructions, citations, grammatical errors, chances for student engagement, and setting expectations for upcoming module
- Missed the table on page 7 grammatical errors, the tables lack of description, required citation for verbatim text on page 8, and grammatical errors throughout storyboard

Course Builder Feedback

- Provided one commendation in the beginning, the remaining feedback consisted of suggestions and recommendations. (Imbalanced feedback)
- Candidate made no mention of the overabundance of ADA compliance issues
- Missed storyboard and course build misalignment
- Missed lack of APA citation where necessitated

CANDIDATE 47776: (DO NOT ADVANCE)

Course Writer Feedback

- No rationale for recommendations
- Candidate recommended, "*Link back to previous modules for quick referencing materials*", however provides no clarity or example
- If the candidate had any assumptions, they were not stated in the response
- Completely missed formatting errors, misaligned objectives, SB containing complex language, typographical errors, unclear instructions, course consistency, incomplete modular summary, ADA, setting expectations for upcoming module, and Common Core alignment issues
- Missed the table on page 7 grammatical errors, the tables lack of description, required citation for verbatim text on page 8, and grammatical errors throughout storyboard

Course Builder Feedback

- Provided recommendations with no rationale
- Page 2 – Candidate recommended, "*Underline headings*". Where did that directive originate, the literature, or the internal organizational style guide? Candidate provided no rationale for suggestions. In addition, several of the recommendations are not aligned with industry best practices. I'm conjecturing the candidate stated this directive due to the heading being underlined in the storyboard? Maybe? Not sure.
- Page 2 – Candidate recommended italics for some text. (Why?)
- Missed several inconsistencies between the course and actual storyboard, a multitude of grammatical errors, and lack of APA citation where necessitated

CANDIDATE 78752: (DO NOT ADVANCE)

Course Writer Feedback

- Comment #1 tells the reader to go to Comment #3 for feedback explanation. Comment #3 offers alternative representation of the entire module. Unclear on why the Candidate directed the course writer to go to #3 instead of simply providing feedback where appropriate

- Comment #2 does not provide rationale for recommendation. It is ideal if recommendations are supported by the literature or industry best practices, not an opinion
- Candidate missed opportunities to provide feedback on content flow consistency, grammatical errors, ADA compliance, source citations, chances for student engagement, unclear instructions, setting expectations for upcoming module, header issues, and incomplete modular summary
- Missed the table on page 7 grammatical errors, the tables lack of description, required citation for verbatim text on page 8, and grammatical errors throughout storyboard

Course Builder Feedback

- Candidate developed a single paragraph of feedback that was unbalanced, lacked rational, overly vague, largely incorrect, and non-specific

CANDIDATE 85825: (DO NOT ADVANCE)

Course Writer Feedback

- Good catch on the unclear objective that stated, *“Now that you know...”* (page 6)
- Candidate provided specific suggestions regarding an appropriate location for the discussion board
- Feedback was imbalanced, initiated conversation with immediate recommendations and suggestions without regard to identifying positive aspects. This is remedied by including an introductory rapport-building paragraph
- Candidate inquired about a “hook” for the module, yet, provided no rationale for this practice. Although, a good recommendation, it was not succinctly supported by the literature or best practices
- Recommendations generally lack rational and/or reference to supporting literature
- Feedback is sometimes unclear. This is why it would be helpful to provide a markup. For example, the Candidate continuously referenced “slides”, however, I am reviewing a PDF, and the content is presented on individual pages. I am finding it difficult to follow along and identify what the recommendations are explicitly referencing
- Feedback is often vague and imprecise. For example, the Candidate stated *“watch voice”*, but offers no additional clarity or context
- A few recommendations are incomplete and do not follow industry best practices. For example, the Candidate recommended, *“Module 4 Summary: Repeat key points from Overview slide.”* I am assuming this is in reference to the inappropriate “Summary” section, however, that suggestion is not acceptable for online course design
- Candidate missed several important elements, to include, course alignment, measurable objectives, language use, header issues, unclear instructions, citations, chances for student engagement, and setting expectations for upcoming module
- Missed the table on page 7 grammatical errors, the tables lack of description, required citation for verbatim text on page 8, and grammatical errors throughout storyboard

- Missed several inconsistencies between the course and actual storyboard and lack of APA citation where necessitated

Course Builder Feedback

- Feedback is imbalanced and lacks rationale
- Recommendations regarding page order are not clear. This supports the need for visual representation during course feedback
- Candidate stated, *"The orange text on slides 2 and 3 is difficult to read. Is there a darker orange such as the one on the last slide?"* This would have been a good opportunity to educate/remind CB of ADA Section 508 federal requirements
- Missed several inconsistencies between the course and actual storyboard, a multitude of grammatical errors, lack of APA citation where necessitated, and additional unclear instructions