Title of Paper: Multimedia Evaluation Report

Name: Shernell Gill

ID#: 320047695

The University of the West Indies-Open Campus Site

Postgraduate Degree in Instructional Design and Technology 2020-2023

EDID 6508 Developing Instructional Media

Course Instructor: Dr. Leroy Hill

Date: 27 November 2021

Table of Contents

Introduction

The purpose of this evaluation report is to summarise the observations of my peers as it relates to the usability of the created multimedia project on Percussion Instruments. The evaluation will provide a reflection on these summaries as well as provide recommendations for revisions of the multimedia project. As UNIFEM (2009) maintains the purpose of the evaluation entails documenting why the evaluation is being completed and how it will be used.

Summary of findings

Relevance and appropriateness

Technology was deemed a high standard and appropriate for the instruction with limitations caused by the authoring tool Rise 360 using Articulate. I believed the technology used throughout was a good standard given the time factor.

Sufficiency

There were sufficient elements for the learners to provide for adequate instruction as well as elements needed for accessibility. I believe that the elements did allow for learning to occur and were accessible. One peer noted that too many videos were included and while reflecting during the process of the multimedia, I too wondered at times if there were too many videos. I felt that for the introduction of new content the videos were fine but at the beginning we could have possibly decreased the amount.

Instructional Events

Instruction and support given to learners were of a high standard and peers liked the email feature for feedback. Additionally, one peer noted that Gagne's Nine Events of instruction were used to guide the learning process. There was a concern of lack of interactivity with the 'Listening Party' slide which was used to gain attention was highlighted. The multimedia project did cover Gagne's nine events and the interaction with the 'Listening Party' will need revising as reflecting on it the interaction is not obvious as there is just a space or dead air so that learners can note information. This was not actually highlighted to be completed during the learning activity.

Functionality

There were mixed reviews pertaining to the navigation throughout the course. One peer, Javian recommended that more direction should be given to learners to help learners locate buttons which were below the screen area. However, on the other hand Nicholas pointed out that the navigation was excellent throughout the assignment. I understand what Javian has stated as there is no indication to scroll down to click 'continue'. Both peers declared that the text was properly placed and organized but Javian referred to the navigation element here as he noted that that could have been placed to indicate where next to access. The graphics were of high quality and created synergy that would capture the intended audience and enhance instruction. I do believe as a group we tried to maintain a certain level of appropriateness for the age group. Both peers noted that the website was accessible as well as they noticed that there were no copyright infringements and this is an element we decided to note as we created each section of the unit

instead of at the end. This made it easier to note and remember all the sources used for each

particular unit within the multimedia project.

Revisions based on findings

Based on the findings, I have considered revising three elements addressed in the

evaluation.

Revision one- Too many videos. I would revise this by removing the screen cast that

gives users the information on the upcoming activities as this was an extension of the objectives.

I would therefore complete a screen cast of the objectives and the learning activities as they were

related and there was already evidence of video making and editing during the 'Listening Party'.

Revision two- Listening party. According to the evaluation the 'Listening Party' was not

interactive enough. I would revise this my inserting a mechanism or activity for learners to select

the instruments and they heard from a list. They would then receive immediate feedback for their

responses.

Revision three- Navigation. I would revise this area by placing text or a button higher up

on the page so that learners know they have to scroll down or are able to click the navigation

button higher up.

The evaluation has been a useful exercise and on reading the evaluation of my peers and

reflecting, I have definitely realized there are areas for improvement. It is ideal to have a second,

third or fourth eye especially when developing and creating instructional media. It has assisted

me in understanding our multimedia project from a different angle and perspective and can only

make the next project better.

References

UNIFEM (2009). Evaluation guidance notes series. Retrieved 27 November from

https://www.endvawnow.org/uploads/browser/files/UNIFEM_guidance%20note_evaluati

on_criteria.pdf

Appendix A

Multimedia evaluation scoring guide

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Multimedia Project

Scoring Guide

(40% of Total Course Grade)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Student Name:</td><td colspan="4">Shernell Gill</td></tr>
<tr><td>Project Team:</td><td colspan="4">Group 3 Sasha, Shernell, Alafia and Allison</td></tr>
<tr><td>Facilitator:</td><td colspan="4">Dr. Hill</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5">Grading Scale:

5= Sophisticated demonstration of skills
4= Above average demonstration of skills
3= Average/ Expected demonstration of skills
2= Somewhat naïve or limited demonstration of skills
1= Show no demonstration of skills
0= No submission</td></tr>
<tr><td>Requirement</td><td>Score

(Out of 5)</td><td>%</td><td>Maximum % allowed</td><td>Comments</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">**Storyboard**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Organisation, sequencing, accuracy, appropriateness</td><td>4.5</td><td>0</td><td>8.0</td><td>The storyboard is very detailed. It provided a good plan for development.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">**Development**</td></tr>
<tr><td>Relevant & appropriate instruction (Instructional events)</td><td>4.5</td><td>0</td><td>2.0</td><td>The instructions and support given to learners is of a high standard. It would have been nice to see the program require interaction from the learner at the "gaining attention" stage.</td></tr>
</table>

Relevant & appropriate technology	5	0	2.0	The technology used was of a high standard. Considering the limitations of the program I loved the email feature that was used to capture the learner's response.
Cooperation/ collaboration/ teamwork	5	0	3.0	There was evidence to show teamwork.
Multimedia evaluation report	4.5	0	5.0	The overall quality of the multimedia project was good.
	Subtotal	0	**12.0**	
Functionality				
Navigation	4		2.0	Sufficient elements were provided to help users traverse through the program. It would have been nice to see more directions being posted to help learners locate buttons which were below the screen area.
Text placement/ layout	4.5		2.0	The text placement was well done given the limitations of the software. It would have been ideal to have all the navigational elements visible on the screen without the need for scrolling.
Animation/ video/ graphics artefacts	5		3.0	The quality of the multimedia artefacts used was exceptional. The artefacts were interactive and enhanced the instructional and visual quality of the program.

Visual layout- design theme	5		2.0	The quality of the visual layout and design was of a high standard.
Copyright	5		1.0	No copyright infringements were observed.
Website usability	4.5		10.0	The website contained almost all the elements needed to provide accessibility to various learners.
	Subtotal	0	20.0	
FINAL SCORE		0.0	40	

Multimedia Project
Scoring Guide
(40% of Total Course Grade)

Student Name: Sasha Griffith, Alafia Branker-Baptiste, Shernell Gill, Allison Salandy-Bernard

Project Team: Group 3

Facilitator: Nicholas Dillon

Grading Scale:

5= Sophisticated demonstration of skills
4= Above average demonstration of skills
3= Average/ Expected demonstration of skills
2= Somewhat naïve or limited demonstration of skills
1= Show no demonstration of skills
0= No submission

Requirement	Score (Out of 5)	%	Maximum % allowed	Comments
Storyboard				
Organisation, sequencing, accuracy, appropriateness	4.5	2	9.0	The storyboard provided an excellent frame work for the project which was concise and easy to follow. Majority of the elements for the project were present on the storyboard.
Development				
Relevant & appropriate instruction (Instructional events)	5	2	2.0	Gagne's Nine Events of Instruction were used to guide the sequence of events.
Relevant & appropriate technology	5	2	2.0	Technology was appropriate for the instructions.
Cooperation/ collaboration/	4	2.8	3.0	There was evidence of collaboration through

teamwork				project.
Multimedia evaluation report		5	5.0	An appropriate multimedia evaluation report is present
	Subtotal	11.8	**12.0**	
Functionality				
Navigation	4	2	2.0	Navigation was excellent throughout the final project.
Text placement/ layout	5	2	2.0	Text included were relevant and properly organized.
Animation/ video/ graphics artefacts	5	3	3.0	These elements were of a high quality. There were good instructional videos at different stages of the lesson. The original videos created were properly edited.
Visual layout- design theme	5	2	2.0	The design and layout were well arranged.
Copyright	5	1	1.0	Proper references were done throughout the project. No evidence of copyright infringements.
Website usability	4	10	10.0	The website is accessible.
	Subtotal	21.8	22.0	
FINAL SCORE		0.0	40	