

**Tiffanie Beasley
Resource Evaluation
ELPS 302
Summer 2012**

Checklist for Microcomputer Courseware

Program Name: Student Life: Debate of the Week Vendor/Author: BBC Schools

Subject Area: English Grade Level: Secondary

Instructional Integrity

- | | Yes | No |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Is the content relevant to the instructional needs of the students? | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 2. Is the program organized and presented in a sequential manner and in appropriate developmental steps?..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 3. Is the content presented clearly? | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 4. Are the use of graphics, sound, and color appropriate? | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 5. Does the program provide meaningful interaction for the students? | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 6. Does the program provide for used self-pacing?..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 7. Does the material require the purchase of accompanying printed material, or is it self-sufficient? ... | <u> </u> | <u>X</u> |
| 8. Does the material provide direct instruction?..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 9. Does the material provide immediate feedback? | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 10. Does the material provide a variety of built-in reinforcements?..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |

Technical Adequacy and Utility

- | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Are the teacher's instructions well organized, useful, and easy to understand?..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 2. Does material require extensive preparation or training on the teacher's part? | <u> </u> | <u>X</u> |
| 3. Is the material of high quality?..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 4. Is the size of the print clear and well spaced?..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 5. Does the speed of presentation match individual learning styles?..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 6. Does the student need typing skills to use the program? | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 7. Is it "kid-proof?"..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 8. Can a student use the program without supervision? | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |
| 9. Is a printout of student performance available, if desired? | <u> </u> | <u>X</u> |
| 10. Can the program be used in a regular classroom, resource room, media center, agency, or institution?..... | <u>X</u> | <u> </u> |

Date 08 June 2012

Evaluator Tiffanie Beasley

Open-ended Courseware Evaluation

Program Name: English Language

Vendor/Author: Mantex

Subject Area: English

Grade Level: Secondary

1. How appropriate is computer use for this activity?

Computer use for this activity is incredibly appropriate. Applications in this program include English Language, How-to guides, Writing Essays, How to write..., Study Skills and Writing Skills. In the secondary classroom, students can use this program from Mantex with a great level of autonomy and self-driven exploration.

2. Are the goals of the program clear? (What are they?)

This program works as a how-to program for the student-centered language arts classroom. Though the program is not meant to all-inclusively instruct students in the ways of writing essays and developing effective study skills, it would be a useful supplement to academic endeavors such as essay writing, literary analysis and study skills.

3. Does the activity in the program focus on these goals?

Yes, the program offers very specific solutions or avenues of achievement towards its clearly-stated goals of essay writing, etc.

4. Are the instructions clear? (If not, why?)

Yes; as a how-to program, Mantex offers transparent suggestions and guidelines for completing incredibly specific language arts-related goals and activities.

5. Is content relevant to instructional needs of students? Why or why not?

Yes, the various how-to guides work to address specific academic concerns of students. In any given classroom, each individual student will undoubtedly have their own questions and concerns and Mantex offers various avenues for exploration such as revision, examinations and composition – these options meet each student at their own personal location in the writing process.

6. How well is the program organized and presented in a sequential manner and in appropriate developmental steps?

The program seems to be organized in an arbitrary manner with no natural or apparent progression of language arts skills.

7. How does the program respond to input mistakes?

As the program is essentially a how-to program, it does not necessarily respond to input mistakes. In this way, students are dependent on themselves to use the material and information provided and apply it to their writing and understandings of language arts concepts.

8. How appropriately is reinforcement used?

Students can use the program as a reference that is unchanging, consistent and reliable. However, the extent to which language arts concepts are reinforced is dependent on the instructor's manipulation of the material: teachers can perhaps direct students in their own personal creation of quizzes, worksheets and/or presentations based upon the concepts presented in the program – this would work to effectively reinforce the material.

9. Does the program provide for user self-pacing? Yes X No

10. Is a printout of student performance available if desired? Yes No X

11. What is your overall evaluation of program?

I would definitely use this program in my secondary language arts classroom in order to enhance student autonomy and self-pacing during the writing process. Students can use the program as a reference guide, printing out information sheets and applying the sheets to writing. Also, instructors can use the information sheets for mini-lessons, creating activities or quizzes guided by the information provided on the website.

Date 08 June 2012

Evaluator Tiffanie Beasley

Package Title: Comma Chameleon Game

Producer: Brad Sheppard

Evaluator Name: Tiffanie Beasley

Organization: Sheppard Software

Evaluator's Level and Subject Taught: Secondary English

Date: 06/08/12 Was your evaluation based in part on student use? Yes No

Reviewer Statement of Non-Violation of Copyright

The producer's copyright was respected during this evaluation, and I did not copy any portion of this package. Signature: Tiffanie Beasley

Date: 06/08/12

SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; D= Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree; NA=Not Applicable

Please include comments on individual items on the reverse page

Content Characteristics (indicate with an x after your selection)

1. SA A D SD NA The content is accurate.
2. SA A D SD NA The content has educational value.
3. SA A D SD NA The content is free of racial, ethnic, sexual and other stereotypes.

Instructional Characteristics

4. SA A D SD NA The purpose of the package is well-defined.
5. SA A D SD NA The package achieves its defined purpose.
6. SA A D SD NA Presentation of content is clear and logical.
7. SA A D SD NA The level of difficulty is appropriate for the target audience.
8. SA A D SD NA Graphics/color/sound are used for appropriate instructional reasons.
9. SA A D SD NA Use of the package is motivational.
10. SA A D SD NA The package effectively stimulates student creativity.
11. SA A D SD NA Feedback on student responses is effectively employed.
12. SA A D SD NA The learner controls the rate and sequence of presentation and review.
13. SA A D SD NA Instruction is integrated with previous student experience.
14. SA A D SD NA Learning can be generalized to an appropriate range of situations.

Technical Characteristics

15. SAx_A_D_SD_NA The user support materials are comprehensive.
16. SAx_A_D_SD_NA The user support materials are effective.
17. SAx_A_D_SD_NA Information displays are effective.
18. SAx_A_D_SD_NA Intended users can easily and independently operate the program.
19. SAx_A_D_SD_NA Teachers can easily employ the package.
20. SAx_A_D_SD_NA The program appropriately uses relevant computer capabilities.
21. SAx_A_D_SD_NA The program is reliable in normal use.

Quality

Write a number from 1 (low) to 5 (high) which represents your judgment of the quality of the package in each division:

- _4_ Content Characteristics
4 Instructional Characteristics
4 Technical Characteristics

Recommendations

- _4_ I highly recommend use of this package
4 I would use or recommend use of this package with little or no change (Note suggestions for effective use below)
4 I would use or recommend use of this package only if certain changes are made (Note under Weaknesses or Other Comments)
1 I would not use or recommend this package (Note reasons under weaknesses)

Describe the potential use of this package in classroom settings:

This package is geared towards specific language arts concepts. In particular, each game represents a particular concept. Students can individually and autonomously use the package in the classroom for self-paced mastery of areas such as grammar.

Estimate the amount of time a student would need to work with the package in order to achieve the objectives: (Can be total time, time per day, time range or other indicator.)

Each game presents several lessons relative to the specific language areas. For example, the grammar application presents several new concepts each time the game is played. Frequent exposure to the concepts through the application will undoubtedly allow the student to master the desired content.

Strengths:

Feedback: the student is provided immediate feedback along with an adequate and transparent explanation of the concepts being introduced or focused upon.

Interaction: the student is required to interact with the applications creatively in that the student must grammatically adjust sentences for correctness.

Weaknesses:

The applications are perhaps not appropriately challenging for the target audience. For instance, the secondary English grammar application would perhaps be more appropriate for an early middle school audience or for remedial readers/writers.

Other Comments:

N/A