



Online Course Evaluation Checklist

Use this checklist while reviewing an online course. Note areas of strength and areas that need improvement. Use action verbs that are actionable and observable in the feedback provided. (See Bloom's verbs for suggested action verbs.)

Name of Course: DL5703 - Instructional Design Fundamentals

Location of Course (provide URL or site information):

<https://ace.instructure.com/courses/2060087>

Introduction to the Course

A course home page is evident. Includes information such as a welcome to the course, course description, link to the syllabus, and instructor information is provided.

Strength(s): The home page provides clear instructor presence through consistent announcements, weekly updates, grading notices, and warm, motivational messages from Dr. Sykes. Navigation elements such as *Start Here*, *Course Tour*, *Syllabus*, *Modules*, and *Announcements* are prominently displayed, making it easy for learners to locate essential course components. The page also links to support resources such as the Student Commons and the Library.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Include a dedicated welcome message or introductory video on the home page to orient learners immediately upon entering the course. Provide a brief course description and learning goals directly on the landing page to help students understand the course purpose without navigating to the syllabus.

Getting Started information such as what to do first, second, etc. Students will know how to get started with the course content.

Strength(s): A "Start Here" section and a "Course Tour" link are provided, establishing clear direction for new learners. The homepage layout gently guides students toward key course resources such as the syllabus, modules, and announcements.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Add an explicit "First Steps" checklist (e.g., review syllabus, watch course tour, read Module 1 introduction, complete first discussion post) to enhance clarity for new learners. Presenting these steps in a numbered list or short video tutorial would further streamline the onboarding process.

Learning Objectives

Course level objectives are measurable and observable.

Strength(s): The course-level objectives are clearly written, measurable, and action-oriented. Each beginning verb (e.g., apply, characterize, research, describe, relate, determine, engage) aligns to Bloom's taxonomy and allows for observable

demonstration of learning. The objectives also align with national standards (ISTE) as shown in the Course Alignments section of the syllabus (pp. 12–13).

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Add brief performance indicators or examples for each objective to clarify how mastery will be demonstrated in assignments and discussions.

Module or unit level objectives are measurable and observable.

Strength(s): Each module includes specific, measurable module objectives (e.g., “Apply instructional design terms...”, “Plan and create a blueprint template...”, “Use collaboration to provide feedback...”, “Develop a personal code of conduct...”). These verbs demonstrate observable behaviors aligned with module tasks.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Add explicit connections to assessments within each module so students immediately understand how the module objectives will be evaluated.

Module learning objectives are aligned to the course-level objectives.

Strength(s): There is strong alignment between module objectives and course-level objectives. For example, Module 1 objectives map directly to course objectives 1, 3, 4, and 5 by focusing on foundational frameworks and terminology. Module 3 objectives support higher-level competencies such as project management strategies and self-assessment, aligning with course objectives 8 and 9. The alignment table in the syllabus confirms this connection.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Provide a visual alignment chart within the LMS (outside the syllabus) so students can easily see how each assignment supports both module and course-level objectives.

The relationship between activities, assignments, and learning objectives is clear.

Strength(s): Assignments directly support the stated objectives. e.g., Module 1’s instructional design guide sections support CO1, CO3, CO4, CO5, and CO7; Module 3’s blueprint revision activity aligns with CO6, CO8, and CO9. Discussions and assignments use verbs parallel to the objectives, demonstrating strong intentionality.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Assignments

Graded activities or assignments contain clear instructions.

Technology integration: The assignment fosters technology integration by requiring learners to create an original instructional design guide using a creative digital tool (excluding presentation software), integrate APA citations, and develop professional documents using Word or another appropriate tool.

Strength(s): The Module 1 Application as an example includes highly detailed, sequential instructions with clearly labeled steps (Steps 1–7). Expectations are explicit: page length, required sections, specific components, APA requirements, and iterative development over the course. The instructions also link out to additional online resources to support instructional design model selection.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Provide an example or template of what a polished guide might look like to help learners visualize the final product. Additionally, consider

embedding brief video walkthroughs demonstrating how to structure the guide or use recommended digital tools.

Rubrics for graded assignments are provided.

Strength(s): The Master’s Assignment Rubric is robust and is included directly below the assignment instructions. It contains five clear, measurable criteria: Conceptual Understanding, Analysis and Evaluation, Use of Evidence, Scholarly Writing, and APA Format. Performance levels include point ranges with explicit behavioral descriptors, supporting transparency and objective evaluation.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Consider adding brief examples of what “Mastery” looks like in categories such as Analysis/Evaluation or APA Format to help students self-assess their work before submission.

Assignments have due dates and point values.

Strengths(s): The assignment is clearly noted as being due Sunday at 11:59 PM PT, aligned with the weekly pacing structure described in the syllabus. The rubric shows the assignment is worth 100 points. Consistency with the course schedule (shown in the “Mark Your Calendar” section of the syllabus) reinforces predictable due dates and workload pacing.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Display the exact due date (e.g., “Due: Sunday, March 2, 2025”) at the top of the assignment page, as Canvas often hides date details depending on view.

Assessments

Graded assessments contain clear instructions.

Technology integration: Technology is integrated meaningfully through document creation tools, APA style requirements, and the expectation of using professional digital tools in guide development.

Strength(s): The Module 1 Application functions as a major graded assessment and contains detailed instructions, multiple steps, clear deliverables, and support resources. The rubric complements these instructions, ensuring alignment between directions and evaluation.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Rubrics for graded assessments are provided.

Strength(s): The rubric is comprehensive and clearly distinguishes performance levels. The descriptors demonstrate strong alignment with graduate-level expectations like critical thinking, depth of analysis, breadth of scholarly research, and professional writing conventions.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Include a downloadable PDF version of the rubric in the module for easier offline review.

Assessments have due dates and point values.

Strengths(s): The assignment carries a clear point value (100 points), consistent with the syllabus expectations. Due date expectations align with the standard ACE course format, supporting consistent learner pacing.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Show a visual grade distribution chart within the LMS so students understand how this 100-point assignment fits within the 655 total course points.

Instructional Materials

All course resources adhere to educational copyright laws and include proper copyright attribution.

Strength(s): All readings are scholarly, peer-reviewed sources listed with full citations in the Course Bibliography (pp. 10–12), demonstrating adherence to copyright requirements. The syllabus also incorporates references to OER, copyright, Creative Commons, and fair use as part of Module 4 content.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Instructional materials demonstrate diversity and inclusion.

Strength(s): Includes readings from a variety of international authors and journals ensuring exposure to global perspectives in instructional design. Diverse contexts are represented, such as workforce training, higher education, and online learning environments.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Learner/Instructor Interaction

Opportunities for learner interaction are provided.

Strength(s): The Module discussions offers structured engagement through required initial posts and peer responses. Prompts require reflection and application, which naturally supports meaningful dialogue. The rubric further reinforces interaction by evaluating the quality of peer engagement.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Introduce optional “extension questions” to deepen peer discussion for students who want to explore beyond the minimum requirements.

Learner interaction expectations are explained.

Strength(s): The discussion instructions and rubric clearly outline expectations for timeliness, depth of response, scholarly integration, and the nature of peer replies (e.g., prompting critical thought). This clarity supports students in producing substantive and meaningful dialogue.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Instructor-to-learner interactions are explained, particularly on discussion boards or feedback on graded assignments.

Strength(s): The rubric and discussion structure imply regular instructor monitoring and feedback.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Instructor shares response time for grading.

Strength(s): The instructor communicates when all assignments will be graded for the week.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Technology

Technology is used to increase engagement and interactions.

Strength(s): The course integrates multimedia effectively through ACE-authored video presentations, downloadable transcripts, embedded PDF attachments, and structured module pages. Students can interact with multimedia via the Canvas video player, which includes transcript access, download options, and navigation controls. The inclusion of transcripts enhances accessibility and supports multimodal learning.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: Include occasional interactive elements (e.g., short embedded quizzes, hotspots, or scenario-based practice) within or adjacent to presentations to strengthen learner engagement and promote active processing.

Accessibility

The course is easy to navigate.

Strength(s): Assignments and discussions follow a consistent structure across Modules, and instructions are clearly labeled and divided into logical steps. The use of headings (Steps 1–7) contributes to readability. Modules appear to follow a predictable ACE structure: Overview → Objectives → Readings → Presentations → Discussion → Assignment.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

The course content is organized into learning units or modules.

Strength(s): The syllabus clearly outlines five modules, each with defined objectives, readings, presentations, discussion assignments, and application tasks. Module 1 content is clearly organized and modular, supporting ease of progression.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Use of color and highlighting is limited following expectations of web accessibility.

Strength(s): Assignment instructions rely primarily on text structure, headings, and spacing rather than excessive color formatting, supporting readability. The LMS default styling generally aligns with accessibility standards.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Images are easy to read.

Strength(s): The assignment uses text-based instructions without embedded images, ensuring screen reader compatibility.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Video is clear, and the audio is of good quality.

Strength(s): All ACE-authored presentations in the course are accompanied by a complete, downloadable transcript file. Students can download:

- A single PDF with all video transcripts, or
- Individual transcripts for each presentation via the Canvas player's "paperclip" attachment button.

This structure ensures universal access and adheres to ADA guidelines for accessible multimedia. The inclusion of a clickable table of contents within the full transcript file also aids navigation and comprehension.

Suggestion(s) for improvement:

Course content is provided in accessible formats.

Strength(s): All presentation transcripts are provided in PDF format with a table of contents, and individual transcripts are attached directly to the media player, making them easy to access. Assignment instructions are delivered in standard Canvas HTML text, ensuring compatibility with screen readers. Directions for citing course presentations follow APA guidelines and are clearly stated using an accessible template.

Suggestion(s) for improvement: