

MP3 Learning Object - Compiled Evaluation Report

Five peer reviewers rated each of the following evaluation items. The results below show the averages of their ratings, ranging from the lowest of one star (★= Strongly Disagree) to the most favorable rating of 5 stars (★★★★★=Strongly Agree).

Interface Design

1. The navigation system is easy to use.	★★★★ ¹ / ₄
2. The information, graphics, etc. are uncluttered.	★★★★ ¹ / ₄
3. The Learning Object uses highly readable colours, fonts and text sizes.	★★★★ ¹ / ₂
Average Rating for The Interface Design*	★★★★ ¹ / ₄

4. Comments about the Interface Design (Optional):	
Reviewer 1: Exquisite; I wish my web site looked even remotely like this!	
Reviewer 2: Excellent interface.	
Reviewer 3: please see below	
Reviewer 4: The server seems inadequately powerful to present all the images and interface elements correctly. I suffered from browser errors and application crashes repeatedly, and from very slow loading of image files. This is not a negative reflection on the LO itself, only on the computer used to serve it.	

Quality of Content

5. The Learning Object is free of spelling and grammatical errors.	★★★ ¹ / ₂
6. The Learning Object is free of informational errors.	★★★★ ¹ / ₂
7. The content of this Learning Object is up-to-date.	★★★★ ¹ / ₂
8. The audio and visuals are of good quality.	★★★★ ¹ / ₄
9. The content is thoughtfully organized.	★★★★ ³ / ₄
Average Rating for The Quality of Content*	★★★★ ¹ / ₄

10. Comments about the Quality of the Content (Optional):	
Reviewer 1: Excellent for all audiences.	
Reviewer 2: Thoughtfully written and informative.	
Reviewer 3: please see below	

Learning Potential

11. The Learning Object presents concepts, models, and skills which could aid students' understanding of the topic being presented.	★★★★ ³ / ₄
12. The Learning Object provides opportunities for higher-order thinking.	★★★★ ¹ / ₄
13. Learners are required to use the Learning Object in an interactive way.	★★★ ³ / ₄
14. The Learning Object could be easily incorporated into various course structures.	★★★★ ¹ / ₂
Average Rating for The Learning Potential*	★★★★ ¹ / ₄

15. Comments about the Learning Potential (Optional):	
Reviewer 1: I wish I had material like this for my courses.	
Reviewer 2: An excellent resource for instructors.	
Reviewer 3: please see below	

Quality of the LRC Record

16. An accurate web address to the Learning Object is given.	★★★★ ³ / ₄
17. The technical requirements detailed in the LRC are accurate.	★★★ ³ / ₄
18. The educational aims/goals are well described in the LRC.	★★★★ ¹ / ₂
19. The educational level is clearly identified in the LRC record.	★★★★ ¹ / ₂
20. Pre-requisite knowledge and skills are accurately identified.	★★★★
21. The author has given enough information for users to effectively and efficiently use the Learning Object.	★★★★
22. Overall, the information given in the LRC record accurately matches the Learning Object.	★★★★ ³ / ₄

23. Comments about the Resource Record (Optional):
Reviewer 2: Since this requires a log-in, I'm assuming you don't need me to comment on this part.

Reviewer 3: please see below

Reviewer 4: Technical requirements seem not to be listed.

General Comments

24. General Comments about the Learning Object (Optional):
Reviewer 1: Although I have seen other web sites on the subject, none have been this sophisticated,informative, and thoughtfully laid out. Very impressive work!

Reviewer 3: 0. In general this is an excellent and informative learning object. Subject matter is well presented and accurate. There are some inconsistencies in formatting and "voice" (sometimes too informal), but I understand you are trying to address several audiences. One possibility is that the top level (intro) material could be less formal, but deeper levels could take on more formal language. I would definitely refer students and interested parties to a site of this quality. Here are some nit-picking observations: 1. It would be nice to know up-front how long the review is expected to take; and how long the user module is supposed to be. 2. MP3 learning object, p1 Within, is a complete explanation MP3. [no comma needed] 3. "light bulbs" in text cause irregular line spacing. 4. <http://e3learning.edc.polyu.edu.hk/HKU-Nathaniel/intro.html> MPEG I layer 3 "Designed to ..." incomplete thought, layer 1 is complete but obsolete, layer 3 as the focus of this document should be completed. 5. What is MP3 1st Para is right just, making it hard to read without hyphenation 6. need next button or link to [how it works] on the bottom or MP3 (cont.) or else make a statement that the section is ended. 7. need consistent links at the end of sections. For example, there is no link to the next section at the end of "Why MP3 is Popular" [to what is it good for], but there is a link at the end what is it good for to what is it not good for (better). 8. <http://www.rjamorim.com/tests> didn't work for me: "can't find host" 9. Artifacts page may be well served by a graph or two 10. informal tone sometimes too informal "chops up the signal"; incomplete sentence at start of Why MP3 is Popular, implied continuation of title. etc.

Reviewer 4: Technically accurate. Very useful. Good level of detail. (Even more detailed programming examples could easily be added later). Good thoughtful presentation.

Reviewer 5: General * Always write MP3 capitalized, not "mp3" What is MP3 * "MP3 is the de facto standard" -- it's already an ISO standard and so technically it's more de jure than de facto. Suggest to remove "the de facto". * "The term MP3 is an abbreviation for MPEG I layer 3" -- should be "MPEG I Audio Layer III" coding, ref: ISO/IEC 11172-3:1993(E) p.33 and TC1 p.vi Same for "Layer I" and "Layer II" What is MP3 (Continued) * ISO 13818-3, strictly speaking, is for MPEG-2 audio encoding and I wonder whether we can say it's MP3 spec. * MPEG stands for *Moving* *Picture* Experts Group MP3 Coder * Huffman coder rollover: remove the idea of "noiseless" as it's imprecise. What it is Good For * Saying AIFF is a format for Audio CD is technically incorrect though Mac presents tracks as AIFF files. References: * Why not include the official web site? <http://www.chiariglione.org/mpeg/>

*Rounded to the nearest 0.25