In mid-February 2015 module 1 of the Micro-Module Courseware Development Grant (MMCDG) “Enhancing the Core Curriculum: A Blended Learning, Micro-Modular Approach” went live online (at http://www.cuhk.edu.hk/his/proj/csd/). Although designed for first-year students of History at CUHK so as to boost fundamental skills of how History works module 1 was tested on an undergraduate elective programme *The Industrial Revolution and its Impacts* (HIST4341/5504) so as to garner quick feedback prior to the MMCDG project’s completion in the summer of 2015. With students of the aforesaid Modern History course having to undertake a paper review as part of their formal assessment, i.e. for assignment 1, thus the micro-module offered an opportunity, firstly, to help develop core students skills within the context of the study of the Industrial Revolution, and secondly, to obtain as noted previously feedback on the design and working of the MMCDG.

Figure 1. Screenshot of the introductory video for the MMCDG.
Comprising of two basic components the micro-module was designed with a short introductory video presentation – see figure 1. It, along with three Echo360 video files – each 2-3 minutes in duration - explained to students what a paper/chapter review is, what a review is not, and what the relationship between academic reading and writing is. With a duration of approximately 10 minutes students were then offered within the micro-module an opportunity to practice their new-found knowledge (figure 2).

Figure 2. Screenshot of the opening to the paper review practice exercise.

With the practice section, the second section of the two-part micro-module, informing students that they had to read a short text an accompanying video outlined to students what they had to read for. They were then given 15 minutes to read the text and write a short summary of the document they had read. Upon inserting their text they could then compare their answer against a model answer. Upon completing this task the students then had to read the same document again, albeit with a different purpose, and once again this had to be undertaken in 15 minutes (figure 3). Upon inputting their summary of the document read again a model answer appeared on the screen so that learners could compare their review against a model answer. Finally, students re-read the document, i.e. for the third time, with 15 more minutes were granted for this task. However a more lengthy summary of the document had to be composed (figure 4).
Whereas earlier they had read for gist and to identify key points in the text, now students in their review had to show depth of understanding. As before, students’ answers once inputted could be compared with a model answer.

Figure 3 and 4. Screenshots of the paper review exercise.
With the aim of informing students about a review, and getting them to practice the undertaking of a review, within a period of about one hour so as to obtain feedback the final screenshot (figure 5) of the micro-module encouraged students to offer their thoughts on the micro-module in an open yet anonymous way. So as to further encourage student feedback a part-time student helper has been employed to gather information about the micro-module and the working of the Historiography programme at CUHK prior to the 2014-15 academic year. To date the opinion of 100 students has been gathered.

Figure 5. The end screenshot of the micro-module.
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