

United States Army Paralegal Competency Course (APCC)



Anthony Rausch

Kevin Schuller

Tammy Poole

IDE 641- Techniques in Educational Evaluation

Syracuse University

Professor Moon-Heum, Cho

13 March 2021

Table of Contents

Background:	3
Description:.....	3
Boundary and scope:	3
Objectives:	4
Current Status of Materials:.....	5
Target Learners:	5
Expert Background:.....	5
Scope of Expert Evaluation:	6
Expert Review Data Summary	6
Students Background:	8
Results of survey:	9
Recommendations:	9
Formative Evaluation Self Evaluation	11
Appendix A.....	13
Appendix B.....	14
Appendix C.....	15
References	16

Background

The Army Judge Advocate General's Corps Noncommissioned Officer Academy Advanced Leader Course was historically broken into two phases. The first phase (IPC I) was designed as a prerequisite to attend the Advanced Leader Course and was completed in a self-paced asynchronous environment. The entire course was 80 hours long. Recently, the course was redesigned and renamed the Army Paralegal Competency Course (APCC). The course changed because of a needs assessment that identified a requirement for a course that could help junior leaders bridge any knowledge gaps that exist as they transition into leadership roles in legal departments focusing on areas of law the leader has never worked in nor received any type of institutional training on prior to reporting to their new assignment.

Description

Many components of the original IPC I remained in the redesigned APCC. The course is still online. However, the course is now focused on only those subjects that were identified in the needs assessment to fill knowledge gaps. Those subjects are Effective Military Writing for Paralegals (module one); Client Services and Administrative Law (module two); Criminal Law Overview (module three); and National Security Law (module four).

Boundary and scope

While there are several modules and lessons contained in the curriculum, due to a limited amount of time, we narrowed our focus. For our project, we are focusing on module one Effective Military Writing for Paralegals. As paralegal leaders continue to develop in their Army career, effective Army writing will be increasingly important. Attorneys will have greater expectations for the legal correspondence that are sent from the office to clients so the leader must be prepared for increased responsibility for drafting and distributing correspondence. Specifically, we will look at lesson four and

five of module one on active writing techniques. These lessons are critically important because it will serve as a foundation for active writing skills as paralegals continue to progress in their careers. Active writing skills are vital for success at the U.S. Army Sergeants Major Academy.

Although the material we will be evaluating is further advanced beyond the “rough stage of development” where one would often find an expert and one to one evaluation most useful (Tessmer, 1993), we determined an expert, and one to one evaluation, is still useful as the benefits for making changes to the curriculum identified in the evaluation would far outweigh the costs for making said changes. The previous statement is premised on the fact that our expert is an in-house developer that can make real time changes to the curriculum incurring no additional cost to the organization.

Objectives

Performance goal

JAG paralegals will consistently and accurately, according to cited references and resources, utilize the appropriate sentence structure to write in active voice.

- Describe the difference in active and passive voice according to AR 25-50 and the APA writing format.
- Identify the appropriate sentence structure for active voice according to AR 25-50 and APA writing style.
- Demonstrate the appropriate use of sentence structure for active voice according to AR 25-50 and the APA.
- Identify the creative thinking principles of effective Army Writing according to AR 25-50, APA.
- Identify the principles of critical reasoning according to AR 25-50, AR 27-10, and AR 600-37.
- Describe the standards of critical reasoning according to AR 25-50, AR 27-10, and AR 600-37.

Current Status of Materials

Currently lesson plans have been developed and a pilot of the class started on February 2nd, 2021. Feedback received from students will be conducted through surveys following the completion of each module. I have been granted permission from the course manager to conduct a formative evaluation of a module by surveying students as they complete each module. This feedback will be provided to the course developers to possibly include my recommendations in their planned course revisions.

Target Learners

This course is specifically designed for U.S. Army paralegals in the grade of E5 and E6. This course is designed to assist paralegals in the Army that recently changed jobs. Paralegals taking on leadership responsibilities in National Security Law, Legal Assistance, National Security Law, Military Justice, or law office management responsibilities that require the drafting and production of legal correspondence will be the primary audience that will benefit from this course.

Expert Background

Our expert is E. Cole a curriculum developer for The Judge Advocate General's Legal Center and School. She has held a variety of assignments and has been with the organization since 2002. Two assignments that she has held that are of particular interest to our evaluation (and what we determined make her most qualified as an expert for our evaluation) is her assignment as an instructor of advanced individual training and her current position as a course developer at the Legal Center and School. She previously taught the IPC I curriculum and was instrumental in developing the current course (APCC).

Scope of Expert Evaluation

The primary purpose of our expert evaluation was to garner her feedback on what she thought of the content contained within the effective writing module. Particularly we were interested in whether she felt the content was designed in a logical sequence and whether the learners were meeting the course learning objectives and goals. We also wanted to gain insight on the implementation plan and whether she felt the course would be well received in the field. Finally, considering the course is being delivered in an asynchronous format where the instructor is more aligned with the roll of facilitator, we were interested to know how the communication flow between students, faculty, and other key stakeholders was occurring and whether students were completing their course work on time.

We used a questionnaire, interview, and think out loud protocols to gather information from the expert to use in our evaluation. We sent our questionnaire via e-mail and conducted our interview via zoom. We obtained the experts verbal consent to use her name in our report.

Expert Review Data Summary

Since one of the most common tools in gathering information and data for training is a questionnaire (Jonassen, et al., 1998), we first approached the expert review by providing the expert with a survey questionnaire. The intent of the survey questionnaire was to gather her feedback on the overall content and delivery of the course material. She strongly agreed with most questions regarding whether the content was logical and clear to the learners. She did score two of our questions as disagree and strongly disagree. The question she scored the lowest was “During the instructional delivery, I had to deviate and adapt the instructional content to fit the established goals and objectives?” She indicated she scored this question along with “The time estimates and requirements within the APCC POI were accurate, realistic, and effective” low due to the fact the course is self-paced, and she is not required to teach it. Otherwise, according to the survey, she was pleased with the

delivery methods and overall quality of the content. The only other low scores had to do with whether students were completing the material in the required amount of time (60 days) and whether the course was enjoyable to instruct. Her responses to those two questions also had to do with the fact that the course is self-paced, and no instruction is involved so she elected to rate those two questions lower.

Next, we arranged for a zoom meeting with the expert at 1p.m. Mountain Time to further discuss her thoughts on the correctness, scope, and sequence of the content. The tools we used to gather this information were “think out loud protocol” and “direct interview.” Anthony, Kevin, Tammy, and the expert were all present at the meeting. Anthony opened the meeting by thanking the expert for taking the time to meet with the team and for her willingness to contribute her thoughts to the evaluation. Anthony explained to the expert the concept behind “think out loud” and shared simple examples to get the expert comfortable with the manner in which a “think out loud” protocol is conducted. Because the expert and Anthony were both familiar with non-judicial punishment in the military Anthony used non-judicial punishment as an example. Once the expert was comfortable with the process the “think out loud protocol” began.

The expert began thinking out loud as she clicked on each slide of the content. Even though our formative evaluation was narrowed and focused on the active voice lessons of the module, the expert looked at all content presented in the module to determine if the curriculum was presented in a logical sequence. As she explained the steps students would go through to complete the active voice lessons, she determined the content was adequate in scope. She did not believe any of the content was incorrect, nor did she identify any typographical or grammatical errors. Overall, the expert indicated she was pleased with the content of the course material. At this time, the meeting transitioned to a direct interview where the team asked questions.

Kevin started the interview when he asked the expert to clarify what measures of effectiveness were used to determine the course was “effective” since she had indicated in the think out loud session that overall, she felt the content was effective. She referenced the Bloom’s taxonomy cognitive domains that learners needed to achieve for the module which were “remember and understand.” She stated that because the cognitive levels were “remember and understand” she felt both the content and the check on learning assessments throughout the lessons were adequate to determine whether students were reaching the required cognitive levels and meeting the objectives. She stated the students are also required to achieve a 70 percent on the end of module exam before moving on. The end of course assessment is the primary means she uses to determine whether the students are effectively grasping the content.

Next, Tammy asked about interactivity of the course since the students had indicated on their survey that they felt that the course needed to be more interactive. The expert indicated that she agreed the students could benefit from more interactivity. She stated there were discussions about adding gamification, but budget constraints prevented the organization from providing that level of interactivity. That said, she did indicate discussions are ongoing about whether to add audio to the lessons and incorporate some assistive technologies to accommodate persons with disabilities.

Finally, there was some discussion on whether learners could benefit more from the course not being self-paced and instead being instructor led. The expert indicated the students could benefit more from the course being instructor led but due to personnel shortages and decisions from the command it was determined the course would be self-paced.

Students Background

The students are all paralegals in the SGT to SSG range. The students completed surveys after each module of the newly redesigned APCC. The students have not completed all modules of the course.

Results of survey

The lesson plan was easy to understand. Practical exercises reinforced the lesson material. Assessment questions matched material presented in lesson plan. Assessment questions matched material presented in lesson plan. The use of multimedia in course lesson enhanced understanding. Instruction was effective in adding to understanding of lesson plan. Modules were easy to use. Instructional material aided in understanding lesson. Resources helped in answering questions. One module was exceptionally long and would benefit from being broken up into smaller lessons within the module. More assistance with writing as it has been a while for some students in writing papers. Modules could benefit from videos to emphasize the material. Too many sub slides within the slide presentation. Test module was challenging. Post checks were beneficial to learning. One student brought up several errors within the modules. Outdated version of AR 25-50 used in lesson material. Lesson two asked learners to view text box, there was no text box presented on slide. There are some minor grammatical errors in lesson seven. Lesson nine office symbol look up link is not working. Visual learners brought up use of more examples versus lots of lectures. The same student mentioned providing audio versus all the reading in the modules. Lesson 10 froze several times, and a student was unable to take the end of module test.

Recommendations

Our interviews and survey questionnaires of two students and an expert as well as our review of course materials provided our team with sufficient information to provide some recommendations for the developers of the effective writing module moving forward. The recommendations we have for revisions are for the developers to reconsider whether the two current assessments (check on learning and end of module test) are sufficient to assess whether students are meeting the objectives. Additionally, we recommend the developer consider incorporating cost effective interactive

technologies to the module to make the curriculum more engaging. Finally, we recommend the developer look at some of the grammatical errors as our review of the course material as well as some of the student feedback did reveal some issues with the grammar and objects located within the slides. We have no recommendations for changes to the sequence of instruction as all indicators point to the sequence being proper.

First, our team questions whether the curriculum is designed at the proper cognitive level for students. Our evaluation revealed that students feel as if they are ready to apply what they know about effective Army writing and even requested that more hands-on activities get added to the module. A practical exercise where the students are required to draft legal memoranda would provide students with the opportunity to reach the cognitive level of apply. Given the age and years of experience of the target audience we believe the curriculum should be designed for students to reach, at a minimum, the apply level of Bloom's taxonomy. Many students will be working independently as a paralegal in their organization and will be required by their supervisor to draft legal correspondence. Simply remembering and understanding is not sufficient. Making this change would allow the students to meet the expectations of their supervisors more adequately. It would likely also improve motivation of the students as they will feel as if they are more capable of performing at their jobs if they are provided an opportunity to demonstrate they are able to apply effective Army writing to legal memoranda.

The second recommendation we have for the developer is to consider adding more videos to the curriculum. The students that will be taking this course fall demographically into the generation that seem to learn most through viewing videos rather than from written materials. Even if the budget does not allow for gamification, our team sees value in adding video and audio at certain points in the curriculum. Students also echoed this sentiment in their responses to the survey questionnaire. Any additions to the modules that will make the course more interactive will go a long way in improving user's attitude toward the curriculum.

Finally, there are a few occasions where there are grammatical errors in the slides. We recommend the developer and SMEs go back and review each slide to ensure the slides are grammatically correct. There are also some functions within the course that are not working properly such as the office symbol link identified by one of the students as well as the use of an outdated regulation. These errors, although viewed as minor, could have a significant impact on the student's attitude toward the training.

Formative Evaluation Self Evaluation

During this project, the team derived many lessons learned within the process of conducting an effective formative evaluation. The team now understands that a formative evaluation is an excellent tool in discovering why the APCC is not working. The formative evaluation process is both critical and mandatory to assisting the evaluation team in producing a successful outcome. Formative evaluation within this project helped us understand the stance of the APCC from both a experts and learners' perspective. Formative evaluation provided valuable feedback that led to our recommendations to helping change a set of complex modules within the course of instruction. According to Potter (n.d). "evaluation is one of the most important steps in the design process, and yet it's usually the step that gets left out." (Lesson 10, para 3.). This project opened our eyes to the APCC's failure to capture successful feedback within its course of instruction. The formative evaluation process conducted within this project interjected the necessary evaluation to enhance the implementation of the course.

The process of formative evaluation requires structure and technique. The "think aloud protocol" structure of interview used in this project, helped the team, by providing a deeper real-time understanding of the expert's point of view within the project. This technique hosted many advantages including allowing the expert to freely express how she felt. In addition, this method was cost effective, required no special equipment, and provided a quality form of data collection. The "think aloud protocol"

was robust and provided the expert the ability to be blatantly biased about the APCC. The flexibility within this protocol was flexible, agile, and provided the convincing data needed to help the team with accurate and qualitative recommendations.

The formative evaluation process like many other tools has both advantages and disadvantages. The key to overcoming some of these disadvantages include ensuring the individuals who conduct the formative evaluation are qualified and trained to produced maximum results in the evaluation, and ensuring the results and recommendations are aligned related to the implementation of the project. The advantages however far outweigh the disadvantages by helping the project achieve successful outcomes, provide continuous improvement, assist in complex settings, and help set or revise future goals and plans.

In the end, this project allowed the team to utilize a broad range of tools and techniques within the formative evaluation process of learner and expert feedback. These tools and techniques helped the team in successfully detecting the difficulties within the APCC and provided quality recommendations to adapt the future educational process of successful APCC implementation for the United States Army.

Appendix A-Expert's Biography



MSG Erica Cole

MSG Erica O. Cole is from Durham North Carolina. She enlisted in the United States Army on, 1 August 2002. MSG Cole attend both basic training and advanced individual training at Fort Jackson, South Carolina.

Her previous military assignments include, HHB, PSB, Fort Sill Oklahoma where she served as the Final Actions Clerk, Legal Assistance Paralegal, Pre-Trial Paralegal, and NCOIC of Trial Defense Services; 8th Army, Yongsan Korea as the Assistant Information Management Officer and Legal Assistance NCO; 30th Regiment, Fort Sill Oklahoma as the TDS NCOIC; 3rd Sustainment Brigade, Fort Stewart Georgia as the Battalion Paralegal NCOIC, and Squad leader. 15 Month Deployment to Q-West Iraq where she served at the battalion paralegal and legal assistance NCO; 8th Army, Yongsan Korea as Joint Service Command Operation NCOIC, Ad Law NCOIC, Office of the Judge Advocate Security Manager, and Client Legal Services NCO; CASCOM, Fort Eustis as the Joint Base Langley Eustis Senior Paralegal and Military Justice NCOIC; Fort Lee as a 27D Paralegal Instructor; 75th Legal Operations Detachment in Mountain View California as the Senior Paralegal NCO and S3 Operations NCOIC; She currently serves as the NCOIC of The Training Developments Directorate at The Judge Advocate General's Legal Center and School, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Awards include: Meritorious Service Medal (2nd award), Army Commendation Medal (four oak leaf clusters), Army Achievement Medal (five oak leaf clusters), Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal (sixth award), Military Outstanding Volunteer Service Medal (3rd award), National Defense Service Medal, Korean Defense Service Medal, Iraqi Campaign Medal, Noncommissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon (fourth award), Basic Army Instructor Badge, Army Service Ribbon, and Overseas Service Ribbon (third award).

Civilian Awards: Two presidential volunteer awards from President Barrack Obama

MSG Cole's military and civilian education includes: Structured Self-development courses 1-4, Army Basic Instructions Course, (she earned the Instructor Skill Identifier SGI8) Cadre Training, Combined Master Leaders Course, Senior Leaders Course, Senior Paralegal Course, Paralegal Advance Leadership Course, Primary Leadership Development Course, Master Resilience Course (she earned the Skill Identifier 8R), SHARP Certification Course (she earned the Skill Identifier 1B), Combined Senior Legal NCO Course, Test Construction Course, Small Group Instructor Training Course, Systems Approach to Training Course (She earned a Skill identifier of 2), Intermediate facilitators Course, Equal Opportunity Course, Law for Paralegal NCO Course, ATTRS Operator Course, Command Post of the Future Course, Combat Lifesaver Course, Bus drivers Training, Senior Enlisted Joint Professional Military Education (SEJPME) I Course, Information Assurance Course and Field Sanitation course. In spring 2021, MSG Cole will graduate from Regent University School of Law with a master's degree in Law/Advance Legal Studies. She graduated Cum Laude with a Bachelor of Science in Paralegal Studies from University of Great Falls. She earned an Associates of Arts in General Studies from Central Texas Community College.

Appendix B-Expert's Questionnaire

Army Judge Advocate General's NCO Academy Expert Questionnaire

Directions: Please indicate with a circle in the corresponding box to the degree in which you agree with the following statements regarding the recent implementation of the newly designed Army JAG Noncommissioned Officer Advanced Leaders Course (APCC). Any additional comments you provide will be helpful in interpreting the results of this questionnaire. The answers you provide will enable the improvement of the overall course

		Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Undecided	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1	The instructional materials provided the relevant information I needed to effectively teach the APCC.	0	1	2	3	4
2	All of the necessary instructional materials for effective instructional delivery of the APCC were readily available.	0	1	2	3	4
3	Organizational support was provided when applicable to assist with effective instructional delivery of the APCC.	0	1	2	3	4
4	The facilities fully supported the effective instructional delivery of the APCC.	0	1	2	3	4
5	The intention and perspective of the APCC were clear to the learners.	0	1	2	3	4
6	The intentions and perspectives of the APCC course were clear to me.	0	1	2	3	4
7	The time estimates and requirements within the APCC POI were accurate, realistic, and effective.	0	1	2	3	4
8	During the instructional delivery, I had to deviate and adapt the instructional content to fit the established goals and objectives.	0	1	2	3	4
9	The instructional materials were used as describe and intended in the APCC.	0	1	2	3	4
10	All learners who were present for instructional days effectively completed all designed instructional materials.	0	1	2	3	4
11	The information I needed was present within the lesson plan and assisted in effective instructional delivery.	0	1	2	3	4
12	I found the APCC easy to instruct and deliver effective instruction.	0	1	2	3	4
13	The APPC was enjoyable to instruct to the learners.	0	1	2	3	4
14	The APCC provided valuable instruction that the learners learned from.	0	1	2	3	4
15	I think enjoyed instruction of the APCC and would instruct other courses similar in design.	0	1	2	3	4
16	I would recommend the APCC to other instructors in the U.S. Army.	0	1	2	3	4
17	The CFDIC Army Instructor course prepared me to effectively instruct the APCC.	0	1	2	3	4

Appendix C-Student's Survey

Army Judge Advocate General's NCO Academy Student Questionnaire

Directions: Please indicate with a circle in the corresponding box to the degree in which you agree with the following statements regarding the recent implementation of the newly designed Army JAG Noncommissioned Officer Advanced Leaders Course (APCC). Any additional comments you provide will be helpful in interpreting the results of this questionnaire. The answers you provide will enable the improvement of the overall course

		Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Undecided	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1	The lesson plan was easy to understand.	0	1	2	3	4
2	The lesson length was appropriate for the material.	0	1	2	3	4
3	Practical exercises reinforced the lesson material.	0	1	2	3	4
4	Assessment questions matched material presented in lesson plan.	0	1	2	3	4
5	Material taught in lesson is relevant to experiences in job.	0	1	2	3	4
6	The use of multimedia in course lesson enhanced understanding.	0	1	2	3	4
7	Instruction was effective in adding to understanding of lesson plan.	0	1	2	3	4
8	Lesson plan schedule allowed enough time for learners to complete group exercises, and individual exercises?	0	1	2	3	4
9	Modules were easy to use.	0	1	2	3	4
10	Instructional material aided in understanding lessons.	0	1	2	3	4
11	There was no difficulty in navigating from one module to another.	0	1	2	3	4
12	Were the resources provided adequate in answering questions?	0	1	2	3	4
13	Were the directions for assessments easy to understand?	0	1	2	3	4
14	Would you recommend the course to your peers?	0	1	2	3	4
15	Overall, how satisfied are you in the course content provided in the modules?	0	1	2	3	4

Additional Comments

Some of the slides had sub slides which made it a little difficult to find a specific answer or information, but overall, I am enjoying the modules as well as the class a whole. I am recommending my Soldiers to sign up for future classes.

Submitted by:

Printed Name/Grade/Rank Wortham, TiJuana, SSG, E-6

Signature WORTHAM.TIJUANA.LANETT.1107396140

Digitally signed by WORTHAM.TIJUANA.LANETT.1107396140
Date: 2021.02.23 12:18:58 -05'00'

Army Judge Advocate General's NCO Academy Student Questionnaire

Directions: Please indicate with a circle in the corresponding box to the degree in which you agree with the following statements regarding the recent implementation of the newly designed Army JAG Noncommissioned Officer Advanced Leaders Course (APCC). Any additional comments you provide will be helpful in interpreting the results of this questionnaire. The answers you provide will enable the improvement of the overall course.

		Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Undecided	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
1	The lesson plan was easy to understand.	0	1	2	3	4
2	The lesson length was appropriate for the material.	0	1	2	3	4
3	Practical exercises reinforced the lesson material.	0	1	2	3	4
4	Assessment questions matched material presented in lesson plan.	0	1	2	3	4
5	Material taught in lesson is relevant to experiences in job.	0	1	2	3	4
6	The use of multimedia in course lesson enhanced understanding.	0	1	2	3	4
7	Instruction was effective in adding to understanding of lesson plan.	0	1	2	3	4
8	Lesson plan schedule allowed enough time for learners to complete group exercises, and individual exercises?	0	1	2	3	4
9	Modules were easy to use.	0	1	2	3	4
10	Instructional material aided in understanding lessons.	0	1	2	3	4
11	There was no difficulty in navigating from one module to another.	0	1	2	3	4
12	Were the resources provided adequate in answering questions?	0	1	2	3	4
13	Were the directions for assessments easy to understand?	0	1	2	3	4
14	Would you recommend the course to your peers?	0	1	2	3	4
15	Overall, how satisfied are you in the course content provided in the modules?	0	1	2	3	4

Additional Comments

I have not completed through the entire course yet as there are many modules and lessons to each portion. So far the content has been great and broken down to explain each portion thoroughly. Each lesson lets you know what will be taught and provides a great knowledge for each lesson. It is easy to navigate but certain portions of it still needs a little bit more of an update as it is the pilot run within the program but not the content itself.

Some of the lessons are long as one topic can have a couple of different screens to go through before the lessons come to an end. This course should really assist with those who have not gone through a writing course in years so they understand each writing portion. It is time consuming and requires a lot of attention but if they do pay attention it would assist them with each topic. This will require self-control and self-discipline but like anything else, it is up to the learner to put their effort into it rather than trying to skip through each lesson.

Submitted by:

Printed Name/Grade/Rank Dana Song, E-6, SSG

Signature Dana Song

(Optional)

IDE-641 USA APCC Formative Evaluation

In Lesson 8, it felt that we were able to bring everything we had studied in past lessons and practice them in learning about the steps of writing our first draft. Personally, I didn't know of all the principles of writing the first draft. The principles I did know, I didn't really practice out of laziness or because I felt I was pressed for time. After going through this lesson and how it brought the topics and principles of other lessons, really showed me the significance of taking time with the first draft. I feel more confident in taking the time I need to organize my thoughts, get them down on paper, and go through the revision process.

2. What I still need to learn more about:

Throughout the module, there were some general principles of the differences between military and legal writing. I would like to learn more about just legal writing and how a general legal brief would look. I understand that most of our writing would probably never go that far, but it would be nice to see how distinct legal writing can be from military writing.

3. The module might have been more effective if:

I believe the module would have been more effective if there were some assignment which allowed us to practice the material. There were some guides which showed us step by step regarding certain concepts, but I would have liked there to be some writing assignment to help me understand by doing.

4. The module provided me with tools that can help me improve the performance of my organization:

I absolutely agree. I feel that I have a better understanding of the types of documents I can expect to write as a paralegal in my organization. Additionally, I feel confident in accepting tasks that are out of the norm in terms of writing.

5. I found the quality of the training materials to be:

Very good. I found the material to be thorough and well organized. By following the lesson plan, I was able to continue to practice and use the freshly learned material in the future lessons.

6. The course might have been more efficient if:

We had some ability to practice the principles we were learning. I was able to see how the principles were used in the scenarios with SGT Smith. The lessons did a good job at showing how a paralegal could break down the situation and use the principles. On the other hand, I would like to see an assignment where we take a similar but different scenario and practice what we learn.

7. I found the end of module test to be (easy, hard, just right):

It was just right. It was a little deceiving at first, because it started off easy and then gradually became more difficult.

8. The Pre/Post knowledge checks were:

I believe the pre knowledge check was a good introduction to module; however, I found the Post-knowledge checks to be more difficult. Some of the Post-knowledge checks asked for detailed material that I either missed going through the lessons or did not focus on enough.

9. I found the following errors in the module (please be specific):

Lesson 1, the link to the lesson is misspelled "Militray" instead of "Military-Legal Writing".

Lesson 2, Characteristics of Nouns and Pronouns, under the "Case" link, there is a missing parenthesis after "An object (objective case)".

Lesson 2, Post-Lesson Check on Learning, one of the questions asks you to review the text provided in the image. The image didn't show up for me.

Lesson 3, Principles of Military Writing, the system would automatically switch slides without letting me review the material. I attempted to go back, but the system would continue to automatically move to the next slide.

Module Test - There was a question that had two possible answers which were the same. The answer was correct. Unfortunately, I chose "d" as my answer, when "c" was the correct answer (even though they were the same).

10. I did/did not have internet compatibility issues:

Did not.

Journal Entry 1

Posted by [REDACTED] Friday, February 12, 2021 6:16:52 PM

What I learned most from this module was:

- I learned that I should take it upon myself to learn more of effective military writing. I have a hard time writing in more of a civilian style than military.
- The module would have been more effective if there was a video to explain the slides instead of just reading slides.
- The module has given me a great start on being a better writer for my unit.
- I found the quality of the training materials to be ok, there were too many subslides inside the slides. It made it hard sometimes to come back to a specific slide for information.
- The course might have been more efficient if: Videos
- I found the end of module test to be (easy, hard, just right): Challenging. I am not a good test taker.
- The Pre/Post knowledge checks were: A lot, but they did help.
- I found the following errors in the module (please be specific): I did not find any errors.
- I did/did not have internet compatibility issues: I did not have any issues.

Comments: 2

Comment


Tijana WORTHAM said...


Friday, February 12, 2021 6:19:38 PM EST
I have to correct one. As far as errors, it only allowed me to take the final test once. I reread the slides in the areas I was having trouble in, so I can retake the test for a better score but it would not let me retake it. :(

Ericca COLE said...

Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:50:14 AM EST
Thank you. I will open the test this morning so you can take it as many times as you like. Call my cell if you have any issues [757-968-0305](tel:757-968-0305).

Wednesday, February 17, 2021

Journal 1  New

Posted by  at Wednesday, February 17, 2021 12:08:57 PM

1. Attention to detail.
2. The latest version of AR 25-50.
3. After getting a question incorrect, the correct answer/explanation was shown.
4. Yes.
5. Adequate.

1. It was not required to click through all additional items to advance to the next slide.
1. Just right. I liked that the correct answers were shown at the end of the test.
1. The post-checks were beneficial. I appreciated the opportunity to skip the pre-tests.


1. I found the following errors in the module:
 1. Outdated version of AR 25-50 used.
 2. Lesson Two: asked to view a text box, but there was no text box on the screen.
 3. Lesson Seven, One: missing period at the end of paragraph three.
 4. Lesson Seven, Two/Four: slide says "less then," but should be "less than".
 5. Lesson Nine: Office Symbol look-up link does not work.
1. Did not.


Suggested improvements:

1. Number the slides and allow student to know how many slides/questions remaining in lesson.
2. Give the ability to "X" out of all pop-up screens. Some screens have this ability, but others do not, so when viewing the hyperlinked items, additional screens build up on the slide. There is no way to get rid of them/view the content behind once they are open.
3. Not allow the test to be turned in with blank answers.

[Comment](#)

Wednesday, February 10, 2021

Journal entry 1 

Posted by  at Wednesday, February 10, 2021 3:08:49 PM

1. What I learned the most from this module was: What an active voice was and how it is used.
2. What I still need to learn more about: I still need to learn about how
3. This module might have been more effective if: It'd be more effective for visual learners (like myself) if there were more examples instead of lectures.
4. This module provided me with the tools that can help me improve the performance of my organization: Agree
5. I found the quality of the training materials to be: Helpful
6. The course might have been more efficient if: If the lesson wasn't as much reading or had an audio option.
7. I found the end of module test to be: I haven't gotten to this test because lesson 10 freezes up and makes me restart just to freeze up again on the same part.
8. The pre/post knowledge checks were: somewhat helpful.
9. I found the following errors in the module: Lessons freeze up and wont work until i'm forced to restart the whole lesson again , questions will say my answer is incorrect and then state the correct answer which is the answer i chose.
10. I did/ did not have internet compatibility issues: i did.

References

- Bijark, S. (2012, December 28). File:iustitia.svg. Retrieved March 14, 2021, from <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Iustitia.svg>
- Jonassen, D. H., Tessmer, M., & Hannum, W. H. (1998). *Task analysis methods for instructional design*. Routledge.
- Potter, K. (n.d.). Lesson 10: Formative evaluation. Retrieved March 12, 2021, from https://www.itma.vt.edu/courses/appliedid/lesson_10.php#6
- Tessmer, M. (1993). *Planning and conducting formative evaluations: Improving the quality of education and training*. Psychology Press.