**

**CE Workshop Evaluation Form**

**Arrangement and Description Track**

Workshop **Evaluation Form:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | EAC-CPF |
| **Reviewer:** | James Roth |

Directions:

* Quantitative: Each item below begins with a **bolded** statement. Score each with a 1-5 ranking to indicate your assessment of the veracity of that statement based on your review of workshop overviews/agendas, evaluations, and other materials.
* Qualitative: In the comments section for each item below, please respond to the additional questions posed and any related issues that this workshop raises for you.
* Provide any additional assessments or comments not relevant to one of the specific, numbered areas in the space provided following the table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Please place an “x” in the appropriate column, use* ***1=low****, undesirable, to* ***5=high****, excellent.* | | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. Does the content **appeal to its specified audience**? Does it indicate specific categories of archivists and/or levels of expertise to assist potential participants in determining the workshop's relevance for them?  Comments: Yes, this has high appeal. It will catch on in the next few years as early adopters showcase how strong a standard this is. No it does not specify categories of archivists and/or levels of expertise, but it should. This is for the more advanced archivist rather than the beginning archivist. | | |  |  |  |  | X |
| 2. To what extent does the subject matter **reflect current archival practices** and theory commonly accepted in the profession?  Comments: This is a new standard that reflects current/future archival practices and theory. | | |  |  |  |  | X |
| 3.. How **relevant/appropriate are the teaching and delivery methodologies** (lecture, video, PowerPoint, exercises, film, audiotape, discussion, simulation, case study, opportunities for in-course feedback, etc.) to the articulated goals and objectives, and to the content?"  Comments: Lecture, Powerpoint, and discussion/hands-on exercises. Very relevant/appropriate. | | |  |  |  |  | X |
| 4. How workable is the **time line** or **agenda** for the course? Is there sufficient detail to indicate how the workshop will evolve? Does it allow sufficient time for active engagement between course participants and the instructor(s)?  Comments: This could probably be developed into a two day workshop. Seems like a lot is crammed into the one day. I worry that there isn’t sufficient time to discuss for participants and instructor. | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| 5. To what degree does the **list of assigned readings** support the content of the proposal?  Comments: No real assigned readings except the standard itself. There are several supporting websites that are highlighted in the powerpoint. This speaks more to the fact that this is a new/emerging standard that has early adopters. | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| 6. Does the presentation support the Learning Outcomes in the descriptions?  Comments: Needs to have learning outcomes in the description—unless you mean Workshop Objective. Those it meets.. | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| **A&D Track Considerations** | | | | | | | |
| 1.Does this content bridge, enhance, and/or build on other workshops (If so, please name) | This is an introductory workshop to the new standard: EAC-CPF. Prerequisite: What is EAC-CPF? | | | | | | |
| 2.Does this build on other workshops not on the list? | Complement to EAD workshops. | | | | | | |
| 3 Should this be part of the A&D Track? | Yes, I believe it should be a part of the A&D track. | | | | | | |
| 4.Where would this workshop fall in the sequence of an A&D track? | It should be similar to EAD. It is a Standards-based workshop, so it should fall somewhere between the truly fundamental A+D courses and the next level up. | | | | | | |
| Why? | Should follow where we place EAD workshops. Should Standards-based workshops be Tactical and Strategic, or Fundamental? | | | | | | |
| 5. What tier does this workshop fall in? (See attached tiers) | Either under Fundamental, or Tactical and Strategic. | | | | | | |
| 6. Target Audience | Practicing Archivists who are considering using EAC. | | | | | | |
| 7. Is the suggested prior “experience/knowledge” appropriate? | I couldn’t find “experience/knowledge” listed. Needs to include. | | | | | | |
| 8. Learning Outcomes:  Are they appropriate and/or relevant? | List of specific, measurable, and actionable outcomes that each person should be able to do (e.g. discuss, explain, evaluate, design) by the end of the course. | | | | | | |
| 9. What should they be?  Please list learning outcomes. | Stated as Workshop Objectives:   * Knowledge of the structure and content of the EAC-CPF standard and the companion content standard ISAAR (CPF); * Explored the metadata scheme design, including elements and attributes defined to reflect that design: XML techniques used to incorporate data from allied standards and current XML techniques leveraged in the standard; * Created EAC-CPF record content from existing data structures, such as the Library of Congress Name Authority File, United List of Artists Names, biographical resources, and other related sources; * and exposure to EAC–CPF projects underway in the United States and internationally.   Need to generate learning outcomes based on Objectives. | | | | | | |
| 10. Can you make suggestions for competencies this workshop would fulfill? |  | | | | | | |
| 11. Would parts of the content lend themselves to a different format? | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Check one: Webinar:   * 30 minute * 90minute | In person:   * 1/2 day * 1 day * **X 2 day** | | | | | | | |
| 12. Which parts? | Consider making this a 2-day workshop | | | | | | |
| 13. Does it lend itself to repurposing as an audio CD? | No. | | | | | | |
| Which parts? | n/a | | | | | | |

Other comments:

I think this is an excellent workshop, but the information needs to be put into the new format. Learning outcomes are not listed, target audience could be explained with more detail.