**

**CE Workshop Evaluation Form**

**Arrangement and Description Track**

Workshop **Evaluation Form:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | Fundamentals of Encoded Archival Description and XSLT Stylesheets |
| **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. No it does not specify categories of archivists and/or levels of expertise, but it does specify administrators. 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 reflects current/future archival practices and theory. EAD has become the standard for online finding aids. These two instructors have set the standard. | | |  |  |  |  | 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, and discussion/hands-on exercises. Very relevant/appropriate, however I wonder that there is no PowerPoint. Was that left out of the review materials? The handout is exceptional in scope, detail and level of granularity. | | |  |  |  |  | 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 seems perfect for a 2 day workshop. | | |  |  |  |  | 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 handout. There certainly is enough written now about EAD that they could include a list of readings. | | |  |  |  | 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 a more advanced workshop for EAD, but it is listed as Fundamental in the title. I think because the second day is about Stylesheets, this should have a prerequisite. | | | | | | |
| 2.Does this build on other workshops not on the list? | Could build on “Beginners Guide to Metadata” and “Describing Archives: A Content Standard” | | | | | | |
| 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 is a Standards-based workshop, so it should fall somewhere between the truly fundamental A+D courses and the next level up. | | | | | | |
| Why? | Audience needs to have intermediate level of knowledge. Should Standards-based workshops be Tactical and Strategic, or Fundamental? | | | | | | |
| 5. What tier does this workshop fall in? (See attached tiers) | Either under Tactical and Strategic or Tools and Services. | | | | | | |
| 6. Target Audience | Practicing Archivists who are considering using EAD. | | | | | | |
| 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? | Not listed. Don’t know. Need to develop. | | | | | | |
| 9. What should they be?  Please list learning outcomes. | Stated as Workshop Objectives:   * Recognize the components of the eXtensible Markup Language (XML) technical standard; * Apply the key elements of EAD, encoding a finding aid using XML editing software; and * Grasp the fundamentals of the eXtensible Stylesheet (XSLT) programming language sufficiently to modify existing stylesheets or create a basic one from scratch to generate a Web-ready EAD document. | | | | | | |
| 10. Can you make suggestions for competencies this workshop would fulfill? | ? | | | | | | |
| 11. Would parts of the content lend themselves to a different format? NO | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Check one: Webinar:   * 30 minute * 90minute | In person:   * 1/2 day * 1 day * 2 day | | | | | | | |
| 12. Which parts? | N/A | | | | | | |
| 13. Does it lend itself to repurposing as an audio CD? | No | | | | | | |
| Which parts? | N/A | | | | | | |

Other comments:

This seems like it just needs to be updated. Tweak the information already existing to fit the new format (Learning Outcomes versus Workshop Objectives). This is a Fundamental course, but I think it should either be Tactical and Strategic or Tools and Services because of the Stylesheets and the need to utilize an editor.