

Assignment #1 Feedback and Scoring: Interest Theory 11/4/2019

Presenters:

Lei Wang

Melissa Downing

Dear Lei and Melissa,

I very much enjoyed your presentation on Self-Efficacy Theory. You chose to create a video which was different than the other presentations and this helped garner our attention. Your production value was high with Melissa narrating and using her skills with Audacity and Lei editing the video using her skills with Camtasia. The graphics were eye-catching and the music helped to pace the video. Great teamwork! I loved how you used the Kung Fu Panda movie clips to show Po's development of self-efficacy through social persuasion, mastery experience, etc. That was a creative decision and one which also helped to sustain the viewers' attention! I particularly liked how you were able to tie self-efficacy theory into the library scenario, then asking how the librarian could increase the young patron's SE, and offering the ways in which this could be accomplished. You both did an excellent job on the research including summarizing the Salanova et al and Vieluf et al articles. It was good to get the international perspective on teacher self-efficacy in the second article. The Flip activity was a perfect way to conclude, and from the discussion responses, I could see how valuable your colleagues felt this activity was. Finally, you did a wonderful job of leading the discussion. You both responded quickly and thoughtfully to your colleagues' contributions and your responses were always thoughtful. Sometimes, you even offered more questions for the responder to ponder. You obviously put a great deal of effort into this presentation and it paid off.

On the next page, I have broken my comments down by the criteria for the assignment along with my scoring for each of them.

Excellent work! You should feel proud of your accomplishment.

Marilyn Arnone

Assignment #1	Outstanding	Good to Very Good	Par to Below Par	Unacceptable	Comments
Engaging/motivating presentation style	4	3.5 - 3.9	3 – 3.4	0 – 2.5	A very interesting presentation that gained and sustained my attention throughout.
Accurate/sufficient content	4	3.5 - 3.9	3 – 3.4	0 – 2.5	Topic well covered. Good connections to other motivation theories such as attribution theory with internal/external sources
Adequate information about research/researcher(s)	4	3.5 - 3.9	3 – 3.4	0 – 2.5	Good coverage.
Examples of usefulness specific information context	4 (>2 examples)	3.5 - 3.9 (2 examples)	3 – 3.4 (<2 examples)	0 – 2.5	Relevant example in the context of libraries.
Brief summary of an article with full citation	4	3.5 - 3.9	3 – 3.4	0 – 2.5	Well done. The two articles you summarized were good choices. Good that the 2nd article looked at SE in international context.
Interactive activity	4	3.5 - 3.9	3 – 3.4	0 – 2.5	Stellar activity—simple but effective. Lots of good discussion from students related to the activity, too. Very well-received by students.
Reference list of at least 5 resources (max.1 website/not textbook or assigned readings)	4 (>5 references)	3.5 - 3.9 (5 references)	3 – 3.4	0 – 2.5 (<5)	This went by fast in the video but looked like you have a number of good references.
Presentation/discussion posted on assigned dates	3	2.5	2	0 - 1	Timely
Engaging/participatory, well-led discussion	4	3.5 - 3.9	3 – 3.4	0 – 2.5	The participation in the discussion was awesome. When I went through, I saw that everyone except just a few participated enthusiastically and they all loved the presentation. You responded positively to students' contributions and comments and your responses were well thought out.
TOTAL	35				This was a high quality submission in every respect. I hope that you both enjoyed this total experience. You were a great team.