

EDTC 6332 Educational Technology Practicum
Practicum Project
A Self-Paced Digital Literacy Training Module
for Adult Community Members

Project Description

This practicum artifact is a self-paced, interactive web-based digital literacy training program designed for adult community members who have basic access to technology but need greater confidence and independence completing everyday digital tasks. The training contains three modules: Email Skills, File & Folder Management, and Online Meetings. Each module contains five lessons. Lesson 1 introduces the skill and includes an instructor-created demonstration video and learner interaction/reflection. Lessons 2, 3, and 4 use guided, simulation-style activities that allow learners to practice realistic tasks in a safe environment that feels similar to actual email, file-management, or online-meeting use. Lesson 5 is a Practice & Skills Check that brings the module skills together. The overall design follows a learner-centered sequence of demonstration, hands-on practice, feedback, retry, and application so adult learners can build practical digital skills and perform essential tasks with minimal or no assistance.

Project Link

Training Modules: <https://dlt.hahuskill.com/modules.html>

Standards Met

This project demonstrates proficiencies in the following AECT (Association for Educational Communications and Technology) standards: Standard 1 – Content Knowledge, Standard 2 – Content Pedagogy, Standard 3 – Learning Environments, Standard 4 – Professional Knowledge and Skills, and Standard 5 – Research. The chart below illustrates the performances that fulfill the AECT standards.

AECT 2012 Standards	
Standard 1 – Content Knowledge: Candidates demonstrate the knowledge necessary to create, use, assess, and manage theoretical and practical applications of educational technologies and processes.	
Performance indicators:	Justification
1.1 Creating. Candidates demonstrate the ability to create instructional materials and learning environments using a variety of systems approaches.	<i>Created a complete interactive web-based training environment with three practical digital-literacy modules. The course combines video demonstration, guided instruction, simulations, practice, feedback, and skills checks.</i>
1.2 Using. Candidates demonstrate the	<i>Selected and used web technologies, short</i>

ability to select and use technological resources and processes to support student learning and to enhance their pedagogy. 1.3 Assessing/Evaluating. Candidates demonstrate the ability to assess and evaluate the effective integration of appropriate technologies and instructional materials. 1.3 Managing. Candidates demonstrate the ability to effectively manage people, processes, physical infrastructures, and financial resources to achieve predetermined goals. 1.5 Ethics. Candidates demonstrate the contemporary professional ethics of the field as defined and developed by the Association for Educational Communications and Technology.	<i>demonstration videos, browser-based interactions, file-selection activities, and realistic simulations to support adult learners in practicing everyday digital tasks.</i> <i>Aligned module practice and Practice & Skills Check activities with the performance objectives. The effectiveness and usability of the developed instruction were also evaluated through an SME review and a one-to-one learner evaluation.</i> <i>Organized the three modules in a consistent reusable platform with simple navigation, lesson progression, progress tracking, feedback/retry opportunities, and practical completion activities.</i> <i>Designed a supportive environment that protects learner confidence and privacy by allowing safe practice without requiring learners to send real email, upload personal information, or perform high-risk actions during simulations.</i>
Standard 2 – Content Pedagogy: Candidates develop as reflective practitioners able to demonstrate effective implementation of educational technologies and processes based on contemporary content and pedagogy.	
Performance indicators:	Justification
2.1 Creating. Candidates apply content pedagogy to create appropriate applications of processes and technologies to improve learning and performance outcomes. 2.2 Using. Candidates implement appropriate educational technologies and processes based on appropriate content pedagogy.	<i>Applied adult-learning and digital-literacy pedagogy to create instruction that moves learners from demonstration to guided practice, realistic simulation, feedback, retry, and independent application.</i> <i>Implemented appropriate instructional technologies and processes for the content: simulated email composition/reply/attachments, file and folder tasks, and simulated online-meeting controls.</i>

2.3 Assessing/Evaluating. Candidates demonstrate an inquiry process that assesses the adequacy of learning and evaluates the instruction and implementation of educational technologies and processes grounded in reflective practice. 2.4 Managing. Candidates manage appropriate technological processes and resources to provide supportive learning communities, create flexible and diverse learning environments, and develop and demonstrate appropriate content pedagogy. 2.5 Ethics. Candidates design and select media, technology, and processes that emphasize the diversity of our society as a multicultural community.	<i>Used formative evaluation to examine both content quality and learner experience. SME feedback addressed clarity, effectiveness, sustainability, content flow, and audience appropriateness; one-to-one feedback addressed navigation/usability, difficulty, confidence, and learner suggestions.</i> <i>Maintained a consistent learner-centered structure across the three modules while allowing adults to work at their own pace, repeat practice, obtain feedback, and return to difficult skills</i> <i>Designed instruction for a diverse adult community audience with varied technology experience by using plain language, clear navigation, multiple forms of demonstration and practice, flexible pacing, and optional support.</i>
Standard 3 – Learning Environments: Candidates facilitate learning by creating, using, evaluating, and managing effective learning environments.	
Performance indicators:	Justification
3.1 Creating. Candidates create instructional design products based on learning principles and research-based best practices. 3.2 Using. Candidates make professionally sound decisions in selecting appropriate processes and resources to provide optimal conditions for learning based on principles, theories, and effective practices. 3.3 Assessing/Evaluating. Candidates use multiple assessment strategies to collect data for informing decisions to improve instructional practice, learner outcomes, and the learning environment.	<i>Created an instructional design product based on learner-centered best practices: clear goals, short demonstrations, hands-on simulation, immediate feedback, practice and retry, and authentic performance-oriented skills checks.</i> <i>Selected familiar, practical tasks and simple web interactions to create optimal learning conditions for adults with different levels of digital experience and confidence.</i> <i>Used multiple assessment and evaluation strategies: interactive lesson practice, end-of-module Practice & Skills Checks, an SME review, and a one-to-one learner evaluation. Findings were used to guide revisions and future implementation.</i>

3.4 Managing. Candidates establish mechanisms for maintaining the technology infrastructure to improve learning and performance. 3.5 Ethics. Candidates foster a learning environment in which ethics guide practice that promotes health, safety, best practice and respect for copyright, Fair Use, and appropriate open access to resources.	<i>Established a maintainable web-based structure with reusable lesson layouts, consistent module navigation, progress indicators, and a common instructional sequence that can be updated as learner needs change.</i> <i>Fostered a respectful, low-risk learning environment by emphasizing safe practice, privacy, appropriate online behavior, and confidence-building rather than penalizing learners for mistakes during practice.</i>
Standard 4 – Professional Knowledge and Skills: Candidates design, develop, implement, and evaluate technology-rich learning environments within a supportive community of practice.	
Performance indicators:	Justification
4.1 Collaborative Practice. Candidates collaborate with their peers and subject matter experts to analyze learners, develop and design instruction, and evaluate its impact on learners. 4.2 Leadership. Candidates lead their peers in designing and implementing technology-supported learning. 4.3 Reflection on Practice. Candidates analyze and interpret data and artifacts and reflect on the effectiveness of the design, development and implementation of technology-supported instruction and learning to enhance their professional growth. 4.4 Assessing/Evaluating. Candidates design and implement assessment and evaluation plans that align with learning goals and instructional activities.	<i>Collaborated with a Subject Matter Expert and a representative tryout learner to review the developed training. Their feedback was collected through separate structured forms and used to evaluate the content and learning experience.</i> <i>Designed and implemented a community-focused technology training solution that can support future digital-literacy instruction and hands-on community training activities.</i> <i>Analyzed SME and one-to-one feedback and reflected on the effectiveness of the design. Positive responses confirmed the overall direction, while specific suggestions led to revisions and plans for continued improvement.</i> <i>Designed and implemented a formative evaluation process aligned with the instructional goals. The SME form focused on clarity, effectiveness, and sustainability, while the one-to-one form focused on usability, difficulty, confidence, and suggestions.</i>

4.5 Ethics. Candidates demonstrate ethical behavior within the applicable cultural context during all aspects of their work and with respect for the diversity of learners in each setting.	<i>Collected feedback for instructional improvement while maintaining respect for participants and using the results to improve accessibility, support, and relevance for adult community learners.</i>
Standard 5 – Research: Candidates explore, evaluate, synthesize, and apply methods of inquiry to enhance learning and improve performance.	
Performance indicators:	Justification
5.3 Assessing/Evaluating. Candidates apply formal inquiry strategies in assessing and evaluating processes and resources for learning and performance. 5.4 Ethics. Candidates conduct research and practice using accepted professional and institutional guidelines and procedures.	<i>Applied formal formative-evaluation strategies to assess the instructional product. The SME review examined content validity, clarity, flow, effectiveness, sustainability, and audience appropriateness, while the one-to-one evaluation identified usability issues, learner difficulty, confidence, and reactions to the training. This approach is consistent with formative evaluation practices that use expert review and individual learner tryouts to improve instruction before broader implementation (Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2015; Tessmer, 1993).</i> <i>Used the evaluation process for instructional improvement rather than learner judgment, collected focused feedback relevant to the training, and treated participant responses respectfully. The evaluation approach followed accepted formative-evaluation practice by gathering evidence from appropriate reviewers before broader implementation (Dick et al., 2015; Tessmer, 1993).</i>

Modifications Made

The project was revised during development and after formative evaluation. The original design plan called for a self-paced web-based training experience built around three core skills - Email Skills, File & Folder Management, and Online Meetings - using step-by-step demonstration, hands-on practice, immediate

feedback, retry, and simple navigation. During development, this plan was expanded into five lessons within each module. Lesson 1 became an orientation and demonstration lesson with video and learner interaction/reflection; Lessons 2 through 4 became simulation-style interactive lessons that allow learners to perform realistic tasks; and Lesson 5 became a Practice & Skills Check that integrates the skills learned in the module.

Two formative performance-evaluation methods were then used to obtain feedback on the developed e-learning product. First, a Subject Matter Expert (SME) Review was conducted using a feedback form focused on clarity, effectiveness, sustainability, content flow, and appropriateness for the adult community audience. Second, a One-to-One Evaluation was conducted with a single representative learner using a separate form focused on navigation and usability, level of difficulty, learner confidence, and suggestions for improvement. The one-to-one evaluation placed the instructional experience in front of an actual tryout learner so that reactions and possible problems could be identified before broader implementation.

The findings from both evaluations were positive. The reviewers expressed satisfaction with the clarity, usability, practical activities, and overall learning experience. Two useful recommendations emerged. One recommendation was to provide the script or written text associated with the demonstration videos so learners can review the information in another format. This support was added to the training design. A second recommendation was to complement the self-paced online training with a hands-on, in-person community session so learners who need additional support can practice the same skills with direct assistance. This recommendation has been incorporated into the future-improvement plan, and the training will continue to be improved through community-based implementation and learner feedback.

The evaluation process also refined the original formative-evaluation plan. Rather than relying only on a planned group review, the completed project documents direct feedback from an SME and an individual tryout learner. This provided both an expert perspective on content and design quality and a learner perspective on actual usability, confidence, and difficulty. These revisions demonstrate an iterative design process in which evaluation findings are used to improve both the current product and future delivery.

The hyperlink that I updated is the same therefore there is no BEFORE and AFTER versions after it got revised.

References

- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2015). *The systematic design of instruction* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Tessmer, M. (1993). *Planning and conducting formative evaluations: Improving the quality of education and training*. Kogan Page.

Association for Educational Communications and Technology. (n.d.). AECT standards. Retrieved October 5, 2026, from <https://aect.org/aect/about/standards>