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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Best Features</strong></th>
<th><strong>Areas of Opportunity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functionality</strong></td>
<td>• Embedded quizzing</td>
<td>• Too much exposed code for non-technical user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Creating a course is easy</td>
<td>• Clunky and restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Look and Feel</strong></td>
<td>• Modern, clear</td>
<td>• Inconsistent user interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beautiful appearance</td>
<td>• Linear approach is limiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Navigation</strong></td>
<td>• Consistent</td>
<td>• Not intuitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Navigating through multiple courses is easy</td>
<td>• More steps than iSites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ease of Use</strong></td>
<td>• Course set up is straightforward</td>
<td>• Many layers, heavy clicking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Checklist with links for course creation</td>
<td>• Heavy reliance on HTML</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“How Satisfied were you with the edX Platform?”

Overall Scores: 1 to 5, with 5 being Excellent

n=34 respondents

- Functionality
  - 56% were Fair/Poor (19/34)

- Look & Feel
  - 32% were Very Good/Excellent (11/34)

- Navigation
  - 82% were Fair/Poor (28/34)

- Ease of Use
  - 85% were Fair/Poor (29/34)

- Overall Experience
  - 59% were Fair/Poor (20/34)
“What did you like Best?”

• **Functionality**
  – The ability to use HTML, the embedded quizzing and video, and the ability to create static pages.
  – Creating a course was very easy for a technical user.
  – It is clearly open to future updates and integrations and it seems like an appropriate core on which to build.

• **Look and Feel**
  – Appearance: beautiful design. A course site looks very nice once fully created.
  – The look and feel is an improvement over iSites.
  – Interface looks modern and clear.

• **Navigation**
  – Creating a course was very easy for a technical user.
  – It is very easy to navigate through multiple courses, and is consistent.

• **Ease of Use**
  – The course set up was the most straightforward part.
  – Checklist with links to areas needing completion was well set up.
• **Functionality**
  
  – I cringe at the idea of using this for language courses and small humanities classes. I tried to put in a translation exercise and had problems. At this point it seems like a step backwards to have to write the xml.
  
  – Navigation, usability, functionality, user experience, robustness, web 2.0 capability, bi-directional learning, flexibility, lack of a 21st century interface, no discussion functionality beyond q/a.
  
  – Too much code is currently exposed for the average user.
  
  – Clunky, restrictive. I can't imagine asking faculty to give up iSites to pilot test this version at this time and have reservations about it being ready in the fall.
  
  – Using third party resources is a huge deterrent. As course staff, you need to interact with YouTube, before delivering your course content/lecture videos through the platform.

• **Look and Feel**
  
  – Linear approach seems somewhat limiting...definitely tailored more towards a self-paced online experience. The emphasis on data collections seems to be trumping the need to create/integrate tools that allow for a better user experience.
  
  – User Interface is inconsistent – especially on “Save”.
  
  – Hard to get back to Edit page after switching to another task.
  
  – Default HTML for section areas should include a HTML comment tag – saves typing.
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“What did you like Least?” (continued)

• Navigation
  – Requires more steps than iSites to set up a course.
  – Navigation and the menu keyboards are not intuitive.
  – Navigation not easy to use.
  – Button terminology could be improved.

• Ease of Use
  – Unclear field descriptors.
  – Many layers, heavy clicking.
  – Needs a Repository feature and spell check.
  – Heavy reliance on HTML could be problematic for many administrators and faculty.
  – Non “techies” seemed to struggle with the interface.
“What Additional Features Would You Like to See Added?”

• Functionality
  – More flexibility with the types of content you can add, more WYSIWYG editors rather than HTML.
  – Image galleries. We have several courses that rely heavily on images, such as archeology and manuscript courses.
  – Chat option. A way to keep track of grades for both faculty and students. Integration between things like course catalog, registration, library resources, etc. Dropbox. Online exams. A way to integrate with lecture videos.
  – Integration with wiki.harvard, Kaltura video, Learning Catalytics.
  – Modern LMS tools such as a grade book, integration with social media, student contribution to site beyond discussions, version control, multiple levels of permissioning, repository, digital asset management (DAM).
  – Team-based participation and assessment structure for students.
  – Batch file upload is needed.

• Look and Feel
  – Buttons instead of links would be better.
  – A Wizard like tool would be helpful.
edX Feedback> Detailed Results

“What Additional Features Would You Like to See Added?”

• Navigation
  – Year to year cloning is required.
  – The Save/Auto Save function is confusing.
  – Drop box, accessibility, alternative video delivery, smoother way to include library readings.

• Ease of Use
  – Sitemap, full list of tools/features, course templates.
  – Ability to choose from a larger set of pedagogical tools -- analogous to iSites.
  – Calendar tool, email/announcement, integration of library resources (library reserves, direct harvest/access of library e-resources with metadata citation.)