Faculty of Education
Fakulteit Opvoedkunde
Lefapha la Thuto

Course code: **ICT 310**
Department: **SMTE**
Student name and number:
Contact number:
E-mail:
Task number:
Date submitted:

Declaration:

1. I understand what plagiarism is and I am aware of the University's policy in this regard.
2. I declare that this assignment is my own original work. Where other people's work has been used (either from a printed or electronic source), this has been properly acknowledged and referenced in accordance with departmental requirements.
3. I have not used work previously produced by another student or any other person to hand in as my own.
4. I have not allowed and will not allow anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

Signature (s): 

Role of Generative AI:

The use of generative AI in the assignment. *Complete in this document.*

1. Briefly explain which AI tool you have used,
2. Where and how you have used it, and which contribution it made to your understanding of the work.
3. If you have used AI language editing software, please specify this and indicate where in your writing it was used.

AI was used to help understand the task and how it's supposed to evaluate educational technology.

Signature (s): 

ICT 310

TEMOGO LEBALLO

Educational Evaluation Tool

1. CONTENT - RELEVANCE AND QUALITY

Criteria	1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Very Good	5 - Exceellent
Originality & Practicality	The content is general and has no practical use	Lacks depth but has some real-world relevance	Contains some real-world examples and is moderately relevant.	Extremely relevant, with examples and real-world applicability.	Extremely relevant, it promotes critical thinking and problem-solving in the actual world.
Depth and mental difficulty	Readily easy to memorization without context	It doesn't really allow much in the way of critical thought.	Some critical thinking but hardly any enforceability.	Cultivates critical thinking and problem-solving abilities.	Totally promotes critical thinking, synthesis, and active engagement.
Customizability and Adaptability	There are no custom options.	Very little adaptability for different learners.	Limited internal flexibility but some personalization.	Sometimes customizable for different needs and learning styles.	Highly adaptive in providing differentiated learning paths.
Multimedia Engagement	Static content (text-heavy, minimal visuals).	Basic multimedia but not interactive.	Some engaging elements but not immersive.	Interactive and visually attractive.	Fully engaging with videos, simulations, and interactive components.

2. INTERACTION – ENGAGEMENT AND COLLABORATION

Criteria	1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Very Good	5 - Exceellent
Active Learning and Knowledge Construction	Passive learning; with little if any user engagement.	Some Interactive features but not central.	Moderately interactive, allows for basic knowledge building.	Supports active participation and knowledge construction.	Fully interactive, allows the learner to experiment, build, and test their understanding.
Collaborative Learning	No collaboration features are present.	Limited peer interaction.	Some features are within (discussion forums, basic group work)	Strong collaboration tools (group work, peer review, teamwork)	Advanced collaboration tools (live discussions, real-time co-creation).
Scaffolding & Adaptive Feedback	No feedback or guidance.	Minimal feedback, not personalized	Crystal clear guidance but not an insinuation	Adaptive learning with personalized support.	Highly responsive, AI-driven, or instructor-adaptive feedback.
Gamification & Motivation	Some engagement tools, but not integrated well.	Progress tracking and rewards are included.	Uses effective gamification to sustain engagement.	Interactive and visually attractive.	Fully integrated motivational strategies (leaderboards, challenges, progress visualization).

3. ACCESS - AVAILABILITY & INCLUSIVITY

Criteria	1 - Poor	2 - Fair	3 - Good	4 - Very Good	5 - Exceellent
Cross-Platform Accessibility	Available only on one platform.	Some devices that are unsupported.	Operable on most common devices	Operable with multiple platforms	An application that runs on most major devices and OS.
Inclusivity and Universal Design	Not accessible; lacks any sort of accessibility options.	Some very basic accessibility (e.g., subtitles)	Some inclusive design, though not comprehensive.	Properly designed for accessibility (screen readers, alternative navigation).	Fully inclusive design that supports diverse learners (visual/audio impairments, neurodiversity).
Cost & Sustainability	Expensive, no free option.	High cost with little access	Moderate cost, some affordability options.	Good value, with free/affordable access for educators.	Free or low-cost, scaled access with institutions.
Offline & Low-Bandwidth Functionality	Always requires high-speed internet.	Limited offline functioning.	Partial offline capability.	Very strong offline access and low data usage.	Usable offline or in low-bandwidth conditions.

SCORING & INTERPRETATION

Score	Interpretation
Below 20	Not recommended.
20-29	A weak tool with a significant number of weaknesses.
30-39	Just okay, worth considering switching to something else or doing some improvement.
40-49	Quite good, though might need minor change.
50-60	Excellent tool; highly recommended for educational