Going through the short video...   
  
\*\*It's very hard to read the white text on the graph of pretest mastery (w/ light blue background). (In general, the white text on light blue background is hard to see.)   
\*\* When initially describing TED instruction, say that it's focused on supporting students' understanding of WHY controlling variables is necessary (this focus differentiates it from typical methods of instruction that focus only on the procedure).   
\*\*I like how you describe TED's adaptivity (i.e., \*\*\*"The tutor learns about their current skills and gives them instruction targeted to their needs"). I think this is much clearer than the text description of the diagnosing for the ramps pretest (what you showed us during the meeting, that included the phrase "heavy lifting" and very long words as the end).   
\*\*After re-watching the section where all the science domains (e.g., Life Science/Physical Science etc.) are hovering, then fall to the ground, I like it even less. I can see people like Leona Schauble and Deanna Kuhn interpreting this visual metaphor as  "Experimental Design" is better than domain content (they've criticized David's work on this ground for decades). (I do realize our intended audience is mostly educators, but most likely there will be some researchers with similar views watching this, so I think we need to be very careful about not giving this impression.) Instead of the domains falling to the ground (and "Experimental Design" emerging from them like the Phoenix), can you have the domains stay hovering in place and fade out as "Experimental Design" fades in. (Perhaps we can user-test both versions with the teachers.)   
  
Other comments...   
  
\*\*The version of TED that's available in the Demo portal (with drop-downs and feedback in EI) is actually the version the Huston students did \_worst\_ on. (we need to figure out why...maybe the immediate feedback (esp. negative) interfered with their processing of the subsequent instruction via affect, or perhaps the shift in explanatory focus between the explanatory feedback and subsequent instruction caused confusion; unfortunately, though, there was a confound in our design, so we don't know if the correct/incorrect feedback or the explanatory feedback was the culprit). Regardless, we should use one of the other/better versions of the tutor.   
\*\*We need a link for getting to the main menu from the "Demonstration Portal;" as is currently in the Teacher and Research portals.   
\*\*~~In the "Assessment and Instruction Sequence," at the end of discussing the Story pretest,  explicitly state something about the Story pretest allowing for differentiated instruction (or whatever the popular term is). That is, students who do not master the Story pretest go into the tutor and students who master the Story pretest can be given alternative activities.~~   
\*\*~~Interpreting Student Results: There's a circle in the middle bottom of the screen blocking text.~~   
\*\*Interpreting Student Results: The "View Results" demo stops after the cursor moves to the "View Results" icon (and I can't move past this point).   
  
  
  
Notes from meeting...   
  
\*\* Make sentence under the 4 portals ("TED is a free tool...") fit on one line (or convert into two sentences or cut off at a better point). Another option is to reduce the vertical space between the lines. In any case, the font should be about 50% bigger.   
\*\* Demo Portal: Make "TRY IT! >"  always visible under both TED INSTRUCTION and ASSESSMENTS. Also, indicate that the story tests do not have audio (to replicate authentic testing).   
\*\* ~~Interpreting Student Results: Use "Same/Different" rather than "Contrasted/Controlled" in examples for each set-up type in both tables and text. (Possibly also have link to a "real" experiment from the story pre/posttest, depending on outcomes of teacher user-testing.);~~ also use both X/red and (check)/green to indicate correctness of variable set-up.   
\*\* "~~Assessment and Instruction Sequence": highlight TED pathway component (in slide) prior to introducing/discussing that component.~~   
\*\* Be consistent in labeling of TED components (e.g., "Story Problem Pretest" = "TED ASSESSMENTS" in Demo portal, where the assessment is actually the story posttest--we should label as such so ppl don't get confused about why there are no deductive reasoning questions. We should probably have \_both\_ the story pre and posttest available--any reason not to??)   
\*\* "~~Assessment and Instruction Sequence": Simplify wording/syntactical complexity of paragraph describing ramps pretest (see \*\*\* above; the second sentence is also a bear to parse--you can say something like "The menu items depend on the student's set-up and are based on our previous analyses of common correct and incorrect responses.").~~   
~~"Assessment and Instruction Sequence": Holistic Instruction, simplify second sentence ("Some students may go back to...")~~   
\*\*Interpreting Student Results: Start with simplest results (Student results); make sure to define each of the scores given in the spreadsheet simply. We also need to think about whether we really need every different type of set-up code (i.e., could have an "Other" category for what are probably random set-ups, like SC/DC/HTTAT).   
\*\*In the bar graph of results, shades of purple hard to discriminate (esp. if not adjacent). Since we're looking at two dimensions (i.e., test-pre/post and type of question--eval/design), it makes more sense to have, say color for only one dimension (and make colors very different) and something like lines in the bars for the other dimension. Do we ever define "evaluate" vs. "design" items? Even if we have, it wouldn't be a bad idea to include a hyperlink pointing to an example of each type from the story tests (same thing for types of set-ups if it's not already there--I was unable to access this part of the website today).   
  
\*\*In general, to simplify this interpreting results section, we can allow teachers to select the type of result output they are interested in, then our instruction can only focus on helping teachers understand the content of that output. For example, for the spreadsheet output, there's no need for teachers to understand the various types of set-ups. All they have to know for the Story pre/posttest is that the scores are the total number of unconfounded experiments students designed or converted bad experiments into (I don't know if this score includes Good/Bad response correctness). Only if teachers select the more detailed (response-level rather than student-level outcomes) will they be told about the various types of set-ups, etc. This would also make it easier for teachers to remember what the different set-up types were (since that can be given right before they are shown the graphs).
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