

A man wearing a dark cap and jacket is focused on his work in a workshop. He is holding a handheld electronic device with a screen displaying a waveform. In the background, a large, bright, glowing object, possibly a furnace or a large light source, creates a strong red glow that illuminates the scene. The man's hands are visible, holding the device and a small component.

Instruct

Author: Yuri Tricys
Date: July 14, 2025

PIDP:3240

Media Enhanced Learning

RESEARCH REPORT SELF-ASSESSMENT

Introduction

The following document is a brief self-assessment of the research report for assignment 1 of PIDP 3240 Media Enhanced Learning.

My personal satisfaction with the research is quite high, though there is of course room for improvement, particularly in the design and overall look and feel of the report. I felt however the content was satisfactory, in terms of achieving the goal of the assignment, which was in my case, as I understand, to research and discuss a specific media creation tool, its components and best practices for its use – as well as how it relates to the essential principles of multi-media design and multi-media enhanced learning.

Principles of Multi-Media Design and Media-Enhanced Learning

While my research report didn't focus exactly on the principles of media-media design, it did focus somewhat rigorously on Open Media Broadcaster Software, which is a modern tool used to create media-enhanced learning material.

I also mentioned how OBS can be used incorrectly, violating one of the principles of multi-media design, the 'Image principle', which states that learning is not optimized when you put a narrator in the video. This answered directly one of the guiding questions, which was related to observing the absence of any principles of multi-media design.

I've found that many creators of video tutorials put the narrator in the video, myself included; however, Mayer's 'Image Principle' is an important consideration, since with OBS it is easy enough to be conservative when including a visual overlay of the narrator.

Guiding Questions

There were a few guiding questions that were not addressed in the report, since it was a themed report. Omitting them was not ideal; however, it was appropriate, in terms of staying true to the theme, to pass over some of the guiding questions.

For example, I did not touch on UDL (Universal Design for Learning), which is a framework for creating flexible, inclusive learning environments that accommodate diverse learners' needs.

UDL shifts education from a one-size-fits-all approach to a personalized, adaptable model, enhancing engagement, retention, and accessibility for every learner. It would have been commendable to mention it in the report; however, again, I believe mentioning it in this self-assessment is more fitting given the report theme and still achieves in my view the aim of the learning outcome.

In terms of inclusion of captions during video production, rather than post-production, again, that is important when teaching to students with visual and hearing challenges and I didn't it. I think it would have been helpful to mention accessibility, equability and diverse representation; however, again, the strict theme took precedence.

Copyright

In terms of copyright, I did include a copyright notice on the report and noted in the references, to APA specifications, the sources of material used in the report. I think a discussion of fair-use and creative-commons licensing belongs in a

report centered around either how to create multi-media content, or copyright law itself, rather than a report focused on tool use.

Rubric

Regarding the rubric, I feel I successfully aligned my work with the highest levels of performance (Level 4), across all rubric categories. My content was thoroughly contextualized, addressing the core assignment goals with depth and precision. I demonstrated meticulous sourcing and citation practices, ensuring scholarly credibility. I presented a polished, professional design that enhances clarity and accessibility. There was sufficient mastery in communicating and explaining the tool's components, usage, and challenges. I offered concrete, field-specific examples and actionable insights.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I reward myself a self-assessment score of **9.5/10**.

This report meets the majority of Level 4 criteria as outlined in the rubric, justifying its high score. The strengths lie in its razor-sharp thematic focus on OBS as a tool for media-enhanced education, coupled with actionable analysis of its features, best practices, and alignment (and misalignment) with multimedia design principles. The logical structure, technical depth, and APA-cited sources enhance its scholarly and professional rigor.

There were Weaknesses, however, including the omission of explicit discussions around Universal Design for Learning (UDL), captioning during production, and equitable representation. Additionally, I did not address legal aspects like Creative Commons licensing within OBS-generated content. These oversights, however, were intentional. Given the report's hyper-focused theme on **OBS as a practical tool for web developer tutorials**, extraneous elements like UDL or equitable representation would have diluted the report's utility for its intended audience.

Despite minor deviations from some guidelines, the report achieves its primary objective: equipping future web development educators with a critical understanding of how OBS can enhance (or undermine) learning when creating tutorials. The technical accuracy, self-directed depth, and practice-focused applicability justify the score.