

Running head: INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN COURSE

Syllabus Response:

EPSY 350: Instructional Design

Cognition and Instruction Comprehensive Exam

Anthony R. Artino Jr.

University of Connecticut

The purpose of this report is to describe a new course that is being developed for the Department of Educational Psychology at Blue Sky State University (BSSU). To achieve this goal, the report includes the following: (a) an overview of the course, including its overarching goals and terminal learning objectives; (b) a description of the textbooks that will be used and a rationale for their selection; (c) a list of supplemental readings that will be employed to enhance course content; (d) an overview of the assessment plan, including a description of specific assessment components and how those components relate back to the terminal learning objectives; and (e) a detailed syllabus and schedule for the 15-week course (see Appendix A).

Course Goals and Learning Objectives

The new course, EPSY 350: Instructional Design, is intended as an introductory course in instructional design for Masters students in two programs at BSSU: Educational Technology and Cognition & Instruction. Prerequisites for the course include two introductory courses in psychology and one graduate course in learning. In turn, EPSY 350 is considered a prerequisite for most advanced courses in instructional design.

There are two overarching goals for EPSY 350. First and foremost, the course is designed to expose students to traditional instructional design practices; that is, the systematic design of instruction, which is sometimes referred to as instructional systems design or instructional systems development. This primary goal is appropriate for the target audience because many of them will be involved with instructional design activities at schools and corporations following graduation. To this end, the course is project-oriented and provides students with the opportunity to use “mainstream instructional design” (Smith & Ragan, 2005, p. vii) to plan and design an instructional product for an authentic educational context of their choosing. As a *design* course, the primary goal is not to develop the final materials for an instructional product, but instead to provide students with opportunities to practice well-established, collaborative processes for addressing identified learning needs. Therefore, the course focuses specifically on analysis and design processes. Formative and summative evaluation processes are only *briefly*

discussed, and materials development and course implementation considerations are not covered in this introductory course.

The second goal of the course is to provide students with an introduction to some of the more progressive instructional design theories that have been developed over the last 15 years. EPSY 350 is not intended to present students with an exhaustive survey of all major instructional design theories. Instead, the course introduces students to constructivist critiques of traditional instructional design practices and presents a few contemporary, learner-centered design theories that have been developed to address the changing needs of educators and trainers. Through readings, discussions, and debates students will come to appreciate different perspectives regarding the use and relevance of systematic instructional design within various education and training contexts.

There are 11 terminal learning objectives¹ for EPSY 350. Specifically, at the end of the course, students will be able to...

- (1) Discuss the benefits and limitations of traditional instructional design practices;
- (2) Conduct a needs assessment and analyze anticipated learners and learning context;
- (3) Use concept mapping, curriculum mapping, or traditional outlining techniques to analyze an instructional task;
- (4) Write high-level course goals for a proposed instructional product and operationalize those goals as measurable learning objectives;
- (5) Design instructional strategies appropriate for specific learning objectives and use contemporary learning, motivation, and/or instructional design theory to justify features of the proposed product;
- (6) Describe new approaches to instructional design, including constructivist learning environments, situated cognition, and ecological psychology perspectives on instructional design;

¹ These learning objectives are written in abbreviated form (i.e., the objectives do not contain all the components of behavior, condition, and criterion normally included in a measurable objective; Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2005). These objectives are simply designed to provide the reader with an overview of the course content and an understanding for how students will be assessed.

- (7) Discuss recent critiques of constructivist learning environments from the standpoint of cognitive load theory and Mayer's cognitive theory of multimedia learning;
- (8) Describe media and technology affordances, including viewpoints on the influence of media on learning;
- (9) Identify the differences between formative and summative evaluation processes;
- (10) Use a variety of communication formats (i.e., written reports, graphic representations, and oral presentations) to communicate ideas regarding a proposed instructional product;
- (11) Collaborate effectively with a team to develop course goals, learning objectives, and an assessment plan for a proposed instructional product.

Textbooks and Supplemental Readings

Two textbooks will be used in EPSY 350:

Smith, P. L., & Ragan, T. J. (2005). *Instructional design* (3rd ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Wiley.

Duffy, T. M., & Jonassen, D. H. (Eds.). (1992). *Constructivism and the technology of instruction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

The primary text, Smith and Ragan (2005), was selected to address the main goal of the course, as described above. This particular book was selected for a number of reasons, some pedagogical and some related to its coverage of the subject matter. From a pedagogical standpoint, the text includes many relevant features that enhance its value as a learning tool. First, each chapter begins with a list of learning objectives that provide students with explicit goals for learning. Moreover, in an instructional design course, these learning objectives serve another important function: they provide students with a model for how to express, in measurable terms, the expected learning outcomes for different types of cognitive skills (Smith & Ragan, 2005). Next, each chapter includes research-based explanations of the principles of instructional design, along with application examples from a variety of learning contexts and content domains. These real-world examples give students the chance to extend and apply the principles learned within each chapter to various educational settings. By providing students with a balance of general principles and specific examples, the text improves the chances that the material learned will transfer to

novel situations outside the classroom (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000). Finally, within each chapter, the text restates previously learned concepts from earlier chapters and builds on that knowledge using several pedagogical techniques. For instance, at the beginning of most chapters the book refers back to a variety of short examples that are used across multiple chapters, thereby encouraging students to recall and build on previously learned material (Gagne, Wager, Golas, & Keller, 2005). Additionally, at the end of each chapter, and within the book's "Learning Resources" Web site, students are able to apply their knowledge to an extended example that portrays an instructional design project as it unfolds from start to finish. In doing so, the text anchors much of the content knowledge in a realistic instructional problem. This, in turn, provides students with many opportunities to apply the principles and procedures of instructional design to solve an authentic, and sometimes messy, instructional problem (Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt, 1997).

From a content standpoint, the Smith and Ragan (2005) text has many advantages (see outline of chapters in Appendix B). First and foremost, the book is research-based and contains an extensive reference list at the end of each chapter. Next, the text combines an emphasis on traditional instructional design concepts, principles, and practices with an acknowledgement that other approaches to the design of learning environments do exist. For example, the book discusses constructivism as an educational philosophy and epistemology, and includes an overview of many contemporary instructional design theories (e.g., anchored instruction, case-based and problem-based learning, and cognitive apprenticeships). Moreover, the book is balanced in that it also describes alternatives to these minimally guided approaches, including detailed discussions of cognitive load theory. Finally, the text presents an extensive treatment of instructional strategies for various learning outcomes; specifically, there are 10 chapters devoted to a prescriptive and heavily documented approach to designing instructional strategies. This feature distinguishes Smith and Ragan (2005) from other, more traditional texts, which often times include only one chapter on the design of instructional strategies (e.g., Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2005).

The second text, Duffy and Jonassen (1992), was selected to address the second goal of the course, as described above. In particular, the book will be used to help balance the course content between

traditional instructional design practices and “implications of constructivism for instructional-design practice” (Duffy & Jonassen, 1992, p. ix). Overall, Duffy and Jonassen’s (1992) edited text – most chapters of which originally appeared in the 1991 volume of *Educational Technology* magazine – provides readers with a provocative dialogue between instructional designers and learning theorists. The importance of this dialogue was summarized well by a recent book reviewer who declared, “it would be difficult to find an article or book on constructivism and its implications for technology supported teaching and learning which does not cite this popular book” (Hasanbegovic, 2004, ¶ 1).

Finally, 14 supplemental readings (journal articles and book chapters) were selected for the course (see the “Additional Readings” section of the syllabus provided in Appendix A). In general, these readings augment material that is inadequately covered by the two primary texts. For example, a chapter on the construction of learning objectives from Dick et al. (2005) is included because Smith and Ragan (2005) do not provide complete coverage of this topic. Other topics covered by the supplemental readings include: media and technology considerations in instructional design, critiques of minimally guided instruction, and chapters on problem-based learning, situated cognition, and ecological psychology.

Assessment Plan

Each of the 11 terminal learning objectives will be evaluated using a variety of assessment methods. The section in the syllabus entitled “Course Requirements” (see Appendix A) provides an overview of the graded elements and their associated value (in terms of points toward a student’s final grade). There are a maximum of 100 points that can be earned. Moreover, each graded element can be mapped back to one or more course learning objectives (LOs). These linkages, as well as the assessment procedures for each element, are described below.

(1) In-Class Participation (10 points; LOs 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11). Students are expected to attend and actively participate in every class. In-class activities include individual and group reflections and discussions on the subject of the day. Class participation will be informally assessed through instructor observations and points will be awarded based on thoughtful responses and questions in class.

Because this is a graduate level course, it is expected that most students who actively participate will receive the majority of the in-class participation points.

(2) Team Participation (5 points; LO 11). Students will complete a portion of the instructional design project as a member of a design team. A student's ability to collaborate effectively as a member of a team will be assessed by each individual team member, as well as through self-evaluation. A rating scale with explicit qualities and response options will be provided to students to guide them in assessing themselves and their teammates. Score reliability will be improved by averaging the individual team member scores and self-evaluation, giving each student an overall team participation score (Thorndike, 2005). Ultimately, however, the instructor reserves the right to adjust the participation score for any student if it appears the student has been treated unfairly by his or her teammates.

(3) Online Participation in WebCT Vista (5 points; LOs 1, 6, 7, 8). Periodically throughout the semester students will be asked to participate in a WebCT Vista discussion or debate regarding issues in the field of instructional design. Online discussions and debates will typically last for two weeks. Students will be given specific posting criteria by the instructor (e.g., "you must make three postings about the topic") and will be assessed by the instructor based on two criteria: (1) meeting the minimum posting requirements and (2) contributing thoughtful responses that add value to the discussions/debates. During the first class, students will be given specific instruction on the qualities of a "thoughtful response."

(4) In-Class Exams (30 points; LOs 1, 6, 7, 8, 9). Students will complete two closed-book exams covering basic knowledge from the readings, discussions, and lectures. Each exam will consist of approximately 10 multiple-choice questions (worth 1/2 point each), as well as a number of short-answer and/or essay-type questions (worth a total of 10 points). Objective items will be constructed using established item-writing guidelines (see, for example, Haladyna, Downing, & Rodriguez, 2002), and all short-answer and essay-type questions will be assessed using a detailed answer guide that includes the critical points that must be covered for students to receive full credit (Thorndike, 2005).

(5) Instructional Design Project (50 points; LOs 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11). The instructional design project represents the focus of EPSY 350. Students will work both independently and as part of a team

(two to three students) to identify an authentic instructional need and design a learning solution from start to finish (note, this will not include actual development of instructional materials). From a pedagogical standpoint, the project provides many distinct learning advantages. First, the project provides students with an opportunity to apply concepts and principles to the design of an authentic instructional product, thereby promoting the construction of extensive, flexible knowledge that is more likely to transfer to other academic and non-academic settings (Bransford et al., 2000). Second, motivation is promoted by giving students some choice in determining exactly what instructional problem they will address (Pintrich & Schunk, 2002). Next, similar to other problem-based learning approaches, the course project promotes the development of effective problem-solving skills, self-directed, lifelong learning skills, and collaborative learning skills (Hmelo-Silver, 2004). And finally, because the project is broken up into small, manageable pieces that are designed to build on each other, it provides students with challenging yet achievable goals. Thus, as students complete each component and move toward goal attainment, their perceived self-efficacy for using instructional design procedures is likely to be boosted – an effect that has been shown to enhance overall academic performance, persistence, and effort (Bandura, 1997; Robbins et al., 2004)

The instructional design project includes four components (see the “Course Requirements” section of Appendix A for a description of each component). These components include (1) an initial project memo, (2) an initial instructional analysis, (3) a learning objectives and assessment plan, and (4) a final design document. Components 1, 2, and 4 will be completed and graded individually. Component 3 will be completed by a design team and the team will receive an overall grade for the assignment. All project components will be graded by the instructor using detailed scoring rubrics with explicit criteria for what should be included in each component and how well those requirements were executed (Thorndike, 2005). To ensure instructor expectations are clearly articulated, students will be provided with copies of the scoring rubrics at the beginning of the course.

References

- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bransford, J. D, Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt. (1997). *The Jasper project: Lessons in curriculum, instruction, assessment, and professional development*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2005). *The systematic design of instruction* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Duffy, T. M., & Jonassen, D. H. (Eds.). (1992). *Constructivism and the technology of instruction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gagne, R. M., Wager, W. W., Golas, K. C., & Keller, J. M. (2005). *Principles of instructional design* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Haladyna, T. M., Downing, S. M., & Rodriguez, M. C. (2002). A review of multiple-choice item-writing guidelines for classroom assessment. *Applied Measurement in Education, 15*, 309-334.
- Hasanbegovic, J. (2004, November 25). Review of constructivism and the technology of instruction. *e-Learning Reviews*. Retrieved February 1, 2007, from <http://www.elearning-reviews.org/editors/hasanbegovic-jasmina/>
- Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? *Educational Psychology Review, 16*, 235-266.
- Pintrich, P. R., & Schunk, D. H. (2002). *Motivation in education* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Robbins, S. B., Lauver, K., Le, H., Davis, D., Langley, R., & Carlstrom, A., (2004). Do psychosocial and study skill factors predict college outcomes? A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*, 261-288.
- Smith, P. L., & Ragan, T. J. (2005). *Instructional design* (3rd ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Wiley.
- Thorndike, R. M. (2005). *Measurement and evaluation in psychology and education* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Appendix A

EPSY 350 Course Syllabus and Schedule

EPSY 350: Instructional Design
Blue Sky State University

INSTRUCTOR

Anthony R. Artino, Jr., M.S.
tony_artino@yahoo.com
860-486-3772 (office)
860-942-9345 (cell)

OFFICE HOURS

Office: Smith Bldg., Room 220
Tue & Thu, 9:30-11:00 A.M.
Thu, 2:00-4:00 P.M.
Or call for an appointment.

COURSE ACCOMMODATIONS

If you need course adaptations or accommodations because of a disability, or if you have emergency medical information to share with me, please make an appointment or see me during office hours as soon as possible.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

EPSY 350 is designed as an introductory course in instructional design for Master's degree students in two programs at Blue Sky State University (BSSU): Educational Technology and Cognition & Instruction. Prerequisites for the course include two introductory courses in psychology and one graduate course in learning. In turn, EPSY 350 is a prerequisite for most advanced courses in instructional design.

Course Goals:

The purpose of EPSY 350 is twofold:

(1) First and foremost, the course is designed to expose students to traditional instructional design practices; that is, the systematic design of instruction, which is sometimes referred to as instructional systems design or instructional systems development. To this end, the course is project-oriented and provides students with the opportunity to use traditional instructional design processes to design an instructional product for an authentic educational context of their choosing. As a *design* course, the goal is not to develop the final instructional materials, but instead to provide students with opportunities to practice well-established, collaborative processes for addressing identified learning needs. Therefore, the course focuses specifically on analysis and design processes. Formative and summative evaluation processes are only *briefly* discussed, and materials development and course implementation considerations are not covered in this introductory course.

(2) The second goal of the course is to provide students with an introduction to some of the more progressive instructional design theories that have been developed over the last 15 years. EPSY 350 is not intended to present students with an exhaustive survey of all major instructional design theories. Instead, the course introduces students to constructivist critiques of traditional instructional design practices and presents a few contemporary, learner-centered design theories that have been developed to address the changing needs of educators and trainers. Through readings, discussions, and debates students will come to appreciate different perspectives regarding the use and relevance of systematic instructional design within various education and training contexts.

Course Topics:

Course topics include the following: needs assessment, analysis of learners and context, learning task analysis, development of learning goals and objectives, assessment planning, design of instructional

strategies for various types of learning outcomes, motivational considerations in the design of instruction, media and technology selection, multimedia learning environments, and constructivist design theories.

STUDENT LEARNING OBJECTIVES

At the end of EPSY 350, students should be able to...

- (1) Discuss the benefits and limitations of traditional instructional design practices;
- (2) Conduct a needs assessment and analyze anticipated learners and learning context;
- (3) Use concept mapping, curriculum mapping, or traditional outlining techniques to analyze an instructional task;
- (4) Write high-level course goals for a proposed instructional product and operationalize those goals as measurable learning objectives;
- (5) Design instructional strategies appropriate for specific learning objectives and use contemporary learning, motivation, and/or instructional design theory to justify features of the proposed product;
- (6) Describe new approaches to instructional design, including constructivist learning environments, situated cognition, and ecological psychology perspectives on instructional design;
- (7) Discuss recent critiques of constructivist learning environments from the standpoint of cognitive load theory and Mayer's cognitive theory of multimedia learning;
- (8) Describe media and technology affordances, including viewpoints on the influence of media on learning;
- (9) Identify the differences between formative and summative evaluation processes;
- (10) Use a variety of communication formats (i.e., written reports, graphic representations, and oral presentations) to communicate ideas regarding a proposed instructional product;
- (11) Collaborate effectively with a team to develop course goals, learning objectives, and an assessment plan for a proposed instructional product.

REQUIRED TEXTS

Smith, P. L., & Ragan, T. J. (2005). *Instructional design* (3rd ed.). Indianapolis, IN: Wiley. [S&R]

Duffy, T. M., & Jonassen, D. H. (Eds.). (1992). *Constructivism and the technology of instruction*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. [D&J]

ADDITIONAL READINGS (ARTICLES & BOOK CHAPTERS)

Clark, R. E. (1994). Media will never influence learning. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 42(2), 21-29. [A1]

Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2005). *The systematic design of instruction* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Chapter 6: Writing performance objectives. [A2]

Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2004). Problem-based learning: What and how do students learn? *Educational Psychology Review*, 16, 235-266. [A3]

Keller, J. M. (1999). Using the ARCS motivational process in computer-based instruction and distance education. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning*, 78, 39-47. [A4]

Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist*, 41, 75-86. [A5]

- Kozma, R. B. (1994). *Will media influence learning? Reframing the debate. Educational Technology Research and Development, 42*(2), 7-19. [A6]
- Mayer, R. E. (2004). Should there be a three-strikes rule again pure discovery learning? The case for guided methods of instruction. *American Psychologist, 59*(1), 14-19. [A7]
- Mayer, R. E., Moreno, R. (2003). Nine ways to reduce cognitive load in multimedia learning. *Educational Psychologist, 38*, 43-52. [A8]
- Merrill, M. D. (2002a). A pebble-in-the-pond model for instructional design. *Performance Improvement, 41*(7), 39-44. [A9]
- Merrill, M. D. (2002b). First principles of instruction. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 50*(3), 43-59. [A10]
- Reiser, R. A. (1994). Clark's invitation to the dance: An instructional designer's response. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 42*(2), 45-48. [A11]
- Richey, R. C. (1995). Trends in instructional design: Emerging theory-based models. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 8*(3), 96-110. [A12]
- Wilson, B. G., & Myers, K. M. (2000). Situated cognition in theoretical and practical context. In S. M. Land & M. J. Hannafin (Eds.), *Theoretical foundations of learning environments* (pp. 57-88). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. [A13]
- Young, M. F. (2004). An ecological psychology of instructional design: Learning and thinking by perceiving-acting systems. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (2nd ed., pp. 169-177). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. [A14]

>> All readings should be completed prior to the class for which they are assigned. <<

WEBCT VISTA

BSSU's WebCT Vista contains valuable course information, as well as access to a discussion board that we will use periodically throughout the semester to discuss and debate issues related to instructional design. The syllabus, videos, website links, and other resources will be posted on Vista regularly to enhance your learning -- <https://vista.bssu.edu>.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The graded elements for this course include the following: in-class participation, team participation, online participation through Vista, performance on two closed-book exams, and performance on the various components of the instructional design project (see breakdown of project components below). The two exams will be given during the regularly scheduled class period. Taken together, there are a total of 100 possible points for all the graded elements in this course. The points are distributed as follows:

1. In-Class Participation - 10 points

You are expected to attend and actively participate in every class. In-class activities include individual and group reflections and discussions on the subject of the day. Class participation points will be awarded based on thoughtful responses and questions in class.

2. **Team Participation - 5 points**

You will complete a portion of the instructional design project as a member of a design team. Based on the design team’s assessment of your contributions to team activities, as well as your own self-evaluation, you will receive an overall team participation score. A rating scale for assessing each team member’s contribution will be provided. Please note, the instructor reserves the right to adjust any student’s team participation score if it appears the student has been treated unfairly by the team.

3. **Online Participation in WebCT Vista - 5 points**

Periodically throughout the semester you will be asked to participate in a Vista discussion or debate regarding issues in the field of instructional design. During these designated times, you will be asked to post your thoughts and reflections on a specific topic. Online discussions and debates will typically last for two weeks. You will be graded based on two criteria: (1) meeting the minimum posting requirements and (2) contributing thoughtful responses that add value to the discussions/debates. We will discuss the qualities of a “thoughtful response” during the first day of class.

4. **First In-Class Exam - 15 points**

This exam will cover material from the first half of the course. The exam will consist of approximately 10 multiple-choice questions (worth 1/2 point each), as well as a number of short-answer and/or essay-type questions (worth a total of 10 points).

5. **Second In-Class Exam - 15 points**

This exam will cover material from the second half of the course. The exam will consist of approximately 10 multiple-choice questions (worth 1/2 point each), as well as a number of short-answer and/or essay-type questions (worth a total of 10 points).

6. **Instructional Design Project - 50 points**

The instructional design project represents the focus of EPSY 350. You will work both independently and as part of a team (2-3 students) to identify an authentic instructional need and *design* a learning solution from start to finish (note, this *will not* include actual development of instructional materials; like an architect designing a building, you will create the “drawings” for your design but won’t actually lay any concrete). The project includes the following components:

Description of Project Components	Effort	Points
(1) <u>Initial Project Memo</u> . This is a short, 500-word memo that will be drafted in response to an invitation from Blue Sky Educational Designs asking you to identify an instructional need. This memo will simply describe an identified need. At this stage, you will not provide specific instructional solutions.	Solo	5
(2) <u>Initial Instructional Analysis (IIA)</u> . This is a report (1200-1500 words) that will describe your investigation of a need that might be addressed by an instructional product. The proposed instruction must be at least 30 minutes and no more than four hours. The IIA will include an analysis of the target audience and learning context, as well as a high-level, cognitive task analysis for the entire course. All members of your team will develop independent IIAs and your team will choose one of them for further development by the entire team.	Solo	10

<p>(3) <u>Learning Objectives & Assessment Plan (LOAP)</u>. This is a PowerPoint presentation that will be given by the team. It will include an overview of the proposed instructional product, a description of the target audience and learning context, a description of the course goals and specific learning objectives, and a summary of the assessment plan for the proposed course. Note, each team will present and submit one PowerPoint slide set, and you will receive an overall team grade for this assignment.</p>	<p>Team</p>	<p>10</p>
<p>(4) <u>Design Document (DD)</u>. This report (1500-2000 words) will describe, in detail, a small portion (i.e., one lesson) from your proposed instructional product that is consistent with your team’s IIA and associated LOAP. The DD will include an overview of the course, a description of the target audience and learning context, instructional goals and objectives, an assessment plan, and a detailed description of the course content, media and technology choices, instructional strategies, and theoretical justification for these decisions.</p>	<p>Solo</p>	<p>25</p>
<p>Please note that this project is designed to build upon itself such that portions of parts 1, 2, and 3 above can be incorporated into your final DD.</p>		
<p>Total Possible Project Points</p>		<p>50</p>

GRADING SCALE

- 93.5 to 100 A represents excellent work
- 89.5 to 93.4 A- represents excellent work
- 86.5 to 89.4 B+ represents very good to good work
- 83.5 to 86.4 B represents very good to good work
- 79.5 to 83.4 B- represents very good to good work
- 76.5 to 79.4 C+ represents average work
- 73.5 to 76.4 C represents average work
- 69.5 to 73.4 C- represents average work

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Students in this course are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic integrity. If you have any questions about what constitutes academic dishonesty (cheating or plagiarism), you should consult with me, the BSSU code of conduct at www.bssu.edu/code.pdf, or some other authoritative source. Involvement in academic dishonesty will result in a breach of our trust and your integrity. Furthermore, per BSSU rules, a student involved in academic dishonesty will receive a failing grade on the assignment in question.¹

¹ Academic integrity statement was modified from a syllabus created by Jason Stephens and GNA Garcia (2005).

COURSE SCHEDULE

Class	Topic	Activities/Assignments ¹	Reading
Part 1: Course Introduction			
1.1	Introductions/Course Overview	Introduction to the extended example.	
1.2	Introduction to Instructional Design (ID) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is ID? • What is Instructional Systems Design (ISD)? • Foundations of ID/ISD 	Select Project Teams	S&R 1, 2
2.1	Limitations/Critiques of ID/ISD	<u>Online Debate</u> : You will be split into two teams (pro and con). Based on your team membership, argue for or against the following statement: "Traditional ID/ISD is an appropriate and relevant methodology for developing effective instruction for today's modern paradigm of education and training."	D&J 1, 2, A12
Part 2: Instructional Analysis			
2.2	Analysis of Context	Initial Project Memo DUE	S&R 3
3.1	Analysis of Learners	**In-Class Activity : Working in groups and given an instructional design scenario, determine the questions you would need to ask and the techniques you would use to find answers to the following questions: How would you validate the need for training? What do you need to know about the learning environment? What information do you need to know about the learners?	S&R 4
3.2	Analysis of a Learning Task: Part 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning Goals • Learning Outcomes 		S&R pp. 75-83
4.1	Analysis of a Learning Task: Part 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information-Processing Analysis 	<u>In-Class Activity</u> : Working in three groups, and using the extended example as a guide, complete a task analysis. Each team will present their results using a different format (i.e., concept map, curriculum map, or outline).	S&R pp. 83-102

¹ The course schedule includes only a sampling of the in-class activities that will be employed in the course. Other activities will be added to give you the opportunity to work with the concepts and procedures discussed in the texts and during the lectures.

4.2	Constructivist Perspectives: Part 1 • Technology and Constructivism		D&J 4, 6
5.1	Learning Objectives: Part 1 • Traditional Approaches	Initial Instructional Analysis DUE <u>In-Class Activity:</u> Practice writing measurable learning objectives for various learning outcomes.	A2
5.2	Learning Objectives: Part 2 • Alternative Approaches	<u>Online Discussion:</u> In Merrill's (2002a) article he argues that learning objectives may be inappropriate in the early stages of instructional design. What does he propose as an alternative? Choose an instructional problem and describe how you would apply his approach.	A9
6.1	Assessing Learning: Part 1 • Models of Assessment • Types of Assessment • Characteristics of Good Assessment Instruments		S&R pp. 103-116
6.2	Assessing Learning: Part 2 • Item Specifications • Rubrics	<u>In-Class Activity:</u> Review the objective assessment provided by the instructor and identify problems with each item.	S&R pp. 106-124
7.1	Assessing Learning: Part 3 • Constructivist Considerations Exam 1 Review • Bring Questions		D&J 3, 12
7.2	EXAM 1 • Covers all readings and in-class material from classes 1.1 to 7.1.	EXAM 1	
Part 3: Instructional Strategies			
8.1	Instructional Design Perspectives • Views of Constructivism from the Field Constructivist Perspectives: Part 2 • Constructivism and ID	<u>Online Discussion:</u> In the chapters by Dick and Merrill in the D&J text, the authors review the previous chapters and provide their reactions from the perspective of two practicing instructional designers. What are some of the issues raised by the authors? Do you think their concerns are valid? Why or why not?	D&J 7, 8, 9
8.2	In-Class Team Presentations	Team Learning Objectives & Assessment Plan DUE (Submit 1 PPT Slide Set Per Team)	

9.1	Instructional Strategies: Part 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Types of Strategies • Gagne's Events of Instruction • Declarative Knowledge 	**In-Class Activity: Working in groups, design a declarative knowledge lesson for a given setting, audience, and task. Present your ideas to the class.	S&R 7, 8
9.2	Instructional Strategies: Part 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept Learning • Principle Learning 	**In-Class Activity: Working in groups, design a concept knowledge lesson for a given setting, audience, and task. Present your ideas to the class.	S&R 9, 11
10.1	Instructional Strategies: Part 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedural Learning 		S&R 10
10.2	Instructional Strategies: Part 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem Solving 	**In-Class Activity: Working in groups, design a problem-solving lesson for a given setting, audience, and task. Present your ideas to the class.	S&R 12
11.1	Constructivist Perspectives: Part 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Problem-Based Learning 		A3
11.2	Motivational Considerations in the Design of Instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is Motivation and Why Should We Care? • Theories of Motivation and Their Instructional Implications • Keller's ARCS Model 	<u>In-Class Activity:</u> Working in groups and given an instructional scenario, use Keller's ARCS model to conduct a learner/task analysis and describe how you would address identified issues using various instructional tactics.	A4
12.1	Constructivist Perspectives: Part 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Situated Cognition • Ecological Perspectives 	<u>Online Discussion:</u> In the article by Young (2004), the author discusses an ecological psychology perspective on motivation. Specifically, he states "motivation is reinterpreted as an on-going momentary personal assessment of the match between the adopted goals for this occasion and the affordances of the environment" (p. 173). What are your thoughts on this interpretation of motivation? How could you use such an interpretation to inform your instructional design practices?	A13, A14
Part 4: Media and Technology Considerations			
12.2	A Classic Debate <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media's Influence on Learning 	<u>Online Debate:</u> Debate statement: "Media will never influence learning."	A1, A6, A11
13.1	Hypertext and Multimedia Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Considerations to Improve Learning 		D&J 5, A8

Part 5: Course Wrap-Up			
13.2	Critiques of Constructivism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cognitive Load Theory 	<u>Online Discussion:</u> In your readings for this week, the authors argue that “based on our current knowledge of human cognitive architecture, minimally guided instruction is likely to be ineffective” (Kirschner et al., 2006, p. 76). Do you agree with the authors? Why or why not? How would a constructivist respond to these critiques?	A5, A7 Note: Read A7 first.
14.1	Introduction to Evaluation Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formative Evaluation • Summative Evaluation Exam 2 Review <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bring Questions 	**In-Class Activity: Working in groups and given an instructional design scenario, determine the level of precision and formality that can/should be employed for the various instructional design procedures discussed throughout the semester.	S&R 19
14.2	EXAM 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Covers all readings and in-class material from classes 8.1 to 14.1. 	EXAM 2	
15.1	Future Directions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future Trends in ID 	<u>Online Debate (revisited):</u> Debate statement: “Traditional ID/ISD is an appropriate and relevant methodology for developing effective instruction for today’s modern paradigm of education and training.”	S&R 20, A10
15.2	Course Wrap-Up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students’ Stance on the ID/ISD-Constructivism Debate • Informal Presentations of Design Documents 	Design Document DUE <u>In-Class Activity:</u> Briefly discuss your final design document, including any problems you encountered during the instructional design process. No PowerPoint presentations please. This is meant to be very informal.	D&J 17, 18, 19

**Adapted from Smith and Ragan (2005).

Appendix B

Outline of Chapters in Smith and Ragan (2005)

INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction to Instructional Design
2. Foundations of Instructional Design

ANALYSIS AND ASSESSMENT

3. Instructional Analysis: Analyzing the Learning Context
4. Instructional Analysis: Analyzing the Learner
5. Instructional Analysis: Analyzing the Learning Task
6. Assessing Learning from Instruction

INSTRUCTIONAL STRATEGIES

7. A Framework for Instructional Strategy Design
8. Strategies for Declarative Knowledge Instruction
9. Strategies for Instruction Leading to Concept Learning
10. Strategies for Instruction Leading to Learning Procedures
11. Strategies for Instruction Leading to Principle Learning
12. Strategies for Problem-Solving Instruction
13. Strategies for Cognitive Strategy Instruction
14. Strategies for Attitude Learning
15. Strategies for Psychomotor Skill Learning
16. Marco Strategies: Integration of Types of Learning

IMPLEMENTATION, MANAGEMENT, AND EVALUATION

17. Implementation
18. Management of Instruction
19. Formative and Summative Evaluation

CONCLUSION

20. Conclusions and Future Direction