SYLLABUS

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT (IDD) PROGRAM

EDIT 705 – 001
Instructional Design (3 Credits)
Fall 2012
Monday, 4:30-7:10 PM, Thompson Hall L003

PROFESSOR:
Name: Dr. Shahron Williams van Rooij
Office hours: By appointment only
Office location: Thompson Hall, Room L044
Office phone: (703) 993-9704
Email address: swilliae@gmu.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

- **Pre-requisites/co-requisites**: There are neither pre-requisites nor co-requisites. However, students should possess basic computer skills (e.g., MS Office, Internet search skills), along with Adobe Acrobat Reader and Adobe Flash Player, both of which are downloadable free of charge at http://www.adobe.com/downloads. Experience in teaching, training, technical development, or equivalent is a plus.
- **Course description from the university catalog**: Helps students analyze, apply, and evaluate principles of instructional design to develop education and training materials spanning a wide range of knowledge domains and instructional technologies. Focuses on variety of instructional design models, with emphasis on recent contributions from cognitive science and related fields.
- **Additional description details**: This course is designed to teach the fundamentals of instructional design, including the principles of learning theory and instructional strategies that are relevant to instructional design. Students will learn the purpose and approach to completing each phase of the instructional design process and will produce a set of outputs from each of these phase in accordance with the requirements specified in a final course project.
- **Delivery method**: The course will be taught in a **blended** format that combines ten (10) face-to-face classroom sessions with five (5) asynchronous (not "real time") online sessions using the Blackboard Learning Management system housed in the MyMason portal.

LEARNER OUTCOMES:

At the conclusion of this course, students will be able to:

- Define instructional design
- Compare and contrast various models of instructional design
- Analyze and discuss various learning theories and how they relate to instructional design
- Collect and analyze data to identify an instructional need
- Conduct learner and contextual analyses
- Conduct task analysis

- Write measurable instructional/performance objectives
- Analyze and discuss instructional strategies used for various types of learning
- Define formative and summative evaluation
- Create an instructional design document (IDD) that provides a solution to an instructional problem/need
- Produce a rudimentary prototype of a design concept using electronic media of choice (e.g., PowerPoint, Camtasia, Dreamweaver, Articulate)

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS:

A. International Board of Standards for Training, Performance and Instruction (IBSTPI), Instructional Design Competencies

a. Professional foundations
   i. Communicate effectively in visual, oral and written form

b. Planning and analysis
   i. Conduct a needs assessment
   ii. Design a curriculum or program
   iii. Select and use a variety of techniques for determining instructional content
   iv. Identify and describe target population characteristics
   v. Analyze the characteristics of the environment
   vi. Analyze the characteristics of existing and emerging technologies and their use in an instructional environment
   vii. Reflect upon the elements of a situation before finalizing design solutions and strategies

c. Design and development
   i. Select and use a variety of techniques to define and sequence the instructional content and strategies
   ii. Select or modify existing instructional materials
   iii. Develop instructional materials
   iv. Design instruction that reflects an understanding of the diversity of learners and groups of learners
   v. Evaluate and assess instruction and its impact

d. Implementation and management
   i. Provide for the effective implementation of instructional products and programs

B. American Society for Training and Development (ASTD), Entry-level Design Competencies

a. Foundational competencies: Business/management
   i. Uses data from a variety of sources to analyze needs and propose sound solutions
   ii. Plans and implements assignments to achieve goals by creating action plans and ensuring completion

REQUIRED TEXTS:

1. Morrison, G.R., Ross, S.M., Kalman, H.K., & Kemp, J.E. (2011). *Designing effective instruction* (6th edition). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons
2. Reiser, R.A. & Dempsey, J.V. (Eds.) (2012). *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd edition). Boston: Pearson

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS AND REQUIRED DELIVERABLES

ASSIGNMENTS

There are five (4) assignments required for successful completion of this course.

1. **Practitioner Profile (10 points**)
    a. Identify **one** individual who serves (or has served) as an instructional/training designer in your organization (or at a former employer-organization). Note: The person does **not** have to have the title of Instructional/Training Designer, but must have served in that capacity. If you are a member of any of the Instructional Design groups on **LinkedIn**, you can select a practitioner from one of those groups.
    b. **Interview** that individual – phone, electronic survey, or face-to-face – and collect the following information:
        i. Educational background, ID experience and current responsibilities
        ii. Most successful **and** least successful ID project (and **reasons why**)
        iii. Professional advice/lessons learned that he/she would like to share with others
    c. Prepare a **short summary** (circa. 2-3 pages, single spaced) of the interview for posting to the **ASSIGNMENT** link on the Blackboard course web site. You may use **either** APA-style formatting **or** standard Business English formatting. For more information on how this assignment is evaluated, please consult the *Practitioner Profile Grading Rubric* at the end of this syllabus and also posted on our Blackboard course site.
    d. Prepare a brief slide presentation (5 slides maximum) of your profile experience (e.g., your net take-aways) to share in class (10 min./presentation)

2. **Instructional Design and Technology Trends & Issues: Online Panel Discussions (25 points)**
    a. There are **five (5) student-led online discussions**. Each discussion corresponds to a section of the Reiser and Dempsey reader:
        i. Discussion #1: Performance Improvement (section IV)
        ii. Discussion #2: Trends and Issues in Various Settings (section V)
        iii. Discussion #3: Global Trends and Issues in IDT (section VI)
        iv. Discussion #4: New Directions in Instructional Design and Technology (section VIII)
        v. Discussion #5: Current Issues in Instructional Design and Technology (section IX)
    b. Each discussion will be led by a panel of **4-5** students. Panel members will be expected to have read all of the chapters under the section of their choice and to post their perspectives on the topic to the designated discussion thread in Blackboard on the date indicated on the course schedule. Perspectives should go beyond the material presented in the chapters by connecting themes/issues in those chapters to personal experience or to other research/applied information in the field of instructional design (e.g., scholarly or practitioner journal publications, applied work contexts, learning theory, professional organizations in the field, relevant and reliable online materials, etc.).
    c. The length and format of the perspectives is open, but the goal is to engage your fellow course members in thought-provoking discussions. It is up to each panel to determine how to split up the work for the perspectives discussion. One approach would be that one panel member prepares a synthesis of all the materials on the chose topic and the other panel member(s) develop the discussion question(s). **All** panel members must take part in **leading** the discussion.

c. Non-panelists will be expected to have read all of the chapters under each discussion section. Comments from non-panelists may be posted throughout the topic week. Comments should add significantly to the discussion by suggesting other perspectives, pointing out problems, or even totally disagreeing. Make sure that you substantiate your responses with evidence, and whenever possible, relate your work experiences to the topic under discussion. For more information on how discussion response quality is evaluated, please consult the *Trends and Issues Panel Discussions Grading Rubric* at the end of this syllabus and also posted to the Bb course site.

3. **Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation– Team Project (50 points)**

- ***Instructional Design Document (40 points)***

Working in teams of 2-3 members, students will develop an instructional design document (IDD) which will detail their approach to development of the prototype instructional module prior to its actual development. The IDD will present the design concept and related materials in a professionally-polished document to the instructor. The design document will include the following components:

a. Instructional Problem Definition/Refinement
b. Learner and Context Analysis
c. Task Analysis (5 points)
d. Instructional Objectives
e. Instructional Approach (Sequencing, Strategies, Messages)
f. Limitations/constraints
g. Instructional Materials (Sample storyboards, flowcharts)
h. Formative & Summative Evaluation

Examples of previous IDDs are posted on the Bb course site.

- ***Prototype Presentation (10 points)***

The prototype presentation will consist of an **in-class** demonstration of the rudimentary prototype of the instructional module outlined in the instructional design document. The demonstration should clearly convey …

a. Scope of the prototype (e.g., topic, lesson, module, course)
b. Electronic media selected
c. Sample assessment items
d. Navigational layout
e. Essence of the design idea that persuades the client that this solution is the optimum choice best on the content of your IDD

Please review the *Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric* at the end of this syllabus and on the Bb course site as you develop your team projects.

4. Peer Reviews of IDD Components (15 points)

There will be a total of five (5) peer reviews, each corresponding to one of the first five components of the IDD and each reflecting the iterative nature of the instructional design process. Each student will be asked to provide constructive evaluative feedback to other teams as you work on the IDD. Your feedback will be based on the criteria set down in the *Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric*. There will be one in-class peer review session for each of the five reviews, so that everyone can familiarize themselves with the peer review process. All

remaining peer reviews will be conducted online using the Bb Discussion Board. Please consult the *Peer Review Grading Rubric* at the end of this Syllabus and on the Bb course site to see how your reviews are evaluated.

Total Possible Points for all Deliverables: 100

Note: Late assignments will be penalized 10% for each class session past the due date.

GRADING POLICIES

- **General information**: The evaluation of student performance is related to the student's demonstration of the course outcomes. All work is evaluated on its relevance to the specific assignment, comprehensiveness of information presented, specificity of application, clarity of communication, and the analytical skills utilized, as documented in the respective grading rubrics at the end of this syllabus and on the Bb course site.
- **Team projects**: Note that the grading rubric for the team project evaluates both the project deliverables and each team member's individual contribution to the project and the project process based on the content and activity in classroom work sessions and the private team areas in Bb. As such, an individual student's scores may differ from the project deliverable scores.
- **Grading scale**: The grading scale used in this course is the official George Mason University scale for graduate-level courses. Decimal percentage values ≥.5 will be rounded up (e.g., 92.5% will be rounded up to 93%); decimal percentage values <.5 will be rounded down (e.g., 92.4% will be rounded down to 92%).

Letter Grade	Total Points Earned
A	93%-100%
A-	90%-92%
B+	88%-89%
B	83%-87%
B-	80%-82%
C	70%-79%
F	<70%

Great care is given to evaluating student performance based on the requirements documented in the grading rubrics for each assignment. As such, grades are not negotiable. In the event that, following discussions with the instructor, a student feels that his/her grade is unfair, the grade may be appealed using the university's appeal process described at http://www.gmu.edu/catalog/apolicies/index.html#Anchor56.

GMU POLICIES AND RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS

a. Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [see http://academicintegrity.gmu.edu/honorcode/].

b. Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing [see http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/1301gen.html].

c. Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their George Mason University e-mail account and are required to activate their account and check it regularly. All communication from the university, college, school, and program will be sent to students solely through their Mason e-mail account.

d. The George Mason University Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) staff consists of professional counseling and clinical psychologists, social workers, and counselors who offer a wide range of services (e.g., individual and group counseling, workshops and outreach programs) to enhance students' personal experience and academic performance [see http://caps.gmu.edu/].

e. Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the George Mason University Office of Disability Services (ODS) and inform their instructor, in writing, at the beginning of the semester [see http://ods.gmu.edu/].

f. Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound-emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.

g. The George Mason University Writing Center staff provides a variety of resources and services (e.g., tutoring, workshops, writing guides, handbooks) intended to support students as they work to construct and share knowledge through writing [see http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/].

PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

Students are expected to exhibit professional behavior and dispositions at all times.

CORE VALUES COMMITMENT

The College of Education and Human Development is committed to collaboration, ethical leadership, innovation, research-based practice, and social justice. Students are expected to adhere to these principles. http://cehd.gmu.edu/values.

For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, Graduate School of Education, please visit our website [See http://gse.gmu.edu].

COURSE SCHEDULE:

DATE	TOPIC/LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS
Week 1 **Aug. 27**	• Introductions, review syllabus • Instructor presentation: *Instructional Design Overview* • Introduction to Blackboard (Bb) and access verification	• Sign up for Online Panel Discussion under the **Groups** link in Bb by **Sept. 9** • Sign up for ID project teams under the **Groups** link in Bb by **Sept. 9** • Start thinking about project topics • Read Morrison et al, Chapters 1-2 • Read Reiser & Dempsey, Section I, Chapters 1-3
Week 2 **Sept. 3**	**LABOR DAY – NO CLASSES**	
Week 3 **Sept. 10**	• Evaluate job ad (handout) based on Morrison, Chs. 1-2 & Reiser & Dempsey, Chs. 1-3 • Project management/teamwork organization • Problem definition/examples • Discuss potential project topics and make final topic selection • Begin working on Project Charter and timeline for final team project	• Upload draft Project Charter and timeline to Bb team space by **Sept. 16** • Access Mason Library e-journal database to read Van Rooij, S. W. (2010), Project management in instructional design: ADDIE is not enough. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 41: 852–864 • Draft Instructional Problem Definition
Week 4 **Sept. 17**	• Present draft Instructional Problem Definition – **Peer Review #1** • Group work: Revise Problem Definition • Instructor presentation: *Learner and context analysis: Data collection techniques*	• Upload final Project Charter to Bb • Upload revised Problem Definition to team space • Read Morrison et al, Ch. 3 • Read Reiser & Dempsey, section IV, chapters 14-17 • Panel #1 discussant perspectives discussion question(s) uploaded to Bb by **Sept. 23**

DATE	TOPIC	ASSIGNMENT
Week 5 **Sept. 24**	• **Online Panel Discussion #1: Performance Improvement (No f2f meeting)**	• Draft Learner/Context Analysis
Week 6 **Oct. 1**	• Present draft Learner/Context Analysis – **Peer Review #2** • Group work: Revise Learner/Context Analysis • Instructor presentation: *Overview of Task Analysis*	• Upload revised Learner/Context Analysis to team space in Bb • Read Morrison et al, Ch. 4 • Read Reiser & Dempsey, section V, chs. 18-22 • Panel #2 discussant perspectives discussion question(s) uploaded to Bb by **Oct. 8**
Week 7 **Oct. 8 is Columbus Day; Panel Discussion begins Oct. 9**	• **Online Panel Discussion #2: Trends & Issues in Various Settings (no f2f meeting)**	• Draft Task Analysis • Upload **Practitioner Profile** under **Assignments** link in Bb by **Oct. 14**
Week 8 **Oct. 15**	• **Practitioner Profile presentations** • Present draft Task Analysis **– Peer Review #3** • Group work: Revise Task Analysis • Instructor presentation: *Writing Instructional Objectives*	• Upload revised Task Analysis to team space in Bb • Read Reiser & Dempsey, section VI, Chs. 23-25 • Panel #3 discussant perspectives discussion question(s) uploaded to Bb by **Oct. 21**
Week 9 **Oct. 22**	• **Online Panel Discussion #3: Global Trends & Issues in IDT (no f2f meeting)**	• Morrison et al, Ch. 5 • Read Techniques & Methods for Writing Objectives/Performance Outcomes • Draft Instructional Objectives
Week 10 **Oct. 29**	• Present draft Instructional Objectives – **Peer Review #4** • Group work: Revise Instructional Objectives • Instructor presentation: *Instructional approach to sequencing, strategies, messages*	• Morrison et al. Chs 6-8 • Read Gagne's Nine Events of Instruction • Draft Instructional Approach
Week 11 **Nov. 5**	• Present draft Instructional Approach **– Peer Review #5** • Group work: Revise Instructional Approach	• Upload revised Instructional Approach to team space • Read Morrison et al., Chs. 9 & 10

DATE	TOPIC	ASSIGNMENT
Week 12 **Nov. 12**	• Instructional materials/self-examination • Selecting media for project prototype: Cruising the Directory of Learning Tools 2012 • Group work: Instructional Materials • Instructor presentation: *Intro to Evaluation*	• Read Reiser & Dempsey, section VIII, Chs. 29-34 • Panel #4 discussant perspectives discussion question(s) uploaded by **Nov. 18**
Week 13 **Nov. 19**	• **Online Panel Discussion #4: New Directions in Instructional Design & Technology (no f2f meeting)**	• Read Morrison et al Chs. 11-13 • Read Kirkpatrick Model of Evaluation
Nov. 21-25	**THANKSGIVING RECESS**	
Week 14 **Nov. 26**	• Formative & summative evaluation/examples • Group work: Draft Formative & Summative Evaluation	• Finalize Formative/Summative Evaluation • Read Reiser & Dempsey, section IX, Chs. 35-38 • Panel #5 discussant perspectives discussion question(s) uploaded by **Dec. 2** • Work on IDD & Prototype presentation
Week 15 **Dec. 3**	• **Online Panel Discussion #5: Current Issues in Instructional Design & Technology (no f2f meeting)**	• Upload final IDD & prototype links/screen shots under Assignments link by **Dec. 9**
Week 16 **Dec. 10**	• **Final Project Presentations: I**	• Complete online Course Evaluations
Week 17 **Dec. 17**	• **Final Project Presentations: II** • Final thoughts	

ASSESSMENT RUBRICS:

A. Practitioner Profile Grading Rubric (Total Possible Points: 10)

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Completeness:	One or more of the three key elements of the assignment is missing, remainder covered superficially *Point values: 0.0-4.7*	All three key elements of the assignment are present, but only some covered in a substantive way *Point values: 4.8-5.9*	All three key elements of the assignment are present and covered in a substantive way *Point value: 6*
Clarity:	Major points not clearly stated, little or no specific details, examples, or analysis *Point values: 0.0-1.5*	Major points are stated clearly, some supported with specific details, examples or analyses *Point values: 1.6-1.9*	Major points are stated clearly, supported by specific details, examples or analysis *Point value: 2*
Organization:	Paper is unstructured and hard to follow *Point values: 0.0-0.7*	Structure of the paper is generally clear, little or no use of headings and sub-headings *Point values: 0.8-0.9*	Structure of the paper is clear and easy to follow, with use of accurate headings and sub-headings *Point value: 1*
Language:	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are not followed, multiple language errors *Point values: 0.0-0.7*	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are generally followed throughout the paper, one or two minor language errors *Point values: 0.8-0.9*	Rules of grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are followed consistently throughout the paper, no language errors *Point value: 1*

B. Trends and Issues Panel Discussions Grading Rubric (Total Possible Points: 5 per discussion x 5 discussions =25 points)

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Preparation:	Postings reflect inadequate thought processes and preparation *Point values/discussion: 0.0-0.7*	Postings reflect adequate thought processes and preparation *Point values/discussion: 0.8-0.9*	Postings reflect outstanding thought processes and thorough preparation *Point value/discussion: 1*
Ideas:	Ideas not substantive or off topic, with no references to assigned readings *Point values/discussion: 0.0-0.7*	Usually includes substantive ideas supported by occasional references to assigned readings *Point values/discussion: 0.8-0.9*	Always includes substantive ideas supported by frequent references to assigned readings *Point value/discussion: 1*
Supplementary Contributions:	No supplementary comments or probing questions *Point values/discussion: 0.0-0.7*	Occasionally supplements comments with an additional probing question or hypothesis for the class to consider *Point values/discussion: 0.8-0.9*	Often supplements comments with an additional probing question or hypothesis for the class to consider *Point value/discussion: 1*
Application:	No application of work and/or previous learning experiences to concepts covered in class *Point values/discussion: 0.0-0.7*	Usually applies work and/or previous learning experiences to concepts covered in class *Point values/discussion: 0.8-0.9*	Frequent application of work and/or previous learning experiences to concepts covered in class *Point value/discussion: 1*
Netiquette:	Consistently violates the rules of digital etiquette (netiquette) *Point values/discussion: 0.0-0.7*	Usually follows the rules of digital etiquette (netiquette) *Point values/discussion: 0.8-0.9*	Consistently follows the rules of digital etiquette (netiquette) *Point value/discussion: 1*

C. Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric: Total Possible Points: 50

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Problem definition:	Instructional design problem is not clearly stated *Point values: 0.0-2.3*	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly, but with little or no supporting data *Point values: 2.4-2.9*	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly and supported with a variety of data sources *Point value: 3*
Learner & Context Analysis:	Little or no description of learner characteristics and how the context relates to the problem, little or no supporting data *Point values: 0.0-3.9*	Adequate description of learner characteristics and how the context relates to the problem, some use of supporting data *Point values: 4.0-4.9*	Comprehensive, data-driven description of learner characteristics and how the context or environment relates to the problem *Point value: 5*
Task Analysis:	Method and content reflects neither SME input nor other data sources *Point values: 0.0-3.9*	Method and content reflects some SME input, little or no other data sources *Point values: 4.0-4.9*	Method and content clearly reflects use of substantive SME input as well as other data sources *Point value: 5*
Instructional Objectives:	Few or none of the instructional objectives are measurable nor supported by the instructional need & task analysis data *Point values: 0.0-3.9*	Most instructional objectives are measurable and most supported by the instructional need & task analysis data *Point values: 4.0-4.9*	All instructional objectives are measurable and all supported by the instructional need & task analysis data *Point value: 5*
Instructional Approach:	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages do not flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, major disconnects *Point values: 0.0-3.9*	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages generally flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, with only minor disconnects *Point values: 4.0-4.9*	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages all flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses *Point value: 5*
Limitations, Constraints:	Instructional design document does not articulate any pre-project limitations or constraints *Point values: 0.0-0.7*	Instructional design document articulates some pre-project limitations or constraints *Point values: 0.8-0.9*	Instructional design document clearly articulates all pre-project limitations and constraints Point value: 1

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Instructional Materials:	Choice of instructional materials does not reflect instructional strategies, limitations/constraints *Point values: 0.0-3.9*	Choice of instructional materials somewhat reflects selected instructional strategies, limitations/constraints *Point values: 4.0-4.9*	Choice of instructional materials clearly reflects selected instructional strategies, as well as limitations/constraints *Point value: 5*
Formative & Summative Evaluation:	Instructional design document does not contain a formative and/or summative evaluation plan, no supporting data sources *Point values: 0.0-3.9*	Instructional design document contains a limited formative and summative evaluation with little or no supporting data sources *Point values: 4.0-4.9*	Instructional design document contains both a comprehensive formative & summative evaluation plan, supported by a variety of data sources *Point value: 5*
Organization:	Instructional design document is unstructured and hard to follow *Point values: 0.0-2.3*	Structure of the instructional design document is generally clear, little or no use of headings and sub-headings *Point values: 2.4-2.9*	Structure of the instructional design document is clear and easy to follow, with use of accurate headings and sub-headings *Point value: 3*
Language:	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are not followed, multiple language errors throughout the instructional design document *Point values: 0.0-2.3*	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are generally followed throughout the instructional design document, one or two minor language errors *Point values: 2.4-2.9*	Rules of grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are followed consistently throughout the instructional design document, no language errors *Point value: 3*
Alignment of Prototype with IDD:	Prototype does not demonstrate the instructional strategies & approach outlined in the instructional design document Point values: 0.0-1.5	Prototype demonstrates some of the instructional strategies & approach outlined in the instructional design document *Point values: 1.6-1.9*	Prototype clearly demonstrates the instructional strategies & approach outlined in the instructional design document *Point value: 2*
Prototype media selection:	Selected media are neither innovative nor appropriate for chosen strategies Point values: 0.0-1.5	Selected media are not particularly innovative, yet appropriate for chosen strategies *Point values: 1.6-1.9*	Selected media are innovative and appropriate for chosen strategies *Point value: 2*

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Sample assessment items:	Sample assessment items do not measure learning objectives Point values: 0.0-1.5	Sample assessment items measure some learning objectives *Point values: 1.6-1.9*	Sample assessment items clearly measure all learning objectives *Point value: 2*
Team member contributions:	Individual team members did not adhere to shared roles/responsibilities documented in Bb private team areas *Point values: 0.0.-1.5*	Individual team members generally adhered to shared roles/responsibilities documented in Bb private team areas *Point values: 1.6-1.9*	Individual team members consistently adhered to shared roles/responsibilities documented in Bb private team areas *Point value: 2*
PowerPoint© best practices:	Presentation did not adhere to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site *Point values: 0.0-1.5*	Presentation generally adhered to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site *Point values: 1.6-1.9*	Presentation adhered consistently to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site *Point value: 2*

D. Peer Review Grading Rubric (Total Possible Points: 3 per review x 5 reviews =15 points)

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Completeness:	Does not use the criteria set down in the Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric *Point values: 0.0-1.5*	Uses some of the criteria set down in the Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric *Point values: 1.6-1.9*	Uses all of the criteria set down in the Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric *Point value: 2*
Quality:	Does not provide constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on the rubric criteria *Point value: 0.0-2.3*	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on some of the rubric criteria *Point value: 2.4-2.9*	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on each of the rubric criteria *Point value: 3*