

SYLLABUS

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

EDIT 705 – DL1

Instructional Design (3 Credits)

Spring 2014, Jan. 21-May 4, 2014

Course meets online via [MyMasonPortal/Courses](#)

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 a 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 phases in accordance with the requirements specified in a final course project.
- **Delivery method:** The course will be delivered online using an **asynchronous** (not “real time”) format using the Blackboard Learning Management system housed in the MyMason portal. The course will utilize a combination of readings, lectures, research activities, threaded discussions, and projects to help participants learn the fundamentals of designing instruction for a variety of learning environments (face-to-face classrooms, virtual classrooms, etc.).
- **Technical requirements:** To participate in this course, students will need the following resources:
 - High-speed Internet access with a standard up-to-date Web browser (Mozilla Firefox and Internet Explorer work best);
 - The following software plug-ins for PCs and Macs respectively, available for free downloading by clicking on the link next to each plug-in:
 - Adobe Acrobat Reader: <http://get.adobe.com/reader/>
 - Windows Media Player: <http://windows.microsoft.com/en-US/windows/download-windows-media-player>
 - Apple QuickTime Player: <http://www.apple.com/quicktime/download/>

- **Open Mic Night:** For those seeking a “live” session with the instructor to ask questions about course requirements/content, there will be an synchronous Q & A session in the Collaborate web conferencing area of our Blackboard course site on **Sunday, Feb. 2, 2014, 8:00 PM to 9:30 PM. Attendance is strictly voluntary.**

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. 2012 International Board of Standards for Training, Performance and Instruction ([IBSTPI](#)), Instructional Design Competencies

- Professional foundations
 1. Communicate effectively in visual, oral and written form
- Planning and analysis
 7. Identify and describe target population and environmental characteristics
 8. Select and use analysis techniques for determining instructional content
 9. Analyze the characteristics of existing and emerging technologies and their potential use
- Design and development
 10. Use an instructional design and development process appropriate for a given project
 11. Organize instructional programs and/or products to be designed, developed, and evaluated
 12. Design instructional interventions
 14. Select or modify existing instructional materials
 15. Develop instructional materials
 16. Design learning assessment

B. American Society for Training and Development ([ASTD](#)), Instructional Design Competencies

- Identify appropriate learning approach
- Collaborate with others
- Design a curriculum, program or learning solution
- Design instructional material
- Analyze and select technologies
- Develop instructional materials

- Evaluate learning design

REQUIRED TEXTS:

1. Morrison, G.R., Ross, S.M., Kalman, H.K., & Kemp, J.E. (2013). *Designing effective instruction* (7th edition). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons
2. Ertmer, P.A., Quinn, J.A., & Glazewski, K.D. (2013). *The ID casebook: Case studies in instructional design* (4th edition). Upper Saddle River: Pearson

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS AND REQUIRED DELIVERABLES

ASSIGNMENTS

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

1. **Practitioner Profile (Individual Assignment) (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. If you already have instructional design experience, select a designer with more (or for those with many years of experience) or less experience than yourself.
 - b. **Interview** that individual – phone, electronic survey, or face-to-face – and collect the following information:
 - i. Educational background, ID experience and credentials/certifications, 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
 - iv. Your own net impressions/take-aways from the interview experience in which you go **beyond** what the interviewee said and **add your own thoughts and analysis**
 - c. Prepare a **short summary** (circa. 2-3 pages, single spaced) of the interview for posting to the **ASSIGNMENTS** link on the Blackboard course web site.
 - d. In addition, upload a copy of your Practitioner Profile to the designated thread of the Blackboard **DISCUSSION BOARD**.
 - e. 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* posted on our Blackboard course site.
 - f. **Note: Late assignments will be penalized 10% for each class session past the due date.**
2. **Instructional Design Case Study Blog Discussions (Group Assignment) (25 points)**
 - a. There are seven cases from the Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski text that we will discuss in this class, with each case drawn from various education/training settings and address various instructional design issues:
 - Case Study #5: *Sandra Sanchez and Vincent Peters: Helping a School Prepare a for a New Mandate* (K-12, ID Credibility)
 - Case Study #22: *Craig Gregersen: Balancing a Range of Stakeholder Interests when Designing Instruction* (Corporate, Stakeholder Influence)
 - Case Study #28: *Natalie Morales: Managing Training in a Manufacturing Setting* (Corporate, Learner and Contextual Analyses)
 - Case Study #19: *Abby Carlin: Documenting Processes in a Manufacturing Setting* (Corporate, Task Analysis)

- Case Study #11: *Malcom Gibson: Designing Authentic Online Experiences for Adult Learners* (Post-secondary Education, Objectives/Outcomes)
 - Case Study #18: *Frank Tawl and Semra Senbetto: Designing Curriculum for Southeast Asian Trainers* (Post-secondary Education, Evaluation)
 - Case Study #30: Jack Waterkamp: Managing Scope Change in an Instructional Design Project (Corporate, Project Management)
- b. Each case study discussion will be led by a panel of 3-4 students who will sign up for the case study of their choice via the **MY GROUPS** link in the left-hand navigation menu of our Bb course site. This is **first-come-first serve**, so decide fairly quickly in order to get your first topic choice.
 - c. Each case study panel will be assigned a private work area in Bb so that members can collaborate virtually. I will monitor but not participate in each panel's private collaborations, to ensure that everyone stays on track and contributes his/her fair share to the process.
 - d. Discussion blogs have been created for each of the case studies.
 - e. In addition to serving as a panelist for one (1) case study, each student will select **four (4)** of the remaining case studies and be a discussion **participant** for each of those four case studies. You need not sign up in advance to be a participant; however, you should have an idea about which topics interest you most, in order to plan your time effectively. Thus, at the end of the course, each student will have participated in a total of five case studies, once as a panelist and four times as a discussion participant.

Preparing for the Case Study Blog Discussion as Panelists

- a. Panel members will be expected to have read the case several times, reviewed the Preliminary Analysis Questions and Implications for ID Practice at the end of each case study and to post perspectives/discussion questions that go **beyond** the material presented in the case by **connecting prominent issues in the case to personal experience or other research/applied information in the field of instructional design** (e.g., academic journal publications, applied work contexts, learning theory, professional organizations in the field, relevant and reliable online materials). In short, the panelists will combine problem-solving skills with existing and new knowledge about instructional design.
- b. The length of the blog posting is open, but the goal is to **engage** your fellow course members in thought-provoking discussions.
- c. It is up to each panel to determine how to split up the work for the blog discussion. One approach would be that one panel member prepares a synthesis of case study and the other panel member(s) develop(s) the perspectives/discussion question(s). **All** panel members must take part in **leading** the discussion. For more information on preparing for and facilitating the case study blog discussion, see the *Panel Discussion Preparation Guidelines* document posted under the **RESOURCES** link of our Bb course site.
- d. As noted in the **Course Schedule** section of this syllabus and in the **COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE** area on our Bb course site, panelists must post their case study analysis and perspectives/discussion questions by **11:59 PM Monday** of the week they are scheduled to lead the case study discussion.

Preparing for the Case Study Blog Discussion as Participants

- a. Non-panelists/participants will be expected to have read the case study of their choice for each of the four blog discussions in which they will serve as participants.

- b. Non-panelists/participants are expected to participate in the discussions in a meaningful way and are required to post **at least two (2) comments** to **each** of the four discussions that they are not leading.
- c. Comments from non-panelists/participants 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** from **recognized** industry sources (e.g., research conducted by professional associations, articles in trade publications) and whenever possible, relate your **work experiences** to the topic under discussion.

All discussion postings (panelists and non-panelists) will be evaluated based on the **quality** of those postings, whether the postings were **timely** and met the deadlines indicated in our course schedule/calendar, and the ability of your postings to **motivate** others in a collaborative effort. For more information on how discussion response quality is evaluated, please consult the *Case Study Panel Discussions Grading Rubric* posted to the Bb course site. **Note: Postings made after a discussion week has ended will receive zero points.**

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

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

- a. Working in teams of **3-4 members** (you may keep the same team members from your Panel groups or you may opt to work with entirely different people), 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.
- b. The topic will be determined **by the team collaboratively**. If there are particular topics that interest you, I would suggest you send a note to your fellow course members via Bb email to see if anyone else is interested in working with you on that topic. Once you've formed your teams, send me a note via Bb email so that I can create your private team spaces in Bb. For those who have no preferences in terms of topic and/or team mate, I will assign you to teams based on current/planned career interests that you mentioned in your bio.
- c. 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:
 - i. Instructional Problem Definition
 - ii. Learner and Contextual Analysis
 - iii. Task Analysis
 - iv. Instructional Objectives
 - v. Instructional Approach (Sequencing, Strategies, Messages)
 - vi. Limitations/constraints
 - vii. Instructional Materials (Sample storyboards, flowcharts)
 - viii. Formative & Summative Evaluation

• **Prototype Presentation (10 points)**

- a. The prototype presentation will consist of an online **demonstration** of the rudimentary prototype of the instructional module outlined in the instructional design document. The demonstration should clearly convey ...
 - i. Scope of the prototype (e.g., topic, lesson, module, course)
 - ii. Electronic media selected
 - iii. Sample assessment items
 - iv. Navigational layout

- v. Essence of the design idea that **persuades the client** that this solution is the optimum choice based on the content of your IDD
 - Have one representative of your team upload your IDD and Prototype Presentation (or Prototype URL if you have created a multimedia prototype) to the **ASSIGNMENTS** link. Make sure to upload all of your documents **before** you click SUBMIT. In addition, upload your Prototype Presentation (or its URL) – **do not upload the IDD** - to the designated forum on the **DISCUSSION BOARD**.
 - Examples of previous IDDs and prototype presentations are posted in the **Exemplary Projects** sub-folder under the **RESOURCES** link on the Bb course site.
 - 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.
 - **Note: Late assignments will be penalized 10% for each class session past the due date.**
- 4. Peer Reviews of IDD Components (15 points)**
- a. There will be a total of five (5) peer reviews conducted throughout the semester, 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 various components of the IDD:
 - i. Peer Review #1: Problem Definition
 - ii. Peer Review #2: Learner and Contextual Analysis
 - iii. Peer Review #3: Task Analysis
 - iv. Peer Review #4: Instructional Approach, Limitations/Constraints, Materials
 - v. Peer Review #5: Formative & Summative Evaluation
 - b. Your feedback will be based on the criteria set down in the *Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric*, a copy of which is at the end of this Syllabus as well as on the Bb course site.
 - c. All peer reviews will be conducted online using the Bb Discussion Board. Please consult the *Student Guidelines for Peer Reviews* posted in the RESOURCES section of the Bb course site for more information about providing feedback to the other teams.
 - d. Instructor comments on each of the documents submitted for peer review will be posted to your **private Team spaces**, so as not to unduly influence the feedback of fellow course members.
 - e. **Note: Postings made after a peer review week has ended will receive zero points.**

Total Possible Points for all Deliverables: 100

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.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

- **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. Your individual contribution is based on the content and activity in the private team areas in Bb, as well as on the results of the two (2) Team Member Effectiveness surveys that will be conducted during the semester. 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 $\geq .5$ 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.

GMU POLICIES AND RESOURCES FOR STUDENTS

- a. Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [see <http://oai.gmu.edu/the-mason-honor-code/>].
- b. Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing [see <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/policies/responsible-use-of-computing/>].
- 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/>].

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

- 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>].

WORKLOAD:

Student success in this course is priority one. We have a great deal to cover in a relatively short period of time, so please keep on track. The scope and intensity of this course is such that playing “catch up” will prove to be extremely challenging. Expect to log in to this course **at least four times** a week to read announcements, participate in the discussions and work on course materials. **It is the student’s responsibility to keep track of the weekly course schedule of topics, readings, activities and assignments due.**

Note: If work or personal challenges threaten to derail your progress, please drop me a note as quickly as possible and we’ll talk.

NETIQUETTE:

Our goal is to be **collaborative**, not combative. Experience shows that even an innocent remark in the online environment can be misconstrued. I suggest that you always re-read your responses carefully before you post them to encourage others from taking them as personal attacks. **Be positive in your approach to others and diplomatic with your words.** I will do the same. Remember, you are not competing with each other but sharing information and learning from one another as well as from the instructor.

MID-SEMESTER FEEDBACK

At the end of Week 7 of the course you will have an opportunity to anonymously provide your feedback to the instructor about what is (not) working for you in the course, along with your ideas as to how the course may be improved. Those preferring a one-on-one consultation with the instructor may certainly do so by making an appointment for a Web conference or a phone conference

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 <i>Point values: 0.0-2.3</i>	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly, but with little or no supporting data <i>Point values: 2.4-2.9</i>	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly and supported with a variety of data sources <i>Point value: 3</i>
Learner & Context Analysis:	Little or no description of learner characteristics and how the context relates to the problem, little or no supporting data <i>Point values: 0.0-3.9</i>	Adequate description of learner characteristics and how the context relates to the problem, some use of supporting data <i>Point values: 4.0-4.9</i>	Comprehensive, data-driven description of learner characteristics and how the context or environment relates to the problem <i>Point value: 5</i>
Task Analysis:	Method and content reflects neither SME input nor other data sources <i>Point values: 0.0-3.9</i>	Method and content reflects some SME input, little or no other data sources <i>Point values: 4.0-4.9</i>	Method and content clearly reflects use of substantive SME input as well as other data sources <i>Point value: 5</i>
Instructional Objectives:	Few or none of the instructional objectives are measurable nor supported by the instructional need & task analysis data <i>Point values: 0.0-3.9</i>	Most instructional objectives are measurable and most supported by the instructional need & task analysis data <i>Point values: 4.0-4.9</i>	All instructional objectives are measurable and all supported by the instructional need & task analysis data <i>Point value: 5</i>

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Instructional Approach:	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages do not flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, major disconnects <i>Point values: 0.0-3.9</i>	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages generally flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, with only minor disconnects <i>Point values: 4.0-4.9</i>	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages all flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses <i>Point value: 5</i>
Limitations, Constraints:	Instructional design document does not articulate any pre-project limitations or constraints <i>Point values: 0.0-0.7</i>	Instructional design document articulates some pre-project limitations or constraints <i>Point values: 0.8-0.9</i>	Instructional design document clearly articulates all pre-project limitations and constraints Point value: 1
Instructional Materials:	Choice of instructional materials does not reflect instructional strategies, limitations/constraints <i>Point values: 0.0-3.9</i>	Choice of instructional materials somewhat reflects selected instructional strategies, limitations/constraints <i>Point values: 4.0-4.9</i>	Choice of instructional materials clearly reflects selected instructional strategies, as well as limitations/constraints <i>Point value: 5</i>
Formative & Summative Evaluation:	Instructional design document does not contain a formative and/or summative evaluation plan, no supporting data sources <i>Point values: 0.0-3.9</i>	Instructional design document contains a limited formative and summative evaluation with little or no supporting data sources <i>Point values: 4.0-4.9</i>	Instructional design document contains both a comprehensive formative & summative evaluation plan, supported by a variety of data sources <i>Point value: 5</i>

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Organization:	Instructional design document is unstructured and hard to follow <i>Point values: 0.0-2.3</i>	Structure of the instructional design document is generally clear, little or no use of headings and sub-headings <i>Point values: 2.4-2.9</i>	Structure of the instructional design document is clear and easy to follow, with use of accurate headings and sub-headings <i>Point value: 3</i>
Language:	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are not followed, multiple language errors throughout the instructional design document <i>Point values: 0.0-2.3</i>	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are generally followed throughout the instructional design document, one or two minor language errors <i>Point values: 2.4-2.9</i>	Rules of grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are followed consistently throughout the instructional design document, no language errors <i>Point value: 3</i>
Alignment of Prototype with IDD:	Prototype does not demonstrate the instructional strategies & approach outlined in the instructional design document <i>Point values: 0.0-1.5</i>	Prototype demonstrates some of the instructional strategies & approach outlined in the instructional design document <i>Point values: 1.6-1.9</i>	Prototype clearly demonstrates the instructional strategies & approach outlined in the instructional design document <i>Point value: 2</i>
Prototype media selection:	Selected media are neither innovative nor appropriate for chosen strategies <i>Point values: 0.0-1.5</i>	Selected media are not particularly innovative, yet appropriate for chosen strategies <i>Point values: 1.6-1.9</i>	Selected media are innovative and appropriate for chosen strategies <i>Point value: 2</i>

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

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

COURSE SCHEDULE:

DATE	TOPIC/LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS
<p>Week 1 01/21- 01/26 Monday, Jan. 20, MLK Day, No Classes</p>	<p>TOPIC: COURSE KICK-OFF AND GETTING ACQUAINTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verify Blackboard (Bb) access; troubleshoot any issues by sending an email with your G-number and description of the problem to courses@gmu.edu • After logging in on MyMasonPortal, clicking on the COURSES tab at the top of the page, then clicking on the link for EDIT 705, read the course Welcome page • Review the course Syllabus and print it out or download it to your device for off-line reading • View the COURSE ORIENTATION video, the link to which is in the left-hand navigation menu bar • Post your bio (photo optional) to the designated thread under the DISCUSSION BOARD link in the left-hand navigation menu bar • Post any syllabus-related questions to the designated thread on the DISCUSSION BOARD • Review the <i>Case Study Discussion Preparation Guidelines</i> posted under the RESOURCES link 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on the bios of your fellow course members throughout the week • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 1 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 1 link.] • Read the Week 1 Learning Outcomes • View the video <i>Instructional Design Overview</i> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 1 in Morrison, Ross, Kalman & Kemp ○ Part I, pp. 2-11 and Case #5, pp. 51-62 in Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski • Click on the GROUPS link in the left-hand navigation menu bar of our Bb course site and sign up for one (1) of the <i>Case Study</i> discussion topics for which you would like to be a discussion panelist. This is first-come-first serve, so decide fairly quickly in order to get your first choice topic. Sign-ups for all seven topics to be completed by 01/23

DATE	TOPIC/LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS
<p>Week 2 01/27- 02/02</p>	<p>TOPIC: THE INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN PROFESSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study #5 blog comments throughout the week • Start thinking about your IDD project team member preferences • Explore the <i>Project Documents</i> sub-folder under the RESOURCES link • View previous EDIT 705 projects in the <i>Exemplary Projects</i> sub-folder under the RESOURCES link • Open Mic Night: Sunday, Feb. 2, 8:00-9:30 PM via Bb Collaborate (attendance optional) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders of the Case Study #5 blog discussion to post their perspectives/questions to the relevant blog under the CASE STUDY BLOGS link in the left-hand navigation menu of our Bb course site by 01/27 • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 2 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 2 link.] • Read the Week 2 Learning Outcomes • View the video <i>To Instruct or Not to Instruct</i> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 2 in Morrison, Ross, Kalman & Kemp ○ Case Study #22, pp. 204-208 in Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski • Send your project team member preferences to the instructor via Bb email by 02/02
<p>Week 3 02/03- 02/09</p>	<p>TOPIC: INSTRUCTIONAL PROBLEM DEFINITION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study #22 blog comments throughout the week • Begin using private team discussion and collaboration tools in Bb • Conduct a virtual kick-off meeting to determine your project topic and prepare your Team Project Charter • Draft your team's Instructional Problem Definition • Review the <i>Student Guidelines for Peer Reviews</i> posted in the RESOURCES section of the Bb course site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders of the Case Study #22 blog discussion to post their perspectives/questions by 02/03 • Upload Team Project Charter for instructor review to the private team space of your choice in Bb (wiki, file exchange, etc.) by 02/07 • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 3 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 3 link.] • Read the Week 3 Learning Outcomes • View the video <i>Learner & Contextual Analysis</i> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 3 in Morrison et al ○ Case Study #28, pp. 247-253 in Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski • Have one representative of your team post your draft Instructional Problem Definition to the Peer Review #1 discussion thread on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD by 02/09

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

DATE	TOPIC	ASSIGNMENT
<p>Week 4 02/10- 02/16</p>	<p>TOPIC: LEARNER AND CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS-WORKPLACE CONTEXTS AND SETTINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study #28 blog comments throughout the week • Peer Review #1 comments throughout the week <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be sure to use the criteria in the <i>Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric</i> to substantiate your comments • Revise Instructional Problem Definition based on peer review comments and instructor feedback • Draft your Learner & Contextual Analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders of the Case Study #28 blog discussion to post their perspectives/questions by 02/10 • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 4 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 4 link.] • Read the Week 4 Learning Outcomes • View the video <i>Overview of Task Analysis</i> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 4 in Morrison et al • Have one representative of your team post your draft Learner & Contextual Analysis to the Peer Review #2 discussion thread on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD by 02/16
<p>Week 5 02/17- 02/23</p>	<p>TOPIC: TASK ANALYSIS-INTRODUCTION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review #2 comments throughout the week <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be sure to use the criteria in the <i>Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric</i> to substantiate your comments • Revise Learner & Contextual Analysis based on peer review comments and instructor feedback • Draft your Task Analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 5 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 5 link.] • Read the Week 5 Learning Outcomes • Review the Web page Perform a Task Analysis • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Case Study #19, pp. 186-189 in Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski • Have one representative of your team post your draft Task Analysis to the Peer Review #3 discussion thread on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD by 02/23

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

DATE	TOPIC	ASSIGNMENT
<p>Week 6 02/24-03/02</p>	<p>TOPIC: TASK ANALYSIS-METHODS, CHOICES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study #19 blog comments throughout the week • Peer Review #3 comments throughout the week <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be sure to use the criteria in the <i>Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric</i> to substantiate your comments • Revise Task Analysis based on peer review comments and instructor feedback • Finalize your Practitioner Profile assignment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders of the Case Study #19 blog discussion to post their perspectives/questions by 02/24 • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 6 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 6 link.] • Read the Week 6 Learning Outcomes • Upload Practitioner Profile to both the Assignments link and the relevant discussion forum on the DISCUSSION BOARD in Bb by 03/02 • Complete the Team Member Effectiveness: Round 1 survey, the link to which will be emailed to you, by 03/01
<p>Week 7 03/03-03/09</p>	<p>TOPIC: KNOWLEDGE-SHARING WEEK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments on Practitioner Profiles throughout the week • Conduct a team process review meeting in your private Team spaces using the your team’s summary results from the Team Member Effectiveness: Round 1 survey posted to your private File Exchange, and the Team Process Review Questions posted in the <i>Project Documents</i> sub-folder under the RESOURCES link 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 7 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 7 link.] • Read the Week 7 Learning Outcomes • View the video <i>Writing Instructional Objectives</i> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 5 in Morrison et al ○ Case Study #11, pp. 113-124 in Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski ○ Read Techniques & Methods for Writing Objectives/Performance Outcomes • Complete the anonymous Mid-Semester Feedback survey on Bb by 03/09
<p>Week 8 03/10-03/16</p>	<p>SPRING BREAK – NO CLASSES</p>	

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

DATE	TOPIC	ASSIGNMENT
<p>Week 9 03/17- 03/23</p>	<p>TOPIC: INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study #11 blog comments throughout the week • Draft your Instructional Objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders of the Case Study #11 blog discussion to post their perspectives/questions by 03/17 • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 9 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 9 link.] • Read the Week 9 Learning Outcomes • View the video <i>Instructional Approach: Sequencing, Strategies, and Messages</i> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapters 6-9 in Morrison, Ross, et al ○ Read Gagne's Nine Events of Instruction • Upload your draft Instructional Objectives for instructor feedback only (no peer review) to the private team space of your choice in Bb by 03/23
<p>Week 10 03/24- 03/30</p>	<p>TOPIC: INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH: MESSAGE AND MEDIUM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise Instructional Objectives based on instructor feedback • Draft Instructional Approach, Limitations/Constraints. Materials (IDD components e, f & g described on p. 5 of this syllabus) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 10 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 10 link.] • Read the Week 10 Learning Outcomes • View the video <i>Introduction to Evaluation</i> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapters 11-13 in Morrison, Ross, et al ○ Case Study #18, pp. 181-184 ○ Read Kirkpatrick Model of Evaluation • Have one representative of your team post your draft Instructional Approach, Limitations/Constraints, Materials to the Peer Review #4 discussion thread on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD by 03/30

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

DATE	TOPIC	ASSIGNMENT
<p>Week 11 03/31- 04/06</p>	<p>TOPIC: EVALUATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study #18 blog comments throughout the week • Peer Review #4 comments throughout the week <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be sure to use the criteria in the <i>Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric</i> to substantiate your comments • Revise Instructional Approach, Limitations/Constraints, Materials based on peer review comments and instructor feedback • Draft your Formative & Summative Evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders of the Case Study #18 blog discussion to post their perspectives/questions by 03/31 • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 11 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 11 link.] • Read the Week 11 Learning Outcomes • View the video Prototyping for Better e-Learning • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Read Flow Chart ○ Read Storyboarding • Have one representative of your team post your draft Formative & Summative Evaluation to the Peer Review #5 discussion thread on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD by 04/06
<p>Week 12 04/07- 04/13</p>	<p>TOPIC: PROTOTYPING IN INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review #5 comments throughout the week <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be sure to use the criteria in the <i>Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric</i> to substantiate your comments • Revise your Formative & Summative Evaluation based on peer review comments and instructor feedback • Start building your Prototype Presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 12 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 12 link.] • Read the Week 12 Learning Outcomes • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 16 in Morrison, Ross et al ○ Case Study #30, pp. 259-271 in Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

DATE	TOPIC	ASSIGNMENT
<p>Week 13 04/14-04/20</p>	<p>TOPIC: CURRENT ISSUES IN INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study #30 blog comments throughout the week • Draft your Prototype Presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leaders of the Case Study #30 blog discussion to post their perspectives/questions by 04/14 • Click on the COURSE-AT-A-GLANCE link in the left-hand navigation menu bar and select the Week 13 link. [Note: All of the following assignments/activities are accessible via the Week 13 link.] • Read the Week 13 Learning Outcomes • Upload your draft Prototype Presentation for instructor feedback only (no peer review) to the private team space of your choice in Bb by 04/20
<p>Week 14 04/21-04/27</p>	<p>TOPIC: FINALIZING IDD & PROTOTYPE PRESENTATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise draft Prototype Presentation based on instructor feedback • Begin consolidating all IDD components into a single document • Revisit the <i>Exemplary Projects</i> sub-folder under the RESOURCES link • Review the <i>Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric</i> to make sure you have completed all project requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalize IDD & Prototype Presentation • Complete the anonymous Mason Online Course Evaluation Survey, the link to which is located in the bottom right-hand corner of the COURSES tab on the MyMason portal
<p>Week 15 04/28-05/04</p>	<p>TOPIC: DESIGN TEAM EXHIBITS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and comment on the Prototype Presentations for four (4) teams other than your own <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Be sure to use the criteria in the <i>Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric</i> to substantiate your comments • Closing remarks from instructor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have one representative of your team upload the final Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation to the ASSIGNMENTS link by 04/28 • Have one representative of your team upload your Prototype Presentation only to the designated thread on the DISCUSSION BOARD by 04/28 • Complete the anonymous Mason Online Course Evaluation Survey, the link to which is located in the bottom right-hand corner of the COURSES tab on the MyMason portal