

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

EDIT 705 Section B01: Instructional Design
(Updated June 2, 2011)

DAYS / TIME / LOCATION	INSTRUCTOR: Wanda Mally
Online June 6 – July 28, 2011	Email Address: wmally@gmu.edu Phone Number: (207) 738-2414; (207) 738-2449 (FAX) Teleconference and Online Office Hours by Appointment Mon-Fri

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Course Prerequisites

Prerequisites for this course are teaching, training or technical development or equivalent experience.

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. The course focuses on a variety of instructional design models, with emphasis on recent contributions from cognitive science and related fields.

NATURE OF COURSE DELIVERY

All course activities for the semester will be held online. The course will be conducted primarily using an asynchronous format consisting of the following:

- Assigned readings & research
- Instructor-provided notes
- Discussions on selected topics and case studies
- Student practical applications and peer in-progress reviews (IPRs)

Each week we will cover different topics in instructional design. Readings, instructions, activities and assignments for the week will be released every Monday morning by 7 a.m. and will remain available through the end of the semester. It is the student's responsibility to keep track of the weekly course schedule of topics, readings, activities, and assignments due. Instructor office hours are available by appointment and can be conducted via telephone or via a private Blackboard chat forum. I do not have office hours on Saturdays and Sundays.

STUDENT OUTCOMES

The course is designed to enable students to:

- Define instructional design
- Consider realistic aspects of the practice of instructional design
- Compare and contrast models of instructional design
- Debate existing perspectives on learning
- Gather and analyze informal or formal data related to an identified instructional need
- Produce production calendar for semester prototype development
- Conduct task analysis using an identified technique
- Conduct learner analysis
- Write instructional and/or performance objectives
- Determine types or levels of learning addressed
- Articulate design approach for learning environment and corresponding instructional activities and strategies
- Create storyboard and navigation layout for an instructional design project
- Produce limited prototype of design concept using electronic media of choice (e.g. Articulate, Word, Powerpoint, Camtasia, Captivate, Dreamweaver, RoboHelp, etc.)
- Conduct regular peer reviews or formative evaluation of prototype and report on findings
- Describe how summative evaluation of learning environment might take place

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT); International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) and National Educational Technology Standards (NETS):

- To design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics. (AECT)
- To develop instructional materials and experiences using print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies. (AECT, ISTE-NETS)
- To use processes and resources for learning by applying principles and theories of media utilization, diffusion, implementation, and policy-making. (AECT)
- To plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles of project, resource, delivery system, and information management. (AECT)
- To evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles of problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning. (AECT, ISTE-NETS)
- Demonstrate a sound understanding of technology operations and concepts. (ISTE and NETS) use technology to enhance their productivity and professional practice. (ISTE and NETS)
- Understand the social, ethical, legal, and human issues surrounding the use of technology and apply that understanding in practice. (ISTE and NETS)

REQUIRED TEXTS:

- Brown, A. & Green, T.D. (2011). *The Essentials of Instructional Design: Connecting Fundamental Principles with Process and Practice*. 2nd. Boston, MA: Pearson, Prentice Hall. (ISBN 0-13-508422-9) **This is a new text.**
- Ertmer, P.A. & Quinn, J. (2007) *The ID Casebook: Case studies in instructional design*. 3rd Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson, Merrill, Prentice, Hall. (ISBN 0-13-171705-7)

Additional relevant online readings/resources reviewed on specific weeks will be provided.

OTHER RESOURCES REQUIRED BY STUDENTS

To successfully participate in the course, students are required to have:

- Internet access
- Web browser software
- A GMU email account
- Subscription to IT Listserv
- A GMU web site (Mason Academic Research System Account)
- Access to Blackboard (CE9.1)
- Adobe Acrobat Reader
- A computer equipped with audio input (a microphone)/output capability for web conferencing and recording audio for your project)
- Elluminate Live
- Microsoft Office (including Word for Windows, at a minimum)

COURSE REQUIREMENTS, PERFORMANCE-BASED ASSESSMENT, AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. Requirements

1. Instructional Design Case Study Discussions (29%)

Each team will be assigned a case study from the Ertmer & Quinn text. During the scheduled weeks, teams will lead an online discussion forum on their assigned case study. In addition to keeping the relevant individual design project materials updated and uploaded in accordance with the schedule (see the schedule section of the syllabus), teams are required to have the case study review/synthesis posted and the discussion initiated by Monday morning at 9 a.m. on the week the case study is scheduled. Failure to post your design case on time will result in an automatic grade reduction in points per the rubric. (See the section on Evaluation Criteria.)

Preparing for the Design Case Study as a Facilitators

Team members will be expected to have read the case several times, review the preliminary analysis questions and implications for ID practice at the end of each chapter and **go beyond the material presented in the text 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 online materials, etc.)**. The format of the discussion is open but the discussion questions should be an attempt to create an engaging learning experience. Creativity is encouraged as well as exploration into the affordances of online learning environments (for example, role-playing, game-based, online synchronous/asynchronous approaches as well as engaging presentations, teaching and learning experiences or other instructional/training approaches). **NOTE:** Discussion blogs have been created for each of the case studies. These will be used for you to initiate the discussion and attach your analysis which is required. The analysis can be in Powerpoint or Word. Teams must notify the instructor in advance if any additional or special resources need to be arranged or set up for your case study. **As previously noted, your case study analysis and questions must be posted by 9:00 am Monday of the week you are scheduled to facilitate.** It will be up to each team to determine how to split up the work for the case study. One approach would be that one team member prepare the analysis and the other member(s) develop the discussion questions. All members must take part in leading the discussion.

Preparing for the Design Case as a Discussion Participant

All students will be expected to have read each case, review the preliminary analysis questions and implications for ID practice at the end of each chapter and participate in all case study discussions. Students are also expected to have completed the other assigned readings for the week in advance. Review the facilitators' analysis/synthesis/summary and post your perspective and feedback, responding to questions or points posed, or specific directions (in cases of role-playing, etc.) given by the facilitators. Tie in personal experiences as an instructional designer as well as relevant points from the week's readings. All postings and activities relating to the case study must be completed by 11:59 pm on the **Sunday** night before the start of each new week. See the Course Schedule for details and the deadlines posted throughout the Blackboard course's weekly links. **Do not wait until the last day of the week to participate in the case study discussions, as this will impact your final course grade. Instead, pace yourself during the week.**

2. Management of ID Project Design Document Materials and In-Progress Reviews (IPRs) (28%)

During the first week of the course, all students must submit proposed topics for an instructional/training problem. Seven of the proposed topics will be selected for this semester's projects then assigned to the teams. You will work in these teams to apply the instructional design process and related techniques to your instructional/ training problem. Each team will progressively produce outputs from the design process, detailing their instructional design project, building towards a completed design document. These outputs (portions of your design document) are to be uploaded to the designated **IPR Team Discussion** area accessible from the **Discussions** link on the menu and other areas of the course. These outputs from each stage of the design process will be separate from the final Design Brief created using Powerpoint and your Prototype described later.

We will use role playing as a means for conducting regular reviews of your design materials (and the design brief and prototype). My role will be that of an organization's Program Manager for all training projects and contracts. Your role will be that of instructional designers/project managers assigned to a team project. Each member of every team will be required to take the lead on various activities and deliverables for the project. Assignment of project responsibilities will be documented by each team in the Project Charter and Production Plan. While working on your team project, you will hold regular in-progress reviews for your projects. Therefore, it is the responsibility of each member on the team to make his or her project materials available for the scheduled reviews and to ensure you provide constructive feedback on your team members' work. Each team is expected to hold a *minimum* of 6 IPRs during the semester. (See the course schedule of the syllabus for the required IPR dates.) The list of teams can be accessed from the course content menu once the course has started. Remember: You will use your IPR Team Discussion area to post your work and exchange team feedback. We will also use some form of synchronous communication to meet as teams during the weeks IPRs are scheduled.

IPR Format

Teams will begin building a design document for your ID project, starting with the needs and task analyses. You will post the latest version of the design document containing the output(s) of the most recently covered instructional design phase. Prior to each IPR meeting each individual team member will be required to complete

the quality assurance checklist for that particular IPR and email it to the instructor. Additionally, each team member will be expected to walk the review team through their assigned portion of the design project to date during the IPR, connecting their work to class learning and outside experiences related to instructional design. In addition to critiquing the work of your team, you, as peer reviewers will be expected to ask questions and prompt discussion of instructional design issues related to the project. You can use tools (i.e., spreadsheets, databases, etc..) to gather and track feedback ('red lines') you will need for making updates to your materials. Examples of the types of redlines you will collect include (but are not limited to) those that are technical, typographical and of course, those relating to the instructional design approach. At the end of each IPR week, each team is required to update and upload their latest/revised design document back to the **IPR Team Discussion** area in accordance with the schedule. Each individual team member is required to email the instructor their updated quality assurance checklist with the "Peer Assessment" section completed for that week's activities.

3. ID Project Prototype and Design Brief (36%)

Some design documents can end up being lengthy documents. Therefore, your team will need to create a high-level design brief Powerpoint presentation to serve as an "executive overview" (approximately 10-12 slides) of your project to accompany your prototype. The executive overview must summarize the following elements:

- The instructional design problem
- Results from your Needs analysis
- Identified Instructional Goal
- Results from your Task analysis
- Results from your Learner & Contextual analysis
- Instructional objectives
- Description of the design approach for the learning environment, instructional strategies/activities and assessment strategies
- Flowchart of the instructional solution
- Summary of your Formative evaluation plan
- Summary of your Summative evaluation plan
- Scope of the Prototype (For example, indicate if the prototype represents a completed topic, lesson, module, course, storyboards, etc.)

The limited prototype of the design concept should:

- Be created using electronic media of choice (e.g. Articulate, Word, Powerpoint, Camtasia, Captivate, Dreamweaver, RoboHelp, etc.); if the instructional solution is a print-based product, then use an application appropriate for the solution such as Word (or be saved in PDF format); if the instructional solution is browser or internet based, the final products should be uploaded to the GMU web site of all members of the team)
- Include sample assessment items
- Represent navigational layout of the program
- Communicate the essence of the design idea and convince a client you would be the right designer for this project

To view examples of previous student final projects, select the "Past Project Examples" link from the course menu.

4. Other Grading (7%)

The student-instructor discussion posting is worth 3 points and must be completed the first week. Two proposed ID project topics should also be emailed to the instructor the first week for an additional 2 points each.

B. Performance-Based Assessment Discussion/Project/Presentation assignments

To summarize, students will be evaluated in the following areas: Participation in all discussions; management, maintenance and review of your ID project materials, and overall quality of your final ID project. Students are expected to keep track of the scheduled assignments, which include the readings in preparation for each week, discussions and regular reviews/revisions of design & prototype materials.

Communication

Working 100% online requires dedication on the part of the instructor/facilitator and the students. As the instructor/facilitator, I rely on you to communicate to me any questions or problems that might arise. In such cases, you need to contact me immediately by email or phone.

Attendance

Attendance in the course is mandatory. Simply put, students are expected to participate in all discussions and IPRs and make sure you establish a regular line of communication with your team member and the instructor. The rubrics in the following section break down the total possible number of points that can be earned in the course.

The assessment of learning in this course will be based on a criterion model. The ID cases and design reviews will use a competency based model in that if there is clear evidence in online interactions that an individual has met the criteria, then he or she will gain full credit. For the design brief/prototype, each major phase of the instructional design prototype will be assessed as a potential client might evaluate a design concept in a realistic setting. The work and importance that the team places on the first phase of the design greatly impacts the quality of the following two major phases. Therefore, it is highly suggested you place increased effort on the first phase (e.g. understanding the problem, audience, context) to ensure higher evaluations as you progress through the process.

Particular components of the design brief/prototype may be improved throughout the semester based on additional learning of the process through modeling of others' work and cycles of feedback by peers and the instructor. At the design review and conclusion of the semester, judgments will be made as to the level of persuasiveness of the design concept by other designers in the class. This input will be considered by the professor who will assign the mid-point and final grade.

C. Criteria for Evaluation

The following list is a summary of all graded items. Items with an asterisk (*) are graded using one of the rubrics that begin on page 9 of this document. The following point spread will be adjusted once the roster is finalized and the number of case study discussions to be covered is determined. Peer Assessments following each IPR will also be factored into the final course grade.

Item/Activity	Points
Intro discussion	3
Proposed topic for ID Project	4
Case Study (Facilitation)*	5
Case Study (Discussion Participation)*	24
ID Project (see below)	
IPR Participation*	28
Final Project Deliverables*	36

Total points = 100

D. Grading Scale

Using the following scale, the final grade is based on your performance out of the possible 100 points:

Grade	Points
A	100-90
B	89-80
Failure	79-0

LOGISTICS

**Required Portfolio Elements for IT students (EDIT601/EDIT701)

If you are a student in the IT program, it is strongly suggested that you retain your design brief/prototype elements produced in this course for your required online Masters electronic portfolio assessment process at the mid-point and end of your coursework (EDIT601/701). You may also want to document the feedback from your peers and indicate what elements of the design were adjusted based on collected formative feedback. You will be asked to reflect on your learning within this course and the best time to formulate those reflections is when you are currently in the course. Please retain these electronic materials for your required portfolio assessment.

COURSE SCHEDULE

The following is a summary of the topics and activities covered in the course. Please keep in mind that the activities and syllabus are subject to change based on the instructor's determination of needs of the class. You will be notified via email and Blackboard announcements if changes to the schedule become necessary.

Week	Topics / Activities / Assignments
Week 1 6/6 - 6/12	<p>Course Kick-off and Administrative Items</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Verify Blackboard (and email) access• Review syllabus and course requirements• Review previous EDIT 705 projects & begin thinking about a project topic• Participate in Student/Instructor intros (using Blackboard discussion tool)• Participate in discussion for case study 15• Email proposed instructional design project topics to instructor by 6/8 <p>Topics: Introduction to Instructional Design, Thinking & Cognition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Content we'll cover:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Brown & Green, Chapters 1-2▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 15 Discussion hosted by instructor▪ Also see related readings under wk 1 link in Blackboard• Read for next week:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Brown & Green, Chapter 11▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 26
Week 2 6/13 - 6/19	<p>Topic: Media, Production and Project Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Content we'll cover:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Brown & Green, Chapter 11▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 26 Discussion hosted by Team 1▪ Also see related readings under wk 2 link in Blackboard• Wednesday, upload draft of production plan/calendar for your ID project/prototype• IPR #1: Thursday, Friday, IPR Teams conduct kick-off meeting (Identify forms to be used, standards, etc.; also, review production plans/calendars; update as appropriate before Monday)• Read for next week:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Brown & Green, Chapters 3-4▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 8▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 18

<p>Week 3 6/20 - 6/26</p>	<p>Topic: Needs and Task Analyses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content we'll cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brown & Green, Chapters 3-4 ▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 8 Discussion hosted by Team 2 ▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 18 Discussion hosted by Team 3 ▪ Also see related readings under wk 3 link in Blackboard • Wednesday, upload draft needs and task analyses • IPR #2: Thursday, Needs and Task Analyses IPR (Note: This IPR should include a review of your draft needs and task analyses) • Friday, Gather, analyze and summarize feedback from needs and task analyses IPR; update as appropriate before Monday • Read for next week: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brown & Green, Chapter 5 ▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 28
<p>Week 4 6/27 - 7/3</p>	<p>Topics: Learner & Contextual Analyses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content we'll cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brown & Green, Chapter 5 ▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 28 Discussion hosted by Team 4 ▪ Also see related readings under wk 4 link in Blackboard • Wednesday, upload learner & contextual analyses • IPR #3: Thursday, Learner & Contextual Analyses IPR (Note: This IPR should include a review of your draft learner & contextual analyses) • Friday, Gather, analyze and summarize feedback from learner & contextual analyses IPR; update as appropriate before Monday • Read for next week: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brown & Green, Chapters 6-8 and 12; Review Chapter 11 ▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 21
<p>Week 5 7/5 - 7/10</p>	<p>Topics: Design and Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content we'll cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brown & Green, Chapters 6-8 and 12; Review Chapter 11 ▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 21 Discussion hosted by Team 5 ▪ Also see related readings under wk 5 link in Blackboard • Wednesday, upload instructional goals & objectives, flowchart, executive summary of learning environment/activities • IPR #4: Thursday, Conduct design & development IPR (Note: This IPR should include a review of your instructional goals & objectives, flowchart, executive summary of learning environment/activities) • Friday, Gather, analyze and summarize feedback from the design & development IPR; update as appropriate update as appropriate before Monday • Read for next week: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brown & Green, Chapters 9-10 ▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 14

<p>Week 6 7/11 - 7/17</p>	<p>Topics: Assessment, Evaluation and Metrics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content we'll cover: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brown & Green, Chapters 9-10 ▪ Ertmer & Quinn, Case Study 14 Discussion hosted by Team 6 • Wednesday, Upload description of learner assessment approach/items, summative evaluation plan, and formative evaluation plan. (Your formative evaluation plan can include but not be limited to a write-up of how you are collecting feedback during IPRs accompanied by samples of any forms you are using; Your summative evaluation should include an explanation of long-term plans for metrics collection) • IPR #5: Thursday, Conduct Assessment and Evaluation IPR (Note: This IPR should include a review of your draft learner assessment items, your draft formative and summative evaluation plans) • Friday, Gather, analyze and summarize formative feedback from Evaluation IPR; update as appropriate before Monday
<p>Week 7 7/18 - 7/24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teams work on final materials: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prototype ▪ Design Brief ▪ Finalized Design Document • Wednesday, upload "near final" materials • IPR #6: Thursday, Friday, conduct final review of all materials then update as appropriate
<p>Week 8 Course Wrap 7/25 - 7/28</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday, 7/25 through Tuesday, 7/26, make final updates to your project materials per most recent IPR feedback. Post your final design brief, prototype and design document by 11:59 pm (just before midnight) Tuesday night to avoid penalty • Wednesday, 7/27 through 7/28, participate in the virtual designers showcase, hosted online beginning. To participate, all students must visit each virtual "design brief" of all exhibitors (the other teams). Select the design briefs and corresponding prototypes to evaluate then supply feedback using the discussion forum for each respective team. The doors to the designer's showcase close at 11:59 pm on 7/28. Therefore all visits and feedback must be finished no later than that date and time to avoid penalty. • Thursday, 7/28 Course Ends • Closing remarks from instructor (via email) • Course Evaluations to be completed online (You will receive instructions via GMU email on the evaluation process)

RUBRICS USED TO EVALUATE WORK ON CASE STUDY DISCUSSIONS

Team Grading Criteria for Case Study Analysis and Facilitation (worth up to 5 points)

Criteria	0 pts Did Not Meet	.5 pts Somewhat Met	1 pt Fully Met
Case study materials complete and uploaded/turned in on time.	No evidence	On time but had to update with additional instructions for clarification later.	On time, complete with abstract and clearly stated instructions.
Thorough understanding/analysis/synthesis of case study.	No evidence	Reflects limited thought processes and preparation.	Reflects outstanding thought processes and thorough preparation.
Connections made to experience/readings/theory/applied practice, etc.	No evidence	Limited references to assigned readings and experiences beyond the case itself and the course.	Often reflected ideas supported by frequent references to assigned readings in and beyond the course.
Attempts at creative format, consideration of affordances of media when preparing case study activities.	No evidence	Limited evidence of thought behind the questions and activities.	Original, thought-provoking questions and/or activities tied in and reinforced instructional design activities or tasks.
Was actively present throughout the week, keeping the audience engaged and the discussion going.	No evidence	Responded to 50% (or fewer) of the postings with postings spread out over a 1-2 day period; rarely supplemented comments with an additional probing question for further consideration.	Responded to 60% (or more) of the postings with postings spread out over several days; often supplemented comments with an additional probing question or hypothesis for the class to consider.

NOTE: The week you are scheduled to facilitate, you are still responsible for participating in any other case study discussions happening that week.

Individual Grading Criteria for Participation in Case Study Discussions (worth up to 24 points)

Based on 6 case studies, each discussion is worth up to 3 points. Case study 14 is worth up to 6 points.

Case Study	<p style="text-align: center;">0 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero evidence of participation for the discussion. This includes posting your response to the facilitator on the final day of the discussion and/or beginning your participation in the discussion on the final day. 	<p style="text-align: center;">2 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary posting or activity requested by the facilitator is completed per the facilitator’s questions and/or instructions for activities, but towards the end of the week. • Posting submitted per facilitators’ instructions reflect little thought and preparation. • 6 or fewer postings, most of which are concentrated in a 1 or 2 day period. (Note from the left column that if you post your input and comments starting on the final day, you will not receive credit for the discussion.) • Some references are made to assigned readings, but references are generally vague and random. • Infrequent application of work and/or previous learning experiences to concepts covered in class. 	<p style="text-align: center;">3 points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary posting or activity requested by the facilitator is completed per the facilitator’s questions and/or instructions for activities. • Posting submitted per facilitators’ instructions reflect outstanding thought processes and thorough preparation. • 6 or more postings distributed over 3 or more days, including any reviews/comments for classmates as required by the facilitator’s instructions. • Substantive ideas supported by frequent references to assigned readings • Frequent application of work and/or previous learning experiences to concepts covered in class
Case 15			
Case 26			
Case 8			
Case 18			
Case 28			
Case 21			
Case 14			

NOTE: On dates your team is not scheduled to facilitate a discussion, you are still expected to fully participate in the scheduled discussion led by fellow classmates or the instructor. This includes the first “student-instructor intro” discussion. This also means not waiting until the last day of a discussion to post your contributions.

RUBRICS USED TO EVALUATE WORK ON ID PROJECT

Individual Grading Criteria for In-Progress Reviews (IPRs) and Showcase Participation (worth up to 28 points)

Criteria (IPR 1-6 and Showcase Discussion)	0 pts No Participation	1 pt Limited Participation	2 pts Full Participation
All design document/prototype/design brief materials for which you are responsible are uploaded on schedule (at the beginning of the IPR and when posting final updates are due at the end of the IPR week).			
<p>You are an active participant in reviews of the team's work. For each IPR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You complete and submit the quality checklist <i>before</i> each IPR team meeting. The checklist includes detailed, constructive, respectful feedback and input that is connected to experiences in/outside of class; • You email the updated quality assurance checklist and completed "Peer Assessment" section of the checklist at the end of the IPR week. <p>For the Designer's Showcase Discussion at the end of the semester, you are an active participant in the discussion over the multi-day period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You post detailed, constructive, respectful feedback on the work of all other teams. • Your participation and feedback are spread out over the multi-day period of the showcase. 			

Your participation in the weekly IPR team meetings is mandatory. If you miss joining a session, you will automatically receive a 0 for that week's IPR.

Team Grading Criteria – Design Brief & Prototype Presentation (worth up to 36 points)

Criteria	0 pts Not Persuasive	2 pts Somewhat Persuasive	4 pts Very Persuasive
<i>Phase 1 – Clear description of problem, audience and objectives</i>			
Description of instructional design problem	Not provided	Provided but not backed with supporting information	Clearly explains why this is a problem; provides supporting evidence and/or data
Description of proposed intervention based on needs & task analysis data that has been collected, analyzed and documented	Not provided	Does not address all possible solutions, even those that are non-instructional	Includes all possible solutions but careful to state what will be within scope of the project
Description of learner characteristics and how the environment relates to the problem	Not provided	Limited to statistical data about the audience without interpretation of the data and implication on the design of instruction	Includes depth of information about the audience, including contextual information; explains results of learner analysis in terms of implication on the design
Articulated instructional goals and objectives	Not provided	Weakly stated goals and objectives that are difficult to measure; not learner-centered	Strongly stated, measurable goals and objectives that are learner-centered
<i>Phase 2 – Description of logical design, approach, strategies and activities</i>			
Articulated design approach and strategies for learning environment	Not provided	Limited expression of ideas for approach and strategies for creating a learning environment; proposed approach and strategies don't facilitate overall goal and objectives	Well thought out, articulated approach and strategies that support the overall goal of instruction and facilitate mastery of the learning objectives
Articulated instructional activities and strategies	Not provided	Limited creativity; has potential for not engaging the learner	Creative; realistic; promotes mastery of the learning objectives and learner engagement
Includes sample storyboards, flowcharts of prototype and/or clearly shows how product will be navigated	Not provided	Materials are provided but with unclear instructions and navigation; scope of the prototype is not clearly identified	Materials are organized, packaged and presented with clear instructions and navigation; scope of prototype is clearly identified
Limited, professional-looking prototype depicting design idea and includes sample assessment	Not provided	Covers 1 to 2 learning objectives; not representative of a near final product	Covers 3 or more learning objectives; representative of a near final, "ready for release and testing" product
<i>Phase 3 – Description of Evaluation Strategies</i>			
Description of formative and summative evaluations include realistic, effective strategies and tools; both target specific metrics and/or outcomes	Not provided	Fails to include one or more of the following: the timeline the evaluations occurs; models used; examples of data collection instruments; needed resources; specific metrics mapped to original need	Addresses all timelines; models used; includes examples of data collection instruments used; identifies required resources; addresses specific metrics that map to the original need for instruction

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT STATEMENT OF EXPECTATIONS AND CAMPUS RESOURCES

Student Expectations

- Students must adhere to the guidelines of the George Mason University Honor Code [See <http://academicintegrity.gmu.edu/honorcode/>].
- 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/>].
- Students must follow the university policy for Responsible Use of Computing [See <http://universitypolicy.gmu.edu/1301gen.html>].
- Students are responsible for the content of university communications sent to their George Mason University email 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 email account.
- Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
- Students are expected to exhibit professional behaviors and dispositions at all times.

Campus Resources

- 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/>].
- 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/>].

GSE faculty may add at the conclusion:

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

RHT faculty may add at the conclusion:

- For additional information on the College of Education and Human Development, School of Recreation, Health, and Tourism, please visit our website [See <http://rht.gmu.edu/>].