GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

EDPD 504: Instructional Design
3 credits, Spring 2015, January 20 – May 5
Tuesdays, 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Foreign Service Institute (FSI)/School of Language Studies, Arlington, VA

PROFESSOR:
Name: Dr. Shahron Williams van Rooij
Office hours: By appointment only
Office phone: 703-993-9704
Email address: swilliae@gmu.edu

UNIVERSITY CATALOG COURSE DESCRIPTION:
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.

COURSE PURPOSE AND INTENDED AUDIENCE:
An FSI priority is to enhance the ability of their language training professionals to design and develop instruction in a consistent, systematic way. This course will help those professionals to acquire and apply basic instructional design skills to meet the diverse needs of their language students. **Note**: Course credits not applicable to a degree program.

LEARNER OUTCOMES:
At the conclusion of this course, participants 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 learning/performance outcomes
- 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

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS:
International Board of Standards for Training, Performance and Instruction (IBSTPI), Instructional Design Competencies
A. Professional foundations
     a. Communicate effectively in visual, oral and written form
B. Planning and analysis
     a. Conduct a needs assessment
     b. Design a curriculum or program
     c. Select and use a variety of techniques for determining instructional content
     d. Identify and describe target population characteristics
     e. Analyze the characteristics of the environment
     f. Analyze the characteristics of existing and emerging technologies and their use in an instructional environment
     g. Reflect upon the elements of a situation before finalizing design solutions and strategies
C. Design and development
     a. Select and use a variety of techniques to define and sequence the instructional content and strategies
     b. Select or modify existing instructional materials
     c. Develop instructional materials
     d. Design instruction that reflects an understanding of the diversity of learners and groups of learners
     e. Evaluate and assess instruction and its impact
D. Implementation and management
     a. Provide for the effective implementation of instructional products and programs

REQUIRED TEXTS:
Morrison, G.R., Ross, S.M., Kalman, H.K., & Kemp, J.E. (2013). *Designing effective instruction* (7th edition). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons

DIGITAL RESOURCES:
*   For the duration of the course, all course materials and completed assignments will be housed in an FSI-dedicated instance of the Blackboard Learning Management System (Bb LMS) hosted by George Mason University. Instructions on accessing the site will be provided on the first class day.
*   At the conclusion of the course, FSI will migrate course participant work products to FSI's SharePoint site. Access to the Bb LMS will terminate at **11:59 PM EST** on **June 15, 2015**.

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS:
There are **four (4)** assignments required for successful completion of this course:

a. **Practitioner Profile (10 points)**
     a. FSI will provide a pool of names of individuals who serve (or have served) as instructional/training designers at FSI. FSI will also assist in setting up **focus group-style interviews** during which small groups of course members will each interview one practitioner.
     b. Interviews may be conducted via phone, email or face-to-face and should collect the following information about the practitioner:
          i. Educational background
          ii. Instructional design experience
          iii. Current responsibilities

iv. Most successful instructional design project and why that project was successful
v. Least successful instructional design project and why that project was not successful
vi. Professional advice and/or lessons learned that the individual would offer to others entering the instructional design field

c. Course members will **individually** prepare a 2 – 3 page single-spaced **summary** of the interview using standard Business English and upload it to the **ASSIGNMENTS** area on our Blackboard course site.

d. Course members will discuss their interview experiences in class, particularly the most memorable lessons learned

e. For more information on how your Practitioner Profile is assessed, please refer to the *Practitioner Profile Grading Rubric* at the back of this syllabus.

b. **Panel Discussion of Course Readings – Team Assignment (15 points)**
   a. There are **five (5) course member-led** discussions. Each discussion corresponds to a topic in the course readings:
      i. Learner and Contextual Analysis
      ii. Task Analysis
      iii. Instructional Objectives (text)/Learning Outcomes (FSI)
      iv. Sequencing, Strategies, Messages
      v. Formative and Summative Evaluation
   b. Each discussion will be led by a panel of **4-5** course members.
   c. Each panel will present a summary (30 minutes maximum) of the readings on their selected topic in class. The presentation should include a **one-page handout** for the class that describes the main ideas and highlights of the readings. The panel will select one (1) of its members to upload the handout and any slides used in the presentation to the **ASSIGNMENTS** area of our Blackboard course site.
   d. During class, the panel will pose questions and/or provide comments about the **relevance** of the readings to their work situation at FSI. All panel members must take part in leading the discussion.
   e. After class, course members may pose additional questions to the panel by posting those questions to the relevant forum on our Blackboard DISCUSSION BOARD.
   f. For more information on how discussion panel quality is assessed, please refer to the *Panel Discussion of Course Readings Grading Rubric* at the back of this syllabus.

c. **Instructional Design Document & Presentation – Team Assignment (50 points)**
   a. *Instructional Design Document (40 points)*
      i. Working in teams of **3-5 members** (you may keep the same team members from your Panel groups or you may opt to work with entirely different people), course members will develop an instructional design document (IDD) which will detail their approach to a real instructional issue or problem at FSI.
      ii. The topic will be determined **by the team collaboratively** but should be related to your current or upcoming area of specialization (e.g., language basics, composition, cultural awareness).
      iii. 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:
         • Executive Summary
         • Instructional Problem Definition

- Learner and Context Analysis
- Task Analysis
- Learning Outcomes
- Instructional Approach (Sequencing, Strategies, Messages)
- Instructional Materials (Sample storyboards, flowcharts)
- Formative & Summative Evaluation Plan

b. *Presentation (10 points)*

i. The in-class team presentation will cover the following points:
- Rationale for topic selection
- Process used to develop the solutions
- Essence of the design idea that demonstrates that your solution is the best choice based on the content of your IDD
- Benefits of the solution to …
  - o target learners
  - o FSI as an organization
  - o Each team member's professional development

ii. For more information on how your IDD and prototype are assessed, please refer to the ***Instructional Design Document & Presentation Grading Rubric*** at the back of this syllabus.

d. **Peer Reviews of IDD Components (25 points)**

a. There will be a total of five (5) peer reviews conducted throughout the semester, each corresponding to one of the components of the IDD and each reflecting the iterative nature of the instructional design process:

   i. Peer Review #1: Problem Definition
   ii. Peer Review #2: Learner and Contextual Analysis
   iii. Peer Review #3: Task Analysis
   iv. Peer Review #4: Learning Outcomes, Instructional Approach, Limitations/Constraints, Materials
   v. Peer Review #5: Formative & Summative Evaluation Plan

b. Each course member will be asked to provide constructive evaluative feedback to other teams as you work on the various components of the IDD. There will be one in-class peer review for each of the five reviews, so that everyone can familiarize themselves with the peer review process.

c. You will then provide feedback to **at least** two teams other than your own by posting your comments to the relevant forum on our Blackboard DISCUSSION BOARD.

c. Your feedback will be based on the relevant 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.

d. 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.

e. 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.

f. **Note: Postings made after a peer review week has ended will receive zero points**.

Total Possible Points for all Assignments: 100

GRADING:
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%

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-2/).
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 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.
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 behaviors and dispositions at all times.

CORE VALUES COMMITMENT

The College of Education & 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 http://gse.gmu.edu/.

COURSE SCHEDULE:

DATE	CLASS AGENDA	ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT CLASS
Week 1 **Jan. 20**	• Introductions • Review syllabus • Sign-up for Panel Discussion team • Blackboard course site orientation • Instructor presentation: *Instructional Design Overview* • Sign-up for IDD project team and select project topic	• Read chapters 1 and 2 in the Morrison text • Draft Instructional Problem Definition and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD
Week 2 **Jan. 27**	• **Peer Review #1** – present draft Instructional Definition • Group work: Revise Instructional Problem Definition • Instructor presentation: *Learner and Context Analysis: Data Collection Techniques*	• Read chapter 3 in Morrison text • Panel #1: Prepare handout for panel discussion and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD AND ASSIGNMENTS link
Week 3 **Feb. 3**	• **Panel #1** leads discussion on **Learner and Context Analysis** • Instructor summary of Learner and Context Analysis • Group work: Begin drafting Learner and Context Analysis	• Complete first draft of Learner and Context Analysis and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD
Week 4 **Feb. 10**	• **Peer Review #2** – present draft Learner and Context Analysis • Group work: Revise Learner and Context Analysis • Instructor presentation: *Overview of Task Analysis*	• Read chapter 4 in Morrison text • Panel #2: Prepare handout for panel discussion and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD AND ASSIGNMENTS link
Week 5 **Feb. 17**	• **Panel #2** leads discussion on **Task Analysis** • Instructor summary of Task analysis • Group work: Begin drafting Task Analysis	• Complete draft Task Analysis and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD
Week 6 **Feb. 24**	• **Peer Review #3** – present draft Task Analysis • Group work: Revise Task Analysis • Preparation for Practitioner Profile summaries and presentations	• Upload **Practitioner Profile** assignment to instructor by 11:59 PM on Sunday, **March 1**

DATE	CLASS AGENDA	ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT CLASS
Week 7 **Mar. 3**	• **Practitioner Profile presentations** • Instructor presentation: *Writing Instructional Objectives*	• Read chapter 5 in Morrison text • Review Gagné's Conditions of Learning • Review Techniques & Methods for Writing Objectives/Performance Outcomes • Panel #3: Prepare handout for panel discussion and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD AND ASSIGNMENTS link
Week 8 **Mar. 10**	**Spring Break, No Classes**	
Week 9 **Mar. 17**	• **Panel #3** leads discussion on **Instructional Objectives** • Instructor summary of Instructional Objectives • Group work: Begin drafting Instructional Objectives	• Complete draft Learning Outcomes and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD
Week 10 **Mar. 24**	• **Peer Review #4** – present draft **Instructional Objectives** • Group work: Revise Instructional Objectives • Instructor presentation: *Instructional Approach-Sequencing, Strategies, Messages*	• Read chapters 6-8 in Morrison text • Read the article *Curriculum Approaches in Language Teaching* • Panel #4: Prepare handout for panel discussion and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD AND ASSIGNMENTS link
Week 11 **Mar. 31**	• **Panel #4** leads discussion on **Instructional Approach** • Instructor summary of Instructional Approach • Group work: Begin drafting Instructional Approach	• Complete draft Instructional Approach and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD • Read chapters 9 and 10 in Morrison text
Week 12 **Apr. 7**	• **Peer Review #5** – present draft **Instructional Approach** • Selecting media: Cruising the Directory of Learning & Performance Tools • Instructor presentation: *Introduction to Evaluation*	• Revise Instructional Approach • Read chapters 11-13 in Morrison text • Read the Kirkpatrick Model of Evaluation • Panel #5: Prepare handout for panel discussion and upload to the designated forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD AND ASSIGNMENTS link

DATE	CLASS AGENDA	ASSIGNMENTS FOR NEXT CLASS
Week 13 **Apr. 14**	• **Panel #5** leads discussion on **Evaluation** • Instructor summary of Evaluation • Group work: Begin drafting Formative and Summative Evaluation	• Work on consolidated IDD & presentation
Week 14 **Apr. 21**	• Preparation/scheduling of final project presentations • Mason Course Evaluation Surveys	• Finalize presentations and upload to the ASSIGNMENTS link by 11:59 PM on **Sunday, April 26**
Week 15 **Apr. 28**	• **Final Project Presentations: I**	
Week 16 **May 5**	• **Final Project Presentations: II** • Course wrap-up	• Upload final IDD by 11:59 PM on **Sunday, May 10**

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 six elements of the assignment is missing, remainder covered superficially *Point values: 0.00-3.79*	All six elements of the assignment are present, but only some covered in a substantive way *Point values: 3.80-4.94*	All six elements of the assignment are present and covered in a substantive way *Point values: 4.95-5.00*
Clarity:	Major points not clearly stated, little or no specific details, examples, or analysis *Point values: 0.00-2.49*	Major points are stated clearly, some supported with specific details, examples or analyses *Point values: 2.50-2.94*	Major points are stated clearly, supported by specific details, examples or analysis *Point values: 2.95-3.00*
Organization:	Paper is unstructured and hard to follow *Point values: 0.00-0.79*	Structure of the paper is generally clear, little or no use of headings and sub-headings *Point values: 0.80-0.94*	Structure of the paper is clear and easy to follow, with use of accurate headings and sub-headings *Point values: 0.95-1.00*
Language:	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are not followed, multiple language errors *Point values: 0.0-0.79*	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are generally followed throughout the paper, one or two minor language errors *Point values: 0.80-0.94*	Rules of grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are followed consistently throughout the paper, no language errors *Point values: 0.95-1.00*

B. Panel Discussion of Course Readings Grading Rubric (Total Possible Points: 15)

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Preparation:	Most aspects of the presentation were not well prepared and presenters demonstrated little or no grasp of topic *Point values: 0.00-3.19*	Most aspects of the presentation were well prepared and presenters demonstrated some grasp of topic *Point values: 3.20-.94*	All aspects of the presentation were well prepared and presenters demonstrated a complete grasp of topic *Point values: 3.95-4.00*
Content Coverage/ Ideas:	Few aspects of the topic were covered and most were not placed in the FSI context *Point values: 0.00-2.49*	Most aspects of the topic were covered and most were placed in the FSI context *Point values: 2.50-2.94*	All aspects of the topic were covered effectively and all were placed in the FSI context *Point values: 2.95-3.00*
Team Coordination:	Major errors/issues in working as a team *Point values: 0.00-2.49*	Some minor errors in coordination and/or collaboration *Point values: 2.50-2.94*	Team was well coordinated and all members collaborated and cooperated *Point values: 2.95-3.00*
Facilitation:	No supplementary comment or probing questions/hypotheses to stimulate class discussion *Point values: 0.00-2.49*	Presenters occasionally supplemented comments with additional probing questions or hypotheses to stimulate class discussion *Point values: 2.50-2.94*	Presenters often supplemented comments with additional probing questions or hypothesis to stimulate class discussion *Point values: 2.95-3.00*
Handout:	Handout did not support the discussion, few aspects were covered *Point values: 0.00-1.59*	Handout generally supported the discussion and most aspects were covered *Point values: 1.60-1.94*	Handout consistently supported the discussion and all aspects were covered completely *Point values: 1.95-2.00*

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

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Instructional Design Document (IDD) [40 points]			
Executive Summary:	Summary misses most IDD components or is unclear; exceeds word limit *Point values: 0.00-1.59*	Provides a summary of most components of the IDD; exceeds word limit *Point values: 1.60-1.94*	Provides a clear summary of all IDD components in 300 words or less *Point values: 1.95-2.00*
Problem definition:	Instructional design problem is not clearly stated *Point values: 0.00-2.39*	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly, but with little or no supporting data *Point values: 3.40-3.94*	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly and supported with a variety of data sources *Point value: 3.95-4.00*
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: 0.00-3.94*	Adequate description of learner characteristics and how the context relates to the problem, some use of supporting data *Point values: 4.00-4.94*	Comprehensive, data-driven description of learner characteristics and how the context or environment relates to the problem *Point value: 4.95-5.00*
Task Analysis:	Method and content reflects neither SME input nor other data sources *Point values: 0.0-3.99*	Method and content reflects some SME input, little or no other data sources *Point values: 4.00-4.94*	Method and content clearly reflects use of substantive SME input as well as other data sources *Point value: 4.95-5.00*
Learning Outcomes:	Few or none of the learning outcomes are measurable nor supported by the instructional need & task analysis data *Point values: 0.00-3.99*	Most learning outcomes are measurable and most supported by the instructional need & task analysis data *Point values: 4.00-4.94*	All learning outcomes are measurable and all supported by the instructional need & task analysis data *Point value: 4.95-5.00*
Instructional Approach:	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages do not flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, major disconnects *Point values: 0.00-3.99*	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages generally flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, with only minor disconnects *Point values: 4.00-4.94*	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages all flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses *Point value: 4.95-5.00*

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Instructional Materials:	Choice of instructional materials does not reflect instructional approach *Point values: 0.00-2.99*	Choice of instructional materials somewhat reflects selected instructional approach *Point values: 3.00-3.94*	Choice of instructional materials clearly reflects selected instructional approach *Point value: 3.95-4.00*
Formative & Summative Evaluation:	Instructional design document does not contain a formative and/or summative evaluation plan, no supporting data sources *Point values: 0.00-3.99*	Instructional design document contains a limited formative and summative evaluation with little or no supporting data sources *Point values: 4.00-4.94*	Instructional design document contains both a comprehensive formative & summative evaluation plan, supported by a variety of data sources *Point value: 4.95-5.00*
Organization:	Instructional design document is unstructured and hard to follow *Point values: 0.00-2.39*	Structure of the instructional design document is generally clear, little or no use of headings and sub-headings *Point values: 2.40-2.94*	Structure of the instructional design document is clear and easy to follow, with use of accurate headings and sub-headings *Point value: 2.95-3.00*
Language:	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are not followed, multiple language errors throughout the instructional design document *Point values: 0.00-2.39*	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are generally followed throughout the instructional design document, one or two minor language errors *Point values: 2.40-2.94*	Rules of grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are followed consistently throughout the instructional design document, no language errors *Point value: 2.95-3.00*
In-Class Presentation [10 points]			
Project rationale:	Presenters do not offer reasons for selecting the team's topic *Point values: 0.00-0.79*	Presenters offer good but not particularly compelling reasons for selecting the team's topic *Point values: 0.80-0.94*	Presenters offer compelling reasons for selecting the team's topic *Point value: 0.95-1.00*
Process:	Presenters do not articulate any of the steps of the process used to develop their solution *Point values: 0.00-1.59*	Presenters articulate some of the steps of the process used to develop their solution *Point values: 1.60-1.94*	Presenters clearly articulate all steps of the process used to develop their solution *Point value: 1.95-2.00*

Solution rationale:	Presenters do not convey the essence of the design idea that demonstrates that their solution is the best choice *Point values: 0.00-1.59*	Presenters partially convey the essence of the design idea that demonstrates that their solution is the best choice *Point values: 1.60-1.94*	Presenters clearly convey the essence of the design idea that demonstrates that their solution is the best choice *Point value: 1.95-2.00*
Benefits:	Presenters do not describe the benefits of their solution to stakeholder groups *Point values: 0.00-1.59*	Presenters describe the benefits of their solution to one or two stakeholder groups *Point values: 1.60-1.94*	Presenters clearly describe the benefits of their solution to all three stakeholder groups (target learners, FSI the organization, presenters as learning professionals) *Point value: 1.95-2.00*
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: 0.00-0.79*	Presentation generally adhered to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site *Point values: 0.80-0.94*	Presentation adhered consistently to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site *Point value: 0.95-1.00*