

SYLLABUS

GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
Division of Learning Technologies
Instructional Design and Technology Program (IDT)
EDIT 705 – 001
Instructional Design (3 Credits)
Fall 2015
Monday, 4:30-7:10 PM, Thompson Hall L003

PROFESSOR:

Name: Dr. Kevin Clark
Office hours: By appointment
Office location: Thompson Hall, Room L045
Office phone: (703) 993-3669
Email address: kclark6@gmu.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

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

LEARNER OUTCOMES:

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

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

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

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS:

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

- a. Professional foundations
 - i. Communicate effectively in visual, oral and written form
- b. Planning and analysis
 - i. Conduct a needs assessment
 - ii. Design a curriculum or program
 - iii. Select and use a variety of techniques for determining instructional content
 - iv. Identify and describe target population characteristics
 - v. Analyze the characteristics of the environment
 - vi. Analyze the characteristics of existing and emerging technologies and their use in an instructional environment
 - vii. Reflect upon the elements of a situation before finalizing design solutions and strategies
- c. Design and development
 - i. Select and use a variety of techniques to define and sequence the instructional content and strategies
 - ii. Select or modify existing instructional materials
 - iii. Develop instructional materials
 - iv. Design instruction that reflects an understanding of the diversity of learners and groups of learners
 - v. Evaluate and assess instruction and its impact
- d. Implementation and management
 - i. Provide for the effective implementation of instructional products and programs

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

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

REQUIRED TEXT:

Morrison, G.R., Ross, S.M., Kalman, H.K., & Kemp, J.E. (2012). *Designing effective instruction* (7th edition). Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons

COURSE RESOURCES

<http://infoguides.gmu.edu/edutech>

COURSE ASSIGNMENTS AND REQUIRED DELIVERABLES

ASSIGNMENTS

There are three (3) assignments required for successful completion of this course.

1. Practitioner Profile (25 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.
- b. **Interview** that individual – phone, electronic survey, or face-to-face – and collect the following information:
 - i. Educational background, ID experience and current responsibilities
 - ii. Most successful **and** least successful ID project (and **reasons why**)
 - iii. Professional advice/lessons learned that he/she would like to share with others
 - iv. Highlight a professional organization and conference (samples below)
 1. Association for Educational, Communications, and Technology ([AECT](#))
 2. International Society for Performance Improvement ([ISPI](#))
 3. American Society for Training and Development ([ASTD](#))
 4. International Society for Technology in Education ([ISTE](#))
 5. Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education ([AACE](#))
 6. American Educational Research Association ([AERA](#))
 7. Society for Applied Learning Technology ([SALT](#))
 8. Consortium on School Networking ([CoSN](#))
- c. Prepare a **short summary** (2-3 pages single-space) of the interview using **either** APA-style formatting **or** standard Business English formatting. For more information on how this assignment is evaluated, please consult the *Practitioner Profile Grading Rubric* at the end of this syllabus and also posted on our Blackboard course site.
- d. Prepare a brief slide presentation (5 slides maximum) of your practitioner profile to share in class (5-10 min.)

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

- *Instructional Design Document (40 points)*

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

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

- *Prototype Presentation (10 points)*

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

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

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

3. Peer Reviews of IDD Components (25 points)

There will be a total of five (5) peer reviews, each corresponding to one of the first five components of the IDD and each reflecting the iterative nature of the instructional design process. Each student will be asked to provide constructive evaluative feedback to other teams as you work on the IDD. Your feedback will be based on the criteria set down in the *Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation Grading Rubric*. One of the five peer reviews will be in-class, so that everyone can familiarize themselves with the peer review process. Please consult the *Peer Review Grading Rubric* at the end of this Syllabus and on the Bb course site to see how your reviews are evaluated.

Total Possible Points for all Deliverables: 100

GRADING POLICIES

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

A = 94-100; A - = 90-93; B+ = 86-89; B = 83-85; B- = 80-82; C = 70-79; F = 69 and below

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

Student performance is based on the requirements documented in the grading rubrics for each assignment. In the event that, following discussions with the instructor, a student feels that his/her

grade is unfair, the grade may be appealed using the university's appeal process described at <http://www.gmu.edu/catalog/apolicies/index.html#Anchor56>.

BLACKBOARD REQUIREMENTS

Every student registered for any Instructional Design and Technology course with a required performance-based assessment is required to submit this assessment, ISD Project to Blackboard (regardless of whether a course is an elective, a onetime course or part of an undergraduate minor). Evaluation of the performance-based assessment by the course instructor will also be completed in Blackboard. Failure to submit the assessment to Blackboard will result in the course instructor reporting the course grade as Incomplete (IN). Unless the IN grade is changed upon completion of the required Blackboard submission, the IN will convert to an F nine weeks into the following semester.

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/>].
- e. Students with disabilities who seek accommodations in a course must be registered with the George Mason University Office of Disability Services (ODS) and inform their instructor, in writing, at the beginning of the semester [see <http://ods.gmu.edu/>].
- f. Students must follow the university policy stating that all sound-emitting devices shall be turned off during class unless otherwise authorized by the instructor.
- g. The George Mason University Writing Center staff provides a variety of resources and services (e.g., tutoring, workshops, writing guides, handbooks) intended to support students as they work to construct and share knowledge through writing [see <http://writingcenter.gmu.edu/>].

PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITIONS

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

CORE VALUES COMMITMENT

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

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

COURSE SCHEDULE:

DATE	TOPIC/LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS AND ASSIGNMENTS
Week 1 Aug. 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions, review syllabus, IDT panel ideas • History of Instructional Design http://faculty.coe.uh.edu/smcneil/cuin6373/idhistory/index.html http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Instructional_design • Introduction to Blackboard (Bb) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start thinking about project topics and teams • Read Morrison Ch. 1-2 • Read 5 Stages of Team Development
Sept. 7	LABOR DAY – NO CLASSES	
Week 2 Sept. 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor presentation (Team Development) • Form teams and share potential project topics 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read Morrison et al, Ch. 3-4
Week 3 Sept. 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present (then post) team problem statement • Group work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read Morrison Ch. 14 & 16 • Post Peer Review #1 by 9/23
Week 4 Sept. 28 (v)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor presentation • Group work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read Morrison et al, Ch. 5 • Read Techniques & Methods for Writing Objectives/Performance Outcomes
Week 5 Oct. 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present (then post) Learner, Context, & Task Analysis • Instructor presentation • Group work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post Peer Review #2 by 10/7 • Read Morrison et al, Ch. 6 • Read Gagne’s Nine Events of Instruction •
Week 6 Oct. 12 is Columbus Day, so we meet on Tuesday Oct. 13 (v)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upload Instructional Objectives by Oct. 19
Week 7 Oct. 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDT Panel Discussion (5:00 – 7:00pm, 1201 Merten Hall) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Task Analysis • Morrison et al. Ch. 7-8

Week 8 Oct. 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present Instructional Objectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review #3 by 10/28 • Read Morrison et al., Ch. 9 & 10
Week 9 Nov. 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Begin Instructional Approach • Practitioner Profile Presentations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on Instructional Approach
Week 10 Nov. 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor presentation • Present (then post) Instructional Approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review #4 by 11/11 • Read Morrison et al Ch. 11-13 • Read Kirkpatrick Model of Evaluation
Week 11 Nov. 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor presentation • Formative and Summative Evaluation examples • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Read Morrison et al, Ch. 15 • Draft Formative & Summative Evaluation plan
Week 12 Nov. 23 (v)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor presentation • Post Evaluation Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review #5 by 11/30
Week 13 Nov. 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group project status • Review team prototypes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work on IDD & Prototype presentation
Week 14 Dec. 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise prototypes and design document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise materials if needed
Week 15 Dec. 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group Presentations • All IDD & Prototypes DUE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •

ASSESSMENT RUBRICS:

A. Practitioner Profile Grading Rubric (25 points)

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards (-20%)	Meets Standards (-10%)	Exceeds Standards (-0%)
Completeness (10 pts):	One or more of the three key elements of the assignment is missing, remainder covered superficially	All three key elements of the assignment are present, but only some covered in a substantive way	All three key elements of the assignment are present and covered in a substantive way
Clarity (5 pts):	Major points not clearly stated, little or no specific details, examples, or analysis	Major points are stated clearly, some supported with specific details, examples or analyses	Major points are stated clearly, supported by specific details, examples or analysis
Organization (5 pts):	Paper is unstructured and hard to follow	Structure of the paper is generally clear, little or no use of headings and sub-headings	Structure of the paper is clear and easy to follow, with use of accurate headings and sub-headings
Language (5 pts):	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are not followed, multiple language errors	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are generally followed throughout the paper, one or two minor language errors	Rules of grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are followed consistently throughout the paper, no language errors

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

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards (-20%)	Meets Standards (-10%)	Exceeds Standards (-0%)
Problem definition (5 pts.)	Instructional design problem is not clearly stated	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly, but with little or no supporting data	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly and supported with a variety of data sources
Learner & Context Analysis (5 pts.)	Little or no description of learner characteristics and how the context relates to the problem, little or no supporting data	Adequate description of learner characteristics and how the context relates to the problem, some use of supporting data	Comprehensive, data-driven description of learner characteristics and how the context or environment relates to the problem
Task Analysis (5 pts.)	Method and content reflects neither SME input nor other data sources	Method and content reflects some SME input, little or no other data sources	Method and content clearly reflects use of substantive SME input as well as other data sources
Instructional Objectives (5 pts.)	Few or none of the instructional objectives are measurable nor supported by the instructional need & task analysis data	Most instructional objectives are measurable and most supported by the instructional need & task analysis data	All instructional objectives are measurable and all supported by the instructional need & task analysis data
Instructional Approach (10 pts.)	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages do not flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, major disconnects	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages generally flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, with only minor disconnects	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages all flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses
Formative & Summative Evaluation (5 pts.)	Instructional design document does not contain a formative and/or summative evaluation plan, no supporting data sources	Instructional design document contains a limited formative and summative evaluation with little or no supporting data sources	Instructional design document contains both a comprehensive formative & summative evaluation plan, supported by a variety of data sources

Prototype (10 pts.)	Selected media are neither innovative nor appropriate for chosen strategies	Selected media are not particularly innovative, yet appropriate for chosen strategies	Selected media are innovative and appropriate for chosen strategies
Presentation (5 pts.)	Presentation did not adhere to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site	Presentation generally adhered to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site	Presentation adhered consistently to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site

C. Peer Review Grading Rubric (25 points)

Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards (-20%)	Meets Standards (-10%)	Exceeds Standards (-0%)
Peer Review #1 (5 pts.)	Does not provide constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on some of the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on each of the rubric criteria
Peer Review #2 (5 pts.)	Does not provide constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on some of the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on each of the rubric criteria
Peer Review #3 (5 pts.)	Does not provide constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on some of the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on each of the rubric criteria
Peer Review #4 (5 pts.)	Does not provide constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on some of the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on each of the rubric criteria
Peer Review #5 (5 pts.)	Does not provide constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on some of the rubric criteria	Provides constructive comments (strengths, weaknesses, recommendations for improvement) on each of the rubric criteria