

**GEORGE MASON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Instructional Design and Technology (IDT)**

EDIT 705 6T1: Instructional Design
3 Credits, Spring 2016
Management Concepts e-Learning Cohort
Mondays, 4:30-7:10 PM, Tysons Corner

PROFESSOR:

Name: Dr. Shahron Williams van Rooij
Office hours: By Appointment Only
Office location: Thompson Hall, L044, Fairfax Campus
Office phone: 703-993-9704
Email address: swilliae@gmu.edu (Email response time: 24 hours)

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

A. Prerequisites/Corequisites

None

B. 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.

C. Expanded Course Description

A Management Concepts priority is to enhance the ability of its learning professionals to design and develop a variety of learning and non-learning opportunities for external and internal clients. This course will help those professionals acquire and apply a broader and deeper set of instructional design skills to meet the needs of their various audiences.

LEARNER OUTCOMES:

At the end 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 analysis
- 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, Captivate, Articulate)

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS (International Board of Standards for Training, Performance and Instruction ([IBSTPI](#))):

- Professional Foundations
 1. Communicate effectively in written and oral form
 2. Apply current research and theory to the discipline of instructional design
 3. Update & improve knowledge, skills & attitudes pertaining to the instructional design process & related fields
 4. Apply data collection & analysis skills to instructional design projects
 5. Identify ethical, legal & political implications of design in the workplace
- Planning and Analysis
 7. Identify & describe target population & environmental characteristics
 8. Select & use analysis techniques for determining instructional content
 9. Analyze the characteristics of existing & emerging technologies & their potential use
- Design and Development
 12. Design instructional interventions
 14. Select or modify existing instructional materials
 16. Design learning assessments

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 EXAMINATIONS:

1. **Practitioner Profile (Individual Assignment): 10 points**
 The purpose of the profile is to compare and contrast the various backgrounds and experiences of practicing instructional designers **outside** of Management Concepts. The profiles also identify some of the other tasks, activities and skill sets those learning professionals use beyond those associated with designing formal instruction.
 - a. Identify **one** individual who currently serves as an instructional designer in an organization other than Management Concepts. **Note:** The person does not have to have the title of Instructional/Training Designer but must have instructional design responsibilities.

- 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 ID project (and reasons why)
 - iii. Least successful ID project (and reasons why)
 - iv. Professional advice/lessons learned that he/she would like to share with others
 - v. 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 Bb course site
- d. In addition, prepare a brief slide presentation (**5 slides maximum**) of your Practitioner Profile to share in class (5-10 minutes)
- e. For more information on how this assignment is evaluated, please consult the *Practitioner Profile Grading Rubric* posted on our course site.
- f. **Note:** Late submissions will be penalized by 10%.

2. **Instructional Design Case Study Panel Discussions (Group Assignment): 20 points**

- a. There are five (5) cases from the Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski text that we will discuss in this class, with each case drawn from various business settings and addressing various instructional design issues:
 - Case Study #19: *Abby Carlin: Documenting Processes in a Manufacturing Setting*
 - Case Study #22: *Craig Gregersen: Balancing a Range of Stakeholder Interests when Designing Instruction*
 - Case Study #27: *Diane King: Rapid Design Approach to Designing Instruction*
 - Case Study #29: *Andrew Steward: Managing Consulting Activities in an Evaluation Context*
 - Case Study #30: *Jack Waterkamp: Managing Scope Change in an Instructional Design Project*
- b. Each case study discussion will be led by a panel of **4-5 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 panel will present a summary (**30 minutes maximum**) of their chosen case in class.
- d. Panelists will also provide a **one-page handout** for the class that describes the key takeaways from their case summary. To assist course members who are participating remotely as well as those who would like to prepare their own thoughts in advance of the class discussion, panelists will upload the handout and any other visual aids they plan to use for the discussion to the **DISCUSSION BOARD** link in the left-hand navigation menu of our Bb course site on the date indicated in the **COURSE SCHEDULE**.
- e. During class, the panelists will pose questions or employ other facilitation techniques (e.g., offer hypotheses, critiques) to stimulate class discussion. Panelists should emphasize the **relevance** of the case study and associated materials to their work situation at Management Concepts.

- f. After class, course members may pose additional questions to the panel by posting those questions to the relevant forum on our Blackboard **DISCUSSION BOARD**.
 - g. For detailed instructions about preparing for the case study discussions, please review the *Panel Discussion Preparation Guidelines* document under the **RESOURCES** link of our course site.
 - h. 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 Friday of the week **before** they are scheduled to lead the case study discussion.
 - i. For more information on how case study discussion quality is evaluated, please consult the *Case Study Panel Discussions Grading Rubric* posted to the Bb course site.
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 will develop an instructional design document (IDD) which will detail your approach to the development of a 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, such as an instructional problem at a current client site, I would suggest you speak with your fellow course members 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.
 - c. The IDD will present the design concept and related materials in a professionally-polished document. 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
 - d. The length of your document will depend on which your choice of instructional design model (s) (e.g., rapid prototyping, agile, classic ADDIE).
 - ***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, performance support tool)
 - 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 based on the content of your IDD

- Have one representative of your team upload **two (2) copies** of your IDD and Prototype Presentation (or Prototype URL if you have created a multimedia prototype):
 - a. One (1) copy to the **ASSIGNMENTS** link for instructor grading. Make sure to upload all of your documents **before** you click SUBMIT.
 - b. One (1) copy to the **ASSESSMENTS** link for archiving in GMUs TK20 system, which retains evidence of student performance-based products in compliance with university accrediting bodies.
 - Examples of IDDs and prototype presentations from previous EDIT 705 students employed in either the corporate or government sectors 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.**
- d. **Online Peer Reviews of IDD Components (20 points)**
- a. There will be a total of five (5) peer reviews conducted via the Blackboard **DISCUSSION BOARD** throughout the semester. Each peer review corresponds to one of the components of the IDD and each reflects 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, 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. **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 $\geq .5$ 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%

TK20 PERFORMANCE-BASED ASSESSMENT SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT

Every student registered for any Instructional Design and Technology (IDT) course with a required performance-based assessment is required to submit this assessment to Tk20 through Blackboard (regardless of whether the student is taking the course as an elective, a onetime course or as part of an undergraduate minor). For EDIT 705, the assessment is the Instructional Design Document and Prototype Presentation. Evaluation of the performance-based assessment by the course instructor will also be completed in Tk20 through Blackboard. Failure to submit the assessment to Tk20 (through 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 Tk20 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 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 George Mason University Disability Services and inform their instructor, in writing, as soon as possible. Approved accommodations will begin at the time the written letter from Disability Services is received by the instructor (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	TOPIC/IN-CLASS LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS & ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK
<p>Week 1 Jan. 25</p>	<p>TOPIC: COURSE KICK-OFF AND GETTING ACQUAINTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introductions • Syllabus review and scavenger hunt • Blackboard course site orientation • Instructor presentation: <i>Instructional Design – An Ever-evolving Profession</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start thinking about IDD project topics and teams • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 1 in Morrison, Ross, Kalman & Kemp ○ Part I, pp. 2-11 in Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski • Sign up for your case study panel topic by 11:59 PM on Jan. 31
<p>Week 2 Feb. 1</p>	<p>TOPIC: THE INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN PROFESSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor-led discussion of assigned readings • Forming teams and sharing potential project topics • Exploring the <i>Project Documents</i> sub-folder under the RESOURCES link • Viewing previous EDIT 705 projects in the <i>Exemplary Projects</i> sub-folder under the RESOURCES link • Instructor presentation: <i>To Instruct or Not to Instruct</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 2 in Morrison, Ross, Kalman & Kemp ○ Case Study #19 in Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski • Leaders of the Case Study #19 panel discussion to upload their handout to the Case Study #19 forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD by 11:59 PM on Feb. 7 • Draft Instructional Problem Definition and upload to the Peer Review #1 forum on the Bb DISCUSSION BOARD by 11:59 PM on Feb. 7
<p>Week 3 Feb. 8</p>	<p>TOPIC: INSTRUCTIONAL PROBLEM DEFINITION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study #19 panelists lead in-class discussion • Peer Review process, discussion • Instructor presentation: <i>Learner & Contextual Analysis</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remaining Peer Review #1 comments throughout the week • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 3 in Morrison et al ○ Case Study #22 in Ertmer, Quinn & Glazewski • Leaders of the Case Study #22 panel discussion to upload their handout to the designated forum on the DISCUSSION BOARD by 11:59 PM on Feb. 14

DATE	TOPIC/IN-CLASS LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS & ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK
Week 4 Feb. 15	TOPIC: LEARNER & CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case Study #22 panelists lead in-class discussion • Q & A on assigned readings • Instructor presentation: <i>Overview of Task Analysis</i> • Group work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revise Instructional Problem Definition based on peer review (and instructor) feedback ○ Begin drafting Learner & Contextual Analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 forum by 11:59 PM on Feb. 21
Week 5 Feb. 22	TOPIC: TASK ANALYSIS – INTRODUCTION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor-led discussion of assigned readings • Review of selected Task Analysis resources on the Web <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Perform a Task Analysis ○ The Job Task Analysis (JTA) Process ○ Job Analysis (SHRM) ○ Job & Task Inventory • Group work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Begin drafting Task Analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online Peer Review #2 comments throughout the week • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Case Study #27 in Ertmer et al • Have one representative of your team post your draft Task Analysis to the Peer Review #3 forum by 11:59 PM on Feb. 28 • Leaders of the Case Study #27 panel discussion upload their handout to the designated forum on the DISCUSSION BOARD by 11:59 PM on Feb. 28

DATE	TOPIC/IN-CLASS LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS & ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK
Week 6 Feb. 29	<p>TOPIC: TASK ANALYSIS – METHODS, CHOICES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case study #27 panelists lead in-class discussion • Q & A on topics to date • Group work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revise Learner & Contextual Analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online Peer Review #3 comments throughout the week • Upload the Practitioner Profile (document only, not the slides) to the ASSIGNMENTS link by 11:59 PM on March 6
Spring Break, March 7 – 13, No Classes		
Week 7 March 14	<p>TOPIC: KNOWLEDGE-SHARING WEEK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practitioner Profile presentations • Knowledge-sharing wrap-up • Instructor presentation: <i>Writing Instructional Objectives</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 5 in Morrison et al
Week 8 March 21	<p>TOPIC: INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor-led discussion of assigned readings • Review of selected Instructional Objectives resources on the Web <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Techniques & Methods for Writing Objectives & Performance Outcomes ○ Writing Objectives Using Bloom’s Taxonomy ○ Writing SMART Objectives • Instructor presentation: <i>Instructional Approach: Sequencing, Strategies, and Messages</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have one representative of your team upload your draft Instructional Objectives for instructor feedback only (no peer review) to the private team space File Exchange in Bb by 11:59 PM on March 27 • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapters 6-9 in Morrison et al

DATE	TOPIC/IN-CLASS LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS & ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK
<p>Week 9 March 28</p>	<p>TOPIC: INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH: MESSAGE AND MEDIUM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor-led discussion of assigned readings • Resources on the Web linking Instructional Approach to Adult Learning Theory <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gagné's Conditions of Learning ○ Roger's Experiential Learning ○ Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory ○ Lave's Situated Learning • Instructor presentation: <i>Introduction to Evaluation</i> • Group work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Begin drafting Instructional Approach, Limitations/Constraints, & Materials sections of your IDD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have one representative of your team upload your draft Instructional Approach, Limitations/Constraints, and Materials section to the Peer Review #4 forum by 11:59 PM on April 3 • Complete the assigned readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapters 11-13 in Morrison et al. ○ Case Study #29 in Ertmer et al. ○ Review the Kirkpatrick Methodology • Leaders of the Case Study #29 panel discussion upload their handout to the designated forum on the DISCUSSION BOARD by 11:59 PM on April 3
<p>Week 10 April 4</p>	<p>TOPIC: EVALUATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case study #29 panelists lead in-class discussion • Q & A on topics to date • Group work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revise your IDD based on Peer Review #3 (and instructor) feedback ○ Begin drafting your Formative & Summative Evaluation plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online Peer Review #4 comments throughout the week • View the video Rapid Prototyping in Instructional Design • Complete the assigned readings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Flowcharts, Storyboards and Rapid Prototyping ○ Storyboarding • Have one representative of your team post your draft Formative & Summative Evaluation plan to the Peer Review #5 forum by 11:59 PM on April 10

DATE	TOPIC/IN-CLASS LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS & ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK
Week 11 April 11 Online Class	TOPIC: PROTOTYPING IN INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online Peer Review #5 comments throughout the week • Group work (online or f2f): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revise your IDD based on Peer Review #4 (and instructor) feedback ○ Start building your Prototype Presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the assigned readings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chapter 16 in Morrison et al ○ Case Study #30 in Ertmer et al. • Leaders of the Case Study #30 panel discussion upload their handout to the designated forum on the DISCUSSION BOARD by 11:59 PM on April 17
Week 12 April 18	TOPIC: INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN PROJECT MANAGEMENT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case study #30 panelists lead in-class discussion • Q & A on topics to date • Group work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Revise your IDD based on Peer Review #5 (and instructor) feedback ○ Continue working on your Prototype Presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upload your draft Prototype Presentation for instructor feedback only (no peer review) to the private team space <i>File Exchange</i> in Bb by 11:59 PM on April 24
Week 13 April 25	TOPIC: CONSOLIDATING IDD & PROTOTYPE PRESENTATION <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduling the Prototype Presentations • Review of the Instructional Design Document & Prototyping Grading Rubric • Group work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Begin finalizing your IDD & Prototype Presentation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have one representative of your team upload one copy each of the Instructional Design Document & Prototype Presentation by 11:59 PM on May 1 to each of the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ One copy to the ASSIGNMENTS link ○ One copy to the ASSESSMENTS link

DATE	TOPIC/IN-CLASS LEARNING EXPERIENCES	READINGS & ASSIGNMENTS FOR THE FOLLOWING WEEK
Week 14 May 2	FINAL PRESENTATIONS – PART I	
Week 15 May 9	FINAL PRESENTATIONS – PART II	

ASSESSMENT RUBRIC(S):

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

IBSTPI Competency	Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Professional Foundations:1: Communicate effectively in written & oral form	Problem definition:	Instructional design problem is not stated clearly <i>Points: 0.00-2.39</i>	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly, but with little or no supporting data <i>Points: 2.40-2.94</i>	Instructional design problem is articulated clearly and supported with a variety of data sources <i>Points: 2.95-3.00</i>
Planning & Analysis: 7: Identify & describe target population & environmental characteristics	Learner & Context Analysis:	Little or no description of learner characteristics and how the context relates to the problem, little or no supporting data <i>Points: 0.00-3.99</i>	Adequate description of learner characteristics and how the context relates to the problem, some use of supporting data <i>Points: 4.00-4.94</i>	Comprehensive, data-driven description of learner characteristics and how the context or environment relates to the problem <i>Points: 4.95-5.00</i>
Planning & Analysis: 8: Select & use analysis techniques for determining instructional content	Task Analysis:	Method and content reflects neither SME input nor other data sources <i>Points: 0.00-3.99</i>	Method and content reflects some SME input, little or no other data sources <i>Points: 4.00-4.94</i>	Method and content clearly reflects use of substantive SME input as well as other data sources <i>Points: 4.95-5.00</i>
Professional Foundations: 4: Apply data collection & analysis skills to instructional design projects	Instructional Objectives:	Few or none of the instructional objectives are measurable nor supported by the instructional need & task analysis data <i>Points: 0.00-3.99</i>	Most instructional objectives are measurable and most supported by the instructional need & task analysis data <i>Points: 4.00-4.94</i>	All instructional objectives are measurable and all supported by the instructional need & task analysis data <i>Points: 4.95-5.00</i>

IBSTPI Competency	Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Design & Development: 12: Design instructional interventions	Instructional Approach:	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages do not flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, major disconnects <i>Points: 0.00-3.99</i>	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages generally flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses, with only minor disconnects <i>Points: 4.00-4.94</i>	Instructional sequencing, strategies & messages all flow logically from the instructional need, learner, context & task analyses <i>Points: 4.95-5.00</i>
Professional Foundations: 5: Identify ethical, legal & political implications of design in the workplace	Limitations, Constraints:	Instructional design document does not articulate any pre-project limitations or constraints <i>Points: 0.00-0.79</i>	Instructional design document articulates some pre-project limitations or constraints <i>Points: 0.80-0.94</i>	Instructional design document clearly articulates all pre-project limitations and constraints <i>Points: 0.95-1.00</i>
Design & Development: 14: Select or modify existing instructional materials	Instructional Materials:	Choice of instructional materials does not reflect instructional strategies, limitations/ constraints <i>Points: 0.00-3.99</i>	Choice of instructional materials somewhat reflects selected instructional strategies, limitations/ constraints <i>Points: 4.00-4.94</i>	Choice of instructional materials clearly reflects selected instructional strategies, as well as limitations/ constraints <i>Points: 4.95-5.00</i>
Design & Development: 16: Design learning assessment	Formative & Summative Evaluation:	Instructional design document does not contain a formative and/or summative evaluation plan, no supporting data sources <i>Points: 0.00-3.99</i>	Instructional design document contains a limited formative and summative evaluation with little or no supporting data sources <i>Points: 4.00-4.94</i>	Instructional design document contains both a comprehensive formative & summative evaluation plan, supported by a variety of data sources <i>Points: 4.95-5.00</i>

IBSTPI Competency	Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Professional Foundations: 1: Communicate effectively in written & oral form	Organization:	Instructional design document is unstructured and hard to follow <i>Points: 0.00-2.39</i>	Structure of the instructional design document is generally clear, little or no use of headings and sub-headings <i>Points: 2.40-2.94</i>	Structure of the instructional design document is clear and easy to follow, with use of accurate headings and sub-headings <i>Points: 2.95-3.00</i>
Professional Foundations: 1: Communicate effectively in written & oral form	Language:	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are not followed, multiple language errors throughout the instructional design document <i>Points: 0.00-2.39</i>	Rules of English grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are generally followed throughout the instructional design document, one or two minor language errors <i>Points: 2.40-2.94</i>	Rules of grammar, usage, spelling and punctuation are followed consistently throughout the instructional design document, no language errors <i>Points: 2.95-3.00</i>
Professional Foundations: 2: Apply current research and theory to the discipline of instructional design	Alignment of Prototype with IDD:	Prototype does not demonstrate the instructional strategies & approach outlined in the instructional design document <i>Points: 0.00-1.59</i>	Prototype demonstrates some of the instructional strategies & approach outlined in the instructional design document <i>Points: 1.60-1.94</i>	Prototype clearly demonstrates the instructional strategies & approach outlined in the instructional design document <i>Points: 1.95-2.00</i>

IBSTPI Competency	Criteria	Does Not Meet Standards	Meets Standards	Exceeds Standards
Planning & Analysis: 9: Analyze the characteristics of existing & emerging technologies & their potential use	Prototype media selection:	Selected media are neither innovative nor appropriate for chosen strategies <i>Points: 0.00-1.59</i>	Selected media are not particularly innovative, yet appropriate for chosen strategies <i>Points: 1.60-1.94</i>	Selected media are innovative and appropriate for chosen strategies <i>Points: 1.95-2.00</i>
Design & Development: 16: Design learning assessment	Sample assessment items:	Sample assessment items do not measure learning objectives <i>Points: 0.00-1.59</i>	Sample assessment items measure some learning objectives <i>Points: 1.60-1.94</i>	Sample assessment items clearly measure all learning objectives <i>Points: 1.95-2.00</i>
Professional Foundations: 1: Communicate effectively in written & oral form	Team member contributions:	Individual team members did not adhere to shared roles/responsibilities documented in Bb private team areas <i>Points: 0.00-1.59</i>	Individual team members generally adhered to shared roles/responsibilities documented in Bb private team areas <i>Points: 1.60-1.94</i>	Individual team members consistently adhered to shared roles/responsibilities documented in Bb private team areas <i>Points: 1.95-2.00</i>
Professional Foundations: 3: Update & improve knowledge, skills & attitudes pertaining to the instructional design process & related fields	PowerPoint© best practices:	Presentation did not adhere to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site <i>Points: 0.00-1.59</i>	Presentation generally adhered to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site <i>Points: 1.60-1.94</i>	Presentation adhered consistently to PowerPoint© best practices documented in the Resources area of the Bb course site <i>Points: 1.95-2.00</i>