ITLS 6350: INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGN PROCESS I

Spring 2018

Instructor
Victor R. Lee, Ph. D.
EDUC 227
Victor.lee@usu.edu
435-797-7562

Teaching Assistant
Abigail Phillips, Ph. D.
EDUC 211
Abigail.phillips@usu.edu
435-797-0072

Overview

ITLS 6350: Instructional Design Process I is a required course for all ITLS Master's degree students and an elective course for other interested graduate students. The course content addresses fundamental instructional design processes, practices, and knowledge that are common in professional instructional design communities. This includes the ADDIE process (Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, & Evaluation), specification of learning objectives, and some varieties of learning solutions. In addition to that, this course will provide some introduction to various instructional design models that have been established previously or are recently emerging (e.g., Backwards Design, Successive Approximation Model).

Students in this course primarily are associated with K-16 instructional design settings or with instructional design in other professional settings (e.g., corporate, government, libraries, museums, non-profits). Practices and approaches associated with both K-16 and professional settings will be covered in this course. Even though some students may expect to pursue more knowledge and experience in one setting, the expectation is that everyone will become knowledgeable in both.

This course includes a number of readings and students are expected to keep up with all reading material and actively participate in the course activities, whether they are discussions, student presentations, or assigned activities. The culmination of the course will be a small group instructional design project that is to be executed over multiple weeks and involves the actual coordination demands involved in real-world instructional design.

It is assumed (but not explicitly required) that students in this course have already taken other foundational courses in the ITLS department such as ITLS 6310: Foundations and ITLS 6540: Learning Theory. It is to the benefit of the student to have prior experience and competence with media creation tools in order to produce prototype design solutions.

Course Objectives

Borrowing from the USU Course Evaluation System, the essential and important objectives of this course include:

1. Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classifications, methods, trends)
   Defining and recognizing fundamental instructional design terminology, such as ADDIE, learning objectives, needs analysis, and various instructional design models

2. Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
   Appreciating the importance of understanding the needs of learners, articulating learning performances, and iteration in instructional design

Connecting core aspects of instructional design to various learning models, such as where needs analysis and evaluation fit into ADDIE, Backwards Design, and SAM

3. Learning to apply course material (to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions)
   State clear learning objectives that inform the design of instruction or a learning activity

   Identify learner or organizational needs and implement strategies for solving instructional design problems

   Producing evidence of learning as needed for stakeholders

4. Developing specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field most closely related to this course
   Recognize the importance of thinking about needs and objectives in instructional design work, consider and reconcile competing demands placed on instructional designers and be able to state the value added of thoughtful instructional design to a team that seeks to improve knowledge or performance of other people.

   Focus on big ideas and enduring understandings when organizing content and conceptualizing learning activities

Course Readings

Required Textbooks

While efforts will be made to provide readings for free, there are two textbooks students are expected to have regular access to throughout the course. These include:

Allen, M. (2012). *Leaving ADDIE for SAM*. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (1998). *Understanding by Design*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

In the syllabus, *Leaving ADDIE for SAM* will be abbreviated as SAM. *Understanding by Design* will be abbreviated as UbD.

Recommended (but not required) text

Considered a foundational book in instructional design, the following is worth owning but is not required for this course (two required chapters will be made available online)

Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2001). *The systematic design of instruction* (3rd ed.): Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, Inc.

Open text

In the interest of keeping costs low and supporting open educational resources, we will also be using the newly published online textbook

West, R. E. (2018). *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology*. Provo, UT.
Available at https://lidtfoundations.pressbooks.com

Course Format

This course is offered both face-to-face and online.

Face-to-face students will meet weekly at the designated time at the Logan campus. They will be expected to complete assigned course readings, as specified in this syllabus, *prior* to arriving to class each week. The class meetings will combine active class discussion, planned activities, and presentation of course material. In the latter portion of the course, class time will be used as a workshop period that all students are required to attend. This is time to meet with your project groups, give updates on progress to the class, and solicit feedback from the instructor

and peers. All official assignments (to be graded) will be submitted through the accompanying Canvas course site accessible at http://usu.instructure.com. It is expected all students are proficient with using Canvas.

Online students will access material through the Canvas course site, accessible at http://usu.instructure.com. It is expected that all students are proficient with using Canvas. Material will be presented in modules, and while there is not an official meeting time, the online course moves in parallel with the face-to-face course. Each week of the course is considered as officially **ending** on Tuesday of the week listed in the syllabus. The new week begins immediately after and and ending at 11:59 PM on the Tuesday of the following week.

That means if the syllabus said that Week 2 ends on Jan 16, then Week 2 BEGAN on January 10 at 12:00 AM. For the first week, some of you may connect to the course a few days in and will have a grace period. Week 1 materials (largely introducing yourself on a message board) is due Jan 15. Week 2 materials are still due Jan 16.

When the university academic calendar has release days on a given Tuesday (e.g., holidays, spring break, etc.), the online course will be considered as having that week off as well. Online students should make an effort to check into the Canvas site daily and are responsible for checking grades, comments, and responses in a timely manner. Online discussions and activities will be required and expected for participation, and official required assignments receiving a grade will be designated as such on the website. It is the student's responsibility to communicate and coordinate with others in the class when there are small group projects, whether that is through e-mail, collaborative cloud-based documents, phone, chat, video, or arranged in-person meetings.

Grading

Your final grade will be computed based on the following percentages. There is no curve for the class. Grades will be assigned based on the scale below, with your final grade rounded to the nearest tenth of a percentage point. Further below are a few notes about grading policies and procedures.

Grade Weightings

Required Assignments	40%
Course Project	40%
Class Participation	20%

Grading scale	
A	93 – 100%
A-	90 – 92.9%
B+	87 – 89.9%
B	83 – 86.9%
B-	80 – 82.9%
C+	77 – 79.9%
C	73 – 76.9%
C-	70 – 72.9%
D+	67 – 69.9%
D	63 – 66.9%
D-	60 – 62.9%

Late submissions

You may submit your required assignments up to 1 week late with a 50% penalty on your total possible grade. For example, for an assignment worth 20 points, 10 points will be subtracted off of your total grade if it is submitted within 1 week after the deadline. **You may not submit any assignment more than 1 week late.** Late final papers **will not** be accepted. Late presentations are not allowed.

Plagiarism

As stated in the USU Student Code, plagiarism is "the act of representing, by paraphrase or direct quotation, the published or unpublished work of another person as one's own in any academic exercise or activity without full and

clear acknowledgment. It also includes using materials prepared by another person or by an agency engaged in the sale of term papers or other academic materials." Plagiarism is harmful both for the author of the original work and for the plagiarizer. Any individuals involved in plagiarizing work will receive an automatic fail for the assignment or project and will be immediately reported to the university administration.

Persons with Disabilities

Students with documented disabilities who are in need of academic accommodations should immediately notify the instructor and/or contact the Disability Resource Center at (435) 797-2444 and fill out an application for services. Accommodations are individualized and in accordance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1992.

Incompletes

In accordance with University policy, incompletes are not to be given for poor performance. There will be no incompletes given except for conditions beyond the student's control, including:

- Incapacitating illnesses that prevent a student from attending classes for a period of at least two weeks
- A death in the immediate family
- Financial responsibilities requiring a student to alter course schedule to secure employment
- Change in work schedule as required by an employer

Other, *unexpected* emergencies may be considered on a case-by-case basis. Regardless of the cause for the incomplete, appropriate documentation of the circumstances is required for an extension to be considered.

Course Schedule

Week No. and Ending Date	Topic	Readings to be completed (Should be done before start of class that week)	Assignments Due
1. Jan 9 or Jan 15 (online)	Intro and Welcome	None	
2. Jan 16	ADDIE, ID Models, & Backwards Design	Gustafson & branch (2002) Dousay (2018) UbD (Intro + Ch 1)	
3. Jan 23	Needs Analysis	Sleezer, et al. (2011) DCC (Ch 5) UbD (Ch 2–3)	ID Model Presentation
4. Jan 30	Learning Objectives	Krathwohl (2002) UbD (Ch 4, 6) Hess et al (2009) Scwheingruber, et al., (2007)	
5. Feb 6	Design Solutions	Kimmons (2018) Savery (2018) UbD (Ch 9, 10)	Learning Objectives Submission
6. Feb 13	Design Solutions	Martin & Oyarzun (2018) Clark & Lyons (2010)	

		Hirsch-Pasek, et al. (2015)	
7. Feb 20	NO CLASS	None (Monday class schedule)	
8. Feb 27	Evaluation	UbD (Ch. 7-8) DCC (Ch 12)	Design Solution
9. Mar 6	Spring break	None	
10. Mar 13	SAM 1: Design Thinking	Svhila (2018) SAM (Ch 1-6)	Evaluation Plan Project Commitment
11. Mar 20	SAM 2: Prototypes	SAM (Ch 7-9)	
12. Mar 27	SAM 3: Execution	SAM (Ch 10-13)	Project Update 1
13. Apr 3	SAM 4: Final Products	SAM (Ch 14-15)	
14. Apr 10	Workshop Day	None	Project Update 2
15. Apr 17	Workshop Day	None	
16. Apr 24	Final Presentations	None	Presentation
17. May 1	NO CLASS MEETING	None	Final Reports due May 1

Additional Course Readings

Clark, R. C., & Lyons, C. (2010). *Graphics for learning: Proven guidelines for planning, designing, and evaluating visuals in training materials*: John Wiley & Sons.

Dousay, T. (2018). Instructional Design Models. In R. E. West (Ed.), *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology*. Provo, UT.

Gustafson, K. L., & Branch, R. M. (2002). What is instructional design? In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and Issues in Isntructionbal Design and Technology* (2nd ed., pp. 15-25). New York, NY: Pearson.

Hess, K. K., Jones, B. S., Carlock, D., & Walkup, J. R. (2009). Cognitive Rigor: Blending the Strengths of Bloom's Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge to Enhance Classroom-Level Processes.

Hirsh-Pasek, K., Zosh, J. M., Golinkoff, R. M., Gray, J. H., Robb, M. B., & Kaufman, J. (2015). Putting Education in "Educational" Apps: Lessons From the Science of Learning. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 16*(1), 3-34. doi:10.1177/1529100615569721

Kimmons, R. (2018). K-12 Technology Frameworks. In R. E. West (Ed.), *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology*. Provo, UT.

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into practice*, *41*(4), 212-218.

Martin, F., & Oyarzun, B. (2018). Distance Learning. In R. E. West (Ed.), *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology*. Provo, UT.

Savery, J. (2018). Overview of Problem-Based Learning. In R. E. West (Ed.), Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology. Provo, UT.

Schweingruber, H. A., Shouse, A. W., Michaels, S., & Council, N. R. (2007). *Ready, set, science!: Putting research to work in K-8 science classrooms*: National Academies Press.

Sleezer, C. M., Russ-Eft, D., & Gupta, K. (2011). *A practical guide to needs assessment*: John Wiley & Sons.

Svihla, V. (2018). Design Thinking and Agile Design. In R. E. West (Ed.), *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology*. Provo, UT.