Program Report for the
Masters Preparation of Educational Technologists
Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT)

NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

C O V E R S H E E T

Institution University of North Dakota **State** North Dakota

Date submitted December 1, 2007

Name of Preparer Richard Van Eck

Phone # 701-777-3574 **Email** richard.vaneck@und.edu

Program documented in this report:

Name of institution's program (s) Instructional Design & Technology
Grade levels for which candidates are being prepared Corporate Training Environments and Curriculum Designers at all Grade Levels and Environments
Degree or award level Master of Science; Master of Education
Is this program offered at more than one site? □ **Yes** **X No**
If yes, list the sites at which the program is offered

Title of the state license for which candidates are prepared
Not Applicable--Program graduates are not licensed by the state

Program report status:

- ☐ **X Initial review**
- ☐ **Revised Report**
- ☐ **Response to national recognition with conditions**

State licensure requirement for national recognition:
NCATE requires 80% of the program completers who have taken the test to pass the applicable state licensure test for the content field, if the state has a testing requirement. Test information and data must be reported in Section III. Does your state require such a test?

□ **Yes** **X No**

SECTION I—CONTEXT

The IDT program lost its only full time faculty member in 2003, after steadily declining enrollments as the result of the failure of the program to meet the needs of the IDT profession and its students. While enrollments declined, official majors in IDT remained on the books. The program underwent a self-assessment in 2004 when a new faculty member was hired. At the time, there were 5 enrolled students, as most of the IDT majors had decided not to complete the degree. Some of these previous students were convinced to return and complete degree requirements over the next three years, but the majority never completed the degree. At the time of the self-assessment, there were only three content courses in the IDT program. After examining national standards for IDT programs (the AECT/NCATE standards), and comparing the program with top IDT programs around the country including Penn State, Indiana University, Florida State University, University of Georgia, Utah State, and the University of Memphis (all highly respected programs in IDT), the program generated 9 new courses to address critical gaps in our curriculum, bringing our course total to its present level of 18.

These courses were approved in the Spring of 2005, and fully implemented in Fall of 2005. Additionally, while the program is officially in its third year of implementation, data are not tabulated for the 2007-2008 year. Accordingly, there are only two years of program data for assessment. The IDT program is exploring the option of seeking national recognition for its program as an SPA, and is generating this report in that format as a means of documenting our process and intentions. However, this is NOT intended as a full SPA report, and data simply do not exist for full assessment of the program according to the standards. The following document presents our assessment plan and process, including some preliminary data and incremental modifications which have been conducted. However, where data do not yet exist, they cannot be reported, and there has not been time to fully analyze and implement even those data which do exist. It would not, in any case, be fully warranted at this point, as the program as it exists now has not been implemented long enough to support firm conclusions from the data nor its application to program modification. At the end of the 2006-2007 year, we will examine the full three-years of data for modification of the program, and determine whether to pursue full SPA approval for the IDT program.

1. *Description of any state or institutional policies that may influence the application of AECT standards.*

The IDT program prepares anyone to be curriculum and training designers, human performance technologists, and technology integration specialists. While some of these students may be educators, the state does not recognize IDT as an initial or advanced certification area, nor does it provide licensure or requirements in this area. Accordingly, there are no state policies that influence the application of these standards. Because some who enter the IDT program are teachers who are already certified and teaching in schools, and because the IDT program has voluntarily adopted the AECT/NCATE standards for advanced ECIT programs, the institution (Department of Teaching & Learning) requires participation in the NCATE accreditation process. Educators currently make up 6 of the 41, or 15%, of the currently enrolled IDT students, and upon graduation either continue to work in their same position for which they were licensed by the state upon graduation from the teacher education program

(in which the IDT program and courses play no role), or work as technology facilitators in schools, in which case they are no longer teachers in the classroom. In all cases, these educators are able to design and assess curriculum, and integrate technology into the classroom.

2. *Description of the field and clinical experiences required for the program, including the number of hours for early field experiences and the number of hours/weeks for student teaching or internships.*

The require field experiences in the IDT program are comprised of the Internship requirement (IDT 584). This two credit course requires 80 hours of supervised experience as an instructional designer. Most internships are conducted in corporate or higher education settings, but may also occur in K-12 environments such as EduTech (and developer of professional development for K-12 educators). The internship may occur any time after core classes have been taken (IDT 500, 520, and 525), but most commonly occurs as a culminating experience in which the student assumes responsibility for an instructional design and technology project.

Internships are conducted in an environment where other instructional designers, curriculum designers, or training developers are engaged in the process of instructional design and development in the real world. The internship should require the student to be actively engaged in the process of instructional design and development with others, although independent work may be a part of this. Appropriate tasks include any of the activities associated with instructional design, including instructional design, media development, multimedia, web-design, editing, working with SMEs, etc.

Independent work on project development that does not occur in such an environment with other ID professionals is generally more appropriate for the practicum, which is an optional course. The practicum is usually a project taken on for others in which the student designs or develops some form of instructional product or products related to instruction in the real world.

The number of hours required for the practicum and the internship vary by the number of credit hours chosen. Two credit hours requires a total of 80 hours, three credit hours requires a total of 90 hours and four credit hours requires a total of 180 total hours should be planned to complete the project. While it is possible to do a practicum or an internship within the organization that the student works currently, the project must be something that would not normally be done as part of the student's duties.

Requirements for the internship are that the student must write one to one and half pages describing the project, their role, their supervisor(s)' role, and the process and the purpose of the internship. This document is submitted for approval a minimum of 2 to 4 weeks prior to the end of the semester before doing the internship. The student's advisor reviews the proposal to ensure that the project is appropriate for instructional design.

Once the proposal is approved by the academic advisor, the student is required to obtain signatures on the Letter of Agreement form. This form outlines the requirements for the

supervisor which include a brief mid-term evaluation (at the mid-point point) and a final evaluation. These requirements are designed in consultation with their supervisor, but it is the student's primary responsibility to develop it.

When the project begins, the student is required to submit a weekly reflective journal to their advisor which outlines their activities for the week, their thoughts on what they've learned, and their goals for the next week. The student is also responsible for scheduling a meeting with their advisor at the approximate mid-point of your internship/practicum.

3. Description of the criteria for admission, retention, and exit from the program, including required GPAs and minimum grade requirements for the content courses accepted by the program.

The IDT program follows the regular Graduate School requirement of an overall undergraduate grade point average of 2.75 or a junior/senior year grade point average of 3.00 for the Master of Education and Master of Science degrees, and for the certificate program. The grade point average requirement for graduate work is a 3.5 or better. Provisional admission may be considered for students whose academic performance does not meet these criteria. Whether such consideration is given will depend on the circumstances and the judgment of the admissions faculty. Applicants must also answer two essay questions as part of the application process. These questions address the student's current experience and skills with technology, and their professional goals for the degree upon graduation and 5 years down the road. These essays are used to ascertain the appropriateness of the degree for the student's goals.

The applicant must have completed a baccalaureate degree in a field of study in the area or discipline appropriate to the field in which he or she intends to work. The applicant must have a basic knowledge of the microcomputer and substantial skill in using standard applications to produce work products (word processing, database, spreadsheet, drawing/painting, graphing, and other common applications). Students are required to maintain a 3.0 GPA for all graduate work with no more than two grades of C or lower. Students must complete a capstone project in which they implement the full instructional design process to analyze, design, develop, implement, and evaluate an instructional solution to a real-world problem of their choice. They must conduct all phases of this process and defend their project orally in a project defense overseen by the IDT faculty, who judge the process on a pass-fail basis. Students cannot graduate without passing this defense.

4. Description of the relationship[1] of the program to the unit's conceptual framework.

The conceptual framework for the Department of Teaching and Learning (see below) rests on three principles: 1) The teacher is a learner who continually seeks additional knowledge and skills in their area, 2) the teacher is an active agent of change in terms of teaching practices, and 3) the teacher is an articulate visionary for educational practices at the local and national levels. The IDT program conceptual framework is founded on this conceptual framework, with the exception that our graduates are not teachers, but instructional designers. The distinction is that teachers design AND deliver instruction, predominantly in a facilitated

[1] The response should describe the program's conceptual framework and indicate how it reflects the unit's conceptual framework

face-to-face manner and for their specific grade and content areas, while instructional designers DESIGN instruction in any content area or domain that will be delivered to learners of all ages and geographic locations, via any medium (face-to-face, web-based, multimedia, print-based, video-based, audio-based, self-paced or facilitated). What changes, then, is the *nature* of the work and *methods* for meeting each of these concepts within the framework, rather than the framework itself.

Figure 1. Teaching & Learning Conceptual Framework.

IDT Students as Learners. IDT students, like Teaching & Learning students, are taught to be reflective practitioners of their craft through self-study, metacognitive and learning strategies (which they learn both how to use and to design their own instruction), participation in professional organizations and conferences like AECT, ASTD, and ISTE, participation in communities of practice (such as the IDT graduate student organization and the IDT ListServ), and reading of current research on best practices and theories in IDT journals and publications.

IDT Students as Active Agents of Learning. The process of instructional design is founded on the identification of desired outcomes, the specification of objectives based on those outcomes and assessments based on objectives, the analysis of learners as individuals with different backgrounds, experiences, skills, preferences, and abilities, and the generation of instructional strategies to align all of these things in such a way as to support mastery learning for all learners. In other words, the entire field of IDT is an instantiation of the principles of being an active agent of learning. They do NOT, however, learn how to facilitate this instruction (act as a teacher), as delivery of instruction is separate in our field from the design of instruction. The only IDT graduates who will act as teachers in educational environments receive their requisite training as teachers from the teaching and learning department at UND or elsewhere *prior* to entering the IDT program.

IDT Students as Articulate Visionaries (Change Agents). IDT students also act as change agents for best practices in human performance technology, training, and education. Analysis of best practices and current theory as they align (or not) with current practices in corporate, government, and educational environments are integrated throughout the curriculum, and change agency is a common thread throughout the curriculum because the process of IDT is not easily understood from without, and is very time and resource intensive. This requires that instructional design professionals be able to articulate the value of the IDT process to others based on theory, research, and practical experience.

5. *Indication of whether the program has a unique set of program assessments and their relationship of the program's assessments to the unit's assessment system*[2].

The IDT program has its own set of program assessments which, while they reflect the conceptual framework, are designed primarily to address the AECT/NCATE standards for advanced ECIT programs. These assessments and standards are unique to our program and not used by the Teaching and Learning department.

[2] This response should clarify how the key assessments used in the program are derived from or informed by the assessment system that the unit will address under NCATE Standard 2.

Attachments to Context (See Also Attachments A & B)

IDT Program Advising Sheet

ALL DEGREES & OPTIONS				**Semester Grade**	
IDT Core Courses (9 credit hours)					
All of the Following:					
IDT	500	Survey of Instructional Design	3	_____	_____
IDT	520	Instructional Systems Analysis & Design	3	_____	_____
IDT	525	Instructional Systems Dev., Implementation & Evaluation	3	_____	_____
Additional Area of Emphasis IDT Courses (M.S. = 9 credit hours, M.Ed.= 6 credit hours)					
IDT	550	Theories & Models of Instructional Design	3	_____	_____
IDT	590	Special Topics in IDT	3	_____	_____
IDT	591	Readings in IDT	1-3	_____	
IDT	592	Research in IDT (Required for M.S. – See Below)	1-3	_____	
IDT	593	Directed Studies in Inst. Design & Technology (Practicum)	1-3	_____	
K-12 Emphasis					
IDT	510	Technology-Based Instruction: Applications & Methods	3	_____	_____
IDT	540	Digital Media and the Internet in Schools	3	_____	_____
Corporate Emphasis					
IDT	560	Instructional Design Consulting	3	_____	_____
IDT	570	Human Performance Technology	3	_____	_____
Computer- and Web-Based Instruction					
IDT	530	Introduction to Computer-Based Instruction	3	_____	_____
IDT	535	Advanced Computer-Based Instructional Development	3	_____	_____
IDT	545	Instructional Simulations & Games	3	_____	_____
IDT	580	Introduction to Web-Based Instruction	3	_____	_____
Scholarly Tools/Research Component (3 credit hours)					
EFR	509	Introduction to Education Research	3	_____	_____
Foundations (3 credit hours)					
PSY	501	Psychological Foundations of Education	3	_____	_____
Internship (2 credit hours)					
IDT	584	Internship in Instructional Design	2	_____	_____
MASTER OF EDUCATION DEGREE ONLY					
In **ADDITION** to courses listed in "**ALL COURSES & DEGREES**," complete the following:					
ALL of the following:					
EFR	500	Foundations of Educational Thought	3	_____	_____
IDT	995	Scholarly Project	2	_____	_____
Electives (6 credit hours, must be approved by advisor)					
___	___	_____	__	_____	
___	___	_____	__	_____	
MASTER OF SCIENCE DEGREE ONLY					
In **ADDITION** to coursed listed in "**ALL COURSES & DEGREES**," complete the following:					
Scholarly Tools/Research Component (3 credit hours)					
IDT	592	Research in IDT May Not Be Counted Toward Emphasis	3	_____	_____
Elective (3 credit hours, must be approved by advisor)					
___	___	_____	__	_____	
Scholarly Project Option (2 credits):					
IDT	995	Scholarly Project	2	_____	_____
OR					
Thesis Option (4 credits):					
IDT	998	Thesis	4	_____	_____

TOTAL = 34 credit hours (M.Ed. & M.S. Independent Study Option) or 36 credit hours (M.S. Thesis Option)

SECTION II— LIST OF ASSESSMENTS

In this section, list the 6-8 assessments that are being submitted as evidence for meeting the AECT standards. All programs must provide a minimum of six assessments. If your state does not require a state licensure test in the content area, you must substitute an assessment that documents candidate attainment of content knowledge in #1 below. For each assessment, indicate the type or form of the assessment and when it is administered in the program.

	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment Is Administered
1	Definition & Current Trends Paper	Essay	First semester/year of program
2	Instructional Design Document	Project	End of second semester
3	Instructional Development & Evaluation Document	Project	End of third semester
4	Internship Evaluation	Internship	Mid- to late-program
5	Scholarly Project Evaluation Document	Project	Part of capstone experience during last semester
6	Scholarly Project Document and Defense	Project & Oral Exam	Final experience in program

SECTION III—RELATIONSHIP OF ASSESSMENT TO STANDARDS

For each AECT standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address the standard. One assessment may apply to multiple AECT standards.

AECT STANDARDFOR MASTERS AECT PREPARATION	APPLICABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
1. Design. Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design, message design, instructional strategies, and learner characteristics.	~~□~~#1 ~~□~~#2 ~~□~~#3 □#4 ~~□~~#5 ~~□~~#6
2. Development. Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to develop instructional materials and experiences using print, audiovisual, computer-based, and integrated technologies.	□#1 □#2 ~~□~~#3 ~~□~~#4 ~~□~~#5 ~~□~~#6
3. Utilization. Candidates demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to use processes and resources for learning by applying principles and theories of media utilization, diffusion, implementation, and policy-making.	~~□~~#1 ~~□~~#2 ~~□~~#3 □#4 □#5 ~~□~~#6
4. Management. Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan, organize, coordinate, and supervise instructional technology by applying principles of project, resource, delivery system, and information management.	□#1 ~~□~~#2 ~~□~~#3 □#4 □#5 ~~□~~#6
5. Evaluation. Candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles of problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.	~~□~~#1 ~~□~~#2 ~~□~~#3 □#4 ~~□~~#5 ~~□~~#6

SECTION IV—EVIDENCE FOR MEETING STANDARDS

*The narrative section for **each** assessment (1-4 above) is limited to two text pages. It is preferred that each attachment for a specific assessment (5a-c above) be limited to the equivalent of five text pages, however in some cases assessment instruments or scoring guides may go beyond 5 pages.*

It is important to note that there are many assessments for some of these standards that exist among multiple courses in the program. These courses are selected at the option of the student, but in all cases each course contains assessments that measure all five of the main standards to one degree or another. The net result is that any graduate of the program has multiple assessments within each of these five areas. Please see the matrix of courses and AECT/NCATE standards in Appendix A and the advising sheet in section one for more on how each of these optional courses address each standard.

Further, we had not identified these key assessments in every instance nor their relation to the standards prior to this report, given the recency of the program re-design and implementation. Our connection to the standards relied on the level of which courses address which standards, and at what level (secondary or primary). All of our classes use online technology for assignments to be turned in, commented on, and graded. Accordingly, no paper copies of many assignments exist. Likewise, individual grades on the assignments are electronic, and disappear after the semester is over. Accordingly, in most cases only data from the most recent assessments are available. Assessments and grades are now tracked individually, as are the scoring rubrics and guides for them, and these data will be preserved and available from this point forward.

#1 CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Definition and Current Trends in IDT

No licensure is required or available in IDT, so this standard is replaced with an additional content knowledge area as required.

Description of The Assessment (One Sentence May Be Sufficient)

Objective: Given a written description of the assignment, access to the course textbook, and access to a word processor, the student will be able to generate a description of the history and origins of the field of IDT, a personal definition of instructional design informed by readings and discussion in and out of class, and a description of a personal career goal by writing a paper that meets the criteria for the assignment (see assignment sheet).

Description of how this Assessment Specifically Aligns with the Standards it Is Cited for in Section III

This assessment is designed to measure a local standard developed as described by the NCATE/AECT standards document, and which replaces the first required assessment in section II since our program does not result in licensure (this document requires we develop an additional content standard in its place, and the AECT/NCATE document indicates that additional, local standards may be developed for programs). In addition, this assessment is part of the first course students take, so students have been exposed to very little content knowledge at the point of this assessment (essentially, one textbook). Accordingly, while this assessment DOES address some of

the five standards pre-specified in Section III, it does so at a point at which learners are more novice than expert.

In regards to standard 1, by defining ID based on their readings and personal understanding, the learner is required to synthesize the many models they have studied (from the definitive AECT text on ID Models by Gustafson and Branch), and the definitions which are both the subject of the first 3 chapters and the underpinnings of each of the 18 other chapters in the *Trends and Issues in Instructional Design & Technology* textbook. This text is designed to provide an overview of the field of IDT, including the theories and models it is based on (chapters 4-8), human performance technology (chapters 14-18), and current trends and issues (e.g., media, modern learner characteristics; chapters 20-22). This assignment requires learners to provide a summary of the major developments, theories, and historical events in the field, to provide a definition of IDT that synthesizes the definitions stated and implied by the course readings, and to use both of these sections to generate their own personal definition that synthesizes what they know from the readings with what they believe and understand about IDT from their own personal perspective.

Analysis of the Data Findings

IDT 500 has been offered three (3) times since it was created. During this time, 35 students have taken the class; 10 in 2005, 11 in 2006, and 14 in 2007. For reasons stated at the beginning of this section, only data from 2007 are available. One student dropped the course, and did not complete this assignment. Of the remaining 13 students in 2007, scores ranged from 15 to 20 out of 20 points for this assignment. One student received a low B (did not meet objective), four received a B (meets objective), four received a low A (exceeds objective), and four received a high A (exceeds objective). Data indicate that all but one student mastered the objective for this assessment.

How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

There are a maximum of 20 points possible for this assignment, with 16 indicating that the student "meets" the objective. These points are distributed across individual components of the assignment, with 0 for "does not meet", 1 for "meets", and 2 for "exceeds" each component. Therefore, a student who "meets" every component of this assessment will receive 16 points. Theoretically, a student who exceeds each component would get 32, but the assignment points are capped at 20. Table 1 presents data for mastery of this objective by students who took the assessment in 2007. Data indicate that more than 90% of students mastered this objective, indicating that the standards it measures are being met by the program.

Attachment of Assessment Documentation

Assessment tool/description of the assignment

Assignment Sheet
for
ID History, Definition, and Career Goal Paper

Objective

Given a written description of the assignment, access to the course textbook, and access to a word processor, the student will be able to generate a description of the history and origins of the field of IDT, a personal definition of instructional design informed by readings and discussion in and out of class, and a description of a personal career goal by writing a paper that meets the criteria for the assignment (see assignment sheet).

Total Points

A total of 20 points can be achieved for the completion of this assignment.

Due Date

This assignment is due June 22, 2007.

Assignment Details

Note: You MUST use APA style for this assignment!

Write a 4 to 6 page (not including diagrams, figures, or references) paper synthesizing what you have learned about the origins of and rationale for the field of instructional design, including the major events, theoretical developments, and key figures in the history of ID, your own personal definition of ID (informed by the class readings and discussion), and a personal career goal for ID. Include a section for each of the following areas:

- Introduction (.5 - 1 pages)
  - Description of what you will cover in the paper, how the elements relate to each other, etc.,
- The history of instructional design (2 - 3 pages)
  - Origins of the field (where it began, why, who was involved then, what disciplines it came from and what their contributions were)
  - Relation to Major Theory or Theories (Behaviorism, Cognitivism, Constructivism, etc.)
  - Key events, theories, and figures in the field since it's inception
  - Basic description of the process today (ADDIE) and related areas (Human Performance Technology, distance learning, etc.)
- Personal Definition of ID (1 page)
  - One definition you like by someone in the field
  - A one to three sentence definition of your own (personally relevant and captures essence of field as described by others and yourself)
  - An Expanded definition (explains and analyzes your definition as it relates or differs from others, and why)
- Career vision for ID (.5 to 1 page)
  - What do you see yourself doing in ID? Why? How does it match up with your strengths, weaknesses, and interests? What will you need to do to get there?

Scoring guide for the assessment

Use 0 for does not meet, 1 for meets, and 2 for exceeds each criteria. Where there are sub-headings, assign points ONLY to subordinate criteria:

1. Paper is appropriate length

2. Paper includes all 4 sections
3. Paper adheres to APA style
4. Introduction describes:
    i. What will be covered in the paper
    ii. Conveys structure and relationship how the elements relate
5. History of instructional design includes:
    i. Includes major theoretical works
    ii. Includes where IDT began and who was involved then
    iii. Includes complete and accurate summaries of Behaviorism, Cognitivism, and Constructivism
    iv. Includes key events, theories, and figures in the field since it's inception
    v. History is inclusive (includes ADDIE and related areas such as human performance technology, distance learning, etc.)
6. Personal Definition of ID
    i. Incorporates all three components of this section
    ii. Accepted definition is attributed to someone in the field
    iii. Personal definition incorporates other definitions with personal elements
    iv. Expanded definition explains and analyzes personal definition as it relates to and differs from other definitions
7. Career vision for ID
    i. Includes analysis of career alignment with personal strengths, weaknesses, and interests
    ii. Includes analysis of what the learner will you need to do to achieve career goal

Candidate data derived from the assessment
Table 1. Learner By Objective Component Analysis

Learners	**Score (Out of 20)**
1	17
2	16
3	19
4	16
5	16
6	16
7	20
8	20
9	15
10	17
11	17
12	17
13	20
# Who Mastered	12
% Who Mastered	92%

#2 CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: Assessment of content knowledge in the field of instructional or educational communications and technology

Description of The Assessment (One Sentence May Be Sufficient)

This assessment is designed to assess one-half of the core competencies for the field of IDT as defined by the AECT standards.

Objective: Given written descriptions of each component of the assignment, access to the course textbook, instructional feedback and guidance from class discussions, and feedback from the instructor on iterative drafts of the individual components of an instructional design document, the learner will be able to generate an instructional design document from analysis through an evaluation plan by writing it out with 80% accuracy.

Description of how this Assessment Specifically Aligns with the Standards it Is Cited for in Section III

This course is the first of a two-course sequence designed to develop initial competency in the core instructional design skill set. As such, it addresses half of the standards identified in Section III, with the exception of numbers 2 and 4, (development & management). This assessment is the final assessment for the course, and thus addresses each of these areas at the highest level, although it should be noted that learners are at the initial stages of mastery, somewhere between novice and expert. This is because the content is extremely complex, ill-defined problem-solving (which is why the competencies are addressed instructionally over a two-semester period) and because the class this assessment is designed for is the second class students have taken in the program. There are 8 major assignments in this course, each of which represents one component of the document

which serves as the final assessment (please see the attachments for this assessment). The final product is an instructional design document which, by definition, addresses nearly all standards at some level. The following outlines how each of these assignment/assessment components is aligned with each of the three main standards it addresses. These descriptions are common to other assessments as well, and will be relied upon in those relevant standard sections.

1. *Instructional Problem, Rationale, & Goal*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to identify a real-world instructional problem, provide the rationale for the need to solve this problem and for instruction as the means to solve this problem, and to state an instructional goal for the instruction. This component primarily addresses the **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design), and secondarily the **standard of development** (develop instructional materials) as this is the first step in the development process, and the **standard of evaluation** (applying principles of problem analysis).

2. *Environmental Context, Learner, Prerequisite, and ID Implications Analysis*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to analysis the cultural, political, and physical environment in which the instructional problem is situated, to analyze the learners for individual differences, to identify any prerequisite knowledge needed for the proposed instruction, and to take the results of these analyses and specify what the instructional design implications are for each area (what must be done in the instruction to address the strengths and weaknesses and characteristics of the environment and learners). This component primarily addresses the **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design; learner characteristics; and to a lesser extent via implications for design, message design and instructional strategies), and secondarily the **standard of utilization** (media utilization, diffusion, and policy-making originate here).

3. *Initial Instructional Sequence*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate an initial sequence of instruction in order to help delineate the instructional scope of the project. It is refined further in component 7. This component primarily addresses the **standard of management** (demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan and organize…).

4. *Task & Learning Task Analysis*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate a complete task analysis of the content to be taught, broken down into constituent learning objectives which are categorized by Gagné's varieties of learning taxonomy and represented hierarchically by enabling or target objectives using Gagné's learned capability verbs. This component primarily assesses the **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design), and secondarily the **standard of management** (demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan and organize…).

5. *Objectives & Assessment Matrix*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate five-component objectives (situation, learned capability verb, objective of the learning, action verb, and tools and constraints) from the learning task analysis and to generate sample assessment items that measure each objective. This component primarily addresses **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design), and secondarily the **standard of evaluation** (applying principles of criteria-referenced measurement).

6. Assessment Instruments

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate the multiple assessment instruments that will be used to assess learning in their final instructional product. This component primarily addresses **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design), and secondarily the **standard of development** (develop instructional materials, of which the assessments are a part) and the **standard of evaluation** (evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles of criteria-referenced measurement).

7. Final Instructional Sequence

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate a revised instructional sequence based on the identified objectives from the previous components, including chunking the instructional units according to the collected objectives that will be addressed together, estimating the instructional time for each unit, and specifying the times at which each objective will be assessed. This component primarily addresses the **standard of management** (demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan and organize…), and secondarily the **standard of evaluation** (evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles of criteria-referenced measurement, and long-range planning).

8. Evaluation Plan

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate a plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the instruction, including the process and timeline for conducting three one-to-one evaluations with revision and the small-group instructional implementation with 5 to 8 learners. This component primarily addresses the **standard of evaluation** (demonstrate knowledge, skills, and dispositions to evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles of problem analysis, criterion-referenced measurement, formative and summative evaluation, and long-range planning.), and secondarily addresses the **standard of management** (demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan and organize…).

Analysis of the Data Findings

IDT 520 has been offered three (3) times since it was created. During this time, 40 students have taken the class; 12 in 2005, 14 in 2006, and 20 in 2007. As described earlier, data have not until now been preserved at a finer grain than course or assignment grade, and that only for the most recent offering of the course. At the time of this writing, it is the last day of the semester for the IDT 520 class. Accordingly, there are no final data for this course at this time. Because each

course replaces the online assignment repository and grade book, we also do not have specific assessment data for 2006 (since the current course replaced the last one). What we do have are final grade data for this course in 2005 and 2006, which is a reflection of both the performance on the individual components of the final assessment (which the reader will recall is generated through the 8 individual assignments) and the grade for the full portfolio document generated at the end of the course.

Of the 26 who have taken this course since 2005, one withdrew from the course and four received an incomplete. Twenty-three (including three of those who took an incomplete) received a grade of "A" for this assessment (it is not possible to get an A in the class without getting an A on the final assessment, and all of these students received course grades of A). One of the students who took an incomplete failed to turn in the assignment, and received a grade of F. One other student never turned in the assignment, having stopped attending class entirely. This student received a grade of F as a result.

How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

It is not possible to get a grade of A in the overall course without getting a grade of A on the final assessment. Therefore, anyone who received a final course grade of A for 520 also got an A on the final assessment. From 2005 and 2006, 23 of 26 learners, or 88%, received a grade of A. A grade of B would be considered to "meet" the objective. One of the students withdrew, one stopped attending, and one failed to submit the final assessment before the deadline for the incomplete, so every student who took the assessment demonstrated competency, indicating that the program is meeting the standards aligned with this assessment. Table 2 presents data for grades by student in more detail.

Attachment of Assessment Documentation

Assessment tool/description of the assignment

Component One

Identify a learning problem/need in your workplace for which instruction is the best solution. The problem may be hypothetical or actual to your institution, but should be relevant. By relevant, it is meant that you can make the case for the need.

1. The Problem. Describe the problem itself in one paragraph or so. Focus on the problem specifically, rather than on the history, context, or rationale. What is it, specifically, that requires some kind of instructional or support solution.
2. The Rationale. Describe your rationale and supporting evidence for the need for instruction/training in one to two pages. In your response, discuss who the problem affects (learners and environment), why the problem IS a problem, and how you know that an instructional (rather than performance support or environmental modification) solution is warranted. Be sure to provide enough detail and context for someone NOT familiar with the learners, problem, domain, or environment to understand. Provide evidence in the form of numbers, statistics, and/or research, and cite your sources.

3. The Goal. State your instructional goal in one sentence. This is simply what you want your learners to be able to do when they have completed your training. Note that this is NOT an objective; you will identify many objectives that are involved in attaining this goal in later assignments.

Component 2
Describe the key characteristics of your learners and the contexts in which they will demonstrate the concepts, rules, and problem-solving skills you address in your instruction.

The Environment. Describe the environment in which your learners operate. This should include the physical characteristics of the training environment and the conditions under which the training will occur as well as the cultural, social, and political context in which learning AND performance take place. Be detailed and specific, but focus primarily on those factors which are most directly related to the problem and learning solution. This should be one to two pages.

The Learners. Describe the learners who will participate in your training. This section should be broad enough to encompass all potential learners, and specific enough to address the cognitive, physiological, affective, and social characteristics of the actual population. As you generate this section, think about the people you anticipate taking your instruction next semester, and how they both *prefer* to learn and how they *have* learned (e.g., in groups or individually; in print or via electronic medium). This should be one to two pages.

Prerequisite Skills. Describe what skills, attitudes, and abilities your learners must have *prior* to participating in your module. These might include computer skills (mouse, keyboard, basic word processing), reading level, etc. This should be one to four paragraphs.

Implications for Design. Interpret how each of the prior sections will affect the design your instruction. Knowing what you do about the environment and learners, how will this constrain, enhance, or modify your instructional module. The prior sections outline facts; this section interprets and connects them to your instructional decisions. In general, there shouldn't be any factors here that have not been mentioned earlier, and everything mentioned earlier should be addressed (explicitly or implied) here. This section should be one to two pages.

Component 3
Think through what you think the sequence of your instruction will be (e.g., what you will do first, second, third). You will want to consider two things:

1. What you would DO first, second, third, etc. when *demonstrating* the skills/knowledge that form the subject of your instruction, and

2. What you would TEACH first, second, third, etc. when trying to help a novice (your learners as outlined in Assignment 2) learn the content of your instruction.

Explanation
This is because sometimes you must teach things in the order in which they are demonstrated or performed as part of a task (e.g., in teaching someone to write an essay, some people say you

teach how to write a topic sentence, the body, and transition sentence for each paragraph, or the introductory paragraph, body, and conclusion).

Other times you must teach several things at the same time for convenience. For example, you might teach someone all they need to know about logging into and out of a program (related, but minor skills) before you teach them how to use the program itself (the most important stuff). It is also true, and perhaps more commonly so, that teaching things in a different order than they are demonstrated is helpful because of the way humans think, put ideas together, etc. For example, to return to the essay example before, some say that it makes no sense to teach the essay as a set of sequential steps, but rather in a more holistic way where you consider what your goal is, what your overall strategy and main points are, etc.

In reality, you will find that most instruction requires that you adopt BOTH of these strategies at different times, and to different degrees. For now, just be aware of the two basic approaches as you develop an overall sequence for your instruction.

Structure of the Assignment

For this assignment, you will can choose any format you like to indicate your sequence, but whatever format you choose should represent both the things you will teach as big "chunks" or sections of your instruction AND the individual things that *comprise* each of those chunks or sections. You will develop this in much more detail in later assignments, so for now think in terms of an outline with main headings (or topics), each with a few sub-headings (or sub-topics), and with perhaps a few of those with their own sub-headings. This should not take you more than one to two pages, double-spaced.

Component 4

Generate an instructional map of the goal, objectives, subordinate objectives, and enabling objectives for your topic. You will use the Gagne et al. taxonomy to classify these objectives, select appropriate action verbs, and use Inspiration to generate the map. This assignment is comprised of three elements, as described below. Your Instructional Sequence (Assignment 3) should serve as a starting point for this, but expect your conceptualization to change in scope and organization. This is because the tools you use constrain and enhance the way you think, so things you do when visually mapping your analysis here will spark new ideas and reveal missing items or new relationships you did not see when working on assignment 3 in Word or Excel.

Task Analysis. Consider what your learners must be able to DO to accomplish (demonstrate) your goal. These are broad steps (in procedural tasks) or concepts (in conceptual tasks). In general, since your goal focuses on what learners can do, there should be some logical order to these steps or concepts. These are listed from left to right on the page, and should number between 5 and 10. Each should be of about the same complexity, and be broad enough that they encompass several steps or requisite skills to accomplish.

Learning-Task Analysis. Extend your analysis of each of the steps generated in the TA to include all the requisite knowledge or abilities needed to accomplish each step. Together with the TA, these will comprise your goal and objectives. Each must then be identified according to the Gagne et al. learning outcomes; for those that are intellectual skills (the majority), they must be

further categorized by type. Finally, you must number each according to their place in the map and identify an appropriate verb for the learning type.

Description. Describe the instruction you will be designing. Include the main topics and sub-topics covered, and the relation of this instruction to other modules. You will want to use your sequence from assignment 3 as a model, but you MUST incorporate the changes that have occurred as a result of your TA and LTA. This should be one to two pages IN ADDITION to your Inspiration map.

Component 5
Use your TA and LTA to create a three-column table that presents each skill and subordinate skill (column one), it's objective (column two), and a sample assessment item (column three). Length of this assignment will vary, but must be long enough to cover every element (except the goal) in assignment 4. Each objective must be written as a 5-component performance objective (SLOAT). See Chapter 7 in PID for more on writing objectives.

You may find it helpful to think of column three as both the actual assessment item (written in the exact wording and style you will use in your actual assessment) AND the answer key, in that you will provide both the assessment question (or directions, or whatever format is most appropriate for testing that particular objective) and the correct answer so that anyone else who looks at this document knows what the correct response should be.

In some cases, as with a multiple-choice question, this is as simple as listing a question and the possible answers with the correct answer highlighted somehow. In other cases, the assessment item may be a directive to the learner generate some product that itself demonstrates the skills being assessed. In such cases, you may be able to describe the correct answer in enough detail here, or you may have to ALSO refer the instructional designer to another document elsewhere (like a rubric) that provides the complete details for how to evaluate the learner's answer/response.

Component 6
Generate all necessary assessment items for your objectives, in the format that they will be presented to the learner (e.g., as a pre-learning quiz, quizzes or tests for each major unit or section). Use titles and formatting as you would for the final product, but for now, *keep them organized and labeled by the objective number sequence* from your Learning/Task Analysis from Assignment 4. In IDT 525, you will change the numbers as appropriate for the actual instructional materials, but for now this numbering is important so that you, I, and anyone else viewing your documentation can immediately see the connection between each assessment item and the objectives or task analysis.

Your sample assessment items from assignment 5 are part of this, so you have already begun the work, but these must be copied to these documents and expanded as necessary. In assignment 5, you may only have listed one assessment item for an objective, but in most cases it will take more than one item to master an objective (would you rely on a pilot who had landed a plane successfully one time during training?). For example, if I want my learner to identify 6 different icons in *Authorware*, my sample assessment item might be to identify one of those icons; I would need to generate an additional five items to match the objective as written.

For EACH objective, you MUST generate posttest items (you may also want pre-test items) and key them to the numbering sequence as described earlier. You must generate not only the question, but the possible answers (if multiple choice) AND the scoring key or rubric.

Component 7

1. Create an instructional sequence plan for your instruction (revised from assignment 3 to reflect changes)
2. Identify the instructional strategies (Smith & Ragan) for each of your main objectives (by creating a modified version of assignment 4 that replaces the first column with the units of "chunks" of your instruction based on your Instructional Sequence, and that replaces the second column with a "Strategies" column, and the assessment column with a "Nine Events" column)
3. Generate the instruction for one of your units that employs both the Smith & Ragan strategies and Gagné's 9 Events from the Strategies Matrix.

1. Instructional Sequence/Matrix. For this part of the assignment, you must chunk your instruction into meaningful sections for learning. While your Learning/Task Analyses may suggest an order or sequence of instruction (left to right and bottom up for each element), this does NOT always reflect the best way to teach your material. Often, the lower (subordinate) elements in your map serve as prerequisite skills for more than one higher order element, meaning it is more logical to teach subordinate elements from several sections at the same time. In other cases, while it would seem logical to teach the subordinate skills prior to higher order skills, it sometimes also makes sense to teach items that are thematically or conceptually related at the same time, in order to minimize extraneous cognitive load. There are a variety of similar factors (e.g., your learner analysis) that may influence what you see as the best way to organize the learning, so trust your instincts as well.

   Once you have completed this "chunking" process, you will need to develop a plan for how long each section/chunk should take. You will do this by creating a table of objectives (column one) by section (column two through column n), by time (row n). See the example at the end of this assignment sheet for more on what this looks like.

2. Instructional Strategies. In this section of the assignment, you will create a four-column table based on your assignment 4 (you may elect to just start a new table from scratch, if you wish) that lists your instructional chunks and objectives in column one based on your Instructional Sequence/Matrix, each of the relevant Smith and Ragan instructional strategies for each major objective (usually those numbered to one decimal, such as 1.1, but use your best judgment) in column two along with a short description of what you might do to address that strategy, and each of Gagné's Nine Events in column three along with one- or two-sentence **descriptions** of how you will implement them.

3. Example for One Section. Using the table created in the prior two sections, you will take one section (chunk) of your module and generate the instruction for that unit, implementing the strategies as you go along. You may not have this done by your conference date, but you

should have enough done that you can get feedback from the instructor and so that you can complete the unit by the end of the term.

Component 8
Develop the plan you will use for formative and summative evaluation.

Evaluation Plan. Keep in mind that while you should be seeking and implementing formative evaluation data from assignment one on, THIS assignment focuses on the evaluation plan for drafts of the actual instructional unit or module. You MUST PLAN for three one-to-one evaluations and one small group (five to eight) evaluation. You will use this plan in IDT 525 when you implement your instruction and evaluate it.

In your plan, you must address how you will control for aptitude (ability), process (the way instruction is delivered), and support (external support system) variables.

Scoring guide for the assessment

IDT 520 Design Document Assessment Rubric

Student Name: _____ Overall Rating: PASS FAIL

4 = Exceptional	Clearly demonstrates thorough evidence of accurate understanding of the instructional design construct. Employs appropriate relevant information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of extensive personal skills that are relevant, accurate, and consistent with the domain.
3 = Good	Demonstrates an understanding of appropriate instructional design constructs. Employs adequate supporting information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of personal skills that are adequate and consistent with the domain.
2 = Fair	Demonstrates only a very general understanding of instructional design constructs. Employs limited information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of limited personal skills consistent with the domain.
1 = Poor	Demonstrates little or no evidence of understanding design constructs or domain. Product and design are not reflective of personal skills needed to be consistent with the domain,
NA	This construct/criteria is not relevant for this project, requires justification in design documentation.

Design Documentation					
Problem Identification	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional learner/context analysis	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional content analysis	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional mastery (objectives)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Orienting strategies	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional strategies	N/A	1	2	3	4
Sequencing	N/A	1	2	3	4
Assessment instrumentation	N/A	1	2	3	4
Formative evaluation plan	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL DESIGN DOCUMENTATION		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Writing Quality					
Writing quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Editing quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL WRITING QUALITY		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Candidate data derived from the assessment

Table 2. Learner By Objective Component Analysis

Learners	**Final Grade**
1	A
2	A
3	A
4	A
5	A
6	A
7	A
8	A
9	A
10	A
11	A
12	A
13	A
14	A
15	A
16	A
17	A
18	A
19	A
20	A
21	A
22	A
23	A
24	W
25	F
26	F
# Who Mastered	23
% Who Mastered	88%

#3 PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates can effectively plan for the professional responsibilities required of instructional or educational communications and technology personnel.

Description of The Assessment (One Sentence May Be Sufficient)

This is the final assessment in IDT 525, which is itself the continuation of IDT 520 taken the previous semester. Because this is the second half of the ID process begun the previous semester, the final assessment here also includes a revised version of the final document (assessment) described in assessment 2, above. In addition, however, the learners develop the actual instruction designed in 520, implement that instruction, and evaluate it.

Description of how this Assessment Specifically Aligns with the Standards it Is Cited for in Section III

Please see assessment two, above, for those standards addressed by the revised version of that final assessment. Because this document is revised as part of the formative evaluation process that continues in this class and thus this assessment, the same standards are addressed as with assessment 2, but at a secondary level.

The development of instruction, an assessment element specific to this assessment, is based on the design document (learner analysis, instructional strategies, etc.) and thus primarily addresses the **standard of development**. The implementation of this instruction with 11 members of the target audience, a second assessment element specific to this assessment, primarily addresses the **standards of utilization and management**. Planning for this whole process and managing time primarily addresses the **standard of management**. Formative and summative evaluation of the instruction itself primarily addresses the **standard of evaluation**.

Analysis of the Data Findings

Not all who took IDT 520 registered for IDT 525. Since 2006, 21 students have taken this course. There are no graded assignments for this course, only developmental and process assignments used for application, instructional feedback, and revision. Accordingly, final course grades are their final assessment grades as well. Of these students, one student withdrew from the course for personal reasons and five took incompletes. Of those who received a final grade in the course (and thus the assessment), 17 received a grade of "A". Three students failed to turn in a final assessment by the deadline of the incompletes they had received, and were awarded a grade of F automatically as a result. One student who received an F re-registered for the course the second year, but never turned in any work and received an F again.

How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

Seventeen of 21, or 81% of all students received a grade of "A" for this final assessment. Of those who did not, one withdrew and the others never turned in the assessment. This data indicates that

the program is meeting the standards with which this assessment is aligned. Table 3 presents student data in more detail.

Attachment of Assessment Documentation

Assessment tool/description of the assignment
Generate a complete packet of materials developed in the previous assignments, including the addition of all supporting materials (facilitator's guide, job aids, etc.), and incorporating all feedback you have received. This packet is a stand-alone product, with all graphics, audio, video, animations, etc. completely developed an in place. Instruction and all supporting materials must be present and in their final form such that the packet can be handed to anyone for delivery/use. Materials include, but are not limited to:

- instructor guides,
- student handouts and other supporting materials,
- instructional and visual aids,
- student activities,
- assessment activities
- Neatness of materials.

You must also have completed your individual review with me and turn this assignment in on time. Failure to do either will result in a (one) letter grade reduction.

Guidelines.

- This material should be complete, including your design documentation on its own, the evaluation report, and the instructional materials used by the learner IN THEIR ACTUAL FINAL FORM
- All graphics, media, instruction, supporting materials, etc. must be present and professional in appearance

Student Guides:

Below are listed contents for the student booklet in an instructional program. Whether each item will be included depends in part on the age of the learners, the nature of the subject matter, the length of the booklet, and whether it is self-paced or facilitated instruction. The words "self-paced" or "facilitated" will appear after items that are unique to one or the other form of instruction. If neither is listed, the item applies to both.

1. Outside cover
2. Inside cover
3. Table of contents
5. Introduction to the instructional unit
    A. Description of what the instruction deals with (self-paced)
    B. Description of why it's important (self-paced)
    C. Pre-requisite skills and assumptions about learners (self-paced)
    D. Description of how the instruction will proceed, look like, what to expect, etc. (self-paced)
        1) Should include orientation to conventions and styles
        2) Suggestions for different learners (e.g., by expertise, etc.)

6. Content for objectives organized by section (your sequence)
    A. Time estimate for section
    B. Materials needed, assumptions, pre-requisite skills
    C. Introduction for the section (pre-instructional strategies, orientation, etc.)
    D. Attention to key instructional events within each section
        1) For EXAMPLE (order, frequency, terminology may vary)
            a) Information that learners need for the objective, including examples if appropriate
            b) Practice on the objective
            c) Feedback on the practice (self-paced)
            d) Enrichment (supplemental) optional
    E. Clear instructions for navigating, taking tests, checking work, etc. (self-paced)
7. Miscellaneous content & suggestions
    A. Use page numbers, consider headers that include the specific section titles and horizontal lines or icons

Teacher Materials:

The teacher guide normally is organized into three parts. The first part is simply the cover and prefatory materials. The second part is designed to inform the facilitator generally about the program. The third part is the lesson-by-lesson "How to do it" description for the instructor. If necessary, one or more additional sections can be added after the second part to incorporate other material that doesn't fit into Parts 1 and 2. It usually isn't necessary, however.

Part I –Cover and Prefatory Materials.

4. Outside cover
5. Inside cover
6. Table of contents

Part II – Introduction.

8. Content
    A. Introduction to the instructional unit
        1) Description of what the instruction deals with
            a) Objectives and major content
        2) Description of why it's important
        3) Pre-requisite skills and assumptions about learners
        4) Description of how the instruction will proceed, look like, what to expect, etc.
            a) Should include orientation to conventions and styles
9. Organization
    A. Number of units/lessons
    B. Tests
10. Materials

Listing and (preferably) brief description of each. The listing may just be in text form, rather than a vertical list, based on your preference and the number of items.

11. Unit Planning
    A. Time required for each

B. How lessons can be broken up
C. Day-to-day planning suggestions for implementing instruction
D. Getting started

Part III – Lesson Sequence. This section is the lesson-by-lesson description for the facilitator. For each lesson, it should include the items below.

12. Content for objectives organized by section (your sequence)
    A. Time estimate for section
    B. Materials needed, assumptions, pre-requisite skills
13. Procedures
    A. Have the teacher introduce the lesson by providing (you provide it) a brief statement about it for the class.
    B. Give the information, if any, that the teacher should present.
    C. Continue to describe what the teacher should do in the lesson. Common items to attend to include
        1) List student materials needed for the lesson
        2) oral or written practice
        3) feedback
        4) review

C. Optional Activities (Enrichment)

Consider suggesting additional things that the teacher and class can do to extend student learning related to the content of the lesson.

Scoring guide for the assessment

IDT 525 Instructional Development & Evaluation Assessment Rubric

Student Name: _____ Overall Rating: PASS FAIL

4 = Exceptional	Clearly demonstrates thorough evidence of accurate understanding of the instructional design construct. Employs appropriate relevant information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of extensive personal skills that are relevant, accurate, and consistent with the domain.
3 = Good	Demonstrates an understanding of appropriate instructional design constructs. Employs adequate supporting information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of personal skills that are adequate and consistent with the domain.
2 = Fair	Demonstrates only a very general understanding of instructional design constructs. Employs limited information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of limited personal skills consistent with the domain.
1 = Poor	Demonstrates little or no evidence of understanding design constructs or domain. Product and design are not reflective of personal skills needed to be consistent with the domain,
NA	This construct/criteria is not relevant for this project, requires justification in design documentation.

Design Documentation					
Problem Identification	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional learner/context analysis	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional content analysis	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional mastery (objectives)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Orienting strategies	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional strategies	N/A	1	2	3	4
Sequencing	N/A	1	2	3	4

Assessment instrumentation	N/A	1	2	3	4
Formative evaluation report	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL DESIGN DOCUMENTATION		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Instructional Unit					
Alignment with Design Documentation	N/A	1	2	3	4
Solves identified problem (is complete)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructor Guide	N/A	1	2	3	4
Learner Support/Guide	N/A	1	2	3	4
Support Materials	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Writing Quality					
Writing quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Editing quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL PRESENTATION QUALITY		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Candidate data derived from the assessment

Table 3. Learner By Objective Component Analysis

Learners	**Final Grade**
1	A
2	A
3	A
4	A
5	A
6	A
7	A
8	A
9	A
10	A
11	A
12	A
13	A
14	A
15	A
16	A
17	A

18	W
19	F
20	F
21	F
# Who Mastered	17
% Who Mastered	81%

#4 PEDAGOGICAL AND PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND DISPOSITIONS: Assessment that demonstrates candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions are applied effectively in practice.

Description of The Assessment (One Sentence May Be Sufficient)

This assessment is comprised of the mid-term and final evaluations of the student's internship experience provided by their internship supervisor. All students are required to work as an instructional designer for 80 hours during a semester, and their supervisor is required to provide an evaluation of their performance on the job as a practicing instructional designer. While the internship has always been a part of the program, initial formative evaluation and assessment of the program via surveys and bi-annual program meetings in 2005 indicated that more guidance was needed for students and internship supervisors, and more data needed to be collected to assess the process and outcomes. Accordingly, we instituted a proposal approval form which describes the internship project that is being proposed. This must be approved by the faculty prior to the internship. Additionally, we required that students keep a weekly journal. In 2006, feedback and assessment indicated that mid-term assessments were needed to ensure the project was proceeding as originally proposed and to catch any potential problems before they became insoluble. Accordingly, we instituted a student and supervisor mid-term and end-term evaluation form, providing 4 additional data points for the process. We also instituted a supervisor letter of agreement spelling out what the student would be doing for the internship and indicating that the supervisor was willing to oversee the student experience as described and to complete the mid and end-term evaluations.

Description of how this Assessment Specifically Aligns with the Standards it Is Cited for in Section III

This assessment primarily addresses the standard of development, as virtually all internships require the generation of instructional materials independently or as part of a team. This is the point of an internship--to provide real-world development experience. It is not possible to document the exact nature of each internship experience, but students must pose a suggested internship experience which is evaluated by the faculty for its ability to provide the desired development experience. Supervisor and student ratings of their experience at mid and end points of the experience serve as data points for evaluation.

Analysis of the Data Findings

Although seven students have graduated since the program was revised, some were part of the old program and/or had done their internships before the new assessment measures were implemented in 2005, and two are completing them this term. Because the internship assessment information was modified based on ongoing assessments, each of these students began the process with different aspects of the assessment in place. Finally, data collection procedures were not fully specified and implemented immediately, resulting in missing data points for some students. Current policy now specifies that each student complete each document and submit it directly (paper versions) to the advisor before grades will be assigned, and that these forms be filed with the student file in the graduate director's office. Accordingly, for this report only partial data are available for four students at this point, only one of whom completed the internship with the new process and assessment forms.

Of these students, we have weekly journals for all students, supervisor letters of agreement for two, and mid-term evaluation data for one student. The journals all document that the experiences were relevant and address the standards with which this assessment is aligned, and that students were actively engaged in practice and reflection on that practice. The mid-term evaluation data showed that the student "Strongly Agreed" that their progress was satisfactory, that they were prepared, getting what they needed, had adequate contact and input from the supervisor, were able to implement that feedback, and were receiving the support needed. The student only "agreed" that their work was focused on instructional design of a project rather than on other areas of development, commenting that he had been involved in other aspects as well as design, and that this was desired, relevant, and beneficial. The supervisor mid-term evaluation indicated that she "Strongly Agreed" that the student's progress was satisfactory, that the student was professional, that the student displayed a positive attitude, and "Agreed" (highest category for this question) that the student had been punctual and accepted and followed through on feedback.

How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

Data are incomplete due to formative evaluation and revision to the internship process, making strong conclusions unwarranted at this time. Preliminary evidence suggests, however, that the internship experiences are meeting the standards with the assessments are aligned. Now that the process is relatively stable, and policies and procedures are in place to ensure reliable collection of all data, this assessment will generate enough data to more fully evaluate the process this next year.

Attachment of Assessment Documentation

Assessment tool/description of the assignment

Internship and Practicum Project Description

The internship is a culminating experience in which the student assumes responsibility for an instructional design and technology project. Internships are conducted in an environment where other instructional designers, curriculum designers, or training developers are engaged in the process of instructional design and development in the real world. The internship should require the student to be actively engaged in the process of instructional design and development with

others, although independent work may be a part of this. Appropriate tasks include any of the activities associated with instructional design, including instructional design, media development, multimedia, web-design, editing, working with SMEs, etc.

Independent work on project development that does not occur in such an environment with other ID professionals is generally more appropriate for the practicum. The practicum is usually a project taken on for others in which the student designs or develops some form of instructional product or products related to instruction in the real world.

The number of hours required for the practicum and the internship vary by the number of credit hours chosen. Two credit hours requires a total of 80 hours, three credit hours requires a total of 90 hours and four credit hours requires a total of 180 total hours should be planned to complete the project. While it is possible to do a practicum or an internship within the organization that the student works currently, the project must be something that would not normally be done as part of the student's duties.

Requirements include:

Write one to one and half pages describing the project, your role, your supervisor(s)' role, the process and the purpose using the Internship/Practicum Proposal Form (attached). Submit this document for approval. We recommend a date a minimum of 2 to 4 weeks prior to the end of the semester before doing the internship. Your advisor will review the proposal to ensure that the project is appropriate for instructional design. Remember, you should be involved in a project in an ID capacity, whether working on your own or as part of a larger team.

Once the proposal is approved by your academic advisor, you will be required to obtain signatures on the Letter of Agreement form (attached). This form should outline the requirements for your supervisor which include a brief mid-term evaluation (at the mid-point point) and a final evaluation. You should generate these requirements in consultation with your supervisor, but it is your primary responsibility to develop it.

When the project begins, you will be required to submit a weekly reflective journal to your advisor which should outline your activities for the week, your thoughts on what you've learned, and your goals for the next week. Any questions should be indicated in a question and answer section which will make it easier for your advisor to immediately address your needs. You will be responsible for scheduling a meeting with your advisor at the approximate mid-point of your internship/practicum. It is also your responsibility to let your advisor know, in a timely fashion, about any issues that interfere with your completion of the internship as described here.

Internship/Practicum Proposal Form

Name:

Project Supervisor(s):

Academic Advisor:

Proposed Dates: Begins: _____ Ends: _____

Design Documentation (Write one to one and half pages outlining tasks and basic content of project.):

1. Describe the time frame (include dates of experience and estimated hours per day/week, etc.):

2. Describe the project. What are the tasks? Who are the tasks for? Why is this project necessary? What is the relation of this project to IDT?

3. Where will the project be?

Scoring guide for the assessment

Student Internship Evaluation

Dear Student:

The purpose of the following evaluation is to review your progress as well as any issues or concerns that have occurred during the first 40 hours and again at the end of the project as outlined in the Proposal Form. Please complete the questionnaire below, sign and return to Dr. Rick Van Eck at Instructional Design & Technology, Department of Teaching & Learning, Education Room 101, 231 Centennial Dr Stop 7189, Grand Forks, ND 58202-7189 (phone: 701.777.3574).

This evaluation is for (check one): ☐ Midterm ☐ Final					
Ratings					
SD=Strongly Disagree; D=Disagree; N=Neutral; A=Agree; SA=Strongly Agree					
	SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**
My progress toward outlined goals has been satisfactory.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
My work has been focused on the instructional design of the	SD	D	N	A	SA
project (rather than other areas of development).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
	SD	D	N	A	SA
I was prepared for this experience.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
	SD	D	N	A	NA
I feel that I am getting what I need from this experience.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
	SD	D	N	A	NA
I have had adequate contact and input from my supervisor.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
I feel that I have been able to accept and follow through on feedback	SD	D	N	A	NA

from my supervisor.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
	SD	D	N	A	NA
I am getting the support needed to complete the project.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					

Additional Comments:

Signatures	
Supervisor Signature	Date
Student Signature	Date

Supervisor Internship Midterm Evaluation

Dear Project Supervisor:

The purpose of the following evaluation is to notify the student and his or her academic advisor of progress as well as any issues or concerns that have occurred during the first 40 hours of the project and again at the end of the project outlined in the Proposal form. Please complete the questionnaire below, sign and return to Dr. Richard Van Eck at Instructional Design & Technology, Department of Teaching & Learning, Education Room 101, 231 Centennial Dr Stop 7189, Grand Forks, ND 58202-7189 (phone: 701.777.3574).

This evaluation is for (check one): ☐ Midterm ☐ Final					
Ratings					
	SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**
The student's progress toward outlined goals has been satisfactory.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
	SD	D	N	A	SA
The student has performed in a professional manner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
	SD	D	N	A	SA
The student has displayed a positive attitude.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
	SD	D	N	A	NA
The student has been punctual and responsive.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments					
	SD	D	N	A	NA
The student accepts and follows through on feedback.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments					
Additional Comments:					
Signatures					
Supervisor Signature	Date				
Student Signature	Date				

Candidate data derived from the assessment
Hard copies of data exist as described earlier. Only one student has evaluation form data, which are included below rather than in tabular form. Future data will be collected and tabulated for analysis.

#5 (Required)-EFFECTS ON STUDENT/CLIENT LEARNING: Assessment that demonstrates candidate effects on the provision of supportive learning environments for student or client learning.

Description of The Assessment (One Sentence May Be Sufficient)

The scholarly project evaluation document is part of the capstone experience, and a sub-set of the larger assessment of the full scholarly project document. Like the assessments in IDT 520 and 525 (assessments 2 and 3), the scholarly project is comprised of a full design document, fully developed instructional materials, the implementation of those materials, and the evaluation of those materials and their efficacy. Unlike assessments 2 and 3, the scholarly project also includes a public presentation and oral defense of the project, and is completed entirely without input or feedback from faculty.

This assessment (number 5) is comprised solely of the evaluation document which forms a part of the overall scholarly project. In this document, learners must describe how they implemented the formative evaluation process with 3 one-to-one evaluations. During this process, three individuals are selected from the target audience for the instruction, and each experiences the full instruction. Data are carefully collected during this process via observation, think-aloud protocols, and learning performance. Revisions are made between each participant until the instruction appears to be effective. The instruction is then implemented with 5 to 8 members of the target audience exactly as intended, in the same environment and with the same resources as will occur in future implementations of the instruction. The student must document the entire process in complete

detail, including how they controlled for aptitude, process, and support variables to ensure the participants and environment reflected the targeted audience and environmental context, how each individual fared on the learning outcomes by each objective, what revisions were made and why, and whether the instruction was ultimately effective or requires additional revision.

Description of how this Assessment Specifically Aligns with the Standards it Is Cited for in Section III

The whole point of the evaluation plan and report is to test and document the actual instructional impact on learners and the adequacy of the instruction through the use of formative and summative evaluation as specified in the **standard of evaluation**. The evaluation report is NOT designed to assess any of the other standards, although it is part of a larger assessment that does (see assessment 6, below).

Analysis of the Data Findings

The program as fully revised and implemented in the 2005-2006 year. However, the current assessment measures were not developed until the end of the 2006-2007 school year. Because this is a capstone assessment, data are only collected for those graduating. There were 5 students who graduated after the implementation of the current assessment measures, and of those, three graduated under the old program in which the scholarly project was not required, and one graduated before the final assessment rubric was in place. Accordingly, we have pass/fail data for 1 student and full assessment data for 1 student (the rest did not complete this assessment as it was not required under the catalog under which they were admitted to the program). The one student for whom data exist scored 2 out of 4 on the formative evaluation report from one member of the committee, and 4 out of 4 from the second voting member of the committee.

How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

Data are insufficient to warrant strong conclusions at this point. While an average score of 3 is considered "good" on the scoring rubric, the score of 2 out of 2 indicated some work needed to be done. This was our first student to go through the full process, so he had no models to work from. We have instituted a meeting for those beginning the scholarly project at which we emphasize the importance of the full ID process, including formative and summative evaluation in detail. Data will be collected in the future and analyzed to see if this standard is being met adequately by the program.

Attachment of Assessment Documentation

Assessment tool/description of the assignment

1. Write up the results of a multi-method evaluation process of instructional materials that you have developed and implemented at the formative and summative levels;
2. Successfully defend the efficacy of your instruction before a panel of IDT faculty.

Project Requirements

A complete project will include:

1. A complete design document;
2. A complete instructional product;
3. An evaluation plan and a write up of evaluation results.

Oral Exam
All candidates must discuss the effectiveness of their instruction according to formative and summative evaluation procedures and theory and use design, instruction, and evaluation documents to support their position.

Scoring guide for the assessment

IDT Scholarly Project Assessment Rubric

MS Candidate Name: _____ Overall Rating: PASS FAIL

4 = Exceptional	Clearly demonstrates thorough evidence of accurate understanding of the instructional design construct. Employs appropriate relevant information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of extensive personal skills that are relevant, accurate, and consistent with the domain.
3 = Good	Demonstrates an understanding of appropriate instructional design constructs. Employs adequate supporting information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of personal skills that are adequate and consistent with the domain.
2 = Fair	Demonstrates only a very general understanding of instructional design constructs. Employs limited information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of limited personal skills consistent with the domain.
1 = Poor	Demonstrates little or no evidence of understanding design constructs or domain. Product and design are not reflective of personal skills needed to be consistent with the domain,
NA	This construct/criteria is not relevant for this project, requires justification in design documentation.

Design Documentation					
Formative evaluation report	N/A	1	2	3	4
Comments:					

Candidate data derived from the assessment
Only one data point is available for this assessment, and it was a 3 out 4 average score on the assessment.

#6 (Required): Additional assessment that addresses AECT standards.

Description of The Assessment (One Sentence May Be Sufficient)

This assessment is the capstone experience for all IDT students, who replicate the full instructional design process, including analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation independently and then defend that process before a panel of IDT faculty. This assessment is a capstone experience that replicates the process and assessment of initial instructional design competencies done as part of assessments 2 and 3 in students' first year of study. Students must conduct the entire process independently without benefit of any feedback along the way, thus demonstrating full competence in all phases of the ID process.

Description of how this Assessment Specifically Aligns with the Standards it Is Cited for in Section III

This assessment measures every standard at the highest level, and serves as the best assessment of program efficacy in terms of student learning outcomes. Students must replicate the full ID process first demonstrated in assessments 2 and 3, but as a single cohesive unit rather than split up into two assessments. As such, the assessment is aligned with the same standards as assessment 2 through the first seven components as described below:

1. *Instructional Problem, Rationale, & Goal*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to identify a real-world instructional problem, provide the rationale for the need to solve this problem and for instruction as the means to solve this problem, and to state an instructional goal for the instruction. This component primarily addresses the **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design), and secondarily the **standard of development** (develop instructional materials) as this is the first step in the development process, and the **standard of evaluation** (applying principles of problem analysis).

2. *Environmental Context, Learner, Prerequisite, and ID Implications Analysis*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to analysis the cultural, political, and physical environment in which the instructional problem is situated, to analyze the learners for individual differences, to identify any prerequisite knowledge needed for the proposed instruction, and to take the results of these analyses and specify what the instructional design implications are for each area (what must be done in the instruction to address the strengths and weaknesses and characteristics of the environment and learners). This component primarily addresses the **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design; learner characteristics; and to a lesser extent via implications for design, message design and instructional strategies), and secondarily the **standard of utilization** (media utilization, diffusion, and policy-making originate here).

3. *Initial Instructional Sequence*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate an initial sequence of instruction in order to help delineate the instructional scope of the project. It is refined further in component 7. This component primarily addresses the **standard of management** (demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan and organize…).

4. *Task & Learning Task Analysis*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate a complete task analysis of the content to be taught, broken down into constituent learning objectives which are categorized by Gagné's varieties of learning taxonomy and represented hierarchically by enabling or target objectives using Gagné's learned capability verbs. This component primarily assesses the **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design),

and secondarily the **standard of management** (demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan and organize…).

5. *Objectives & Assessment Matrix*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate five-component objectives (situation, learned capability verb, objective of the learning, action verb, and tools and constraints) from the learning task analysis and to generate sample assessment items that measure each objective. This component primarily addresses **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design), and secondarily the **standard of evaluation** (applying principles of criteria-referenced measurement).

6. *Assessment Instruments*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate the multiple assessment instruments that will be used to assess learning in their final instructional product. This component primarily addresses **standard of design** (design conditions for learning by applying principles of instructional systems design), and secondarily the **standard of development** (develop instructional materials, of which the assessments are a part) and the **standard of evaluation** (evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles of criteria-referenced measurement).

7. *Final Instructional Sequence*

This component of the assessment requires the learner to generate a revised instructional sequence based on the identified objectives from the previous components, including chunking the instructional units according to the collected objectives that will be addressed together, estimating the instructional time for each unit, and specifying the times at which each objective will be assessed. This component primarily addresses the **standard of management** (demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to plan and organize…), and secondarily the **standard of evaluation** (evaluate the adequacy of instruction and learning by applying principles of criteria-referenced measurement, and long-range planning).

These elements thus fully address the **standard of design** and secondarily address the **standards of management, development, utilization, management, and evaluation**. The components from assessment 3 are also part of this capstone assessment, including the full development of all instructional materials (student guide, facilitator guide, handouts, assessments, etc.), implementation of the full instructional product with 11 members of the target audience, and the full application of formative and summative evaluation processes, and the extensive planning and project management that are required to both implement the instruction with a real-world audience and to manage the evaluation process in such a way as to collect all information and complete the process in time to defend their project. These elements fully address the **standards of development, utilization, and management, and evaluation**.

Finally, this assessment also incorporates an oral presentation and defense of the product and process, which is unique to this assessment and ensures that the candidate is not only able to

perform these skills sets, but to also reflect upon them and engage in a meaningful discussion with other instructional designers as a colleague and peer about the instructional design process.

Analysis of the Data Findings

At the time of this writing, three students have gone through the full assessment as it is currently designed. All three passed, two of them conditionally. A conditional pass indicates that the student overall is competent, but may have received less than a 3 out of 4 on one or more components. Where these scores are seen as only minor issues or areas that can reasonably be attributed to differences in perspective rather than skill on the part of the student, they may be ignored. In cases where the issue appears to be related to minimal competencies, the student is required to make revisions and re-submit to the committee chair within one week. If the committees concerns are satisfactorily addressed, the student passes and paperwork to that effect is completed. There are 12 possible points on the evaluation rubric. One student scored a 9 out of 12, another scored 12 out of 12, and another scored 11 out of 12. All of these are considered passing scores. The two conditional passes required additional revision to the evaluation document, and in once case the correction of some basic typographical and grammatical errors throughout the documentation. Both sets of revisions were made and were satisfactory.

How Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

We have a 100% pass rate on this assessment to date, indicating that the program appears to be meeting the standards to which it is aligned regarding this assessment. We noticed a weakness on the evaluation section, and have revised both the IDT 520 and 525 courses as well as the materials and support that go into preparing students to begin their scholarly project.

Attachment of Assessment Documentation

Assessment tool/description of the assignment

IDT 995 Course Requirements

Course Goals

This course is designed to provide an opportunity for students to demonstrate professional competency as an instructional designer, including the opportunity:

1. to demonstrate professional competence in the Instructional Design process;
2. to demonstrate professional competence by developing useable instructional materials;
3. to engage in a comprehensive formative evaluation of the complete package of produced materials;
4. to develop a final portfolio product.

Course Requirements

You will develop an instructional product using an instructional design model of your choosing. You will develop the product "from cradle to grave." This is equivalent to the process and design document that you created in the IDT 520 and 525 classes, and that document should serve as your model in this regard. We will, however, be looking for the equivalent of "A" work in those classes, so strive to do that level of work in this project.

You will be personally responsible for making all of the instructional design and development decisions. While you may consult with any IDT faculty member, student, or other knowledgeable person, you are ultimately responsible for all decisions. The nature of your support and interactions with the IDT faculty should be commensurate with those that are appropriate for a practicing instructional designer to have with his or her peers on the job.

You will be required to publicly display your products at an oral examination that will be open to other IDT students. However, your oral exam and final evaluation of your project will be conducted by the IDT faculty in a closed session.

Course requirements include:

1. Prepare a complete instructional design document including decisions on problem identification, goal analysis, learner and setting analysis, and other appropriate front end analysis elements;
3. Prepare appropriate instructional support materials including but not limited to: teacher guides, student guides, instructional aids, visual aids, and assessment tools;
4. Design, implement, and write up the results of a multi-method evaluation process at the formative level;
5. Prepare the final package of instructional materials and accompanying documentation;
6. Successfully defend all design and development decisions before a panel of IDT faculty.

Course Activities

For students engaging in this course option, mandatory course meetings are not required. A schedule of due dates will be communicated to you at the first project meeting during the semester or made available to you if you are not able to attend this optional information meeting.

It must be understood that the purpose of this is to certify that you can manage the instructional design and development process with minimal supervision. This means that while a supervising faculty member will help with reviews and guidance, you must make and, ultimately, defend all of your design and development decisions.

Success in the course depends not on your ability to make the same decisions that the supervising faculty member would make, but rather on your ability to successfully defend the decisions that you do make.

Project Requirements

A complete project will include:

1. A project proposal;
2. A complete design document;
3. A complete instructional product;
4. An evaluation plan and a write up of evaluation results.

Because of the confines of the semester system, it is strongly recommended that students work on leader led, or self-paced paper-based materials for an instructional unit between 30 minutes and one hour. Other media will need to be approved by the IDT faculty. Projects outside of the one outlined here may be done, but must be approved by the supervising IDT faculty member.

Oral Exam

All candidates must defend their design and development decisions to an IDT committee of at least two faculty members. The oral exam will consist of questions specific to the candidate's project, and generic to the field of Instructional Design & Technology. For example, if the candidate elects to use a particular instructional design model, the candidate could be asked to explain the rationale for choosing that model over a different model. Or, if a candidate chooses to create self-paced product instead of a leader led product, the candidate may be asked to defend the instructional method or choice of media used.

Critical Dates

1. Sep 04 First draft proposal due*
2. Sep 06 Intent to Graduate materials due
3. Oct 02 Design Document completed (but not submitted)
4. Oct 29 Evaluations completed (but not submitted)
5. Nov 05 Presentation of Materials to the IDT faculty
6. Nov 12 Oral Exams begin

* Topic must be approved by advisor prior to submission of proposal.

Scoring guide for the assessment

IDT Scholarly Project Assessment Rubric

MS Candidate Name: _____ Overall Rating: PASS FAIL

4 = Exceptional	Clearly demonstrates thorough evidence of accurate understanding of the instructional design construct. Employs appropriate relevant information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of extensive personal skills that are relevant, accurate, and consistent with the domain.
3 = Good	Demonstrates an understanding of appropriate instructional design constructs. Employs adequate supporting information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of personal skills that are adequate and consistent with the domain.
2 = Fair	Demonstrates only a very general understanding of instructional design constructs. Employs limited information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of limited personal skills consistent with the domain.
1 = Poor	Demonstrates little or no evidence of understanding design constructs or domain. Product and design are not reflective of personal skills needed to be consistent with the domain,
NA	This construct/criteria is not relevant for this project, requires justification in design documentation.

Design Documentation					
Problem Identification	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional learner/context analysis	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional content analysis	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional mastery (objectives)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Orienting strategies	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional strategies	N/A	1	2	3	4
Sequencing	N/A	1	2	3	4
Assessment instrumentation	N/A	1	2	3	4
Formative evaluation report	N/A	1	2	3	4

OVERALL DESIGN DOCUMENTATION		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Instructional Unit					
Alignment with Design Documentation	N/A	1	2	3	4
Solves identified problem (is complete)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructor Guide	N/A	1	2	3	4
Learner Support/Guide	N/A	1	2	3	4
Support Materials	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Presentation Quality					
Writing quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Editing quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Graphics quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Layout quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Interface quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Functionality/Navigation	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL PRESENTATION QUALITY		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Faculty Signature_____ Date _____

Candidate data derived from the assessment

Table 4. Student performance data on capstone assessment.

Learners	**Design Document** (4 possible)	**Instructional Unit** (4 possible)	**Presentation** (4 possible)	**Total** (20 possible)	**Pass/Fail**
1	3	3	3	9	Conditional Pass
2	4	4	4	12	Pass
3	4	4	3	11	Conditional Pass
# Who Mastered	3	3	3	3	3
% Who Mastered	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

SECTION V—USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE AND PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Evidence must be presented in this section that assessment results have been analyzed and have been or will be used to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. This description should not link improvements to individual assessments but, rather, it should summarize principal findings from the evidence, the faculty's interpretation of those findings, and changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and the program. **This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.**

(response limited to 3 pages)

This information should be organized around (1) content knowledge, (2) professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions, and (3) student learning.

While these key assessments document our alignment and evaluation process for the IDT program, they constitute only one part of our ongoing program assessment, which also includes:

1. A bi-annual program meetings at which students, alumni, and program faculty exchange ideas and information about the current state of the program and possible future directions or needs
2. An ongoing ListServ on which students, faculty, alumni, and community members share ideas and resources
3. An annual online program survey
4. Daily interactions with students
5. Weekly program area meetings

We have recently hired a second faculty member and are taking a collective look at the state of the program. Data from this report are a part of that process. We do not feel that the current program has been in place long enough to warrant strong conclusions regarding significant changes, although preliminary analysis shows there may be some evidence that improvements can be made in the future. We will continue to collect data according to the assessment and processes outlined in this report now that all assessments are uniformly available and implemented, and now that policies are in place to ensure consistent collection of key assessment data.

We have already begun the process of program revision prior to the data captured here in this report, but this is largely based on our other program assessment data (e.g., the surveys).

Content Knowledge

Our students appear to be mastering the content-related knowledge in IDT based on key assessment data. However, some students seem to struggle with the evaluation process. It seems that they have the skills needed, but fail to apply them correctly out of a misperception of what is

required for the evaluation documentation. In addition, faculty perceptions during courses suggest that they lack prerequisite knowledge of some of the basic cognitive learning theories that might help them with tasks like specification of instructional strategies. We have revised our course materials for IDT 520 and 525 to emphasize the role and process of the formative evaluation document, and also emphasize its importance and key elements in our meetings with students who are preparing to take the scholarly project. We are also changing program requirements to make IDT 550, Theories and Models, a co-requisite to IDT 520 to address the issue of prerequisite cognitive learning theories. Data will continue to be collected and analyzed for evidence that we are meeting the content knowledge needs of our students.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skill, and Dispositions

Data indicate that our students are receiving and mastering the knowledge, skills and dispositions of instructional design practitioners. Our internship data, which is the only real assessment of professional practice in the real world during the program, indicates these experiences are successful in meeting program objectives. Data will continue to be collected and analyzed in this regard. Additionally, of those students who have graduated, our most recent survey shows that they feel the program prepared them to be practicing instructional designers (3.5 out of 4) and that 100% are using the skills they learned in the program and that 66% are working in the field of instructional design. We intend to formulate an advisory board of professionals in ID, including alumni, local businesses, and local school teachers, that will meet once or more per year to provide input on the program outcomes as it relates to candidate knowledge of pedagogy, skills, and dispositions. Input from this will be used to modify the program as necessary.

Student Learning

An analysis of course offerings reveals that current course schedules do not allow students to take 2 relevant and related courses every semester to meet each degree track requirement. In addition, our most recent survey indicates that there are some specific student learning needs that have implications for program design. In particular, the schedule and times for our program, which is a hybrid online/on-campus, synchronous/asynchronous program, may not be meeting the professional or learning needs of our students. Initially, it was believed that distance students could not attend weekly classes due to work schedules (otherwise, it was assumed they would be on-campus students somewhere). Student feedback from course evaluations prompted us to include questions about course rotation, offerings, schedules, times, and summer courses on our most recent survey.

Half of our online students indicated that they would prefer live reading discussions over online discussions, even if this required live class sessions every week. Half indicated that they could meet every week for a full class if required, and the other half indicated they would find it difficult, but not impossible. Accordingly, we are considering scheduling more live discussions sections for each class. Other feedback on course offerings, schedules, time of day for classes, etc. are also being used in conjunction with a careful analysis of course rotations to devise a new course rotation that ensures every student in every degree has access to two relevant courses each semester and that courses meet their scheduling and learning needs.

ATTACHMENT A

Candidate Information

The following tables show the number of IDT majors actively enrolled each year in the M.Ed. or M.S. degrees, as well as the number graduates each year. It is important to note that the program lost its only faculty member in 2003, and that for the year prior to that, enrollments were steadily declining as a result of poor program design and implementation. Accordingly, the data from year one reflects many of the problems inherited by the program. Likewise, as the program modifications were not implemented until 2005 due to normal curriculum change approval time frame (which at one year is considered very fast), 2006-2007 is the first year for which the results of the new program can be measured in any meaningful way. Enrollments of students as majors (more than 90% of whom were new majors) grew from 5 to 12 and then 17 over this three year period. Currently, there are approximately 41 student majors in IDT, 6 of whom are educators in the M.Ed. program. We anticipate graduating 12 by summer of 2008. At a graduate rate of 30% of the enrolled class in this and (if the trend continues) future years, it appears that the vast majority of our students graduate within two to three years of entering the program. Because most of them are employed full-time, they take 1 to 2 classes per semester, which means most will take 30 to 36 months to graduate.

Program: Master of Science		
Academic Year	**# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program**	**# of Program Completers[3]**
2007-2008*	35	10
2006-2007	9	2
2005-2006	4	2
2004-2005	5	2

Program: Master of Education		
Academic Year	**# of Candidates Enrolled in the Program**	**# of Program Completers**
2007-2008*	6	2
2006-2007	8	3
2005-2006	8	0
2004-2005	0	1

[3] NCATE uses the Title II definition for *program completers*. Program completers are persons who have met all the requirements of a state-approved teacher preparation program. Program completers include all those who are documented as having met such requirements. Documentation may take the form of a degree, institutional certificate, program credential, transcript, or other written proof of having met the program's requirements.

* Estimated, partial year data only, and includes students not actively enrolled this semester.

ATTACHMENT B

Faculty Information

Directions: Complete the following information for each faculty member responsible for professional coursework, clinical supervision, or administration in this program.

Faculty Member Name	Highest Degree, Field, & University	Assignment: Indicate the role of the faculty member	Faculty Rank	Tenure Track (Yes/ No)	Scholarship, Leadership in Professional Associations, and Service: List up to 3 major contributions in the past 3 years	Teaching or other professional experience in P-12 schools
Richard Van Eck	Ph.D., IDT, University of South Alabama.	Faculty, Graduate Director	Associate Professor	Yes	4 book chapters, 3 refereed journal articles, 1 refereed conference proceeding, 22 invited presentations, 19 conference presentations; Board member North American Simulations & Games Association, Reviewer for Association for Educational Communications and Technology and American Educational Research Association, reviewer for Educational Technology Research and Development Journal; 15 committees served on, 2 free professional development workshops for educators, 2.5 million grant to promote international research collaboration for graduate students	2 Workshops for teachers; grant to develop instructional simulation game for science education*
Woei Hung	Ph.D., IDT, University of Missouri, Columbia.	Faculty	Associate Professor	Yes	2 book chapters, 1 edited book, 6 refereed journal articles, 7 conference presentations; Reviewer for American Educational Research Association, Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning, 5 committees served on	N/A

* Our field, IDT, does not produce K-12 educators nor are we licensed to teach; IDT is a process that supports the design rather than delivery of instruction.

Appendix A

NCATE/AECT Standard	***Courses That Address This Standard***
1.1 Instructional Systems Design	
1.1.a Utilize and implement design principles which specify optimal conditions for learning.	*520; 525;* 530*;* 535*; (540);* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.1.b Identify a variety of instructional systems design models and apply at least one model.	*520; 525;* 530*;* 535*; (540); 550;* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.1.c Identify learning theories from which each model is derived and the consequent implications.	*(PSY501); (500);* 520*;* 525*; 550; **584**; **593**;* 995 ***
1.1.d (UND Local Objective) Describe and define the field of instructional design, including major theorists, models, approaches, history, and practices of instructional design	*500*
1.1.1 Analyzing	
1.1.1.a Write appropriate objectives for specific content and outcome levels.	*(500);* 510*; 520;* 530*;* 535*; (540);* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.1.1.b Analyze instructional tasks, content, and context.	*(500);* 510*; 520;* 530*;* 535*;* 540*;* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.1.1.c Categorize objectives using an appropriate schema or taxonomy.	*(500);* 510*; 520;* 530*;* 535*;* 540*;* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.1.1.d Compare and contrast curriculum objectives for their area(s) of preparation with federal, state, and/or professional content standards.	*510; 540;* 545
1.1.2 Designing	
1.1.2.b Create instructional plans (micro-level design) that address the needs of all learners, including appropriate accommodations for learners with special needs.	*510; 520;* 530*;* 535*;* 540*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.1.2.d Incorporate contemporary instructional technology processes in the development of interactive lessons that promote student learning.	*510; (520); 525;* 530*; 535; 540;* 545*; 580; **584**; **593**;* 995 ***
1.1.3 Developing	
1.1.3.a Produce instructional materials which require the use of multiple media (e.g., computers, video, projection).	*510;* 520*;* 525*; 530; 535; 540; 580; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.1.3.b Demonstrate personal skill development with at least one: computer authoring application, video tool, or electronic communication application.	510*; 530; 535; 540; (570); 580*
1.1.5 Evaluating	
1.1.5.a Utilize a variety of assessment measures to determine the adequacy of learning and instruction.	*520; 525;* 530*;* 535*;* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.1.5.b Demonstrate the use of formative and summative evaluation within practice and contextualized field experiences.	*520; 525;* 530*;* 535*;* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.1.5.c Demonstrate congruency among goals/objectives, instructional strategies, and assessment measures.	*520; 525;* 530*;* 535*; 540;* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.2 Message Design	
1.2.a Apply principles of educational psychology, communications theory, and visual literacy to the selection of media for macro- and micro-level design of instruction.	*PSY501; 520; 525;* 530*; 550; 580; **584**; **593**;* 995 ***
1.2.b Apply principles of educational psychology, communications theory, and visual literacy to the development of instructional messages specific to the learning task.	*PSY501; 520; 525;* 530*; 550; 580; **584**; **593** EFR509; PSY501; 995**
1.3 Instructional Strategies	
1.3.a Select instructional strategies appropriate for a variety of learner characteristics and learning situations.	*510; 520;* 530*;* 535*;* 540*;* 545*; 550;* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.3.b Identify at least one instructional model and demonstrate appropriate contextualized application within practice and field experiences.	*(500); 520; 525;* 530*; 540; (550); (560);* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**
1.3.c Analyze their selection of instructional strategies and/or models as influenced by the learning situation, nature of the specific content, and type of learner objective.	*510; 520; 525;* 530*;* 535*; 540;* 580*; **584**; **593**; 995**

Non-Italic: Standard has primary role in course
Italic: Standard has secondary role in course
(Parenthetical): Standard addressed only minimally (e.g., verbal information)
Bold: Course content varies with project and will address different standards accordingly (584 = practicum; 593 = internship experiences)
*: Capstone experience

NCATE/AECT Standard	*Current Program*
1.4 Learner Characteristics	
1.4.b Describe and/or document specific learner characteristics which influence the selection of instructional strategies.	*520; 530; 535; (545);* 550*; 580;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
1.4.c Describe and/or document specific learner characteristics which influence the implementation of instructional strategies.	*520; 530; 535; (545);* 550*; 580;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
2.0.1 Select appropriate media to produce effective learning environments using technology resources.	*510; (520); 525;* 530*;* 535*; 540; 580;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
2.0.2 Use appropriate analog and digital productivity tools to develop instructional and professional products.	*(520); 525;* 530*;* 535*; 540; 580;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
2.0.3 Apply instructional design principles to select appropriate technological tools for the development of instructional and professional products.	*(520); 525;* 530*;* 535*; 540; 580;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
2.0.4 Apply appropriate learning and psychological theories to the selection of appropriate technological tools and to the development of instructional and professional products.	*(PSY501); (520); 525;* 530*;* 535*; 540; 580;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
2.0.5 Apply appropriate evaluation strategies and techniques for assessing effectiveness of instructional and professional products.	*525;* 530*;* 535*;* 580*;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
2.0.6 Use the results of evaluation methods and techniques to revise and update instructional and professional products.	*525;* 530*;* 535*;* 580*;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
2.0.7 Contribute to a professional portfolio by developing and selecting a variety of productions for inclusion in the portfolio.	500; 510; 520; 525; 530; 535; 540; 545; 550; 560; 570; 580; **584**; 590; 591; 592; **593**; 997*;* 995 *
2.1 Print Technologies	
2.1.1 Develop instructional and professional products using a variety of technological tools to produce text for communicating information.	500*; 510; 520; 525; 530;* 535*; 540; 560; 570; 580;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
2.1.3 Use presentation application software to produce presentations and supplementary materials for instructional and professional purposes.	*Integrated throughout program*
2.2 Audiovisual Technologies	
2.2.2 Apply development techniques such as storyboarding and or scriptwriting to plan for the development of audio/video technologies.	*530; 535; 545*
2.2.3 Use appropriate video equipment (e.g., camcorders, video editing) to prepare effective instructional and professional products.	530*;* 535*; 540;* 580
2.2.4 Use a variety of projection devices with appropriate technology tools to facilitate presentations and instruction.	*Integrated throughout program*
2.3 Computer-Based Technologies	
2.3.1 Design and produce audio/video instructional materials which use computer-based technologies.	*530; 535; 540; 580*
2.3.2 Design, produce, and use digital information with computer-based technologies.	*530; 535; 540;* 570*; 580*
2.3.3 Use imaging devices (e.g., digital cameras, video cameras, scanners) to produce computer-based instructional materials.	*530; 535; 540;* 570*; 580*
2.4 Integrated Technologies	
2.4.1 Use authoring tools to create effective hypermedia/multimedia instructional materials or products.	*530; 535; 540;* 570*; 580*
2.4.2 Develop and prepare instructional materials and products for various distance education delivery technologies.	530*;* 535*; 540; (560); (570); 580*
2.4.4 Use telecommunications tools such as electronic mail and browsing tools for the World Wide Web to develop instructional and professional products.	*510; 540; (560); (570); 580*
2.4.5 Develop effective Web pages with appropriate links using various technological tools (e.g., print technologies, imaging technologies, and video).	*540; 580*
3.1 Media Utilization	
3.1.1 Identify key factors in selecting and using technologies appropriate for learning situations specified in the instructional design process.	*510; 520; 525; 530; 535; 540; 545; 560; 580; 995**

Non-Italic: Standard has primary role in course
Italic: Standard has secondary role in course
(Parenthetical): Standard addressed only minimally (e.g., verbal information)
Bold: Course content varies with project and will address different standards accordingly (584 = practicum; 593 = internship experiences)
*: Capstone experience

NCATE/AECT Standard	***Current Program***
3.2 Diffusion of Innovations	
3.2.1 Identify strategies for the diffusion, adoption, and dissemination of innovations in learning communities.	545*; 560; 570*
3.3 Implementation and Institutionalization	
3.3.1 Use appropriate instructional materials and strategies in various learning contexts.	500*; 510; (520); 525;* 530*;* 535*; 540;* 545*; 550; 560; 570;* 580*; 995**
3.3.2 Identify and apply techniques for integrating ECIT innovations in various learning contexts.	*(540); 560; 570*
3.3.3 Identify strategies to maintain use after initial adoption.	*560; 570*
3.4 Policies and Regulations	
3.4.1 Identify and apply standards for the use of instructional technology.	*510; 540*
3.4.2 Identify and apply policies which incorporate professional ethics within practice.	*Integrated throughout curriculum*
3.4.3 Identify and apply copyright and fair use guidelines within practice.	*Integrated throughout curriculum*
3.4.5 Identify policies and regulations which apply to the utilization, application, and integration of distance delivery technologies.	*(540); 580*
4.0.1 Demonstrate leadership attributes with individuals and groups (e.g., interpersonal skills, group dynamics, team building).	*Integrated throughout curriculum*
4.1 Project Management	
4.1.1 Apply project management techniques in various learning and training contexts.	*560; 570*
4.2 Resource Management	
4.2.1 Apply resource management techniques in various learning and training contexts.	*560; 570*
4.3 Delivery System Management	
4.3.1 Apply delivery system management techniques in various learning and training contexts.	*530; 535;* 560*;* 570*; 580*
4.4 Information Management	
4.4.1 Apply information management techniques in various learning and training contexts.	535*; 560; 570*
5.1 Problem Analysis	
5.1.1 Identify and apply problem analysis skills in appropriate educational communications and instructional technology (ECIT) contexts	*(520); 560; 570;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
5.2 Criterion-Referenced Measurement	
5.2.1 Develop and apply criterion-referenced measures in a variety of ECIT contexts.	*PSY501; 525;* 530*;* 535*; 540;* 545*;* 580*;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
5.3 Formative and Summative Evaluation	
5.3.1 Develop and apply formative and summative evaluation strategies in a variety of ECIT contexts.	*520; 525;* 530*;* 535*;* 580*;* ***584****;* ***593****; 995**
6.1 Performance Improvement (UND Local Objective)	
6.1.1 Analyze, specify, implement, evaluate, and maintain human performance technology solutions to performance problems	560*; 570*

Non-Italic: Standard has primary role in course
Italic: Standard has secondary role in course
(Parenthetical): Standard addressed only minimally (e.g., verbal information)
Bold: Course content varies with project and will address different standards accordingly (584 = practicum; 593 = internship experiences)
*: Capstone experience