R511: Instructional Technology Foundations (Fall 2016)
IST Department, IU School of Education
(Section 6666; Face-to-Face Version; Syllabus (HTML, Word, PDF)
Syllabus: http://php.indiana.edu/~cjbonk/P511_FTF_syllabus_fall_2016.htm
Zoom (Synchronous); https://IU.zoom.us/j/8123222878 or https://IU.zoom.us/my/curtbonk
Course Link to Canvas: http://canvas.iu.edu/

Instructor: Professor Curt Bonk, Indiana University, Email: cjbonk@indiana.edu
Bonk Homepage: http://php.indiana.edu/~cjbonk/
Student Info: http://www.trainingshare.com/r511bios.php
Instructional Assistant: Kei Tomita, IST Doctoral Student, Email: ktomita@indiana.edu

Course Description
This is a foundational course in Instructional Systems Technology (IST) and provides an overview of instructional technology (IT) (which many people refer to as "educational technology" (or just "ed tech")) and more recently, some might refer to "learning technology" and "digital technology"). Your instructor was trained at the University of Wisconsin where they referred to the field as educational technology, in which he minored, while majoring in educational psychology. Hence, he will refer to the field using different terms this semester. The course also explores the important and fast emerging field of human performance technology (HPT). There are several courses in IST related to HPT.

Given that many IST students come from diverse fields and backgrounds, R511 provides a sense of history and an explanation of how the components of instructional technology, educational technology, learning technology, and human performance technology, and other associated fields all fit together. The course has been designed to focus primarily on IT and HPT. An introduction to IT and HPT includes definitions, theories, histories, trends and issues, and career opportunities. Class discussions and activities will be devoted to broadening your understanding of these fields as they relate to learning and performance in diverse organizations and institutions (e.g., schools, colleges and universities, military training departments, corporate learning, non-profit entities, government settings) as well as in more self-directed and often solitary educational pursuits.

Learning Objectives
Those enrolled in this course are expected to develop an understanding of the basic vocabulary and underlying principles of IT and HPT as well as learn about many of the key contributors to these fields. By the end of this course, you should be able to:
1. **Terms:** Use and comprehend many of the basic terms in IT and HPT with comprehension, confidence, and high ethical character.
2. **Definitions and Frameworks:** Generate personal definitions and conceptual frameworks for thinking about the fields of IT and HPT as a means to better engage with the content and expand one's learning.
3. **Conceptual Models:** Compare and contrast different conceptual models, frameworks, and definitions that have emerged over the past century or more; in particular, the past two or three decades.
4. **History:** Trace the evolution of major ideas in IT and HPT over time, including being able to explicate one's internal understanding in the forms of concept maps, timelines, taxonomies, flowcharts, models, etc.
5. **Leaders:** Begin to associate key people with different ideas in terms of HPT and IT. As the course moves into the latter stages, one should begin to discern people with common perspectives or

instructional philosophies.

6. **Trends:** Identify and discuss trends and issues that affect the fields of IT and HPT today. In addition, one should predict new trends and concerns on the near horizon.
7. **Careers:** Gain an understanding of career development and potential roles in IT, HPT, and associated fields. As part of this, one should learn about key professional organizations and associations as well as popular and emerging conferences, institutes, and meetings in the field. One might even become a member, reviewer, or contributor within one or more of such professional organizations. Exploring possible career paths and goals is a part of this objective.
8. **Potential Role:** Begin to realize the vast job opportunities in the field as well as some in related fields; and ponder your potential role or responsibilities in one or more such positions.
9. **Personal Network:** Begin to grow your network of contacts in the field of instructional and educational technology through meetings with synchronous guest experts as well as archived videos of such esteemed leaders.
10. **Standards:** Become aware of performance standards advocated by different professional organizations and institutions, technical reports and white papers, and governmental policies.
11. **Values:** Appreciate the different values espoused by those in these fields as they push for greater access, instructional efficiencies, effective educational processes, and generally enhancing the human condition through educational and instructional technologies.
12. **Ethical Challenges:** Grapple with ethical challenges that characterize IT, HPT, and related fields.
13. **Technology Awareness:** Learn about some of the emerging learning technologies and tools helping shape the field. And obtain such experience and competence in using one or more of these technologies.
14. **Technology Competence:** Become savvy with the content and technology resources provided for learning the topic(s) of each week in the R511 course (including the weekly videos, digital documents, PowerPoint slides, etc.). By the end of the course, the learner will have ability to respond to questions and concerns using such content and materials.
15. **Continual Conversation:** Understand that there is no one right answer for many of the key issues, questions, and concerns that will be discussed in the course. Be flexible at times with such ambiguity in the field (including the definition of what the field actually is). In effect, you will have a continuing conversation with your peers in this course as well as with experts, the instructor, and others.

Tentative Schedule (may change depending upon circumstances)

Week 1 (August 25): Course Introductions and Open Explore Week
Week 2 (September 1): Instructional Technology Overview
Week 3 (September 8): Instructional Systems Design
Week 4 (September 15): Instructional Development Process (Task #2 due)
Week 5 (September 22): Theories of Learning: Behaviorism
Week 6 (September 29): Cognitive and Constructivist Perspectives
Week 7 (October 6): Authentic Learning and Cognitive Apprenticeship
Week 8 (October 13): Theories of Learning Comparison
Week 9 (October 20): History of IT (Task #3 and Task #4 due)
Week 10 (October 27): Trends and Issues in IT
Week 11 (November 3): Human Performance Technology: Concepts and Process Models
Week 12 (November 10): History, Trends, and Issues in HPT
Week 13 (November 17): Professional Ethics
Week 14 (December 1): Career and Professional Development
Week 15 (December 8): Self-Selection Week, Explore, and Final Projects (Task #5 and Task #6 due)

Assignments, Grading Criteria, and Due Dates

The course will be broken into three main areas or modules:
1. IT definitions, concepts, models, theories, history, and trends and issues
2. HPT definitions, concepts, models, theories, history, and trends and issues
3. IT and HPT career and professional development, ethics, and standards

Tasks/Assignments:
1. Weekly discussion postings in Canvas   40 points
2. Personal definition of IT in Canvas   20 points September 15
3. Comparing Learning Theories   30 points October 20 (Midterm team-based)
4. Video and Script on an IT Issue or Trend   30 points October 20 (Midterm team-based)
5. Display Understanding of IT and/or HPT   30 points December 8
6. Final Project and Reflection (see options)   50 points December 8

Note: Many of the course tasks will require an associated reflection paper. Note also that the "Midterm Teams" will be determined democratically and with student voices, if possible.

Total Points = 200 (Grading will be according to a 90-80-70-60 scale; see below.)

Grades: 200 or more = A+; 187 = A; 180 = A-; 173 = B+; 167 = B; 160 = B-; 153 = C+; 147 = C; 140 = C-; 120 = D

Grading Guidelines:
All papers will be evaluated for criteria such as: (1) organization and clarity; (2) coherence and flow; (3) content appropriateness and relevancy; (4) apparent effort expended and completeness; (5) originality and creativity; and (6) attention to details (including the use of APA 6th edition where appropriate). I will use more detailed grading rubrics for several of the tasks.

Lateness: I have a 48 hour lateness policy with no penalties for any assignment. Anything submitted after that 48 hour cushion or window loses 1 point per day. So if it says it is due Thursday during class, you actually have until Saturday at midnight to turn it in without penalty.

Incompleteness, Copyright, Plagiarism, and Original Work: I expect personally created, unique work on all assignments. Please do not try to cheat the system or this course. Please acquaint yourself with the "*IU Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct*" for the concept of plagiarism. If you are unsure of the rules and regulations regarding plagiarism, you can take a self-paced course on Understanding Plagiarism from Dr. Ted Frick from the IST department. This website is devoted to teaching people about plagiarism and it has tutorials and tests (info). Any assignment containing plagiarized material will be awarded a grade of F. At the discretion of the instructor, any assignment turned in that is deemed incomplete, failing to address the task objectives, or seriously flawed in any way may be turned back to the student for revision or correction of the problem. No incompletes will be awarded unless there is an emergency or mutually agreed upon reason.

Textbooks and Resources
No particular book is required for this course. Book chapters and articles are available in Canvas and Dropbox. If you want to purchase the books below, please try to acquire cheap used versions at

Amazon. But you will likely find them cheaper at Half.com, AbeBooks.com, Half-Priced Books.

Recommended Books and Resources:
1. Januszewski, A., & Molenda, M. (2008). *Educational technology: A definition with commentary*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Amazon; AbeBooks.com; AECT

2. Reiser, R. A., & Dempsey, J. V. (Eds.) (2012). *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc. (Note: the second edition of this book from 2007 is much cheaper to find online used and perhaps is all you need.)

Bonus Bonk Book (free): You also have access to a new free e-book from the course instructor: Bonk, C. J., & Khoo E. (2014). *Adding Some TEC-VARIETY: 100+ Activities for Motivating and Retaining Learners Online*. OpenWorldBooks and Amazon CreateSpace: Free book: http://tec-variety.com/; free chapters at http://tec-variety.com/freestuff.php

Narrated Presentations and Course Resources (and acknowledgements)
Most modules include narrated presentations featuring Dr. Michael Molenda and Dr. James Pershing, IST Professors Emeritus, with their take on IT and HPT. We should all recognize and appreciate their respective contributions to this class and to this field. I personally thank them for their assistance and knowledge in forming many of the course materials that we will use. I also wish to thank Professor Yonjoo Cho and Professor Kyungbin Kwon for their time, resources, and kindness. Dr. Kwon also provided help with the activities and resources that we will access in Canvas.

Bonus Bonk Resource: To help you understand learning and instructional theories, you might also want to access and watch one or more of my set of video lectures on learning theories developed for a different course (i.e., P540). Some that I recommend are specifically listed in the weekly course schedule as optional. Video Lectures: http://mypage.iu.edu/~cjbonk/September102008.html

Optional Weekly Synchronous Meetings (i.e., my R511 online class will have weekly chats with former IST students—Note: these are optional to attend)
In my online section of R511, I will use Zoom (and perhaps Skype) for **optional weekly meetings** with former professors of IST here at IU as well as well-known educators and researchers in the field and former master's and doctoral students of the IST program from the past two or three decades. In effect, I am thinking of inviting a different person for each week of the course. We will vote on the time, but perhaps 7 or 8 pm on either Monday or Tuesday night might work. You have the option to attend any or all of these or skip them entirely. If you attend, you can ask them any question about the field or their professional life or research that you want. The conversation might be about the topic of the week, what they learned about the field when in graduate school, their current or past job responsibilities, major projects and publications, professional accomplishments, and any trends and issues that they see for the field now or on the near horizon. At the end of the session and the guest has departed, you can ask me questions that you have about the weekly readings, assignments, field or IT or HPT, etc. They will be recorded. The link will be shared and also posted to Canvas. Remember these sessions are OPTIONAL!

Task Option: If you attend 4 or more of the optional synchronous sessions (see page 1 for the link(s)) and write a 2-3 page single spaced reflection paper on what the guest speakers said

about the field of IT and/or HPT, you can replace Task #3, #4, or #5 (**Important Note:** "or" means just once can you use this option). If you attend 7 or more of these sessions and write a 4-6 page single spaced reflection paper, you can replace the final assignment (i.e., Task #6). If you select this option, I want you to include at least 3 similarities across two or more guests and at least 3 differences. Look for themes in the trends and issues which they mention for the field of IST. The inclusion of a few direct quotes is optional but strongly encouraged. How has the field of IT and HPT evolved and changed according to these experts including many former professors and students of this class? And where is it headed? What insights have these guests revealed or hinted at? What kernels of knowledge and wisdom can you now bank on or at least lean on? Can you come up with a summary of the top 10 kernels of wisdom from these guests and relate these to your own future career goals?

R511 Course Tasks

Class Discussion (Task #1 Group; Task #2 Individual but shared)

Task #1: Weekly Discussions (40 points)
I will not be lecturing in this class. Instead, I will post PowerPoint files and various other resources from a couple of the IST instructors. One student will lead the discussion of the assigned articles and PowerPoint narrations each week. This student will bring a set 10 key points as well as a few starter questions for 2 or more articles from that week. The discussion leader will have 15 minutes to present on the key points of the week followed by a class discussion. In addition, the discussion leader will also bring showcase 5 key slides from the weekly narrated PowerPoint narrations. You will be a discussion leader or co-leader once or twice in this class. Bonus points will be given to those who lead discussion a third time.

> **Note:** There will also be a weekly class discussion in Canvas in my online section of R511 that you can participate in. You can also **sign up for online** to help moderate any online week if you like (but it is not required see role: http://trainingshare.com/r511.php). The moderator will start the discussion and also wrap up discussion at the end of the week as the closer (e.g., summarize key points made and discussion themes, note questions that remain open, and remind us of some of the cool or interesting resources shared). In starting the discussion, he or she will be required to post their questions by 10 am EST Sunday morning of the week (for example, Week 2 would be due on Sunday August 28). The week will close on Friday (11:55 pm EST) each week in Canvas (Discussion). We may engage in some online role play in the middle of the semester. The online role play form for R511 can be found here:
> http://www.trainingshare.com/r511roles.php.

Task #2: Researching Your Own Definition of Instructional Technology (IT) (20 points)
Definitions of instructional technology (IT) and educational technology (ET) are diverse and are often not agreed upon because they are constantly evolving. To be frank and honest, I am the instructor and even I do not fully know what IT or ET means. In this first task, you are asked to conduct interviews with at least two educational technology or instructional technology people located anywhere on Planet Earth or in the international space station hovering above. One interviewee should be a faculty member, instructional designer, learning center director, trainer, instructional consultant, or similar. The second

interviewee should be a graduate student or recent graduate in the field of education or training (preferably someone who has taken R511, but that is not required). Based on your interviews, readings, and associated class discussions, you will write up your definition of IT as well as educational technology along with your key interview notes and post it to Canvas. At the instructor's discretion, a bonus point will be awarded to one or more students who interview someone highly distinctive, interesting, important, or unusual or whose result is deemed markedly interesting or innovative.

Midterm Tasks (In Teams of Two or Three Members (Tasks #3 and #4)

Task #3: Designing a Learning Theories Matrix and Explanation Guide (30 points)
In this task, I want you to work with one other course member and display your basic understanding of the underlying concepts and principles of behaviorism, cognitive theory, constructivism, and cognitive apprenticeship in theory and application. As a team of two (or three) people, you will negotiate your understanding. In essence, you will create a matrix table that indicates characteristics, principles, theorists, and examples for at least 3 learning theories. You will develop a customized matrix that showcases your understanding of the three frameworks and how they fit into your context. The context could be a business, school, university, government agency, non-profit organization, consulting firm, or military training institute. Please be sure to mention how your matrix would affect approaches to instructional design and delivery. Prepare a comparison advance organizer (matrix table) and an accompanying explanation guide that walks others through your customized learning theories matrix. The visual should be a maximum of 2 pages while a one page single spaced reflection paper of your learning growth and on the ideas in your display should accompany it (i.e., 3 pages total).

This assignment will be graded for its overall originality, logic, clarity, parsimony, relevance, and persuasiveness. The main terms used should be explained or defined. Effort should be made to include terms and ideas from both the readings as well as the class discussions in Canvas. There should be a brief overview of each theory. The categories and format of different classifications in the table should make comparisons and contrasts relatively easy.

Task #4: Creating a Script and Video for an Issue or Trend (30 points)
In the same team, you will create a video of some pressing issue or trend in the field of IT or HPT. The purpose of this task is to help you better understand the history, issues, trends, and views surrounding the IT or HPT field. Please select an issue that seems highly pressing or important to you. Next, develop a script that discusses the issue from different points of view. After that, put this script into a video format which should be of 5-10 minutes in length (12 minutes maximum). A video creation tool like Go Animate, Moovly, PowToon, VideoScribe, Wideo, Make Web Video, or some other such tool can help. Finally, you should complete this task with a one page maximum single spaced reflection paper discussing your stance on the issue as well as the process you went through in creating your video. Make sure to include supporting evidence and place the issue in your own context, including your possible role in the future in terms of this issue or trend. Please post a link to your video in Canvas and attach your reflection paper.

This assignment will be graded for its overall originality, completeness or depth, logic and coherence, clarity, parsimony, relevance, and persuasiveness. The script should include at least two characters discussing or debating the issue, trends, or concept. Key terms within that issue should be included. In

addition, an effort should be made to link this issue to class discussions in Canvas. References should be included where appropriate. And substantial evidence should be provided to back up any claims made.

Task #4 Examples:
1. The Relative Advantages and Disadvantages of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOC's), by Michael Karlin and Sabina Ramazanova, November 4, 2014: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uq47rjTP2Wc
2. R511 Midterm Video Flipped Classroom, by Roger Dreher, Angie Lauchtmann, Kim Woodward, March 7, 2015: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bcr3_aZT_xQ&feature=youtu.be
3. How to Create an Authentic Environment in a Content-Driven School?, by Nik Bauchat and Nick Hargnett, Spring of 2015: https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B4kcTyz6nZEOeWo1V2VPMFNuRU0/view?ts=5682abf4
4. The Impact of Blended Learning, by Renee Hung and Kim Spartz, March 7, 2015 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zl7qvxPeEq0
5. School Board Meeting Debate: The Flipped Classroom Model, by Nora McCaffrey and Lauren Smith, March 9, 2015
   Video: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/geijknepvtjmxdc/AAAuQ9JCBcEtaiBcC-ZLxPuCa?dl=0&preview=b03ea104-0935-a723_1329.mp4
   Script: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/geijknepvtjmxdc/AADjU_nBYKuoi-QE45zgkbuaa/Task%204%20Flipped%20Classroom%20Model%20Debate.docx?dl=0
6. March 8, 2016, R511, Task, Ran Record and Amber Knox, Video: http://goanimate.com/videos/0FUdIng--9TU
7. March 8, 2016, Ryan and Geng (Roy), R511 Task 4, Open Educational Resources, R511 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1giHtFjzHQc
8. March 8, 2016, Deb and Channelle, HPT Task 4, R511 https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_XiD_9haSU8&feature=youtu.be

Final Tasks (Task #5 is individual; Task #6 is individual or team-based)

Task #5: Displaying Understanding of IT and/or HPT (30 points; completed individually)
This task has three pages. On page one, using the terms below and at least 10-15 additional terms learned in this class, I want you to create a graphical representation (e.g., Venn diagram, comparison and contrast chart, taxonomy, timeline, flowchart, mindmap, concept map, etc.) to show how these terms relate to each other. To explain this diagram, include a second page that lists your own definitions for each term and a third page which contains a 2 or 3 paragraph summary explaining the ideas, connections, and relationships in your visual design or diagram. If some of these terms overlap for you, feel free to combine these or choose other more relevant terms or entirely new terms in your diagram. Here are some starter terms: 1. Instructional Technology; 2. Educational Technology; 3. Instructional Systems Technology; 4. Instructional Systems Design; 5. Instructional Design; and 6 Human Performance Technology. Please add additional terms of your own choosing.

These visuals depictions will be graded on many aspects or dimensions. For instance, I will look at

their overall connectedness, macrostructure, micro linkages or details, casual relations, descriptions and explanations or relationships made, and formatting or organization. In addition, creativity and innovation in your design and ideas will be assessed.

Task #5 Examples:
1. R511 Final Projects, April 2016, The World of IT and HPT (Website) Geng (Roy) Niu, http://johnnydepp0.wix.com/r511foundation
2. R511 Final Projects, April 2016, Performance by Design (Prezi) Greg Reuchel, https://prezi.com/oz7eskjihhrw/performance-by-design/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy
3. R511 Final Projects, April 2016, IT and HPT Comparison (Website) Doug Hsu, http://dougandindira.wix.com/r511finalproject

Task #6: Final Project Options (50 points)
The final project will exhibit your understanding of IT and HPT. There are four options for this task which are listed below. You can work alone or in a team. It is your choice.

Option 1: Promotional Visual Material. Think of the project as an advertisement or a promotional piece that presents the fields as you explain them to people in your context. This promotional piece can be in whatever platform (e.g., a website, a video, or 2-4 page brochure) you feel most appropriate as long as it meets the requirements as expressed in the grading rubric. The visual or graphic should answer the following questions for the intended audience: What do IT and HPT fields mean to you? Where did IT and HPT come from? Who are the influential people and what are the "big ideas"? How might you implement IT and HPT in your organization? Remember, this is 30% of your grade and it also serves as a capstone to what you have learned! A 1-2 page single spaced reflection paper should be included with this assignment. First, that paper should explain the conceptual aspects of your website design, brochure, or similar type of promotional material. Second, it should include a recap of key ideas that you have learned in the course in the context of your past, present, and anticipated future plans in the field.

Task #6 Option 1 Examples:
1. Gina Howard and Michael Karlin, What is Instructional Technology?, Fall 2014: http://mkarlin1.wix.com/r511final
2. Kendal Rasnake (Writing, Editing, and Effects - Informational Parody - Is IT Right For You?), Spring 2015: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MJ3GUDICIGw
3. Troy Cockrum, Welcome to IST, April 26, 2015: http://troy-cockrum.com/instructional-systems-technology/
4. What is Instructional Technology (Website), Channelle Jones and Deb Cole http://r511bonk.weebly.com/

Option 2: Useful Textual Material. In this option, instead of a visual or graphical overview and reflection, I want students to create a text-based summary. Such a text might be a wikibook, mobile book, study guide, glossary, series of job aids, technical report, white paper, research report, or something similar. This text material should explicate some aspect of IT or HPT. You might attempt to publish it or make it available free to the world community. A 1-2 page single spaced reflection paper should be included with this assignment. First of all, that paper should explain the conceptual aspects of

your final project. Second, it should include a recap of key ideas that you have learned in the course in the context of your past, present, and anticipated future plans in the field.

Option 3: Voluntary Services or Materials. This option involves using the content of the course to help another person or an entire organization or entity out. This could be helping a non-profit agency with a strategic plan involving IT or HPT content. It might take the form of tutoring, mentoring, or teaching one or more people about the field or IT or HPT. You might develop an instructional module or one-to-one personal tutorial. You might also create a lecture or speech that you deliver in a class, conference workshop, or some other training event. A 1-2 page single spaced reflection paper should be included with this assignment. First, that paper should explain the conceptual aspects of your final project. Second, it should include a recap of key ideas that you have learned in the course in the context of your past, present, and anticipated future plans in the field.

Grading of the final will depend, in part, on which option was selected. Be sure to include references (in APA format), examples, and evidence where appropriate. Key terms should be defined in a key or ending glossary. The final product or design should display some sense of creativity as well as unity in the design.

Option 4: Leader in the Field Video Reviews and Reflections. Those selecting this option should watch video interview reflections or presentations from at least 15 leaders in the field of instructional and educational technology (e.g., Robert Reiser, Mike Molenda, Charlie Reigeluth, David Merrill, Michael Spector, Mendel Sherman, Marcy Driscoll, Robert Gagne, Rita Richey, Phil Harris, Robert Mayer, David Jonassen, Tom Reeves, Mike Hannafin, Kay Persichitte, Kyle Peck, etc.). Many video links listed below in this syllabus (see the "Course Readings and Videos" section). More such video interviews of stars in the field are at the AECT Legacies and Legends project (see http://aectlegends.org/#). If you select this option, you are to write a 4-6 page single spaced reflection (perhaps 2,500-3,000 words or more) of the insights, concerns, commonalities, disagreements, suggestions, trends, experiences, projects, and technologies mentioned by these thought leaders. What are some the issues raised in these videos that the field of instructional and educational technology needs to address? What might the future hold for the field according to these experts? Please include one or more tables with the themes which run through 2 or more of the videos. You should also include a table with a list of questions that might you want to ask one or more of them. Your paper should indicate which person or people mentioned the particular issues, trends, and needs. In addition, somewhere in your paper you should list the expert videos in which you watched (i.e., a reference section).

Option 5: Personal Choice or Design. This option allows you to design your own final product that meets the goals of showing your knowledge growth within this course. You will need to obtain approval from the course instructor by November 1st if you intend to select this option.

Task #6 Option 5 Examples:
1. IST Groove Song, Jeffrey Jenkins, R511, Spring 2015:
   https://soundcloud.com/jeffjenkins25/ist-groove
2. R511 Final Projects, April 2016, Blended Learning and Career Readiness
   Russell Ryan (voiceover slides)
   https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B5vTM-S2Oc0ldXEtYWJQeE1fOTg/view

Schedule of Weekly Course Readings and Videos

Weekly Instructional Task: There are 3 to 6 articles assigned each week. You are required to read 3 or 4 of them. If you find interesting articles to read in one of the two recommended books above (i.e., Januszewski & Molenda (2008) and Reiser & Dempsey (2012)), you can substitute them at any time without penalty. I also highly recommend that you watch the video interviews with many of the highly well-known authors below so that you will be better able to recognize these IT and HPT leaders and appreciate their decades of commitment to the profession. Those who find similar highly informative video interviews of other scholars in our reading list and share them with the class will receive a bonus point. I have also included 4 of my 8 video lectures on learning theories which I produced back in September 2008. You should also review the PowerPoint slides posted for each week or module as well as the audio files from Dr. Mike Molenda.

Week 1 (August 25). Course Introductions and Open Explore Week
> **Open Week:** I recommend that you download all of the articles and read through a few of them (the link will be posted to Canvas as well as sent to you via email). Please also post your personal introductions in the Week 1 discussion forum in Canvas. You might also get started on Task #2. And you might post your article reflections in Canvas.

Week 2 (September 1). Instructional Technology Overview

1. Januszewski, A., & Molenda, M. (2008). Chapter 1: Definition. In *Educational Technology: A Definition with Commentary* (pp. 1-14). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. (see also video interview with Dr. Molenda on his definition of educational technology for AECT: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sXSqkcwjCss).

2. Januszewski, A., & Perischitte, K. A. (2008). Chapter 10: A history of the AECT's definitions of educational technology. In *Educational Technology: A Definition with Commentary* (pp. 259-282). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

3. Molenda, M., & Boling, E. (2008). Chapter 4: Creating. In *Educational Technology: A Definition with Commentary* (pp. 81-139). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

4. Reiser, R. A. (2012). What field did you say you were in? Defining and naming our field. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-7). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

5. Spector, M. (2008). Theoretical foundations. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. V. Merriënboer, & M. P. Driscoll (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 21-28). New York: Taylor & Francis Group. (see also video interview with Michael Spector (40:16): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qjI9eZPJfPs).

6. Collis, B., & Moonen, J. (2002). Flexible learning in a digital world. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open and Distance Learning*, *17*(2). 217-230.

Week 3 (September 8). Instructional Systems Design
1. Branch, R. M., & Merrill, M. D. (2012). Characteristics of instructional design models. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), Trends and issues in instructional design and technology (3rd ed.) (pp. 8-16). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

2. Willis, J. (2011). The cultures of contemporary instructional design scholarship, part one: Developments based on behavioral and cognitive science foundations. *Educational Technology*, *51*(1), 3-20.

3. Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2001). The systematic design of instruction (5th ed.) (pp. 2-14). New York: Longman.

4. Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. M., & Kemp, J. E. (2007). Introduction to the instructional design process. Designing effective instruction. (5th ed.) (pp. xviii-26). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

5. Zemke, R., & Rossett, A. (2002). A hard look at ISD. *Training*, *39*(2), 26-34.

Week 4 (September 15). Instructional Development Process
1. Molenda, M., Pershing, J.A., & Reigeluth, C.M. (1996). Designing instructional systems. In R.L. Craig (Ed.), *The ASTD Training and Development Handbook* 4th ed. (pp. 266-280). New York: McGraw-Hill.

2. Driscoll, M. P. (2000). Gagné's theory of instruction. Ch. 10 in *Psychology of Learning for Instruction*, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 341-372 (see also a Tribute to Robert Gagne (57:30): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ggJ1-AjlGeE).

3. Merrill, M. David. (2002). First principles of instruction. *Educational Technology Research & Development* 50(3), 43-59 (see in 2012 video interview with David Merrill (53:56): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7COb2aZDrcs).

4. Reigeluth, C. M. (1999). The elaboration theory: Guidance for scope and sequence decisions. In C. M. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional Design Theories and Models: A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory* (pp. 425-453). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. (see also video interview "Talking Reinventing Public Schools with Dr. Charles Reigeluth" (19:36); https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wrT_s0Lk_WMand Charles Reigeluth: What education could be – roles (4:23): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3_3iy-O_03M and Charles Reigeluth: Why systemic change is important (4:29) https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QVFiwRMywqM

Week 5 (September 22). Theories of Learning: Behaviorism
1. Skinner, B.F. (1954). The science of learning and the art of teaching. *Harvard Educational Review* 24:1: 86-97.

2. Saettler, P. (1990c). Behaviorism and educational technology: 1950 - 1980. Ch. 10 in *The Evolution of American Educational Technology* (pp. 286-317). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

3. Driscoll, M. P. (2005). Radical behaviorism. In Psychology of learning for instruction (3rd ed.) (pp. 29-69). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

4. Foshay, R (July 2001). Is Behaviorism dead? Should HPT care? *ISPI News & Notes*, 1-2.

5. Mayer, R. E. (2004). Should there be a three-strikes rule against pure discovery learning?. *American Psychologist*, 59(1), 14-19.

6. **Video Lecture Supplement:** Curt Bonk on Behaviorism (Ivan Pavlov, John Watson, and B. F. Skinner as well as Hermann Ebbinghaus and Edward Thorndike). Archive URL (45 minutes): http://www.indiana.edu/~video/stream/launchflash.html?folder=istream&filename=fall08/EDUC-P_540_8832_20080905_1.mp4

Week 6 (September 29). Cognitive and Constructivist Perspectives

1. Silber, K. H., & Foshay, W. R. (2006). Designing instructional strategies: A cognitive perspective. In J. A. Pershing (Ed.), *Handbook of human performance technology* (3rd ed.) (370-413). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

2. Mayer, R., E., & Moreno, R. (2003). Nine ways to reduce cognitive load in multimedia learning. *Educational Psychologist*, *38*(1), 43-52. (see also video interview: "Talking multimedia learning with Dr. Richard Mayer" (19:20): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q5eY9k3v4mE) and Research-based principles for multimedia learning (presentation at Harvard May 5, 2014) (124:27): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AJ3wSf-ccXo

3. Duffy, T. M., & Raymer, P. L. (2010). A practical guide and a constructivist rationale for inquiry based learning. *Educational Technology*, *50*(4), 3-15.

4. Wilson, B. G. (2012). Constructivism in practical and historical context. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 45-52). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

5. Jonassen, D. H. (2000). Toward a design theory of problem solving. *ETR&D*, *48*(4), 63-85 (see also "An interview with David Jonassen: Problem Solving in the humanities" (9:21): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zCBXg_49gZw; See also a more recent interview (35:19): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fhnotpgru-4. 2013 AERA Fellow (37 seconds): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gDFoD06BARM

6. Savery, J. R., & Duffy, T. M. (2001, June). Problem-based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. *CRLT Technical Report No. 16-01*, pp. 1-17. Indiana University Bloomington.

Also published in:
   a. Savery, J. R., & Duffy, T. M. (1995). Problem-based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. *Educational Technology, 35*, (5), 31-38.
   b. Savery, J. R., & Duffy, T. M. (1996). Problem based learning: An instructional model and its constructivist framework. In B. Wilson (Ed.), *Constructivist learning environments: Case studies in instructional design* (pp. 135-148). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

7. **Video Lecture Supplement:** Curt Bonk on the Cognitive Information Processing (CIP) model. Archive URL (73 minutes): http://www.indiana.edu/~video/stream/launchflash.html?folder=istream&filename=fall08/EDUC-P_540_8832_20080910_4.mp4

7. **Video Lecture Supplement:** Curt Bonk on Cognitive and Social Constructivism, including Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Jerome Bruner, and Robert Gagne. Archive URL (45 minutes): http://www.indiana.edu/~video/stream/launchflash.html?folder=istream&filename=fall08/EDUC-P_540_8832_20080905_3.mp4

Week 7 (October 6). Authentic Learning and Cognitive Apprenticeship
1. Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, *18*(1), 32-42.

2. CTGV (Cognition and Technology Group at Vanderbilt) (1993). Anchored instruction and situated cognition revisited. *Educational Technology*, *33*(3), 52-70.

3. Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press (Note: pp. 29-43 only)

4. Herrington, J. & Oliver, R. (2000). An instructional design framework for authentic learning environments. *ETR&D*, *48*(3), pp. 23-48 (see also their website with Tom Reeves on authentic learning: http://authenticlearning.info/AuthenticLearning/Home.html)

5. Herrington, J. (2006). Authentic e-learning in higher education: Design principles for authentic learning environments and tasks. *In proceedings of the World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education (E-Learn) 2006*, October 13-27, 2006, Honolulu, Hawaii. Retrieved from http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/5247/1/Authentic_e-learning(authors).pdf

6. Bonk, C. J., & Kim, K. A. (1998). Extending sociocultural theory to adult learning. In M. C. Smith & T. Pourchot (Ed.), *Adult learning and development: Perspectives from educational psychology* (pp. 67-88). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

7. **Video Lecture Supplement:** Curt Bonk on Constructivism, Social Constructivism, Learner-Centered Instruction, and PBL. Archive URL (41 minutes): http://www.indiana.edu/~video/stream/launchflash.html?folder=istream&filename=fall08/EDUC-P_540_8832_20080910_3.mp4

Week 8 (October 13). Theories of Learning: Comparison

1. Reeves, T. C., & Reeves, P. M. (2015). Learning. In L. Cantoni & J. A. Danowski (Eds.), *Communication and Technology: Handbook of Communication Science* (pp. 467-483). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. (See also interview of Dr. Tom Reeves, The University of Georgia (26:19): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZU32W1oclnw)

2. Driscoll, M. P. (2012). Psychological foundations of instructional design. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 35-44). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

3. Ertmer, P. A., & Newby, T. J. (1993). Behaviorism, cognitivism, constructivism: Comparing critical features from an instructional design perspective. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 6*(4), 50-72.

4. Bonk, C. J., & Cunningham, D. J. (1998). Chapter 2: Searching for learner-centered, constructivist, and sociocultural components of collaborative educational learning tools. In C. J. Bonk, & K. S. King (Eds.), *Electronic collaborators: Learner-centered technologies for literacy, apprenticeship, and discourse* (pp. 25-50). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

5. Grabinger, S. R. (1996). Rich environments for active learning. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology*. NY: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

6. Perkins, D. N., & Salomon, G. (1989). Are cognitive skills context-bound? *Educational Researcher*, *18*(1). 16-25.

Week 9 (October 20). History of IT

1. Cho, Y., Park, S., Jo, S. J., & Suh, S. (2013). The landscape of educational technology viewed from the *ETR&D* journal. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *44*(5). 677-694.

2. Reiser, R. A. (2007). A history of instructional design and technology. In R. A. Reiser, & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (pp. 17-34). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall (see also video interview with Dr. Reiser (22:24): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b8TKA7ta7gU).

3. Molenda, M. (2008). Historical foundations. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. V. Merriënboer, & M. P. Dirscoll (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 3-20). New York: Taylor & Francis Group. (see also video conference with Dr. Molenda (53:28): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BigNdMiyHbI

4. Davis, M. (2008). *Street gang: The complete history of Sesame Street* (Prologue & Epilogue). New York: Penguin Books.

5. Various "History Makers" Project and AECT Legends and Legacies" Videos; See index: http://aectlegends.org/:

1. Dr. Robert (Bob) Appelman (29:46): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TipGTRlJZg4
2. Dr. Ivor Davies (47:44): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_de5F-gf8t8
3. Dr. Malcolm Fleming (23:16): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5ZtzeeR_9R4
4. Dr. Mike Hannafin (24:11): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vdo1h4zT1GE
5. Dr. Phil Harris (22:50): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aBwBl2uyT4M
6. Dr. Robert Heinich (50:14): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sw-8I09QdMk
7. Dr. Mary Herring (18:15): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qK1Jcw7ZjZk
8. Dr. Roger Kaufman (18:16): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B0uxzkOmJnQ
9. Dr. Kyle Peck (26:11): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4_jC0bhnQAI
10. Dr. Kay Persichitte (31:57): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dalz555GB_w
11. Dr. Rita Richey (43:35), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F1kafjVHwQ8
12. Dr. Mendel Sherman (44:14): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ROh41-P8a50
13. Dr. Walt Wittich (27:40): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2opzSlpcQMY
14. Dr. Leo P.K. Yam, Hong Kong AECT Founder (31:45): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aynB3Epv6Iw

Week 10 (October 27). Trends and Issues in IT

1. Deslauriers, L., Schelew, E., & Wieman, C. (2011, May 13). Improved learning in a large-enrollment physics class. *Science*, *332*, 862-864.

2. Mishra, P., Koehler, M. J., & Kereluik, K. (2009). The song remains the same: Looking back to the future of educational technology. *TechTrends*, *53*(5), 48-53.

3. Boling, E., & Smith, K. M. (2012). The changing nature of design. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 358-366). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

4. Clark, R. E. (1994). Media will never influence learning. *ETR&D*, *42*(2), 21- 29. (see video interview with Richard Clark (108:58): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XR6IJrh6pxI).

5. Kozma, R. B. (1994). Will media influence learning? Reframing the debate. *ETR&D*, *42*(2), 7-19.

6. Reeves, T.C. (2011) Can educational research be both rigorous and relevant? *Educational Designer, 1*(4). Retrieved from http://www.educationaldesigner.org/ed/volume1/issue4/article13/index.htm

Week 11 (November 3). Human Performance Technology: Concepts and Process Models

1. Gawande, A. (2007, December 10). The checklist. *The New Yorker*, 86-95.

2. Pershing, J. (2006). Human performance technology fundamentals. In J. A. Pershing (Ed.), *Handbook of human performance technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 5-34). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

3. Martin, F., Hall, H. A. IV, Blakely, A., Gayford, M. C., & Gunter, E. (2009). The HPT model

applied to a kayak company's registration process. *Performance Improvement*, *48*(3), 26-35.

4. Wilmoth, F. S., Prigmore, C., & Bray, M. (2010). HPT models. In R. Watkins & D. Leigh (Eds.), *Handbook of improving performance in the workplace, vol. 2: Selecting and implementing performance interventions* (pp. 5-26). Silver Spring, MD: International Soceity for Performance Improvement.

5. Van Tiem, D. M., Mosely, J. L., & Dessinger, J. C. (2004). Performance technology - defined. In D. M. Van Tiem, J. L. Moseley, & J. C. Dessinger (Eds.), *Fundamentals of performance technology* (pp. 2-20). Washington, DC: International Society for Performance Improvement.

6. Cheng, J., Son, S., & Bonk, C. J. (2010). Technology and knowledge management. In M. Malloch, L. Cairns, K. Evans, & B. O'Connor (Eds.), *International Handbook of Workplace Learning* (pp. 381-391). Sage Publications.

Week 12 (November 10). History, Trends, and Issues in HPT
1. Rummler, G. A. (2007). The past is prologue: An eyewitness account of HPT. *Performance Improvement*, *46*(10), 5-9.

2. Stolovitch, H. D., & Beresford, B. (2012). The development and evolution of human performance improvement. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 135-146). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

3. Cho, Y., Jo, S. J., Park, S., Kang, I., & Chen, Z. (2011). The current state of human performance technology: A citation network analysis of *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 1988-2010. *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, *24*(1), 69-95.

4. Pershing, J. A., Lee, J., & Cheng, J. (2008). Current status, future trends, and issues in human performance technology, part 1: Influential domains, current status, and recognition of HPT. *Performance Improvement, 47*(1)*,* 9-17.

5. Kim, K.-J., Bonk, C. J., & Teng, Y.-T. (2009, August). The present state and future trends of blended learning in workplace learning settings across five countries. *Asia Pacific Education Review (APER), 10*(3)*.*

    (or perhaps something more specific: Teng, Y.-T., Bonk, C. J., & Kim, K.-J. (2009, February). The trend of blended learning in Taiwan: Perceptions of HRD practitioners and implications for emerging competencies. *Human Resource Development International*, *12*(1), 69-84.

6. Bonk, C. J., Lee. M. M., Reeves, T. C., & Reynolds, T. H. (in press). The emergence and design of massive open online courses (MOOCs). In R. A. Reiser, & J. V. Demsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th Ed.), (pp.?). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Week 13 (November 17). Professional Ethics

1. Guerra, J. A. (2006). Standards and ethics in human performance technology. In J. A. Pershing (Ed.) (2006), *Handbook of human performance technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1024-1046). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

2. Smaldino, S. E., Donaldson, J. A., & Herring, M. (2012). Professional ethics: Rules applied to practice. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 342-347). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc. (see also video interview with Dr. Smaldino (43:59): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wOjhdH4dAE4

3. Banaji, M. R., Bazerman, M. H., & Chugh, D. (2003, December). How (un)ethical are you? *Harvard Business Review*, *81*(12), 56-65

Thanksgiving break…November 20-27.

Week 14 (December 1). Career and Professional Development

1. Butler, T., & Waldroop, J. (1999). Job sculpting: The art of retaining your best people. *Harvard Business Review*, *77*(5), 144-152.

2. Klein, J. D., Rushby, N., & Su, Y. (2012). Professional organizations and publications in instructional design and technology. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 273-282). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

3. Christensen, C. M. (2010). How will you measure your life? *Harvard Business Review*, *88*(7/8), 46-51; see also TEDx Boston, July 17, 2012, How will you measure your life? (19:30): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tvos4nORf_Y

4. Gabrielli, G. K., & Branson, R. K. (2012). Getting a job in business and industry. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 263-272). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

5. Miller, L. (2013). ASTD's 2013 state of the industry report: workplace learning remains a key organizational investment. *T+D*, November, 40-45.

6. Reiser, R. A. (2012). Getting an instructional design position: Lessons from a personal history. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 256-262). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Week 15 (December 8). Self-Selection Week, Personal Explorations, and Final Projects

Note: You can do anything you wish in Week 15. For instance, you might reflect on the course in Canvas. You might explore some of the resources that you skipped earlier in the course. You might find some new resources not listed. We will definitely have a class meeting that week to share what you have discovered and to reflect on the course overall.