

R511: Instructional Technology Foundations (Fall 2019)

IST Department, IU School of Education

(Section 4430; Face-to-Face Version; Syllabus ([HTML](#), [PDF](#)))

Syllabus: http://php.indiana.edu/~cjbok/P511_FTF_syllabus_fall_2019.htm

Zoom (Optional Synchronous Sessions): <https://IU.zoom.us/j/8123222878>

Course Link to Canvas: <http://canvas.iu.edu/>

Instructor: Professor Curt Bonk, Indiana University, Email: cjbok@indiana.edu

Bonk Homepage: <http://php.indiana.edu/~cjbok/>

Instructional Assistants: Merve Basdogan, IST Doctoral Candidate, basdogan@iu.edu
and Jennifer Park, IST Doctoral Student, jenjpark@iu.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). If you are interested in learning more about HPT, talk to IST Professor Yonjoo Cho.

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.

Schedule (Note: This may change depending upon circumstances)

Week 1 (August 27): Course Introductions and Open Explore Week

Week 2 (September 3): Instructional Technology Overview (Task #2 due)

Week 3 (September 10): Instructional Systems Design

Week 4 (September 17): Instructional Development Process

Week 5 (September 24): Theories of Learning: Behaviorism

Week 6 (OCTOBER 1): Cognitive and Constructivist Perspectives

Week 7 (October 8): Authentic Learning and Cognitive Apprenticeship

Week 8 (October 15): Theories of Learning Comparison (Task #3 and Task #4 due)

Week 9 (October 22): History of IT

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

Week 11 (November 5): Human Performance Technology: Concepts and Process Models

Week 12 (November 12): History, Trends, and Issues in HPT

Week 13 (November 19): Professional Ethics and Social Change

Week 14 (December 3): Career and Professional Development (Task #5 and Task #6 due)

Week 15 (December 8): Self-Selection Week, Explore, & Final Projects

Assignments, Grading Criteria, and Due Dates

The course will be broken into five main areas or modules:

1. Instructional technology definitions, concepts, models, overview.
2. Theories of learning and learning approaches.
3. Trends, issues, and history of instructional technology.
4. HPT definitions, concepts, models, theories, history, and trends and issues.
5. IT and HPT career and professional development, ethics, and standards.

Tasks/Assignments	Points	Due Dates
1. Weekly participation & discussion	40 points	All semester
2. Book issue panel debate	40 points	September 17
3. Learning Matrix, Expert Profile, or Extended Book Reading	30 points	October 15 (Midterm)
4. Video and Script on an IT Issue or Trend	30 points	October 15 (Midterm)
5. IT and/or HPT Display or Book Review	30 points	December 3 (Finals)
6. Final Project and Reflection (see options)	50 points	December 3 (Finals)
7. Poster (Optional)	5 bonus points	Last week of class

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 = 220 (Grading will be according to a 90-80-70-60 scale; see below.)

Grades:

220 or more = A+
 205 = A
 198 = A-
 190 = B+
 183 = B
 176 = B-
 168 = C+
 161 = C
 154 = C-
 132 = 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 Sunday at midnight, you actually have until Tuesday 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](#) as well as Half.com, AbeBooks.com, and 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](#)
2. Reiser, R. A., & Dempsey, J. V. (Eds.) (2018). *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th 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. The third edition is cheaper too.)
3. Carr-Chellman, A. A., & Rowland, G. (Eds.) (2017). *Issues in technology, learning, and instructional design: Classic and contemporary issues*. NY: Routledge.

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>

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., chats with former IST students, retired IST professors, IST leaders, and others—Note: these are optional to attend)

I will use [Zoom](#) for **optional weekly meetings** of around an hour for guests chats with alums of the IST program as well as textbook authors, book authors, former master’s and doctoral students,

retired/emeritus professors from the program, prominent researchers and scholars in the field (including those whose articles we read), and high profile people from the IST field in corporate, consulting, or non-profit settings. They will discuss their careers in the field, often in line with the weekly topic, and captivate you with their personal stories, life-changing decisions, and sage advice. I have had some high profile and illuminating guests in R511 during the past few years.

In the past, these have been very instructor-centered events. I would make the contact, draft the questions, find or craft the bios and share them, and conduct the live interviews (kinda like a talk show) and save a little bit of time for a few student questions near the end. I want to make this more interesting than in the past, so I want to have one (or two) students in the class to be a weekly co-host with me. That student will come up with 4-5 questions that we would start with and write a one-page single spaced reflection paper on the experience for class moderator participation points. I have generated an online form for students to volunteer to co-host the Zoom meeting and to nominate guest experts for these Zoom meetings (please sign up: <http://trainingshare.com/r511volunteer.php>). If selected, they can get two bonus points.

As per below, I have recently published on this approach:

Bonk, C. J. (2018, November). Tapping into History Via Video: Enlisting the Legends and Legacies of Our Field. *TechTrends*, 62(6), 538-540. DOI: 10.1007/s11528-018-0332-3

I typically invite a different person for each week of the course. We will vote on the time, but perhaps 7 or 8 pm on Tuesday or Wednesday night might work. You have the option to attend any or all of these or skip them entirely. If you attend these one hour sessions, 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. 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. Summary tables or charts are always helpful and informative. 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? Again, a summary table or two is often useful for putting your observations together.

R511 Course Tasks

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

Task #1: Weekly Postings (40 points)

Face to Face R511 (cool resource provider): In the face-to-face class, students will volunteer to lead one or more weeks of discussion and activities as the designated “cool resource provider” for the week; typically, at the start of the class. This person will create an activity or two related to the articles for the week (e.g., a fun review quiz in Jeopardy Rocks or Kahoots!). They will also select short snippets of the AECT Legacies and Legends expert interview videos to show in class (see <http://aectlegends.org/#>). Instead of sitting passively and watching segments that I select, I want you to attempt connect concepts from the readings to the shared online video discussions.

Many superstars of the IST field can be found in this AECT video interviews including former IU professors Robert Heinich, Bob Appelman, Charlie Reigeluth, and Ivor Davies as well as instructional technology leaders such as Michael Spector, Rita Richey, Richard Clark, Sharon Smaldino, Mary Herring, David Jonassen, Marcy Driscoll, David Merrill, and dozens of others. This is a truly remarkable collection of the thought leaders of the field. Nothing else currently approximates it. Importantly, these “history maker” project videos can be used in many ways; both teacher-centered and learner-centered. See my recent publication on this:

Bonk, C. J. (2018, November). Tapping into History Via Video: Enlisting the Legends and Legacies of Our Field. *TechTrends*, 62(6), 538-540. DOI: 10.1007/s11528-018-0332-3

But we will not have time to watch the entire episode. So, I want you to use TubeChop (<https://www.tubechop.com/>) or some other tool to create short sequences. The class will vote on the “Most Informative,” “Most Emotionally Interesting,” and “Most Impactful Videos” seen during the semester. A different student can get an award for each category. The use of these shared online video interviews will also create a macro-context and conceptual anchor for class discussion. If the expert is still alive, the student in charge for the week is encouraged to contact him or her with several interesting questions which would be shared in class. An overall participation grade is awarded for innovativeness in activities designed, presentations, leadership, regular attendance, attentiveness, participatory contributions, civility and evidence of preparation.

Task #2: Book Issue Panel Debate (40 points): As noted in the recommended books for this class, there is an exciting recent book out from an IST alum, Dr. Ali Carr-Chellman. This book focuses on many interesting current debates, challenges, trends, issues, and discourses in the field of instructional and educational technology. It is titled:

Carr-Chellman, A. A., & Rowland, G. (Eds.) (2017). *Issues in technology, learning, and instructional design: Classic and contemporary issues*. NY: Routledge.

I will lend my copy of the book to the class. You and a peer will be assigned two of the article debates

(In one debate, you will recap the article as the original author and in the second debate you will respond to points made by the author). My former instructional assistant, Dr. Meina Zhu at Wayne State University, will assign a pair of students the other side of the debate to pairs of students so that you will have an actual team to debate. I want you to take the point of view of the author and author rejoinder in one chapter. And the point of view of the expert responder in another. We will find a wiki or collaborative technology tool to post these debates (e.g., Google Docs).

In your final post for each debate, I want you and teammate to reflect on what the debate is all about. In addition, what are the new possibilities for the field and for education in general? Why is this issue controversial or important? What role can educational and instructional technologists play in this area? Any visuals (e.g., flowcharts of the discussion, pro and con tables, comparison and contrast charts, unique diagrams, mindmaps or concept maps, or simply a text recap of the prevailing issues and opportunities) are welcome in your final posts.

Note: The face to face section of R511 will engage in debates in class. I will assign an article from the Carr-Chellman book and two teams will form a panel. One team will act as the author of that article and the other team as the responder. They will prepare short 5 minute presentations to give as a member of that panel, and then take questions from the rest of the class. Each panel member will have a chance to be an “author” and an “expert” who rebuts the author. You will turn in a 1 page single-spaced summary (no more than 4 paragraphs) of what you learned from this activity.

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

Task #3: A. 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 #3 Option B: Expert Profile: In this option, I want you to choose one of the authors from our

reading list and write a professional profile of that scholar. You might read his or her bio from their homepage, Google Scholar website, ResearchGate or Academia.edu account, blog, Twitter account, LinkedIn page, or other sources. You might watch a couple of his or her online video presentations. Similarly, you might find an online interview with that person in the AECT Legacies and Legends videos (<http://aectlegends.org/#>). In your 2-3 page single spaced paper (not counting references and appendices), you will discuss his or her evolution or track in the field. Why is he or she famous? Where did this scholar grow up and later study? Did the scholar have experience in the field prior to starting research? What topics has this person studied in addition to the one we are studying in class? How have her or her interests changed or evolved over time? Has this author co-published with others from our list? Can you find out what this author is studying now? Has this scholar revised her ideas over time? Best performance will be to find the author or colleagues of the author to augment your understanding. You might also directly email this scholar for such information or to answer specific questions that you may have.

Task #3 Option C: Extended Book Reading and Analysis: Also noted in the earlier recommended book section of this syllabus, there is a brand new version of the Robert (Bob) Reiser and Jack Dempsey book (i.e., the long awaited 4th edition) from which we are reading many chapters written for earlier editions of this book. It is titled:

Reiser, R. A., & Dempsey, J. V. (Eds.) (2018). *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

As my friend Dr. Bob Reiser mentioned to this class when he was a guest in Zoom, there are many new chapters in the fourth edition of the popular book. Hence, in this option, you will read 3-5 chapters that are not already assigned in the R511 syllabus and analyze them. What key chapters were the most interesting or engaging to you and why? What did you learn when reading them that we had not already discussed in R511? Why are certain trends and ideas discussed and debated in these particular chapters important to the field of instructional technology? You might attempt to make the case for including these chapters next time. Finally, what did you read that confirmed what you have learned in R511 thus far? In terms of length, estimate about 1 page of content per chapter reviewed or at least 3 pages total, not counting appendices and references.

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 Laughtmann, 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/0B4kcTyz6nZEOeWo1V2VPMFNU0/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_nBYKuo-iQE45zgkbuuaa/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 Russell and Geng (Roy) Niu, R511 Task 4, Open Educational Resources, R511: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1giHtFjzHQc>
8. March 8, 2016, Deb Cole and Channelle Jones, HPT Task 4, R511
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XiD_9haSU8&feature=youtu.be
9. October 21, 2016, Merve Basdoga, Self-Regulated Learning (SRL),
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TYpouHO2eJ8&feature=youtu.be>
10. October 26, 2016, R511, Faishal Zakaria, Roberto Borfecchia and Weipeng Yang, PBL (11:11):
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9YDNkNTIa4DNHJTazd0NDk2VUE/view>
11. October 26, 2016, R511, Rob Elliot, Erin Milanese, and Patrick Walsh Traditional Textbook (8:11): <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B25AtCR9Ddd5NE9DaS16RlpiMW8/view>
12. October 9, 2017, R511, Best Practices for Reducing Extraneous Cognitive Load, Task 4 by Sara Finnigan, Jonathan Coleman, and Sarah Skreko:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1fEC5rFCATw&feature=youtu.be>

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

Task #5 Option A: 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 Option B: Book Review: You might do a 3-4 single spaced page review of one of the two new books recommended for this course. In such a book review, you might map out the strengths, weaknesses, potential audiences and uses, key issues, etc. Just what key terms and concepts did you learn from this book? What remains missing from the text and is a potential opportunity for others? A mini-glossary of personal definitions for 20-25 key terms and concepts found in this book might be included in an appendix at the end of the review. In addition, you might post a snippet of your review to Amazon for a bonus point.

Carr-Chellman, A. A., & Rowland, G. (Eds.) (2017). *Issues in technology, learning, and instructional design: Classic and contemporary issues*. NY: Routledge.

Reiser, R. A., & Dempsey, J. V. (Eds.) (2018). *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

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 A: 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 A Examples:

1. Troy Cockrum, Welcome to IST, April 26, 2015: <http://troy-cockrum.com/instructional-systems-technology/>
2. IU School of Medicine, Medical Imaging Technology Online MRI Education, Kellie Cranfill, Debra Patterson, Ashley Marshall: R511, Fall 2016, December 13, 2016: <http://bonk511-mri.weebly.com/education-at-iupui.html>
3. Where Did HPT and Ed Tech Come From?, Sarah McDonough, R511, Fall 2016 (Timeglider): December 13, 2016: <http://sarahmcdonoug1.wixsite.com/website/the-roots-of-both-fields>
4. Librarians for Instructional Technology, Latrice Booker, R511, Fall 2016, December 13, 2016, <http://bookerlr2000.wixsite.com/librariansforit/cognitivism>
5. "IST Construction, Co.," Rob Elliot, Patrick Walsh, Erin Milanese, R511, Fall 2016, December 13, 2016, <http://relliott.net/istconstruction/index.php>
6. What is Instructional Technology (Website), Channelle Jones and Deb Cole <http://r511bonk.weebly.com/>
7. "Cousins but Not Twins: Instructional Technology and Human Performance Technology," Merve Basdogan and Brett Gary, R511, Fall 2016, December 13, 2016: <http://educbasdogan.wixsite.com/511final>
8. Dec 12, 2017, Bev Wilgenbusch: <https://prezi.com/view/UrYTxG89nM3FRZKUBcDI/>
9. December 12, 2017, Lisa Milsom and Michale Siverio: <https://msiverio.wixsite.com/r511>
10. December 12, 2017, Katie Jantaraweragul: <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdQqe40z0FYMfMI51v5ccMks4GJpBEgpStANWgalXf-yUqLnQ/viewform>
11. December 12, 2017, Jonathan Coleman: <http://elumin.us/ist-overview/>
12. December 12, 2017, Raj and Khadijah: <https://akhadijah.wixsite.com/r511>
13. December 12, 2017, Rachael Zeiher Kean: <https://razeiher.wixsite.com/edtechcoms>
14. December 12, 2017, Matthew Willey: <https://sway.com/QGdiCv7p64DFBe8A?ref=Link>

Option B: 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 C: 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 D: Leader in the Field Video Reviews and Reflections. Those selecting this option should watch video interview reflections or presentations from at least eight 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 E: 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 F 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. You can find the course articles at a link in Canvas.

If you find interesting articles to read in one of the two recommended books above (i.e., Januszewski and Molenda (2008) and Reiser and Dempsey (3rd edition in 2012 or 4th edition in 2018)), 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. The whole 8-pack of talks is now available via this easy-to-remember link: <http://curtbonk.com/8-pack>.

Week 1 (August 27). 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.

1. Dewey, John (1897, January). My pedagogic creed. *School Journal*, 54, pp. 77-80.
Retrieved from <http://dewey.pragmatism.org/creed.htm>

Week 2 (September 3). 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. (2018). 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* (4th Ed.), (pp. 1-7). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
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 10). Instructional Systems Design

1. Branch, R. M. (2018). Characteristics of instructional design models. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th Ed.), (pp. 23-

- 30). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
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 17). 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_WM and 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>
5. Podcast – "Gagne's and his theory of instruction," Curt Bonk and Chris Essex (my former podcast partner who is now deceased), March 28, 2006. Audio podcast (Length: 21:25): <http://curtbonk.com/gagne-mp3.html>

Week 5 (September 24). 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.
 - a. Alternatively, see: Gredler, M. (2001). B. F. Skinner's operant conditioning. In her book on *Learning and Instruction* (4th Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.
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 or <https://youtu.be/KefAapQdAHs>

Week 6 (October 1). 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. (2018). Constructivism, for active authentic learning. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th Ed.), (pp. 60-67). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
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. Spiro, R.J., Coulson, R.L., Feltovich, P.J., & Anderson, D.K. (1988). *Cognitive flexibility theory: Advanced knowledge acquisition in ill-structured domains*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Technical Report No. 441.
7. 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; or <https://youtu.be/xQsTUPI-Qbw>
8. **Video Lecture Supplement:** Curt Bonk on Cognitive and Social Constructivism, including Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky, Jerome Bruner, and Robert Gagne. Archive URL (45 minutes):
https://youtu.be/YMoH2X_bjEw

Week 7 (October 8). 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.
 - a. See also: Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Holum, A. (1991). Cognitive apprenticeship: Making thinking visible. *American Educator*. Retrieved from <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.124.8616&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
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](http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/5247/1/Authentic_e-learning(authors).pdf)

6. Lockee, B., & Song, K. (2016). The AECT Legends and Legacies Project. *TechTrends*, 60(2), 107-109.
7. Lockee, B. B., Song, K., & Li, W. (2014, September-October). The AECT HistoryMakers Project: Conversations with leaders in educational technology. *Educational Technology*, 54(5), 42-45. Retrieved from <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/44430305.pdf>
8. Bonk, C. J. (2018, November). Tapping into history via video: Enlisting the legends and legacies of our field. *TechTrends*, 62(6), 538-540. DOI: 10.1007/s11528-018-0332-3
9. **Video Lecture Supplement:** Curt Bonk on Constructivism, Social Constructivism, Learner-Centered Instruction, and PBL. Archive URL (41 minutes): <https://youtu.be/qJKofs2PuBU>

Week 8 (October 15). 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. (2018). Psychological foundations of instructional design. In R. A. Reiser, & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th ed.) (pp. 51-60). 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.
7. Sawyer, R. K. (2006). The new science of learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences* (pp. 1-16). New York: Cambridge University Press.

8. Ellen D. Wagner and Barbara L. McCombs (1995, March/April). Learner centered psychological principles in practice: Designs for distance education. *Educational Technology*, 35(2), 33-35.

Week 9 (October 22). 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. (2018). A history of instructional design and technology. In R. A. Reiser, & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th ed.) (pp. 8-22). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc. (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. Driscoll (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. 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=TipGTRIJZg4>
 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=5ZtzeR_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 29). 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. (2018). The changing nature of design. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th Ed.), (pp. 60-67). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
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.

Week 11 (November 5). 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 Society 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 12). History, Trends, and Issues in HPT

1. Rummier, G. A. (2007). The past is prologue: An eyewitness account of HPT. *Performance Improvement*, 46(10), 5-9.
2. Stolovitch, H. D. (2018). The development and evolution of human performance improvement. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th Ed.), (pp. 121-131). New York, NY: Pearson Education.
3. Stolovitch, H. D. (2015). Human performance technology: Research and theory to practice. *Performance Improvement*, 54(3).
4. 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.

5. 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.
6. 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. *HRD International*, 12(1), 69-84.)
7. Bonk, C. J., Lee, M. M., Reeves, T. C., & Reynolds, T. H. (2018). The emergence and design of massive open online courses. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th Ed.), (pp. 250-258). New York, NY: Pearson Education. Preprint available: <http://www.publicationshare.com/3> or: http://publicationshare.com/pdfs/MOOCs_Reiser_book_by_Bonk_Reeves_Reynolds_Lee_Final_with_citation.pdf

Week 13 (November 19). Professional Ethics and Social Change

1. Guerra, J. A. (2006). Standards and ethics in human performance technology. In J. A. Pershing (Ed.), *Handbook of human performance technology* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1024-1046). San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
2. Smaldino, S. E., Donaldson, J. A., & Herring, M. (2018). Professional ethics: Rules applied to practice. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th Ed.), (pp. 303-308). New York, NY: Pearson Education. (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.
4. Kowch, Eugene (2018, June 7). Conversations from Southeast Asia: Should we imagine social entrepreneurship as a catalyst for positive change? *TechTrends*, 62, 213-316.
5. Bradshaw, Amy C. (2018, March 23). Reconsidering the instructional design and technology timeline from the lens of social justice. *TechTrends*, 62, 336-344.

Thanksgiving break...November 24 to November 30.

Week 14 (December 3). Career and Professional Development

1. Klein, J. D., & Rushby, N. (2018). Getting involved in instructional design and technology: Recommendations for Professional Development. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (4th ed.) (pp. 219-228). Boston,

MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

2. 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.
3. Intentional Futures (2016, April). Instructional design in higher education: A report on the role, workflow, and experience of instructional designers.
4. Miller, L. (2013). ASTD's 2013 state of the industry report: workplace learning remains a key organizational investment. *T+D*, November, 40-45.
5. 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.
6. Kim, Joshua (2018, June 6). A Traditional Ph.D. Does Not an Instructional Designer Make Joshua Kim, Inside Higher Ed, <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/blogs/technology-and-learning/traditional-phd-does-not-instructional-designer-make>
7. Kim, Joshua, (2018, March 8). Career Opportunities at the Intersection of Learning and Technology: A talent shortage?, Joshua Kim, *Inside Higher Ed*, <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/technology-and-learning/career-opportunities-intersection-learning-and-technology>

Week 15 (December 10). 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. And you might share your final projects in Week 15 in Canvas. I will also try to arrange an optional synchronous chat session that week in Zoom to enable you to share what you have discovered and to reflect on the course overall.

Need Some Points? In Week 15, it would be great to create a poster of your learning in this class. This is not required but I will give five bonus points to everyone who does so. If you do this, please take one of the major ideas from our readings, prepare a poster to be presented at the class poster event where you will present it to others. Your poster should include a summary of this idea, attribution to its originator, example(s) of its application in the field, relationship to other major ideas as applicable. Online students can post a picture of their poster to Canvas and/or bring it to the last synchronous session.