

Syllabus Updated September 17, 2023
R511: Instructional Technology Foundations (Fall 2023)

IST Department, IU School of Education
(Section 3623: Online Version; 15 week)

Syllabus: http://curtbonk.com/R511_online_syllabus_fall_2023.htm
Zoom (Optional Synchronous Sessions): <https://IU.zoom.us/j/8123222878>
Course Links to [Dropbox](#) and Canvas: <http://canvas.iu.edu/>
R511 in Canvas: <https://iu.instructure.com/courses/2167097>

Moderator Sign-up: <http://trainingshare.com/r511.php>
Instructor: Professor Curt Bonk, Indiana University, Email: cjbonk@indiana.edu
Bank Homepage: <http://www.curtbonk.com/>

Spring of 2023 Student Info in Padlet: [the Padlet for the class](https://padlet.com/mlucimara/r511-fall-2023-getting-to-know-one-another-wyhbgt9xzcgkfmum)
<https://padlet.com/mlucimara/r511-fall-2023-getting-to-know-one-another-wyhbgt9xzcgkfmum>

Examples from spring of 2022: <https://padlet.com/sunseol/b1yr49ljxwc6smkc>

Examples from spring of 2023: <https://padlet.com/sunseol/19cpudfcxkjrqq3n>

Instructional Assistants: Cherisse Mahabir-Cletus (cmahabir@iu.edu)
and Luci Mello (mlucimara@gmail.com or lcemello@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). Each week we will watch different guest speaker recordings and discuss their careers and views on trends in the field. Some of these people are in the reading list. I also have a playlist of the YouTube videos from the guests of the fall 2021 and spring 2023 semesters (see below).

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, 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, and models.
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 recordings of meetings with synchronous guest experts.
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 the 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.

15-Week Schedule (Note: Topics may change depending upon circumstances)

Date and Time	Week Topic
Week 1. Monday August 21	Course Orientation
Week 2. Monday August 28	IT Overview
Week 3. Monday September 4	ISD
Week 4. Monday September 11	ID Process
Week 5. Monday September 18	Behaviorism
Week 6. Monday September 25	Cognitive & Construct. Theory (Due: Task #3 & Task #4)
Week 7. Monday October 2	Authentic Learning
Week 8. Monday October 9	Theory Comparison
Week 9. Monday October 16	History of IT
Week 10. Monday October 23	Trends and Issues in IT
Week 11. Monday October 30	HPT Concepts
Week 12. Monday November 6	History and Trends HPT (Due: Task #5 and Task #6)
Week 13. Monday November 13	Ethics and Change
Week 14. Monday November 20	Career and PD (ed tech jobs) (Due: Task #2)
Week 15. Monday November 27-Dec. 4	Sharing and Discussing 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 Canvas discussion forums reflections	60 points	Due each week
2. Discussion forum reflection paper	50 points	Nov. 20 (Discussion reflection paper with no grace)
3. Learning Matrix, Expert Profile, or Extended Book Reading	30 points	Sept. 25 (Midterm) (with 2-day grace period)
4. Video and Script on an IT Issue or Trend	30 points	Sept. 25 (Midterm) (with 2-day grace period)
5. IT and/or HPT Display or Book Review	30 points	Nov. 6 (Finals) (with 2-day grace period)
6. Final Project and Reflection (see options)	50 points	Nov. 6 (Finals) (with 2-day grace period)

Note: Working in teams on Tasks #3 and #4 is optional but is required in Task #5 and #6.

Total Points = 250 (Grading will be according to a 90-80-70-60 scale; see below.)

Grades:

250 = Excellent work
234 = A
225 = A-
217 = B+
209 = B
200 = B-
192 = C+
183 = C
175 = C-
150 = 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 or 7th edition where appropriate). I will use more detailed grading rubrics for several of the tasks.

Lateness: I have a 48-hour (2 day) lateness policy with no penalties for any assignment. Anything submitted after that grace period or window can lose 1 point per day unless you ask for an extension. So, if it says it is due Monday at midnight, you actually have until Wednesday night at midnight to turn it in.

Mondays: Everything is due on Mondays.

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 [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. But do see below for recommended and free books.

Instructional Assistants: My instructional assistants, Dr. Cherisse Mahabir-Cletus (cmahabir@iu.edu) and Dr. Luci Mello (mlucimara@gmail.com or lcmello@indiana.edu), will help me give feedback on your weekly discussion posts. They will also help me coordinate class tasks and plans. Both Cherisse and Luci are recent Ed.D. alumni of IU and IST. I was their advisor. They are both fantastic people.

Recommended Books and Resources:

1. Al Januszewski & Michael Molenda (2008). *Educational technology: A definition with commentary*. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. [Amazon](#); [Abebooks](#)
2. Robert A. Reiser & John V. Dempsey (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.) (see [Dropbox](#))
3. Ali A. Carr-Chellman & Gordon Rowland (Eds.) (2017). *Issues in technology, learning, and instructional design: Classic and contemporary issues*. NY: Routledge. (Note: Free e-book at IU: <https://iucat.iu.edu/iub/16124646>) (see [Dropbox](#))
4. Jason K. McDonald & Richard E. West (2021). *Design for Learning: Principles, Processes, and Praxis (1st ed.)*. EdTech Books. <https://edtechbooks.org/id> (**free**)
5. Richard West, Editor, *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology* (second edition in process). <https://edtechbooks.org/lidtfoundations>
6. Olaf Zawacki-Richter & Insung Jung (Eds.) (2022). *Handbook of open, distance and digital education*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-0351-9> (**free**)
7. Donald Clark, Great Minds on Learning podcast (21 shows) (**free**)
<https://podcasts.apple.com/gb/podcast/great-minds-on-learning/id1582598860>
8. Martin, F., Dennen, V. P., & Bonk, C. J. (Eds.) (2023). Special Issue: Systematic Reviews of Research on Online Learning. *Online Learning Journal*, 27(1).
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24059/olj.v27i1.3887>. (**free**)

Available: <https://olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org/index.php/olj/issue/view/126>. Entire issue with cover: <http://www.publicationshare.com/34>; EdTechBooks: https://edtechbooks.org/online_learning_journal_27_1; DOI: [10.24059/olj.v27i1.3887](https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v27i1.3887)

Two Bonus Bonk Books (free) and free course: You also have access to two free e-books from the course instructor:

Curtis J. Bonk & Elaine Khoo (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>

Elaine Khoo & Curtis J. Bonk (2022). *Motivating and Supporting Online Learners*. Burnaby, BC, Canada: Commonwealth of Learning. Free book available: <http://hdl.handle.net/11599/4481> and **free course** available: <https://colcommons.org/welcome/coursedetails/8>; <https://www.colvee.org/>

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). Video Lectures: <http://curtbonk.com/8-pack>

Optional Recorded Expert Chats (i.e., chats with former IST students, retired IST professors, book and article authors, IST leaders, and others. If you watch five or more recordings from the playlist of guests from the fall of 2021 or spring of 2023 listed below 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:** You can use this option just once).

If you watch 7 or more of these sessions and write a 4-page single-spaced reflection paper with a one page comparison chart or other visual in an appendix, 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? 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?

Prior R511 Playlists of guests:

1. R511 Playlist of Guests, Fall 2021,
<https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLHcReRoW2lxPeQcA1LKHnj11MPllpKWp>
2. R511 Playlist of Guests, Spring 2023:
<https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLHcReRoW2lxOCpwRuol3oaNbgQzQIdW8F>
3. R511 Playlist of Lectures, Spring 2023:
<https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLHcReRoW2lxNduT64X11ayNyhsT2wPj-Q>

Guests in R511 Instructional Technology Foundations

Fall 2021, 17 Sessions and 18 Guests

2021 Playlist <https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLHcReRoW2lxPeQcA1LKHnj11MPllpKWp>

1. August 21, 2021	Lin Lin and Yunjo An, University of North Texas	(1:09:57): https://youtu.be/ZRF7Mg-5ShU
2. August 24, 2021	Terry Anderson, Athabasca University, Canada	(1:09:57): https://youtu.be/ZRF7Mg-5ShU
3. August 31, 2021	Khendum Gyabak, University of Minnesota	(1:51:19): https://youtu.be/ekgVOglCsaM
4. Sept. 9, 2021	Rachel Kobic from 2U	(1:14:12): https://youtu.be/d9qpy-GaYwQ
5. Sept. 17, 2021	Richard Mayer, UC Santa Barbara	(1:17:47): https://youtu.be/pVo7IRsbgkA
6. Sept. 21, 2021	Brent Wilson Univ. of Colorado Denver	(1:16:08): https://youtu.be/iJqJULyIo60
7. Sept. 21, 2021	Scott Grabinger, Univ. of Colorado Denver	(1:01:54): https://youtu.be/PgnFFO2gtzw
8. Sept. 26, 2021	Tom Reeves, Univ. of Georgia on authentic learning	(1:12:24): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5pSZJiW3XTw
9. Sept. 29, 2021	Anita Vyas, Baylor Univ. College of Medicine	(1:16:48): https://youtu.be/CLMEbiGrYJs
10. Oct. 4, 2021	Tim Newby, Purdue Univ.	(1:12:11): https://youtu.be/HfAfIjBm8k8
11. Oct. 12, 2021	Kyle Peck, Penn State	(1:10:38): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ycKFA6x-f-Q
12. Oct. 18, 2021	Punya Mishra, ASU	(1:06:19): https://youtu.be/jBFliB11N5I
13. Oct. 26, 2021	YaTing Teng, Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences	(1:23:39): https://youtu.be/_ZoWnOHhb_c
14. Nov. 1, 2021	Allison Rossett, San Diego State University	(1:14:19): https://youtu.be/-a3PrynIi4A
15. Nov. 8, 2021	Jim Klein, Florida State U.	(1:08:44): https://youtu.be/IHVk0Qh74ZQ
16. Nov. 11, 2021	Amy Bradford, University of Oklahoma	(1:05:44): https://youtu.be/TnFE4OA7EaM
17. Nov. 14, 2021	Merve Basdogan, Indiana U.	(1:22:10): https://youtu.be/4PCSXArug4k

**Guests in R511 Instructional Technology Foundations
Spring 2023, 15 Sessions and 20 Guests (one session did not record)**

2023 Playlist: <https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLHcReRoW2lxOCpwRuol3oaNbgQzQIdW8F>

1. January 9, 2023	Orientation Session and Sunmi Seol	(2:09:22): https://youtu.be/DsxSATHjzWE
2. January 15, 2023	Zihang Shao and Ling Qian on Instructional Design jobs	(2:32:18): https://youtu.be/m75rc7ihexo
3. January 23, 2023	Cheryl Murphy Vice Provost Univ. of Arkansas	(1:20:45): https://youtu.be/rjUaJBKy1J8
4. January 30, 2023	Yue Ma and Nathaly Gal Instructional Design Methods and Practices	(1:26:26): https://youtu.be/DfBzfb9913E
5. February 6, 2023	Renee Hung and John McCormick of Brandeis University	(1:11:01): https://youtu.be/5KMWL2IF6j0
6. February 13, 2023	Mengyuan Zhao on The CN	(1:58:11): https://youtu.be/XkDrHDdfui4
7. February 20, 2023	Ozgun Ozdemir and Remzi Kizilboga on Authentic Learning	(Did not record properly)
8. February 27, 2023	Donald Clark on AI and Learning Technology	(2:27:17): https://youtu.be/8h_fDuv4hEY
9. March 6, 2023	Rick West and Jason McDonald from BYU Discuss Free and Open EdTechBooks	(1:03:39): https://youtu.be/md0J5DqZsfs
10. March 20, 2023	Bob Kozma's new book: Making the World a Better Place	(1:47:15): https://youtu.be/UOP09h5x_4I
11. March 27, 2023	John Graves Change Management	(1:13:19): https://youtu.be/Xbk0BsUDsSE
12. April 3, 2023	Maria Solomou from PwC Experience Center in Cyprus (with holograms)	(1:20:38): https://youtu.be/oMXG7GFpShA
13. April 10, 2023	Daria Vaughn, Indianapolis, Corporate Consulting and Training	(1:17:43): https://youtu.be/dlX9RwftwiU
14. April 17, 2023	Gina Anderson, CEO Luma Brighter Learning	(1:23:53): https://youtu.be/-yHvFbnbiAo
15. April 21, 2023	Jessi Yi from Box (not in playlist)	(1:12:12): https://youtu.be/EQ5V_uMxCOI (also found at: https://iu.mediaspace.kaltura.com/media/t/1_nhb9vrd6)

**Curt Bonk Theory Lectures, R511 Instructional Technology Foundations
Spring 2023, 14 Sessions (one session did not record)**

2023 Playlist: <https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLHcReRoW2lxNduT64X11ayNyhsT2wPj-Q>
 Old Bonk Learning Theory Lectures from September 2008: <http://curtbonk.com/8-pack> (or here: <https://curtbonk.com/September102008.html>)

3. January 23, 2023	Curt Bonk on Instructional Design Models	(1:10:03): https://youtu.be/g8MuqkHMxIs
4. January 30, 2023	Curt Bonk on Gagne, Merrill, and Bonk	(1:15:37): https://youtu.be/esrlCpfWmPQ
5. February 6, 2023	Curt Bonk on Behaviorism	(1:02:44): https://youtu.be/u2hdy9CXt_g
6. February 13, 2023	Curt Bonk on Cognitive Information Processing	(1:00:56): https://youtu.be/OHd8fPMp37I
7. February 20, 2023	Curt Bonk on Authentic Learning	(Did not record properly)
8. February 27, 2023	Curt Bonk on Lev Vygotsky and Social Constructivism	(47:00): https://youtu.be/f6vKubEaB5k
9. March 6, 2023	Curt Bonk Part 1. on Vygotsky and Bruner Part 2. Educational Initiatives and Applications of Constructivism	(22:26): https://youtu.be/OIaOeVQGBtA (36:48): https://youtu.be/NzW_01lm4Fc
10. March 20, 2023	Curt Bonk on Piaget	(21:33): https://youtu.be/SGxOJrZLeAQ
11. March 27, 2023	Curt Bonk on Knowledge Management	(53:50): https://youtu.be/lIgwzauKe6A
12. April 3, 2023	Curt Bonk on Albert Bandura Part 1	(31:28): https://youtu.be/9nIbhXINtTs
13. April 10, 2023	Curt Bonk on Bandura and Self-Efficacy Part 2	(39:51): https://youtu.be/f6V65Sth88M
14. April 17, 2023	Curt Bonk on Motivation Part 1	(29:13): https://youtu.be/LfY3W9Qq6Q4
15. April 21, 2023	Curt Bonk on Motivation Part 2	(37:27): https://youtu.be/Q7A1cpzgY_0

Guest Zoom link: <https://IU.zoom.us/j/8123222878>

R511 Course Tasks (see [Dropbox](#) for task examples)

Reading Reflections

Task #1: Discussion Forum Reflections (60 Points): There will be two discussion forums: (1) one for the reflections on the articles for the week and my recorded lectures from the spring of 2023, and (2) one for the recorded guest chats from the fall of 2021 and spring of 2023. Please contribute at least one post to each forum each week. At the start of each week, I want one person to post a short summary to Canvas on 3-4 of the main articles assigned for that week. That person is the starter for discussion. Other students will add to their conversation with their reflections and reactions. As a summarizer or starter, you might:

1. State reactions, questions, and suggestions for the upcoming readings.
2. Post author pictures, quotes, figures, tables, etc., from the articles for the coming week.
3. Recap or briefly summarize key parts of the assigned articles for the week.
4. Monitor the discussion. And spark it when it goes weak.
5. Offer feedback to peers on their posts.
6. Add resources and links to resources to the discussion.
7. Connect to experts in the field.
8. Connect or synthesize comments within the week.
9. Point to counter points and inaccuracies in the postings of students during the week.
10. Be creative or offer creative insights when needed.
11. Point out the relationship of upcoming week topic or articles to past lectures or readings.
12. Reflect on the discussion from past weeks; repost prior quotes from others.
13. Discuss the position of a researcher or pioneer in the field (or perhaps even write to him/her).
14. Discuss a recent speech or colloquium you attended related to the week or a visit to a technology center or exhibit.
15. At the end of the week, you might react and reflect on the class discussion that transpired as well as the questions and concerns raised. You might also link to the next week's readings.

You can sign up for this task at: <http://trainingshare.com/r511.php>

Participation considerations:

1. Diversity (some variety in ideas posted, and some breadth to exploration);
2. Perspective taking (values other perspectives, ideas, cultures, etc.);
3. Creativity (original, unique, and novel ideas);
4. Insightful (makes interesting, astute, and sagacious observations).
5. Relevancy (topics selected are connected to course content); and
6. Learning Depth/Growth (shows some depth to thinking and elaboration of ideas).

Task #2: Discussion and Lecture Reflection Paper (50 points): Near the semester, you are to reflect on what you learned from weekly discussions in Canvas or in class each week as well as from the readings and the recorded guest chats and recorded lectures. You should include at least 7 of the weeks in your reflection. What were the ideas, issues, concepts, facts, figures, diagrams, etc., that struck a chord with you? What did you learn during the semester? How did your thinking change in a particular week or over time? What inspired you? What did you find disappointing? What is next?

Using these questions as a guide, please write a 3 page single-spaced reflection paper (not counting any references, appendices, or tables created). Though not required, it would help if you included a fourth page with a recap table, chart, figure, or some type of summary of key themes, concepts, terms, etc., mentioned in the reflection paper. This is to be a meta-reflection of your growth in the course, unique learning insights, personal gains, etc., at least in part, from your weekly discussions and responding to your peers. What were the key concepts you grappled with this semester? How has your thinking evolved? What are the gaps in the research that you might target now? What weeks or particular articles inspired you and why? Post your reflection paper to Canvas.

Midterm Tasks (In Teams of Two is Preferred (Tasks #3 and #4; individual is ok but should clear it with the instructor ahead of time)

Task #3: Option 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 or by yourself, 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 two 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., three 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. With a partner it is 3-4 pages single-spaced.

Brave People Option: Have ChatPDF, ChatGPT, or other generative AI tool or platform generate a 2,000-3,000 word summary or essay of a scholar. Next, write a 2-3 page single-spaced reflection paper, review, or critique of that scholar and incorporate a couple of quotes and aspects of what generative AI produced.

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. You can do this task by yourself or with a partner (or two). 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. (see [Dropbox](#))

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. (At least 4 pages with a partner.)

Brave People Option: Put the book into ChatPDF, ChatGPT, or other generative AI tool or platform and have it do a critique or a book review. Next, write a 2-3 page single-spaced reflection paper, review, or critique of what generative AI produced.

Task #4: Creating a Script and Video for an Issue or Trend (30 points)

In the same team or working alone, 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). Free tools include CapCut: <https://www.capcut.com/>; Canva Video Editor: <https://www.canva.com/video-editor/>; and Adobe Lightworks is free for IU students and staff. IU also provides free license for Powtoon. follow these steps to request a license: <https://kb.iu.edu/d/bggr>. In addition, video creation tools that students have used in the past may now cost money like Go Animate, Moovly, VideoScribe, Wideo, and Make Web Video.

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 an issue, trends, or concept. Key terms within that issue should be included. 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 Leuchtmann, Kim Woodward, March 7, 2015:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Bcr3_aZT_xQ&feature=youtu.be
3. March 8, 2016, Ryan Russell and Geng (Roy) Niu, R511 Task 4, Open Educational Resources, R511: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1giHtFjzHQc>
4. March 8, 2016, Deb Cole and Channelle Jones, HPT Task 4, R511
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_XiD_9haSU8&feature=youtu.be
5. October 21, 2016, Merve Basdogan, Self-Regulated Learning (SRL),
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TypouHO2eJ8&feature=youtu.be>
6. October 26, 2016, R511, Rob Elliot, Erin Milanese, and Patrick Walsh Traditional Textbook (8:11): <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B25AtCR9Ddd5NE9DaS16RlpiMW8/view>
7. 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>
8. October 13, 2019, Machine Learning in Education, R511, Spring 2019, Tina Closser and Sunmi Seol, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Xeti7aT03nw&feature=emb_logo
9. February 2023, ChatGPT, Morgan Luo: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qq4NsitEYn0>, (GoAnimate!)
10. February 2023, Instructional Design Considerations: ColorBlind, Beau Scott:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8kPg_Cx2WDs (VideoScribe:
<https://www.videoscribe.co/en/free-trial/>)
11. February 2023, The Great Media Debate, Matthew Leos and Michelle Gilbert:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5ZMIR0zPa_E (tool used: Animaker
(<https://www.animaker.com/>) for the video, and ElevenLabs (<https://beta.elevenlabs.io/speech-synthesis>) for the voiceovers.
12. February 2023, Japanese Faculty Readiness for Online Learning, Amelia Ijiri and Masahiko Hirano: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gAN-Uea8f-0> (D-ID's Generative AI to enable users to transform any picture or video into extraordinary experiences: <https://www.d-id.com/>)
13. March 2023, Accessibility and Inclusive Design Considerations, Kristin Eck,
<https://youtu.be/NtI8GuiHRW0>

Final Tasks (Teams are preferred on Task #5 and Task #6; individual work is ok but you should clear it with the instructor ahead of time)

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, mind map, 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 visual depictions will be graded on many aspects or dimensions. For instance, I will look at their overall connectedness, macrostructure, micro linkages or details, causal 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 books recommended for this course (or something else that you find). Read at least 75 percent of the book you selected. 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.

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

Carr-Chellman, A. A., & Rowland, G. (Eds.) (2017). *Issues in technology, learning, and instructional design: Classic and contemporary issues*. NY: Routledge. (Note: This is a free e-book at IU: <https://iucat.iu.edu/iub/16124646>) (see [Dropbox](#))

McDonald, J. K. & West, R. E. (2021). *Design for Learning: Principles, Processes, and Praxis* (1st ed.). EdTech Books. <https://edtechbooks.org/id>

Brave People Option: Put a PDF of the chosen book or books into ChatPDF, ChatGPT, or other generative AI tool or platform and have it do a critique or a book review on it. Next, write a reflection paper, review, or critique of what generative AI produced. 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.

Task #5 Option C: Debate Review: If you choose the second book above by Carr-Chellman and

Rowland above, you might reflect on 3 or 4 or 5 of the point-counterpoint debates in that book in a 3-4 page single-spaced paper. What are the issues raised? Who won the debate and why? What are the new possibilities for the field and for education in general? Why are these particular issues 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, mind maps or concept maps, or simply a text recap of the prevailing issues and opportunities) are welcome in your debate review. You might put key terms from the different chapters in an appendix at the end. Please include the references to the reviewed chapters at the end.

Brave People Option: Have ChatPDF, ChatGPT, or other generative AI tool or platform write a paper about a topic is debate in the field of learning, design, and technology. Next, write a 3-4 page reflection paper or critique of what generative AI produced (single-spaced preferred). I want you to include both your paper and the paper generative AI created.

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. 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>
2. 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>
3. Librarians for Instructional Technology, Latrice Booker, R511, Fall 2016, December 13, 2016, <http://bookerlr2000.wixsite.com/librariansforit/cognitivism>
4. What is Instructional Technology (Website), Channelle Jones and Deb Cole <http://r511bonk.weebly.com/>
5. "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>
6. Dec 12, 2017, Bev Wilgenbusch: <https://prezi.com/view/UrYTxG89nM3FRZKUBcDI/>

7. December 12, 2017, Lisa Milsom and Michale Siverio: <https://msiverio.wixsite.com/r511>
8. December 12, 2017, Katie Jantaraweragul: <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSdQqe40z0FYMfMI51v5ccMks4GJpBEgpStANWgalXf-yUqLnQ/viewform>
9. December 12, 2017, Raj and Khadijah: <https://akhadijah.wixsite.com/r511>
10. December 12, 2017, Rachael Zeiher Kean: <https://razeiher.wixsite.com/edtechcoms>
11. December 12, 2017, Matthew Willey: <https://sway.com/QGdiCv7p64DFBe8A?ref=Link>
12. December 11, 2019, Instructional Technology and Human Performance Technology, R511, Spring 2019, Matt Brown, <http://pages.iu.edu/~mb2/EDUC-R511-Task6/>

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 aspects 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 of IT or HPT. You might develop an instructional module or maybe try your luck at a 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.

AECT Legacies and Legends project: Those selecting this option should watch video interview reflections or presentations from at least five 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 are 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 4-5 page single-spaced reflection (perhaps 2,000 to 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 of 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

you might 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. Silver Lining for Learning.

In March 2020, my colleagues and I started a weekly show called Silver Lining for Learning. Each Saturday, we feature people or a project related to the field of educational technology that offers a ray of hope during the COVID-19 pandemic. See <https://silverliningforlearning.org>. Those selecting this option should watch at least five Silver Lining for Learning episodes. If you select this option, you are to write a 4-5 page single-spaced reflection (perhaps 2,000 to 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 of 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 F: 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 March 1st if you intend to select this option.

Task #6 Option F Examples:

1. 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 around 3 to 6 articles assigned each week (sometimes more). You are required to read or watch 3 or 4 of them. Your choice. You can substitute any article with interesting chapters from any of the recommended books or podcast episodes from relevant sources.

You can substitute any chapter or article at any time without penalty. I also highly recommend that you watch the video interviews with many of the 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. Note that 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 21). Module #1: 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).

1. Dewey, John (1897, January). My pedagogic creed. *School Journal*, 54, pp. 77-80.
Retrieved from <http://dewey.pragmatism.org/creed.htm>
2. **Read any chapter:** Richard West, Editor (2018), *Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology* (second edition in process).
<https://edtechbooks.org/lidtfoundations>
3. **Read any chapter:** Jason K. McDonald, & West, Richard E. (2021). *Design for Learning: Principles, Processes, and Praxis* (1st ed.). EdTech Books. Available: <https://edtechbooks.org/id>
4. Reeves, T. C., & Lin, L. (2020). The research we have is not what we need. *Educational Technology Research and Development* (ETR&D), 68(4), 1991-2001.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09811-3>

Week 2 (August 28). Module #2: 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. Molenda, M., & Boling, E. (2008). Chapter 4: Creating. In *Educational Technology: A Definition with Commentary* (pp. 81-139). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
3. 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.

4. 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>).
5. Collis, B., & Moonen, J. (2002). Flexible learning in a digital world. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open and Distance Learning*, 17(2), 217-230.
6. Anderson, T., & Rivera-Vargas, P. (2020, June). A critical look at educational technology from a distance education perspective. *Digital Education Review*, 37, 208-229. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1344/der.2020.37.208-229>; Retrieve from <https://revistes.ub.edu/index.php/der/article/view/30917>

Week 3 (September 4). Module #3: Instructional Systems Design

1. John H. Curry, Sean R. Jackson, & Heather Moran (2022, November). It's not just the HOW, but also the WHO: The TCoP Model of technology integration, *TechTrends*, 980-987.
2. McDonald, J. K. (2023). The future of the field is not design. In R. E. West, & H. Leary (Eds.), *Foundations of learning and instructional design technology: Historical roots & current trends* (2nd ed.). EdTech Books. Retrieved from https://edtechbooks.org/foundations_of_learn/the_future_of_the_field_is_not_design
3. **Read any chapter:** Jason K. McDonald, & West, Richard E. (2021). Design for Learning: Principles, Processes, and Praxis (1st ed.). EdTech Books. Available: <https://edtechbooks.org/id>
4. **Read any chapter:** Richard West, Editor (2018), Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology (second edition in process). <https://edtechbooks.org/lidtfoundations>
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2001). The systematic design of instruction (5th ed.) (pp. 2-14). New York: Longman.
8. Zemke, R., & Rossett, A. (2002). A hard look at ISD. *Training*, 39(2), 26-34.
9. Mintz, Steven (2021, February 8). 7 innovative approaches to course design. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/higher-ed-gamma/7-innovative-approaches-course-design>

Week 4 (September 11). Module #4: Instructional Development Process

1. **Read any chapter:** Jason K. McDonald, & West, Richard E. (2021). Design for Learning: Principles, Processes, and Praxis (1st ed.). EdTech Books. Available: <https://edtechbooks.org/id>
2. **Read any chapter:** Richard West, Editor (2018), Foundations of Learning and Instructional Design Technology (second edition in process). <https://edtechbooks.org/lidtfoundations>
3. 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.
4. 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>).
5. 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>).
6. 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>
7. 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>
8. Song, Jing (2023). Dr. Charles Reigeluth: a True Scholar. *TechTrends*, 67(4), 608-610.

Week 5 (September 18). Module #5: 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. Or 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): <https://youtu.be/KefAapQdAHs>

Week 6 (September 25). Module #6: 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. (2019). *Comparative pedagogical models of problem-based learning*. In M. Moallem, W. Hung and N. Dabbagh (Eds.) *Wiley Handbook of Problem-Based Learning*, (pp. 81-104) John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Also see:

- 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.
 - c. 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.
7. **Video Lecture Supplement:** Curt Bonk on the Cognitive Information Processing (CIP) model. Archive URL (73 minutes): <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 2). Module #7: 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.
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. Downes, S. (2022). Connectivism. *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 17(1), 58-87. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6173510>
7. Lockee, B., & Song, K. (2016). The AECT Legends and Legacies Project. *TechTrends*, 60(2), 107-109.

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 9). Module #8: 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 16). Module #9: 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. Bonk, C. J., & Wiley, D. (2020). Preface: Reflections on the waves of emerging learning technology. *Educational Technology Research and Development* (ETR&D), 68(4), 1595-1612.

DOI 10.1007/s11423-020-09809-x.

Available: <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s11423-020-09809-x.pdf> and <http://publicationshare.com/28>

3. 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>).
4. 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>
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=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=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=qK1Jew7ZjZk>
 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 23). Module #10: Trends and Issues in IT

1. Martin, F., Dennen, V. P., & Bonk, C. J. (2020). A synthesis of systematic review research on emerging learning environments and technologies. *Educational Technology Research and Development* (ETR&D), 68(4), 1613-1634. DOI 10.1007/s11423-020-09812-2. Available: <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007/s11423-020-09812-2.pdf> and <http://publicationshare.com/29>
2. Martin, F., Dennen, V. P., & Bonk, C. J. (2023). Systematic reviews of research on online learning: An introductory look and review. *Online Learning*, 27(1). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24059/olj.v27i1.3827>; Available: <https://olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org/index.php/olj/article/view/3827>

Entire Special Issue: DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24059/olj.v27i1.3887>. Available: <https://olj.onlinelearningconsortium.org/index.php/olj/issue/view/126>. Entire issue with cover: <http://www.publicationshare.com/34>; EdTechBooks: https://edtechbooks.org/online_learning_journal_27_1; DOI: [10.24059/olj.v27i1.3887](https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v27i1.3887)

3. Martinez, S., & Whiting, J. (2021). Designing informal learning environments. In J. K. McDonald & R. E. West (Eds.), *Design for learning: Principles, processes, and praxis*. EdTech Books. https://edtechbooks.org/id/designing_informal
4. Rodriguez, Brenda Cecelia Padilla (2022). The rise and fall of the HyFlex Approach in Mexico. *TechTrends*, 911-913.
5. 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.
6. 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>).
7. Kozma, R. B. (1994). Will media influence learning? Reframing the debate. *ETR&D*, 42(2), 7-19.
8. Bonk, C. J. (2020). Pandemic ponderings, 30 years to today: Synchronous signals, saviors, or survivors? *Distance Education*, 41(4), 589-599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1821610>

Week 11 (October 30). Module #11: Human Performance Tech: 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. 443-455). Sage Publications.

Week 12 (November 6). Module #12: History, Trends, and Issues in HPT

1. LinkedIn Learning (2022) 2022 Workplace Learning Report. The Transformation of L&D. Retrieved from <https://learning.linkedin.com/resources/workplace-learning-report>
2. Rummler, G. A. (2007). The past is prologue: An eyewitness account of HPT. *Performance Improvement*, 46(10), 5-9.
3. 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.
4. Stolovitch, H. D. (2015). Human performance technology: Research and theory to practice. *Performance Improvement*, 54(3).
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.)
8. 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>

Week 13 (November 13). Module #13: 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 through a lens of social justice. *TechTrends*, 62, 336-344.

Week 14 (November 20). Module #14: Career and Professional Development

1. Martin, F., Chen, Y., Oyarzun, B., & Lee, M. (2022). Learning and development roles and competency domains in higher education: a content analysis of job announcements. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 34(2), 297-320.
2. 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.
3. Ritzhaupt, A. D., Martin, F., Pastore, R., & Kang, Y. (2018). Development and validation of the Educational Technologist Competencies Survey (ETCS): Knowledge, skills, and abilities. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 30(1), 3-33.
4. Kang, Y. & Ritzhaupt, A. D. (2015). A job announcement analysis of educational technology professional positions: Knowledge, skills, and abilities. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 43(3), 231-256.
5. Ritzhaupt, A. D., & Kang, Y. (2015). Are we ready for bachelor's degrees in educational technology?: Perceptions from the field and a proposal. *Educational Technology*, 55(3), 14-22.
6. Kumar, S. & Ritzhaupt, A. D. (2017). What do instructional designers in higher education really do? *International Journal of E-Learning*, 16(4), 371-393.
7. Wang, X., Chen, Y, Ritzhaupt, A. D., & Martin, F. (in press). Examining competencies for the instructional design professional: An exploratory job announcement analysis. *International Journal of Training and Development*. DOI: 10.1111/ijtd.12209
8. Shironica P. Karunanayaka & Som Naidu (2021). Impacts of authentic assessment on the development of graduate attributes, *Distance Education*, 42(2), 231-252, DOI: 10.1080/01587919.2021.1920206
9. 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>

10. Basdogan, M., Ozdogan, Z., & Bonk, C. J. (2020). Understanding the diverse field of “educational technology” as revealed in Twitter job postings: Encoding/decoding approach. *The Qualitative Report*, 25(8), 2044-2066. Available: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol25/iss8/3>
11. Intentional Futures (2016, April). Instructional design in higher education: A report on the role, workflow, and experience of instructional designers.

Week 15 (November 27-December 4). Module #15: Final Project Discussion and Sharing