

Terri Krause
EDCI 573 / Practicum
Dr. Jennifer Richardson, Instructor

e-TROY PRACTICUM FULL PROJECT OVERVIEW

This project consists of:

1. Creating a Course Proposal for a new undergraduate online survey course for Troy University (eTroy) entitled, *Survey of Instructional Design—A Trans-Disciplinary Approach*.
2. Writing the Instructional Plan
3. Creating the course structure/template on Troy's BlackBoard LMS.
4. **NOTE:** This section replaces #4 of the Pre-Proposal
 - a. After working with the Course Proposal provided by Dr. Fortune, and thinking through probable modules, structure and content, I realized the format of the course structure I created for EDCI 569 for Dr. Fortune could be adapted to this new course and save a lot of time setting up the template. While I will turn off some of the functionality and possibly modify the structure of the modules for the change in content and learner level, this step will expedite the process and allow me more time for content development.
 - b. After adjusting the Practicum Project Plan/Timeline (see attached) to account for reworking the Troy *Graphics Design in Multimedia* course template, I believe I will be able to develop two full modules for this *Survey of Instructional Design* course.

This project does not include:

1. A paper prototype
2. Comprehensive Storyboard
3. Completed Course (TBD)
4. Course Delivery (Instruction/Facilitation)

PROJECT LOCATION

This project will be conducted remotely via phone, email and web conferencing. The course and artifacts will be hosted on Troy's BlackBoard LMS at <http://troy.blackboard.com>.

TARGET AUDIENCE FOR COMPLETED WORK

The intended audience is 3rd year undergraduate students in three disciplines: Education; Graphics Arts; and, Technology who are interested in investigating Instructional Design as an option for an advanced degree or career path. Because of the diversity of backgrounds, the skillsets will vary; but, critical requisite skills are necessary.

Learner Analysis.

Learners will be:

1. At least third year undergraduate students
2. Education, Graphics Arts, and/or IT majors with a programming or web development focus
3. Interested in working in a team environment/Interested in e-Learning
4. Open to Instructional Design as a possible career path
5. Success oriented / Academics oriented

In addition, Learners will be:

1. Tech/computer savvy (Note: IT students will have had at least two programming classes; Graphics Design (CGT) students will be proficient in PhotoShop and have had at least two graphics design course; Education students will self-report a propensity for technology and cite examples to substantiate the claims.)
2. Social media users
3. Open to learning new software applications
4. Curious
5. Early adopters
6. Excellent communicators
7. Professional/Punctual
8. Able to meet deadlines
9. Self-motivated
10. Possess an inner locus of control (Dabbagh, 2007)

Learners will have at least the following additional skills:

1. Ability to read and comprehend complex concepts
2. Ability to follow complex instructions
3. Ability to work remotely in a group
4. Self-motivated
5. Work well independently (Krause, 2015)

MY ROLE

In this project, I will serve as the SME/Course Developer/Writer/Instructional Designer and Developer/ and Graphics Designer. While this may seem overly ambitious, I believe this is what we are requiring of many of our Faculty/Instructors today, and is probably a very typical real-world experience. I believe with the ability to consult with Dr. Fortune, and the resources available to me as a result of taking the Purdue MEd program, coupled with my background in graphics design and technology, this is a manageable project. I also have already worked with the Troy Blackboard LMS and feel confident in my ability to produce working modules. Modifying a template I developed earlier will also make the project more manageable.

OBJECTIVES/GOALS

The purpose of this course is to introduce students from three of the disciplines integral to the field of Instructional Design to the field of ID in a venue that allows them to experience the type of real world teamwork and projects they might encounter as members of the profession.

Background. The Troy Graduate School offers the M.S. in Curriculum and Instructional Design and in Instructional Technology. On the undergraduate level, three courses are offered: EDU 4471 Curriculum and Instructional Delivery; EDU 4499 Technology Across Curriculum; and, EDU 3305 Teaching with Technology. While each of the three undergraduate courses touch on a portion of Curriculum and Instructional Design and Educational Technology, currently none is trans-disciplinary and all are geared to education majors.

Institutional Objective. The goal is to create a highly sought after, competitive course with an equal but limited number of slots available to each discipline so that three-member working teams can be comprised of students (by Instructor Recommendation) from each domain. The nine-week e-Troy course can be offered as a pre-requisite for students applying to the MEd in Curriculum and Instructional Design, better preparing MEd candidates for the reality of the field; and/or to enable students in the non-educational disciplines to directly enter their respective fields as a part of an e-Learning team. With the growth of other LDT programs,

and the movement of instruction toward (at the very least) a blended environment, this survey course steps into the career path at least one year earlier for Troy students, and may help move “Undecideds” with multiple (and somewhat seemingly disparate) areas of interest into Instructional Design.

Learner Objectives. The integrated approach would allow students to understand the role of each of the main players involved in Instructional Design; provide a working vocabulary comprised of language specific to each domain as well as to the field of Instructional Design as a whole; provide a basic understanding of the theory, models, modes, methods, and means of instructional delivery; provide an opportunity to collaborate on small instructional projects; and provide an opportunity to share ideas about best practices and the future of instruction based on trends in education, design, and technology with practical demonstration of the integration of the system(s). The make-up of the class will ensure an inherent scaffolding structure to off-set the gaps in background training and/or experience.

Course Objective. Working in three person trans-disciplinary teams, students will produce products typical of real world instructional designers and experience varying levels of instructional design by discipline so as to demonstrate through the completion of successful group projects, peer reviews, and personal reflections their understanding of the vocabulary(ies), principles, and basic concepts: 1) Specific to each discipline; and; 2) As each relates to the field of Instructional Design.

Learning Objectives. I do not have these fully developed for all nine weeks, yet, as this is part of the Course Proposal which is not deliverable until Week 4; but, I have four of the learning objectives written so far which will be the focus of the first two weeks/modules.

Week 1

Learning Objective: Given a diverse learning environment, Learners will be able to distinguish between similar concepts and vocabulary caused by distinctions in approach, objectives, process, or function; and will be able to communicate ideas effectively to their team mates from the other disciplines.

Learning Objective: Working in teams, Learners will demonstrate an ability to work together—sharing and conveying ideas, expressing appropriate appreciation for the rules and requirements that govern best practices, and modeling mutual respect and consideration for the other members of their team.

Week 2

Learning Objective: Learners will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the process required to differentiate a problem requiring a training solution versus one calling for a non-training solution by following the process set forth in Mager and Pipe and proposing a suitable solution to a performance problem.

Learning Objective: Students will demonstrate the ability to conduct a Learner Analysis and correctly profile a prospective Learner by creating an Avatar with the characteristics of the Learner that can have an impact on instructional design.

FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Dr. Fortune as well as several of my classmates will participate in a formative evaluation after the 4th module is completed. I am also going to ask three undergraduate students to participate—one from each of the three disciplines.

PROJECT SUPERVISOR

Dr. Deborah Fortune | Contact Information: Email: dfortune@troy.edu

Dr. Deborah Fortune, Director of the Center for Excellence in eTeaching at Troy University will serve as Project Supervisor. Dr. Fortune has her Ed.D., in Distance Education and Instructional Technology from Nova Southeastern University and has served as Associate Dean of Distance Learning and Director of eTroy Quality Assurance for Online Programs. Dr. Fortune is also an adjunct instructor with Troy as well as in Purdue University's Department of Curriculum & Instruction. Dr. Fortune was my instructor for EDCI 569, *Introduction to e-Learning*.

ADDITIONAL CLARIFICATIONS

This project covers the entire range of the ID cycle from conception, potentially to completion (I want to leave this open in case I am able to produce more than I think is possible). It is a real world project that encompasses my areas of interest: Trans-disciplinary Instructional Design Curriculum in a Post-Secondary Environment. It is a unique opportunity afforded to me by Dr. Fortune in which I will be allowed to develop a prep course derived from the issues and concerns arising from the diverse backgrounds of the Learners that I noted and experienced as I took my MEd through Purdue.

Citations

Krause, T. 2015. Instructional plan for Troy University course, *Survey of instructional design—A Trans-disciplinary approach*. EDCI 573. Purdue University.

Dabbagh, N. (2007). The online learner: Characteristics and pedagogical implications. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 7(3), 217- 226.