

EDPS 561: Program Planning in Adult and Higher Education  
Instructor: Renate Kahlke

**University of Alberta, Faculty of Education  
Department of Educational Policy Studies  
Fall 2014**

**EDPS 561: Program Planning in Adult and Higher Education**

**(course weight: \*3)**

**Classroom: Education North 7-152/online in E-Class Live (Adobe connect)**

**Instructor: Renate Kahlke, PhD**

Office: 5-164 Education North

Office hours: By appointment

Email: [rkahlke@ualberta.ca](mailto:rkahlke@ualberta.ca)

---

**Course Outline**

**General Description:**

This course will examine the theory, methods and practice of instructional design in adult and postsecondary learning environments. Drawing on both seminal and current literature and theories, as well as research in instructional design practice and models, the course will be interweave three areas of roughly equal emphasis:

- (a) instructional design **theories** and **models**,
- (b) **components** of dominant instructional design models (including needs analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation), and
- (c) **practical** aspects of implementing systematic instructional design models.

The theories and models covered in this course will be used as guiding frameworks for practical application.

**Rationale:**

Instructional design provides a means for effective and efficient course (unit or program) development. Designing instructional materials to bring about learning is, by nature, complex; instructional design models aim to abridge this complexity by way of an evidence-based and systematic process. Instructional design models, theories, and practices provide a structure and process for anyone designing instruction. Building on the rigour of existing scholarship in the learning, instructional, and cognitive sciences, instructional designers must also learn the 'art' of creative design. This requires a solid understanding of the benefits and drawbacks of instructional design models alongside knowledge of the unique disciplinary and contextual factors within the postsecondary sector. By recognizing and managing the limitations of instructional design models within each unique context, instructional designers deeply enhance the learning process. Hence, instructional design is both an art and science.

**Course Outcomes:**

Upon completion of this course, participants will be able (or better able) to:

1. Contrast, compare, and critically appraise established instructional design models in relation to their suitability in diverse contexts.
  - a. Identify instructional design models relevant in adult and postsecondary curriculum development.
  - b. Recognize and analytically appraise criticisms and controversies related to established instructional design models.
  - c. Identify and describe approaches to instructional design that have been proposed as alternatives to the established instructional design models.
2. Select and apply an instructional design model to design a learning event in collaboration with content experts and other partners.
  - a. Evaluate the instructional design process and outcomes related to the learning event.
3. Recognize and reflectively evaluate moral and ethical implications of instructional stances and choices in the design and development of teaching and learning in adult and higher education.

**Reading Material****Required Texts:**

- Brown, A. H., & Green, T. D. (2016). *The Essentials of Instructional Design: Connecting Fundamental Principles with Process and Practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Reiser, R.A. & Dempsey, J.V. (2012). *Trends and Issues in Instructional Design and Technology* (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

**Required Articles:**

- Andrews, D. H., & Goodson, L. A. (1980). A comparative analysis of models of instructional design. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 3(4), 2-16.
- Botturi, L., Contoni, L., Lepori, B. & Tardini, S. (2009). Fast prototyping as a communication catalyst for e-learning design. In J. Willis (Ed.), *Constructivist instructional design (C-ID): Foundations, models, and examples* (pp. 189-206). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Branch, R. M., & Kopcha, T. J. (2014). Instructional design models. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Elen, & M. J. Bishop (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 77-87). New York, NY: Springer.
- Campbell, K., Schwier, R., & Kenny, R. (2009). Agency of the instructional designer: Moral coherence and transformative social practice. In J. Willis (Ed.), *Constructivist instructional design (C-ID): Foundations, models, and examples* (pp. 243-264). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Christensen, R., & Knezek, G. A. (2014). Measuring technology teadiness and skills. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Elen, & M. J. Bishop (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 829-840). New York, NY: Springer.
- Kennedy, D., Hyland, A., & Ryan, N. (2006). *Writing and Using Learning Outcomes: A Practical Guide*. Handbook C 3.4-1. Retrieved from: <http://www.tcd.ie/teaching->

- [learning/academic-development/assets/pdf/Kennedy\\_Writing\\_and\\_Using\\_Learning\\_Outcomes.pdf](#)
- Luschei, T. F. (2014). Assessing the costs and benefits of educational technology. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Elen, & M. J. Bishop (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 239-248). New York, NY: Springer.
- Norum, Karen E. (2009). Appreciative instructional design (AID): A new model. In J. Willis (Ed.), *Constructivist instructional design (C-ID): Foundations, models, and examples* (pp. 423-436). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Paquette, G. (2014). Technology-based instructional design: Evolution and major trends. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Elen, & M. J. Bishop (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 661-671). New York, NY: Springer. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5\_53
- Smith, E. (2012). The digital native debate in higher education: A comparative analysis of recent literature. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology*, 38(3), 1-18.  
Retrieved from [http://www.uh.cu/sites/default/files/The Digital Native Debate Higher Education.pdf](http://www.uh.cu/sites/default/files/The_Digital_Native_Debate_Higher_Education.pdf)
- Wibur, K. (2009). Instructional design: Is it time to exchange Skinner's teaching machine for Dewey's toolbox? In J. Willis (Ed.), *Constructivist instructional design (C-ID): Foundations, models, and examples* (pp. 47-59). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Wiley, D., Bliss, T. J., & McEwen, M. (2014). Open Educational Resources: A Review of the Literature. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. Elen, & M. J. Bishop (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (pp. 781-789). New York, NY: Springer.
- Willis, J. (2009). Basic Principles of a Recursive, Reflective Instructional Design Model: R2D2. In J. Willis (Ed.), *Constructivist instructional design (C-ID): Foundations, models, and examples* (pp. 283-312). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Willis, J. (2009a). Foundations of instructional design: What's worth talking about and what's not. In J. Willis (Ed.), *Constructivist instructional design (C-ID): Foundations, models, and examples* (pp. 81-108). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Willis, J. (2009). A general set of procedures for C-ID: R2D2. In J. Willis (Ed.), *Constructivist instructional design (C-ID): Foundations, models, and examples* (pp. 313-355). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Willis, J. (2009b). Three trends in instructional design. In J. Willis (Ed.), *Constructivist instructional design (C-ID): Foundations, models, and examples* (pp. 11-45). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

**Online resources:**

[http://www.instructionaldesigncentral.com/html/IDC\\_instructionaldesignmodels.htm](http://www.instructionaldesigncentral.com/html/IDC_instructionaldesignmodels.htm)

**Evaluation**

Assignments are designed to invite students to integrate theories and models of instructional design (ID) with application in an authentic ID setting. Reflection and class discussion are built into the assessment in order to support learning.

**Grading in General:**

Grades will reflect the degree to which written and in-class activities exemplify work at a graduate level: your work should be organized, rigorous, and critically analytical. Written

assignments must be grammatically clean and use APA (American Psychological Association) style. Use of an appropriate academic style helps structure and present academic work in a clear and accurate manner. Moreover, it respectfully acknowledges the contributions of author-researchers whom you have used to strengthen your presentation and arguments. You can access information about the APA Style Manual and associated guides by using this WEB site:

<http://www.apastyle.org/>. Students are expected to write within set word limits in order to develop a writing and editing style that is concise. Assignments submitted that are in excess of the maximum word limit will not be accepted.

### **Evaluation Criteria:**

1. **Instructional Design Model Analysis.** In 1000-1500 words, students will contrast and critically appraise two instructional design models. One of these models will be a traditional model and the other an alternative model. Included in this assignment will be criticisms and controversies related to the use of established instructional design models. Be advised, if you select models not covered in class or in the selected readings, you will need to explain the model in greater detail (25%).

**Due Jan 28**

2. **Reflective Assignments and Class Discussions.**
  - a. Every second week from Feb 4-March 24, students will submit a 400-600 word reflection on the instructional design process (total of four reflections). Topics are open to **any issue pertinent to the design of your learning event** (assignment 3, below). Reflections should be used to explore practical issues and their philosophical/theoretical implications. Examples include:
    - i. Ethical issues
    - ii. Partnership concerns/conflicts
    - iii. Issues working with design models

**Due Feb 4, Feb 25, March 10, March 24**

- b. Each student will lead one 30-45 min discussion on a theoretical, ethical, or practical issue discussed in one of their reflective assignments. Discussions will take place each week, and can be based on any relevant reflective assignment submitted. Students should make an effort to ensure that any redundancy is productive. You will be assessed both on the topics that you bring forth, and on your ability to effectively moderate a discussion. Allowances will be made for students leading discussions in an online environment.

Assignments and discussions must be thoughtful and organized. Discussions should focus on a topic of relevance to the whole class (15% - each written assignment is worth 3%, discussion is also worth 3%). Each will be marked on a scale of 1-3; 1 (submitted but insufficient), 2 (sufficient), 3 (excellent).

**Due dates between Feb 4 and March 24. A sign-up sheet will be distributed.**

3. **Instructional Design Project.** In groups of 2-3 (depending on enrollment), students will work with an external partner to develop a learning event. The event may be a course, module, or workshop series (for example). You will negotiate project outcomes with your partner group, including subject matter experts (SMEs), completing an instructional design (ID) contract by Feb 4 (unless extenuating circumstances are identified). Partners will be

assigned the week of Jan 18. The general scope of the project will be provided – specific outcomes are up to you and your partner group. The ID contract will be approved by me in order to ensure a reasonable scope.

Your job is to complete the terms of the contract, using one or more of the ID models presented in the course to guide your process. You are required to submit project documents such as needs analyses, lesson plans, and evaluation plans, in accordance with the terms of your ID contract. You should also **submit 1-2 cover page(s) explaining which model you used, how you used it. The cover page(s) should also introduce the other documents submitted.** Except in extreme cases, discussed with me in advance, the project mark will be shared. I will contact your project partner to discuss whether the terms of the ID contract were fulfilled, and will take their feedback into consideration in determining the final grade for this project (35%).

**ID Contract Due Feb 4** (unless extenuating circumstances are identified)

**Final Products Due April 7**

4. In 1000-1500 words, students will evaluate their instructional design process. evaluation should consider (25%):
  - a. Strengths and limitations of the design model in achieving outcomes
  - b. An evaluation of/reflection on the final product/event
  - c. Reflections on the process of working with your project partner

**Due April 14**

### Grading Policy

The four point letter grading system will be used (GFC 61.1) for graduate student courses.

The course assignment points will be applied to the 4-point letter grading system, mindful of the University's guiding distribution policy, with approximately 40% of grades falling in the A (Excellent) range, about 33% of grades fall in the B+/B (Good) range, and about 20% falling in the B-/C (Satisfactory) range. B+ is the expected class median grade. Grades will be set based on a combination of absolute and distribution.

N.B. Students are reminded that they are required to follow the University of Alberta Guidelines concerning:

**Plagiarism and Cheating** ([www.ualberta.ca/~unisecr/appeals.htm](http://www.ualberta.ca/~unisecr/appeals.htm))

**Copyright** ([www.library.ualberta.ca/copyright/index.cfm](http://www.library.ualberta.ca/copyright/index.cfm))

**Inclusive Language** ([www.education.ualberta.ca/ed/L35?EQRSimto](http://www.education.ualberta.ca/ed/L35?EQRSimto))

### Grading Scale

Letter	%		Descriptors
A+	97-100	4.0	Excellent. Superior work in all respects including technical quality; meets all criteria consistently.
A	92-96	4.0	
A-	87-91	3.7	
B+	83-86	3.3	Good. Some above-average work; meets most criteria consistently; minimal technical problems.
B	78-82	3.0	
B-	73-77	2.7	Satisfactory. Competent but inconsistent work; meets some criteria; some technical errors or problems.
C+	69-72	2.3	

C	64-68	2.0	Failure. Inadequate work; does not meet criteria; many technical errors or problems.
C-	60-63	1.7	
D+	55-59	1.3	
D	50-54	1	
F	<50	0	

**Attendance, Absences, and Missed Grade Components:** According to the University of Alberta Calendar, excused absences are not automatic, and are at the discretion of the instructor. Consistent attendance and participation is expected throughout the course. This means arriving to class on time, turning off the distraction of a cell phone, and preparing by having read the materials and completing assigned work. Unanticipated events may be considered an excusable absence, and it is appreciated if notification is provided. Please note the following examples from the University Calendar of UNACCEPTABLE reasons for absence from class:

- Vacations
- Weddings
- Travel arrangements

#### **Faculty of Education Equity Statement**

The Faculty of Education is committed to providing an environment of equality and respect for all people within the University community, and to educating faculty, staff, and students in developing teaching and learning contexts that are welcoming to all.

**Policy about course outlines can be found in Section 23.4(2) of the University Calendar.**

**The University of Alberta is committed to the highest standards of academic integrity and honesty. Students are expected to be familiar with these standards regarding academic honesty and to uphold the policies of the University in this respect. Students are particularly urged to familiarize themselves with the provisions of the Code of Student Behaviour (on line at [www.ualberta.ca/secretariate/appeals.htm](http://www.ualberta.ca/secretariate/appeals.htm)) and avoid any behaviour which could potentially result in suspicions of cheating, plagiarism, misrepresentation of facts and/or participation in an offence. Academic dishonest is a serious offence and can result in suspension or expulsion from the University. (GFC 29 SEP 2003)**