

Developing ID Expertise – Reflection Paper

L. Kevin Newsome

Purdue University

## I. Case 1 – Beth Owens

### *Problem Finding*

- *Summarize vs. Synthesize:* For this being my first case analysis I feel like I did an alright job of synthesizing the case instead of just summarizing the main points. The areas where I could have done better at this though was when I listed the stakeholders concerns, and when I identified the ID challenges and constraints. I did as the Ertmer and Stepich (2005) article said “novices simply recount the given information, with little apparent synthesis, using words from the initial description of the situation.” (p. 39). A good example of simply recounting information was in my constraints section where I stated “Right off the bat she was convinced that Chef Reiner was too strict of an instructor, and that in order to increase student retention he would need to shift his focus towards a student-centered teaching approach.” In this I did not go into any sort of detail about why this constraint might cause problems for Beth and Chef Reiner, I simply recounted the fact that this was something Beth was concerned about.
- *Principles vs. Features:* Throughout I really didn’t do that great of a job at this, I mostly just listed what the problems were with little reflection as to the underlying principles that guide why they might be problems or how to solve the problems. I did do some of this in my final recommendations section though, where I actually expanded upon the importance of staying neutral and being solutions focused instead of cause conscious.
- *Relationship among issues:* I remember specifically keeping this in mind as I went through my paper and I think I did a pretty good job of this as I was writing my case analysis. I continually tried to keep in mind how the issues were related, and how my solutions would need to work together to solve the overall problem - “Though the third constraint is probably the most important to fix, it wasn’t placed as number 1 or 2 because those have to be addressed before Beth could truly conduct an effective initial analysis.”

- *Reflective vs. Reflexive*: I was definitely looking at this from the perspective of what was missing, instead of what information did I already have. In my analysis I only suggested completing some sort of an initial analysis, “Without conducting any analysis there is no way for her to know what the real issues are, what the students think about the program and Chef Reiner, or what potential solutions there may be to fix the problem.”, when I should have suggested a more focused analysis that would have determined specifically if any sort of intervention should be put into place and what it should be. I think the solutions I had of conducting an initial analysis was a good idea, but I should have made it more specific around trying to figure out what the problem was.

#### *Problem Solving*

- *Relationships among solutions*: In this case I definitely had two distinct solutions that did not necessarily go together or work together to solve the problem. Both solutions would have been necessary to solve the issue, but they did not necessarily work in conjunction to help solve the problem. It was much more of the “laundry-list” of possible solutions idea that Ertmer and Stepich (2005) identify as being a characteristic of novices.
- *Considerations of Implications*: I think completing the pros and cons section of the analysis really helped with this, but I can tell from re-reading my analysis that I did not fully consider how the solutions would be implemented or their impact. It was obvious that I had a grand idea of how these solutions would help, but did not thoroughly think through how to implement them, what it would take to implement them, and how these solutions might impact other portions of the project.
- *Rigid vs. Flexible*: I know I was not the most flexible when it came to the solutions I had suggested. This was really apparent when we began discussing the analysis with the class because others would give a possible solutions and I would always make sure that my solution

somehow fit in with theirs. After coming this far through the class though, I know that it would be important for me to be flexible, and to work with others to come to a final solution.

However, in my final recommendations I did kind of leave it open to interpretation on how to implement the solutions suggested, so I would say I was flexible there.

*Overall Rating – **Medium*** – The reason I gave myself a medium was because I think that I did identify the correct ID challenge and the constraints that Beth would face, but I think my solutions could have been a lot more focused to ensure that they were addressing the constraints identified.

## II. Case 2 – Jack Waterkamp

### *Problem Finding*

- *Summarize vs. Synthesize:* After reading through my case analysis I realize that I did a really bad job of summarizing instead of synthesizing the information. Throughout I simply recounted what was stated in the case instead of taking the time to make sense out of what was said, and try to put it into my own words. This was really apparent as I was going through listing my constraints and what I thought were the ID challenges.
- *Principles vs. Features:* As I was trying to identify the constraints and problems within the case I only somewhat took into account principles of instructional design and project management. For the most part I did as the novice does and listed what the problems were and why they might possibly be problems without really explaining in my own words why they are problems, or how to fix them. Take this quote from my constraints section “First, Jack needs to prioritize his job responsibilities and everything else he is working on. If he can avoid working on multiple large projects at once, and can get away with only working on this project until it is complete, he should.” I stated what he should do, but never really explain why it is important for him to do this or why it might help.

- *Relationship among issues:* Unlike in my first analysis I really did not tie the various constraints in this analysis together. I saw each constraint as an individual issue that had to be overcome instead of looking at how one causes the other, and how solving one would help to solve the next. The only place I somewhat related how the constraints fit together was when I went through and explained how I prioritized the constraints I identified stating that, “The constraints are prioritized according to how they fit into the overall project timeline and plan.” However, even in this portion of my analysis I didn’t do a very good job of relating all of the constraints together.
- *Reflective vs. Reflexive:* Going through trying to figure out what the real problem was in this case, and how to solve the problem I remember I had a hard time coming up with solutions because I felt like I didn’t have a full view of what was going on. Only after discussing the case with the class did I begin to see the bigger picture and begin to understand the full case. I think this made it really hard for me to be reflective instead of reflexive to the information in the case. I didn’t look at what information was already presented before I jumped to conclusions on how to solve the case.

### *Problem Solving*

- *Relationships among solutions:* I can tell from reading through my two solutions that I definitely did not think of how they would work together to solve the constraints I had listed. They both work to solve the constraints, but the solutions are very independent of one another – 1) Create a project timeline that allowed for multiple parts to be worked on together, and 2) Have all the stakeholders involved in the instructional design plan from the get go. I definitely think that I should have taken more time figuring out how these two solutions might work together to solve the ID challenge, or developed better solutions that did work together to help solve the ID challenge. I did mention one time how the two solutions work together though, “These two

solutions would work together by having all the stakeholders involved throughout the process and by having them work together to decide what steps need to be completed, and which of those steps can be combined.”

- *Considerations of Implications:* Looking back I know that I didn’t really consider the implications of my solutions very well. Of course I completed the pros and cons section, but I didn’t consider things outside of that like how long the solutions might take, how to actually implement them, what would be needed to implement them. In fact, one of the implications I should have considered is how the project would have been different if all the stakeholders had been involved from the beginning. I definitely did the novice thing where I just stated my solutions, gave reasons for them, and gave no real thought into how they might actually be implemented.
- *Rigid vs. Flexible:* From re-reading my analysis it seems like I was pretty rigid in the way that I wrote up how to implement the solutions, but I remember I was pretty flexible when it came to arguing my solutions to the class in the discussion. In my final recommendation I have it laid out step-by-step what needs to be done and how one step should lead to the next. However, I remember in the discussion I was very much open to others suggestions on how to improve my solutions and was open to the solutions they had provided.

*Overall Rating – Low* – I gave myself an overall rating of low for this case because I feel like the solutions I selected were not the best. I think that if I had taken more time to really think about how to solve the ID challenges I could have come up with better solutions.

### III. Case 3 – Tina Sears

#### *Problem Finding*

- *Summarize vs. Synthesize:* In this case analysis I definitely did a lot of just summarizing information, but I did also do a lot of synthesizing of the information. This was especially present in the constraint sections where I would state specifically what was said in the case, and

then would go through and explain my reasoning for selecting that particular issue as a constraint. In my first constraint I listed – Stakeholder not involved in the evaluation process or design – I explained that this is a constraint and then explained in my own words why, “Had Tina gotten Mr. Cook involved in the development of a comprehensive evaluation plan she would have known what his primary concerns were, and more importantly what data he wanted to see to show that the program was effective.”

- *Principles vs. Features:* As I complete this reflection paper I am noticing that this is something I really need more work with. Again in this analysis I did a poor job of explaining how the possible problems relate to sound instructional design principles, and fell into the novice trap of just listing problems that were stated in the case. As I reflect back on completing my analysis papers I can remember considering what instructional design principles relate to the problems in the case, I just need to work on putting them into words as I am completing analysis papers like these.
- *Relationship among issues:* I would say that all of the issues I identified in this case are related – 1) Stakeholders not involved in evaluation process or design, 2) A thorough evaluation plan was never put into place, 3) Tina was not collecting the right type of data, 4) No evaluation was done for the ITBS scores. They all revolve around the fact that a better evaluation needed to be completed in order to get the results that Mr. Cook was looking for.
- *Reflective vs. Reflexive:* Even though I misinterpreted some of the information in this case, I did actually try to be more reflective instead of reflexive. I tried to make sure that I was staying within the case and looking at the information provided instead of jumping to solutions outside of the case. I do think I could have focused my analysis down a bit more though instead of being so vague in regards to the constraints and the solutions. I stated what the constraints were and

why they were constraints, but should have given better examples of why I thought they were issues.

### *Problem Solving*

- *Relationships among solutions:* The two solutions I provided directly relate to one another which I think was really good for this project. First they had to get the stakeholders involved in the evaluation, and create a better evaluation plan. For this case it was actually really easy to come up with solutions that made sense for the case and would work together to solve the overarching ID challenge. Once you get your stakeholders involved you will begin to create a more thorough evaluation plan that works for everyone, and will collect the data they all want. Remembering back to the discussion it seemed like everyone had very similar solutions in the case analysis papers.
- *Considerations of Implications:* As mentioned before completing the pros and cons section really made it easier to see how these solutions could impact the project. However, this is also something that I think I could use a lot more work on in regards to building my ID expertise. Both of the solutions I mentioned are things that should have been done before, had Mr. Cook not given Tina more time it would have been impossible to implement these solutions and so they would have just been wishful thinking.
- *Rigid vs. Flexible:* I would say I was pretty flexible in my solutions to fixing the ID problems I identified. I stated what needed to be done, but didn't give a strict guide as to how things had to be done. The way I set up my solutions was to have everyone involved work together to come up with how to solve the problem – "Tina should start by having a meeting with all the stakeholders where she can work with them to create evaluation objectives, determine what data needs to be collected, determine how that data will be collected, and then figure out how that data will be interpreted to determine if the evaluation was effective or not."



*Overall Rating – High* – I rated this case as high because it was pretty easy to identify that the core ID problem was a lack of a proper evaluation, and both of the solutions I provided directly worked to solve that problem. The only thing I think I would have done differently was connect the two solutions together more, and be more specific on how the two work together to solve the ID problem.

#### **IV. Case 4 – Iris Daniels**

##### *Problem Finding*

- *Summarize vs. Synthesize:* I think by the time I got to this case I really began to realize the difference between summarizing and synthesizing. Of course I did a lot of summarizing in this case, but I put it into my own words and explained what I was summarizing to put everything into context and to give it more meaning. Here is an example of what I mean as it relates to stakeholder concerns, “The employees of the various companies that use the Lapin software are the main audience. They are the ones that will be directly using the web-based training once it is launched and so it is important to take into consideration their thought, ideas, and concerns. Their major concerns would also fall in-line with those listed for the other stakeholders above, but their main concern would be with the overall effectiveness of the course.”
- *Principles vs. Features:* Again this is something I definitely need to work on to build up my ID expertise. Instead of explaining the issues in regards to the ID principles that make them issues, I do as the novice does and list the issues I see in the case without explaining why they are issues and what possible ID principles might apply to those issues.
- *Relationship among issues:* The thing that helped me the most in writing this case analysis was the fact that I was able to readily recognize the relationship between the various issues. I broke down the constraints into three groups - accounting for cultural differences, coming to an agreement, and accounting for technical constraints. All of these constraints work together to solve the overall problem, as you are able to address one issue the others will begin to become

resolved as well. Put it this way, if your able to account for cultural differences wouldn't it make it easier to come to an agreement?

- *Reflective vs. Reflexive:* I think I did a good job at this by remaining within the case, and using the information provided. Specifically, I tried to look at the information within the case before I began offering solutions to the problems. One of the biggest things I pushed for in this analysis was not making it solely about Iris, but about everyone in the consortium. I think often times we see the main character as the one who has to solve all of the problems, but I think leaving the others out of the problem solving equation is a bad idea.

#### *Problem Solving*

- *Relationships among solutions:* Though the two solutions I came up with – perform a thorough cultural and audience analysis, develop the prototype with help from the consortium - don't seem like they don't work in conjunction to one another I believe that they really do. My big push during the discussion was that if you develop the prototype with the members of the consortium you will begin to learn more about them and their culture, so basically this is a part of the analysis process. Plus, you have to have a full understanding of your audience and their culture before you can develop a proper prototype, and having people from those cultures there to help makes it that much easier.
- *Considerations of Implications:* In this case I did a better job of considering the implications than I did with any of the other cases. This was most apparent in the discussion with the class, where I continually argued for my solutions and discussed with the other members of the class how my solutions would impact each other for the benefit of the whole project. How conducting one of the solutions would assist with the other and vice versa. Then in my final recommendations I directly talk about how my solutions impact the constraints identified and help to resolve them.

- *Rigid vs. Flexible:* In regards to being rigid vs flexible in regards to the solutions I outlined here, I was kind of rigid in that I had a detailed plan laid out that wasn't very flexible. Even in the discussion I wasn't very flexible, and like I said before I kept arguing for why my solution was the best one. There were definitely some areas where I was more flexible though, like how the analysis should be completed and what information should have been included in the analysis. In fact, I probably should have been more specific about this information in my case analysis.

*Overall Rating – Medium* – I gave myself a score of medium because I think that I hit the nail on the head in regards to identifying the proper ID challenges and constraints, but I think I could have come up with better solutions to the problems. The two solutions I had were very good, but I think I could have come up with ones that would have worked together better and would have solved the problem better.

#### **V. Action Plan Moving Forward**

After completing this course I definitely feel like I have a better understanding of the ID process and what it means to be an ID expert, but it is up to me to continue growing my skills and to move forwards towards becoming an ID expert. I guess my plan of action moving forward would be to now take and analyze every one of my own projects that I have worked on, and that I work on in the future. It is important to be able to analyze your own work and to be able to find the mistakes you make, because I believe you learn more from your own mistakes than from anything else. Specifically, in this process it would be important for me to focus on those things that I struggled with during these case analyses – Being flexible, not being reflexive, and identifying ID principles to work off of.

I know that I still have a long way to go before I become an ID expert, and that the only way to become an ID expert is through experience and practice, but I look forward to the journey ahead. I just have to keep looking back at what I have learned in this class and use this knowledge to help guide me. I have already seen my own skills grow since starting this class. I have become more critical in every

aspect of my own work, making sure that I truly analyze my projects, as well as myself, to see them in their true light. By doing this, I believe it will help me to move up the continuum from novice to expert.

### References

Ertmer, P. A. & Stepich, D. A. (2005). Instructional Design Expertise: How Will We Know It When We See It? *Educational Technology, Nov-Dec*, pp. 38-43