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CASE 1: BETH OWENS

Problem Finding

Summarize vs. Synthesize

In my analysis of the case study for Beth Owens, I did a lot of summarizing of the information, with little to no synthesis of the case study. While I was able to correctly identify the overall instructional design problem, it was only after reading and re-reading the case study multiple times that I was able to achieve this. Looking back through my analysis of the case challenges, constraints, and rationale, I only generally identified each and often restated these instead of offering any synthesis. For example, I identified an instructional design challenge as “conflicting theories on how to design instruction based on the ADDIE model.” However, I didn’t identify any specific stages of the model in relation to the case problem; but instead only focused on the learning theory approaches as discussed in the case study.

Principles vs. Features

While I was able to correctly identify all the stakeholders, their roles, and primary concerns; I only stated the issues rather than articulate any principles. For example, I listed some challenges to the instructional design problem such as: “Beth faces an ethical dilemma, whether to inform Chef Reiner that his teaching method is not ideal, and force him to use the constructivist approach instead,” as well as “Chief Reiner may be resistant to change.” Still very much a novice, I only listed these issues, instead of organizing these issues to better understand the situation and how these issues impact the instructional design problem.

Relationships among Issues

Looking back to my first analysis of Beth Owens, I had identified a list of issues with the case such as conflicting design theories, ethical dilemma, resistant to change, and result delivery. Additionally, when I provided the rationale for how to prioritize the ID challenges and constraints, I first wrote “delivering results to Dean Jacobs by evaluating and analyzing data about the program…, resistant to changing, ethical dilemma, then resolving the conflicting theories.” Thinking back on these statements, I can see how I am still a novice, as I failed to demonstrate how each of these issues impact the other.

Reflective vs. Reflexive

In my approach to the Beth Owens case, I could have been more reflective. While I was able to utilize my previously acquired knowledge from other LDT courses to better understand the issues presented in the case, such as the use of learning theories
and instructional design approaches. However, for this case, I mistakenly used and cited the previous week’s readings instead of the ones specifically related to the Beth Owens case; which would have made it less challenging to determine the issues and solutions for this case study.

**Problem Solving**

**Relationships among Solutions**

For the Beth Owens case, I discussed the following solutions: “offer a combined teaching approach incorporating both behaviorism and constructivism practices and techniques” and “conduct an evaluation and assessment of current programs through analysis of instructional goals, needs analysis, and learner analysis.” Like a novice, I only list the potential solutions, however neither solution connects them to each other, but rather only to the central issue of the case study. In order to move towards an expert level instructional designer, I need to seek out connections between solutions, rather than just listing the possible solutions for any issue or case problem.

**Consideration of Implications**

In the Beth Owens case, I was able to demonstrate the implications for each solution offered. It was difficult for me to find an ideal solution to these issues, however I did consider the implications of each. From the case study analysis, I listed the pros/cons of each implication, accordingly:

**Pros:** “allows both Beth and Chef Reiner to be able to use their preferred teaching approaches”, “constructivist methods allow students to construct their own knowledge and apply these skills to similar situation in the future”, and “needs analysis will help to objectively determine the best teaching approach to use for the program.”

**Cons:** “students are already familiar with the current teaching style and may not want a new instructional approach”, “change management is not immediate – it takes time to perform”, “program evaluation and needs/learner analysis is time consuming and requires a lot of resources/expenses to acquire results.”

By reviewing these implications, I can begin to consider the impact of these solutions; in order to move more towards expert thinking on the novice-expert continuum.

**Rigid vs. Flexible**

I am a bit rigid in the solutions that I offer for the Beth Owens case. While I have provided two possible solutions, I need to do a better job of examining each solution to determine the impact of each on solving the problem. From the possible solutions offered, I chose the solution that is most similar to the one discussed in the case study. The final recommendation ‘is for the Beth Owens case is for her to build a professional rapport with Chef Reiner, in order to present him with the benefits of using a constructivist teaching method for the culinary arts program.” For this case study, I am
definitely a novice, as the solutions offered are very rigid and do not offer much flexibility other than to recommend a combination of both solutions to solve the issue or problem.

**Overall Rating:** High

**CASE 2: JACK WATERKAMP**

**Problem Finding**

*Summarize vs. Synthesize*

Looking back at my review of the Jack Waterkamp case study, I realize that I spent more time summarizing than synthesizing information about the case. I had a difficult time identifying the challenges and case specific constraints of the case. After reading the case study several times, I was not very confident on the challenges and case-specific constraint; which is what lead me to list too many challenges and constraints for this case study. For example, I listed the case challenges as "implementation, development, design, and analysis"; with the following case constraints: "status of product, new technology, communication, and project management."

*Principles vs. Features*

Even though I was able to identify the stakeholders, roles, and their primary concerns; I still found it difficult to determine the ID challenges and case-specific constraints in the Jack Waterkamp case study. Without being clear as to the specific challenges for this case study, I decided to include all the possible challenges (implementation, development, design, and analysis) and constraints (product status, new technology, communication, and project management). In hindsight, I now realize that without selecting one or two challenges and constraints made it more difficult to analyze the impact these principles and features on the overall instructional design problem.

*Relationships among Issues*

For the Jack Watercamp case, I did not demonstrate a link or relationship between the identified issues. As a result, I would be considered a novice based on the analysis of this case, since an expert would be able to provide connections on how the issues are related to one another. For example, I identified Jack’s priority as follows: development – scope management, status of product completion, design – revisiting this phase due to a change in scope, implementation – facilitator training, new technology, project management/communication, and analysis. However, I did not offer any details on how each of these challenges and constraints are interconnected with one another, but instead only listed the challenges and constraints of the problem.
Reflective vs. Reflexive

The combination of my knowledge about the ADDIE model, experience in managing products, and the weekly case readings, helped me to be more reflective about the Jack Waterkamp case study. For example, I reflected in the case study analysis: “In a prior course, I learned about instructional design models, such as ADDIE, and how it can be used in building successful training plans. The ADDIE model consists of the following phases: analyze, design, development, implementation, and evaluation; many of which are used in addressing the challenges of this case study (McGriff, 2000). Additionally, the cyclic nature of the ADDIE model is advantageous in this case study, as Jack Waterkamp had to revisit multiple phases in the ADDIE model due to changes in the training curriculum as determined by the executive team. Having experience managing projects, I understand Jack’s frustration, as it can be difficult to change your training plan midway through the design process, especially if the plan has already been approved by administrators. Additionally, it can be confusing when you have multiple stakeholders with varying requests, as you want to address everyone’s concerns but realize that it may not be possible due to time and budget constraints; however, you still need to be able to produce the training program requested by the client, despite these barriers. Similarly, I can recall a time when I was working on developing training materials for a face-to-face workshop, only to have to change the design to a web-based delivery instead at the request of the client. While at the time, it was challenging to modify the training content to fit the new delivery method; in hindsight this change was relatively minor as it only impacted the training platform.” In this dimension, I think that I am moving towards expert in seeking additional information to support the issues rather than guided by the need to just search for information much like a novice would.

Problem Solving

Relationships among Solutions

I offered the following solutions to address Jack Waterkamp’s problem, where each solution is connected to the central issue of the case study. Additionally, both solutions are related to one another depending on how/when the product is completed. The two solutions for this case included: “multi-faceted approach consisting of a communication plan, developing web-based training modules, and creating train the trainer programs to ensure facilitators are qualified to deliver training programs to clients” and the other solution being to “develop a training framework, but only adding data and making final changes once the software product has been finalized.” With this case, I can see myself moving towards expert level thinking, as I am able to build more connections between the proposed solutions. However, I can admit that I’m still having some difficulty in utilizing the proposed solutions to address each ID challenge and/or constraint in the case study.
Consideration of Implications

Examining the Jack Waterkamp case study, provides an opportunity to consider the implications of the solutions presented. Such implications include:

Pros: “In this multi-faceted approach, each component is managed separately, but also together as a whole plan”, “communication plan will help to strengthen the support for change”, “Well trained facilitators will increase success and decrease delays in delivery”, “Positive impact on budget, as resources are not utilized until product testing has been completed”, and “Reduce reduplication of training materials, as content is only designed one time”.

Cons: “Too many different timelines and processes, may lead to missed Deadlines”, “no additional support budget available from project management”, “product changes continue through the implementation process, may have an impact on final product timeline and whether they meet the deadline”.

Unlike the previous case study, I think I did a better job of identifying how the solution will impact the case problem by specifically outlining the pros and cons of each approach.

Rigid vs. Flexible

While I am less rigid in presenting the solutions of the Jack Waterkamp case, than in the previous case; I still don’t consider myself an expert in knowing the effects of the solution on the problem. The final recommendation for Jack Waterkamp demonstrates my “novice" rigidity: “to take a multi-faceted approach to address the challenges and constraints associated with this training. He should first create a clear and detailed communication plan to ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the training status and how their primary concern project may impact the training design. Secondly, Jack needs to develop training modules that fits with the executive team’s mandate, where training is offered in both a classroom and online (web-based) environments. However, with the software product still in the development stages, Jack needs to be prepared to make multiple changes to the training module, so it most accurately represents the final software product. Finally, Jack needs to create a trainer-to-trainer program to provide an opportunity for facilitators to increase their comfort level in using online technologies to deliver client training, as well as teaching clients how to effectively use the software product”. Based on the final recommendation, I think that I am still on the novice side of the continuum, since I don't offer much flexibility in providing solutions to the problem, but rather only offer one choice that makes the most sense, while the other solution is less than ideal and only makes sense for specific conditions.

Overall Rating: Low
CASE 3: TINA SEARS

Problem Finding

Summarize vs. Synthesize

For the Tina Sears case study, I did some summarizing of the information; and attempted to provide some synthesis of the case (although lacking in detail and sometimes misleading). For example, I stated that the challenges and constraints of the case were instructional design, evaluation, lack of learning objectives, and lack of quantitative measures. Even though I had written that instructional design was a challenge, I did not elaborate correctly on this – leading to some incorrect assumptions, such as the entire instructional model being the challenge, but rather the challenge is only the design phase of the ADDIE model. With the project having already been implemented, Tina’s challenge is the design of the project evaluation.

Principles vs. Features

In reviewing the Tina Sears case study, I was able to successfully identify all the stakeholders, their roles and primary concerns. Unlike in other case analysis, I can see a move towards describing issues in abstract conceptual principles rather than just listing the issues as concrete features. For example, I stated that the key challenge: “Tina realizes the importance of documenting progress, but is unsure how best to conduct the evaluation. She consults a colleague from a neighboring district and decides to collect survey data from students, teachers, and parents; as well as video recordings of students accomplishing different activities (Grant & Ross, 2014). However, the results from this type of evaluation only yields qualitative data and does not provide a comprehensive picture of the effectiveness of the pilot program on student learning.”

Where the key constraint to the case is the lack of quantitative measures, as stated in the case study analysis: “Tina needs to design a more effective survey, as the two questions she asked on the single survey: (1) Do you think students are learning more? (2) Have laptops made students more interested in learning? - did not yield any quantitative results that can be used to demonstrate the impact of laptop computers on student learning; which Mr. Cooke is seeking, in order to continue funding the laptop program (Grant & Ross, 2014)”.

In moving towards expert on the instructional design continuum, I attempted to provide some interpretation of the situational information and highlight the impact of the challenges and constraints to the overall problem, rather than only listing the issues like a novice would.

Relationships among Issues

Looking back on the issues that I had identified in the Tina Sears case, I attempted to link the key issues together; in order to provide a “big picture” situation of
how challenges and constraint relates to the case problem. For example, I prioritized the key issues with the primary challenge identified as: evaluation, where the “the process of determining the effectiveness and efficiency of instruction cannot be demonstrated due to the lack of measurable data within phases, between phases, and after implementation,” and the key constraint being that the “evaluation conducted by Tina only resulted in qualitative data from parent, teacher, student surveys and video observations.”

Additionally, while I understood some of the other key issues were in the design of the project; however, I didn’t convey this very well in writing the case analysis. I had incorrectly identified one of the issues as the instructional design model, rather than only the design phase of the ADDIE model. For example, I stated: “Little time is spent on the process of instructional design. An instructional design plan was never fully developed with student learning objectives defined. Only details of the professional development plan for teachers is specified (Grant & Ross, 2014). Without a solid instructional design model, the process of specifying how students learn is more difficult to determine and measure (McGriff, 2000).” I also stated that there was a lack of project objectives: “Prior to signing the contract with Toh, Inc., Mr. Cook should have consulted the district (Grant & Ross, 2014). This would have provided time for stakeholders to discuss rules and regulations for allowing students to use the laptops. The pilot program was not designed to allow other grades to participate and results measured cannot fully demonstrate the impact of acquisition and application on computer”.

While I can see some progress towards expertise level on the continuum, there are still some novice tendencies to identifying the relationships between issues as evidenced by this case study example.

Reflective vs. Reflexive

In the Tina Sears case study, rather than seeking resources to provide information about issues and solutions, I tried instead to locate resources to help support specific information that I had previously mentioned in the case study. Having already learned about the ADDIE and Kirkpatrick models, I tried to utilize both of these models and information in the case study analysis.

For example, I stated: “In a prior course, I learned about instructional design models, such as ADDIE, and how it can be used in building successful training plans. The ADDIE model consists of the following phases: analyze, design, development, implementation, and evaluation; some of which are used in addressing the challenges of this case study (McGriff, 2000). Additionally, I have some familiarity with using the Kirkpatrick model, which consists of four levels: reaction, learning, behavior, and result to evaluate the effectiveness of training. With Tina only completing the first level of the evaluation model, collecting reaction survey data, she was not able to confidently demonstrate the effectiveness that the laptop program had on student learning. In order to make this determination, she would need to create more data measures to collect the following data: student learning as a result of laptop use, transfer of knowledge on laptop use from the 5th grade to the 6th grade, and whether changes in teachers’ attitudes, methods, and strategies have improved student learning”. In addition, I scanned through the related readings to look for information to support
specific points that I wanted to make in the case study analysis. Some examples include: “...I learned about the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) standards that provides a model for teachers to create effective learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; while also enriching the professional practice (International Society for Technology in Education, 2008). Teachers utilize the laptops to provide students with a more constructivist teaching model rather than only a direct approach to instruction, where both students and teachers interact with technology to complete assignments and activities”. With other examples such as “a study on the federal e-rate program indicated that the availability of technology does not necessarily result in student achievement with no direct correlation between the use of e-rate subsidies and SAT scores in North Carolina public schools (Kazi, 2016). Despite, Mr. Cook’s insistence on conducting a full evaluation in the second year to demonstrate a positive improvement in student scores on the ITBS; he still may not be able to determine if student learning is directly impacted by his provision of laptop computers to Andersen County school district students (Grant & Ross, 2014). Additionally, “I also learned about the 5J Approach: job related, just enough, just in time, just in case, and just try it; which can be used by teachers to successfully integrate technology into the classroom (Burns, 2010). The teacher professional development program incorporates strategies from the framework through simulated activities rather than just learning about the technology. By incorporating 5J strategies, teachers can provide better instruction, greater student collaboration, and enhance student learning.

Unlike with other case study analyses, I tried to locate information to support specific points that I wanted to make rather using information as a guide like how a novice would seek information.

**Problem Solving**

**Relationships among Solutions**

For the Tina Sears case, the proposed solutions were taken into consideration to address the impact that each have on solving the problem. Instead of just listing the solutions like a novice, I tried to provide an explanation of how each of the solutions might address the problem. For example, I provided the following as possible solutions to address Tina’s problem:

Solution 1: “Work with Mark Waters to re-design workshops and training to define learning objectives for teachers and students in the Andersen County school district. Tina should collaborate with Mark to develop a new evaluation plan, which includes a pre-assessment measure. Then, she can compare pre/post evaluation results to better demonstrate the impact of laptop computers on student learning. Initial assessment results can also be used by teachers to analyze student learning needs”.

Solution 2: “Tina should offer to serve as liaison between students, teachers, and the evaluation team. She can facilitate communication with teachers and students; while ensuring the acceptance of an external evaluator, Dr. Colm, to the program. Having
some familiarity with the laptop program, Tina can advocate for the need to conduct both summative and formative evaluation, as both will measure program design objectives and effectiveness to gain future funding for the project”.

To address the problem, Tina can implement either solution or both depending on the time constraints of the project. The solutions are related in that they both address the problem to varying degrees.

**Consideration of Implications**

Taking into consideration the implications, let’s look at the pros and cons of each proposed solution:

Pros: “Define learning objectives to conduct pre/post assessment measures”, “Teachers can use pre-assessment results to determine lesson content based on student needs”, “Laptop pilot program evaluated by a leading professional in the field of school evaluation”, “Increase communication between all stakeholders”, and “Able to collect both qualitative and quantitative data from evaluation measures that are summative and formative in nature.”

Cons: “Neither are evaluation experts, may miss some key measures or data collection opportunity”, “Re-design process takes time”, “Results are not immediate”, “May not have comparative annual data to analyze from pre/post tests depending on when evaluation is delivered”, and “Cost of hiring an external evaluator may not be in the district budget beyond the 2nd year of the program, when it is no longer funded by Mr. Cook.”

Moving towards expert level thinking, I have taken into consideration both the immediate and future implications of the solutions; in addition to how each solution may impact the implementation process.

**Rigid vs. Flexible**

Compared to previous case study analysis, the solutions that I have presented for Tina Sears are much more flexible. While each of the solutions can solve Tina’s evaluation problem, she should select the solution that best fits the project time frame and needs as determined by the stakeholders. The final recommendation “is for Tina to serve as the liaison to the evaluation team. She can facilitate communication between teachers and students and the evaluation team to ensure all stakeholders are heard. As liaison, Tina can talk to stakeholders to determine training needs, and then communicate these data findings directly to the evaluation team. Often when a program brings in external personnel, there may be an acceptance period, however as a liaison Tina can ease the transition period and provide cohesion between Dr. Colm, the evaluation team, and the stakeholders to ensure that everyone is working together towards the common goal to provide measurable data on the effectiveness of the laptop program on student learning. Based on results from the initial evaluation conducted by Tina, an external evaluator is needed to provide Mr. Cook with the quantitative data that he is seeking. Dr. Colm is hired as the external evaluation, since she is a leading expert in school evaluation programs. She determines that it would be best to conduct both
summative and formative evaluation to measure the effectiveness of the laptop program. As justification of this recommendation, I stated: “In order for Mr. Cook to continue funding the laptop program, he needs to see a positive impact that laptop computers have on student learning. Since Tina lacks the experience to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the laptop program, she needs to hire a subject matter expert to conduct the program evaluation. She hires Dr. Colm, who is a leading expert in school evaluation programs. The expenses of hiring an external expert will be covered by Mr. Cook, so the school district does not have to worry about this cost impacting the budget this year. By serving as the evaluation team liaison, Tina will have an opportunity to learn from an expert. When the cost of an evaluator is no longer covered by Mr. Cook, hopefully Tina will be able to conduct a full evaluation plan should the district need one in the future. Dr. Colm has already assembled an evaluation team, and they have already met with all the stakeholders and outlined learning objectives. The evaluation team is already working on a proposal to gather data on the purpose of the project, how teachers and students use laptops, feedback from teachers and parents, and student test scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), and will use these measures to determine the impact that laptop computers have on student learning”.

After analyzing the Tina Sears case study, I think that I have made a move towards expert on the novice-expert continuum by presenting multiple solutions to address the issues, rather than just one solution to the problem.

**Overall Rating:** Medium

**CASE 4: IRIS DANIELS**

**Problem Finding**

**Summarize vs. Synthesize**

With the case study for Iris Daniels, I noticed a shift towards more synthesis rather than just summarizing the information from the reading. After reviewing the case study, I was able to discern the majority of the problems centered around communication. In the analysis, I stated that: “Cross-cultural groups need to better communicate with each other to ensure that the training incorporates an approach, which will benefit their learners”. Being able to determine the problem from the beginning allowed me to identify challenges, constraints, and eventually solutions that best fit the problem, rather than having to rely on being able to locate and recount the information given in the case study. For example, I previously wrote that: “Prior to beginning the design process, Iris needs to be able to understand the learning needs of each organization to ensure that the training project will address the needs of all consortium members. Improved communication between other cultures will also increase the productivity of consortium meetings to be able to gain consensus on the proposed prototype, in order to move forward in the design process”.
Principles vs. Features

In reviewing the case analysis for Iris Daniels, I was able to easily identify the key challenge (as design) and constraints (intercultural communication and multiple perspectives) of the case problem. Additionally, instead of only describing the issues, I focused on presenting the issues using abstract conceptual principles. For example, I described the case challenge as follows: “Iris needs to collaborate with Jacqueline to design a web-based software training module on Lapin products, which addresses multiple perspectives and approaches of organizations that make up the seven-member consortium (Spannaus & Jones, 2014). A decision on the design of the project is required, in order to proceed to subsequent phases of the ADDIE model (McGriff, 2000)”. With the primary case-specific constraint: “Iris needs to be able to understand the learning needs of each organization to ensure that the training project will address the needs of all consortium members. Improved communication between other cultures will also increase the productivity of consortium meetings to be able to gain consensus on the proposed prototype, in order to move forward in the design process”. Along with a secondary case-specific constraint: “Creating a design prototype to benefit all consortium members and software users needs to take into account the varying technical perspectives and learning approaches used in different countries”.

Relationships among Issues

In my final case analysis of Iris Daniels, I tried to step back to get a case perspective of the problem, in order to determine the relationships between the issues; rather than just listing the issues without taking into consideration how they may relate to one another. Each of the challenges and constraints, which I identified for the Iris Daniels case analysis is interconnected with one another, where the challenge and constraint have an impact on each other. For example, I wrote that the key case constraint is intercultural communication, where “prior to beginning the design process, Iris needs to be able to understand the learning needs of each organization to ensure that the training project will address the needs of all consortium members”. Similarly, “improved communication between other cultures will also increase the productivity of consortium meetings to be able to gain consensus on the proposed prototype, in order to move forward in the design process”. To address the challenge of design, “Iris needs to collaborate with Jacqueline to design a web-based software training module on Lapin products, which addresses multiple perspectives and approaches of organizations that make up the seven-member consortium (Spannaus & Jones, 2014). A decision on the design of the project is required, in order to proceed to subsequent phases of the ADDIE model (McGriff, 2000)”.

Reflective vs. Reflexive

The use of the assigned case readings aided in being able to gather information to better support the case scenario – issues identified, challenges/constraints, and
possible solutions to the case problems. In the case analysis, I wrote “Iris Daniels is currently in the design phase of the ADDIE model. She is still working on how best to incorporate the learning analysis and needs from different international organizations as represented in the seven-member consortium to design a prototype of the web-based software training module. Additionally, I stated that “I learned about the challenges in designing a training that can be delivered to a broad multicultural audience. The article also offered several solutions to address these challenges such as a blended approach, one size fit all approach, customizable approach for one culture, and a multicultural integration approach to address the challenges in training design (Walkgrove Limited, 2015). Some of the solutions offered in this article would be useful to Iris Daniels as she prepares to design another prototype to better address the needs of the consortium members (Spannaus & Jones, 2014)”.

Additionally, “The article, On-line course design and delivery: cross-national considerations, discusses the advantages of moving from a classroom-based training to web-based training, such as multiple delivery formats, cost-effectiveness, and currency of teaching materials (Mercado, Praveen Parboteah, & Zhao, 2004). Many of these same reasons were cited by the seven-member consortium as justification for the move to offer web-based software training rather than classroom, in-person based training (Spannaus & Jones, 2014). This article also discusses the individualism-collectivism dimension as a way to differentiate between cultures, where some people may prefer to act as individuals rather than as members of groups (Mercado, Praveen Parboteah, & Zhao, 2004). In accordance with this dimension, Iris may need to reconsider how she schedules future meetings with stakeholders, as one-on-one meetings may be more effective and productive in moving the design process and the project forward, rather than only depending on group review meetings (Spannaus & Jones, 2014). According to Mercado, Praveen Parboteah, and Zhao (2004), the new prototype designed by Iris, Jim and Kimberly is properly designed as it addresses several critical elements such as presentation of course materials, facilitative instruction, assessment, and feedback.”

The use of these examples to support the identified issues demonstrates the move from novice information seeking behavior to that of an expert, who seeks to utilize the information to guide and support the conceptualization of the issues from the case study.

**Problem Solving**

**Relationships among Solutions**

In the Iris Daniels case, I discussed the following solutions: “create one integrated web-based training module for a global and multicultural audience. The training module will be in accordance to the consortium needs, while incorporating design and technical approaches from diverse perspectives” and “create customized training modules to address the learning needs, design perspectives, and teaching approaches for each specified culture, country or organization. Iris would need to design a separate and different training modules for each organization or member in the consortium”. Since the solutions for the case study were on opposite ends of the spectrum, in order to offer very different solutions, I did list them similar to how a novice
would without providing any connections between the solutions, other than the connection of each solution to the issue itself.

**Consideration of Implications**

By examining the pros and cons of each solution in the Iris Daniels case, we can better understand the impact that each solution will have in resolving the problem. In the case analysis, I discussed the following:

**Pros:** “Cost effective, one version”, “Training is simple and direct, ‘a one size fits all’ approach through cultural inclusion”, All learners receive the same training materials”, “Exposes learners to multiple cultures, important for global/international companies”, “Highly targeted learning” and “Customizable, learner feels the training is designed for them.”

**Cons:** “Too many cooks – may result in a confusing final product and/or training module”, “May be costly if fully implemented; as the consortium - would need to pay to create a different training module for each member organization”, and “None (or very little) exposure to other cultures.”

Upon reviewing these implications and making considerations about the impact of these solutions on the identified case problem, I am able to move towards a more expert way of thinking and away from a novice who presents solutions without making considerations on the impact that these solutions may have in solving the problem.

**Rigid vs. Flexible**

The solutions presented in the Iris Daniels case study demonstrates more flexibility in the solutions offered. The two solutions provided are on opposite ends of the spectrum with each having its own pros and cons, in terms of how each impacts the identified issue. The final recommendation is “for Iris Daniels to create one integrated web-based training module, which incorporates both American design ideas and elements of the French instructional approach to address the learning needs of Lapin software users. She should first design an effective prototype to demonstrate the design approach including technical aspects and diverse perspectives to provide consortium members with a better idea of what the completed training module would look like. With only one integrated training module, Iris would be able to provide all learners with the same training materials, as well as have the opportunity to address any cultural differences in delivering the module to a global and multicultural audience,” where I stated the justification of this recommendations as “Intercultural communication and managing diverse learning needs are essential skills to creating an effective training program, as both are critical to Iris being able to understand and collaborate with all stakeholders, while also addressing the diverse learning needs of users from different cultures and countries. Having multiple stakeholders and subject matter experts involved in the design process may result in a confusing end product or training module. However, Iris can reduce the risk of creating an ineffective training module by meeting with stakeholders one-on-one, as well as in a group setting to discuss the overall training design to ensure that cultural differences are represented in the training module. By creating an integrated design prototype, Iris will be able to incorporate the design ideas
and technical elements from different cultures to produce a prototype that all consortium members will be able to support, allowing Iris Daniels to proceed with the development of the web-based software training module for all Lapin users”.

Unlike the previous case studies, this one on the Iris Daniels case provides multiple solutions to address the issues. The solutions were identified early in the problem-solving process with each solution being very different from the other; thus offering more flexibility in the problem-solving process.

**Overall Rating:** High

**ACTION PLAN FOR MOVING FORWARD**

The opportunity to be able to reflect on our developing expertise of problem finding and problem solving using the dimensions discussed in the Ertmer & Stepich (2005) article was both challenging as well as enlightening. Having a standard mechanism such as these dimensions offered a standard way to compare these case studies to determine our individual progress along the novice-expert continuum, as well as how we can better improve our knowledge, skills and experiences as instructional design professionals.

Using the dimensions of the novice-expert continuum, as a measure of my reflection, I was able to identify areas such as synthesizing vs. summarizing, relationships among issues, reflective vs. reflexive, relationships among solutions, consideration of implications, where I have been able to demonstrate marked improvement across the case studies we examined. However, there are still other dimensional areas, where more improvement is needed such as principles vs. features and flexible vs. rigid, in order to be able to advance further along the novice-expert continuum towards becoming an expert in the field of instructional design.

In order to continuously improve my expert thinking in instructional design, I need to continuously improve in the following dimensions:

**Problem-Finding:** by learning how to synthesize issues rather than only recounting the given information, by seeking and reflecting on the underlying issues rather than only examining the concrete issues, by examining the impact and relationship between issues rather than only listing each issue, by considering both the pros and cons and the impact that each has on the issue rather than only making assumptions.

**Problem-Solving:** by creating plans to offer possible solutions based on a cause and effect relationship rather than providing plans that offer no connections, by examining the implications of solutions to a problem rather than offering solutions without any consideration to their impact, by offering a variety of solutions to demonstrate flexibility rather than rigidity in solving instructional design problems.

By gaining more experience with analyzing instructional design problems, and determining solutions for these problems, I will be able to continue to improve on these dimensions, in order to move from novice to expert on the continuum. Hopefully, gaining knowledge and skills, as well as experience by working with these types of cases will help to improve my instructional design skills for the future.
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