Objective Design and Instructional Alignment



DESCRIPTION

Instructional alignment is an essential characteristic of any effective learning experience. The presence of instructional alignment positively impacts learning. Instructional alignment is also a significant and necessary prerequisite condition for both the pursuit of efficacy and the application of more complex aspects of learning design, such as those related to designing for motivation and adaptive learning.

Instructional alignment refers to a high degree of agreement among the objectives, assessments, and the content in a learning experience (Cohen, 1987). It also includes deriving objectives from and aligning them to sets of relevant external frameworks or standards. Objective design refers to the practice of

articulating the objectives, based on relevant sets of standards or external frameworks, for a learning experience such that the objectives reflect the specified measurability attributes while explicitly stating the learning goals. The objectives form the central framework for a learning experience and function as the critical point of reference when designing aligned assessments and content.

The main components of this principle are Pearson's research-based points-of-view on objectives, including their definitions, attributes that support measurability (Anderson, 2001; Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2015; Hattie, 2009; Marzano, 1998; Messick, 1989) and their function and the framework they form (Anderson, 2001; Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2015; Fullan & Langworthy, 2014; Hattie, 2009; Mayer, 2011). The principle also covers the role of standards alignment in the design process as well as an overview of assessment alignment and content alignment.

Design recommendations include:

- Explicitly specify observable knowledge, skills, or attributes a learner will achieve in the learning experience in objective statements.
- · Derive these from relevant standards.
- Align all assessments and content to objectives to create aligned learning experiences, which are essential to effective learning experiences and Pearson's efficacy goals.

CAPABILITIES

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Adaptivity: Adaptive remediation
- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Management: Learner analytics
- · Robust Technology: Adaptive practice aligned to objectives
- · Simple Technology: Objectives informing content design
- · Content Support: Showing learners performance by objective

- Achievement
- Self-regulation

Objective Design and Instructional Alignment



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong use of learning outcomes to define measurable impacts that the learning will have on learners	Some use of learning outcomes to define measurable impacts that the learning will have on learners	Poor use of learning outcomes to define measurable impacts that the learning will have on learners	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of learning objectives to describe what learners will be able to do at the end of the course	Some use of learning objectives to describe what learners will be able to do at the end of the course	Poor use of learning objectives to describe what learners will be able to do at the end of the course		=
	Strong use of enabling objectives to define module or activity level goals	Some use of enabling objectives to define module or activity level goals	Poor use of enabling objectives to define module or activity level goals		
Objectives	Strong use of objectives that are clear, concise, and learner-centered	Some use of objectives that are clear, concise, and learner-centered	Poor use of objectives that are clear, concise, and learner-centered	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of objectives that are discrete and non-repetitive	Some use of objectives that are discrete and non-repetitive	Poor use of objectives that are discrete and non-repetitive		_
	Strong use of objectives that are achievable in the context	Some use of objectives that are achievable in the context	Poor use of objectives that are achievable in the context		
	Strong use of objectives that are observable and measurable	Some use of objectives that are observable and measurable	Poor use of objectives that are observable and measurable		
Alignment	Strong use of appropriate instructional alignment standards to inform design, such as APA, P22, etc.	Some use of appropriate instructional alignment standards to inform design, such as APA, P22, etc.	Poor use of appropriate instructional alignment standards to inform design, such as APA, P22, etc.	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	_
	Strong evidence that standards are aligned to learning objectives, thus providing design validation	Some evidence that standards are aligned to learning objectives, thus providing design validation	Poor evidence that standards are aligned to learning objectives, thus providing design validation		
Assessment	Strong application of multiple measurement methods to facilitate the triangulation of data	Some application of multiple measurement methods to facilitate the triangulation of data	Poor application of multiple mea- surement methods to facilitate the triangulation of data	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of assessments that are aligned to learning objectives	Some use of assessments that are aligned to learning objectives	Poor use of assessments that are aligned to learning objectives		=
	Strong use of feedback that supports improvement towards objectives	Some use of feedback that supports improvement towards objectives	Poor use of feedback that supports improvement towards objectives		

The Assessment Process: Assessment Instrument Design



DESCRIPTION

Sound assessment item or instrument design, including their development, administration, and ongoing validation practices, are essential to yielding accurate information regarding what learners know, think, and can do at various time points over the course of a learning experience (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014). As such, assessment design and strategy are critical to supporting student learning and efficacy. The first step of rigorous assessment instrument design involves establishing alignment between any given objective statement and assessment item(s) or instrument(s) developed to elicit the knowledge, skills, or attributes (KSAs) articulated within it. This principle provides a conceptual overview of validity and reliability, and research-based considerations and recommendations for developing assessment items/instruments that adequately and accurately assess objective statements.

CAPABILITIES

- · Assessment: Short answer, constructed response
- Assessment: Open-ended assignments (multi-step)
- · Assessment: Project

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Adaptive/personalized learning experience
- · Simple Technology: Self-paced, mastery learning experience
- Content Support: Assessment instrument development and administration

- Achievement
- Motivation
- · Self-regulation
- Behavior

The Assessment Process: Assessment Instrument Design SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Objectives	Strong use of objectives that are: Clear Measurable via multiple methods Discrete Achievable Descriptive of success	Some use of objectives that are: Clear Measurable via multiple methods Discrete Achievable Descriptive of success	Poor use of objectives that are: Clear Measurable via multiple methods Discrete Achievable Descriptive of success	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
	Strong alignment between objectives, assessments, and learning design	Some alignment between objectives, assessments, and learning design	Poor alignment between objectives, assessments, and learning design		
Instruments	Strong use of instruments whose va- lidity is supported through evidence and theory	Some use of instruments whose validity is supported through evidence and theory	Poor use of instruments whose validity is supported through evidence and theory	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
	Strong use of instruments that are reliable through repeated measures	Some use of instruments that are reliable through repeated measures	Poor use of instruments that are reliable through repeated measures		
Thinking Skills	Strong use of objectives to specify higher-order thinking skills	Some use of objectives to specify higher-order thinking skills	Poor use of objectives to specify higher-order thinking skills	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of instruments to assess higher-order thinking skills	Some use of instruments to assess higher-order thinking skills	Poor use of instruments to assess higher-order thinking skills		=
	Strong application of activities that are in-depth, complex, and authentic	Some application of activities that are in-depth, complex, and authentic	Poor application of activities that are in-depth, complex, and authentic		
Assessment/ Feedback	Strong application of both formative and summative assessment	Some application of both formative and summative assessment	Poor application of both formative and summative assessment	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong emphasis on feedback as the purpose of assessment	Some emphasis on feedback as the purpose of assessment	Poor emphasis on feedback as the purpose of assessment		=
	Strong provision of feedback to all relevant stakeholders	Some provision of feedback to all relevant stakeholders	Poor provision of feedback to all relevant stakeholders		

Learning Object Design



LEARNER IMPACTS

- Behavior
- Self-regulation
- Motivation

DESCRIPTION

Learning object design is integral to effective digital learning environments, especially adaptive learning environments. From a learning design perspective, a learning object is the smallest independent structural experience that contains a properly aligned objective, a learning activity, and an assessment that truly measures the stated objective (L'Allier, 1997; Polsani, 2003). Learning objects are described as "appropriately" small (i.e. single sitting), stand alone, and reusable.

Content objects, such as text passages, videos, and assessment items, must be considered through the lens of learner, instructional, and domain models (and UX) before being properly aligned to the stated objective, and before being integrated into the learning object (that is experienced by the learner).

CAPABILITIES

- · Instruction: Modularity
- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Instruction: Active learning experience

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Adaptive scaffolding between problem solving steps
- Simple Technology: Queuing up of relevant study materials
- · Content Support: Consistent UX between modules/learning experiences

Learning Object Design



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong use of objects that leverage both technical and pedagogical standards Strong structural identification of objects that represent small, independent experiences Strong composition of objects that contain objectives, activities, and assessments	Some use of objects that leverage both technical and pedagogical standards Some structural identification of objects that represent small, independent experiences Some composition of objects that contain objectives, activities, and assessments	Poor use of objects that leverage both technical and pedagogical standards Poor structural identification of objects that represent small, independent experiences Poor composition of objects that contain objectives, activities, and assessments	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Model	Strong application of the learner model	Some application of the learner model	Poor application of the learner model	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Design	Strong alignment between objects and learning objectives Strong balance between objects that are easily reused and instructionally effective Strong identification of object granularity based on the needs of the context	Some alignment between objects and learning objectives Some balance between objects that are easily reused and instructionally effective Some identification of object granularity based on the needs of the context	Poor alignment between objects and learning objectives Poor balance between objects that are easily reused and instructionally effective Poor identification of object granularity based on the needs of the context	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Assessment	Strong alignment between objectives and valid measures Strong evidence that selected objects, activities, and assessments support objectives Strong application of objects that support adaptation and customization of the environment	Some alignment between objectives and valid measures Some evidence that selected objects, activities, and assessments support objectives Some application of objects that support adaptation and customization of the environment	Poor alignment between objectives and valid measures Poor evidence that selected objects, activities, and assessments support objectives Poor application of objects that support adaptation and customization of the environment	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=

Formative Assessment



DESCRIPTION

Formative assessment is a critical component of a comprehensive assessment strategy as it supports student learning by providing timely, specific feedback to learners and instructors at meaningful points during the learning experience. According to the research, the benefits of formative assessment and the feedback it provides depends on its design and implementation (Bennett, 2011; Shute, 2007). Thus, the focus of this principle is what constitutes effective formative assessment and how this can be implemented within our products to best support student learning. Research-based recommendations focus on addressing the five strategies of effective formative assessment (William, 2007) and adhering to the standards for educational and psychological testing (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014).

CAPABILITIES

- Assessment: Open-ended assignments (single step)
- Instruction: Item level hints
- · Management: Algorithmically variable assessments

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Utilizing Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS) in association with formative assessment instruments
- $\bullet \ \ \text{Simple Technology: Opportunities and capabilities to support self- and peer-assessment}$
- Content Support: Providing specific, descriptive, and actionable feedback statements in association with assessment instruments

- Achievement
- Motivation
- · Self-regulation
- Behavior

Formative Assessment



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong integration of formative assessment into a comprehensive assessment system	Some integration of formative assessment into a comprehensive assessment system	Poor integration of formative assessment into a comprehensive assessment system	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of timely, specific feedback to support students and instructors throughout the learning experience	Some use of timely, specific feedback to support students and instructors throughout the learning experience	Poor use of timely, specific feedback to support students and instructors throughout the learning experience		=
Establishing where learners	Strong use of activities that elicit evidence of learning	Some use of activities that elicit evidence of learning	Poor use of activities that elicit evidence of learning	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
are	Strong assessment of prior knowledge	Some assessment of prior knowledge	Poor assessment of prior knowledge		=
	Strong use of pre-training as needed to ensure prerequisites are met	Some use of pre-training as needed to ensure prerequisites are met	Poor use of pre-training as needed to ensure prerequisites are met		
Establishing where learners	Strong use of criteria to clarify the conditions for success	Some use of criteria to clarify the conditions for success	Poor use of criteria to clarify the conditions for success	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
are going	Strong use of continual peer and instructor communication to support progress	Some use of continual peer and instructor communication to support progress	Poor use of continual peer and instructor communication to support progress		=
	Strong use of hints, tips, instructions, or related measures to facilitate the discussion of course standards	Some use of hints, tips, instructions, or related measures to facilitate the discussion of course standards	Poor use of hints, tips, instructions, or related measures to facilitate the discussion of course standards		
Establishing how learners	Strong use of feedback to propel learners towards the objectives	Some use of feedback to propel learners towards the objectives	Poor use of feedback to propel learners towards the objectives	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related	
are going to get there	Strong use of peers and collaboration to work towards goals	Some use of peers and collaboration to work towards goals	Poor use of peers and collaboration to work towards goals	activity	=
	Strong use of self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies to work towards goals	Some use of SRL strategies to work towards goals	Poor use of SRL strategies to work towards goals		

Supporting Student Learning with Feedback



DESCRIPTION

Feedback is "information provided [as 'a consequence of performance'] by an agent (e.g., teacher, peer, book, parent, self, experience) regarding aspects of one's performance and understanding" (Hattie & Timperley, 2007). Research suggests that feedback provided to learners and instructors in a formative context should adhere to certain characteristics in order to positively impact learner performance and achievement (Shute, 2007). This principle provides an overview of the formative assessment feedback literature and provides research-based recommendations for providing feedback to both learners and instructors that has the potential to support student learning (i.e., feedback that is corrective/addresses misconception[s], motivating, and facilitates self-regulation). Recommendations include providing feedback statements to learners that are understandable, descriptive, specific, and actionable (Lipnevich & Smith, 2009; Nicol & MacFarlane-Dick, 2006; Shute, 2007) and providing specific, timely performance reporting and recommendations to instructors to inform intervention (Bennett, 2011; Wiliam, 2007).

CAPABILITIES

- Adaptivity: Local "targeted" feedback
- · Instruction: Software simulation
- · Instruction: Item leveled hints

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Utilizing Intelligent Tutoring Systems (ITS) in association with formative assessment instruments
- Simple Technology: Providing access to specific, targeted resources based on performance
- Content Support: Providing specific, descriptive, and actionable feedback statements in association with assessment instruments

- Achievement
- Motivation
- · Self-regulation
- Behavior

Supporting Student Learning with Feedback

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong integration of formative assessment into a comprehensive assessment system	Some integration of formative assessment into a comprehensive assessment system	Poor integration of formative assessment into a comprehensive assessment system	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	_
	Strong use of timely, specific feedback to support students and instructors throughout the learning experience	Some use of timely, specific feedback to support students and instructors throughout the learning experience	Poor use of timely, specific feedback to support students and instructors throughout the learning experience		
Establishing where learners	Strong use of activities that elicit evidence of learning	Some use of activities that elicit evidence of learning	Poor use of activities that elicit evidence of learning	Does NOT use effectively	
are	Strong assessment of prior knowledge	Some assessment of prior knowledge	Poor assessment of prior knowledge	or is not a related activity	=
	Strong use of pre-training as needed to ensure prerequisites are met	Some use of pre-training as needed to ensure prerequisites are met	Poor use of pre-training as needed to ensure prerequisites are met	delivity	
Establishing where learners	Strong use of criteria to clarify the conditions for success	Some use of criteria to clarify the conditions for success	Poor use of criteria to clarify the conditions for success	Does NOT use effectively	
are going	Strong use of continual peer and instructor communication to support	Some use of continual peer and instructor communication to support progress	Poor use of continual peer and instructor communication to support progress	or is not a related activity	=
	progress Strong use of hints, tips, instructions, or related measures to facilitate the discussion of course standards	Some use of hints, tips, instructions, or related measures to facilitate the discussion of course standards	Poor use of hints, tips, instructions, or related measures to facilitate the discussion of course standards		
Establishing how learners	Strong use of feedback to propel learners towards the objectives	Some use of feedback to propel learners towards the objectives	Poor use of feedback to propel learners towards the objectives	Does NOT use effectively or	
are going to get there	Strong use of peers and collaboration to work towards goals	Some use of peers and collaboration to work towards goals	Poor use of peers and collaboration to work towards goals	is not a related activity	=
	Strong use of self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies to work towards goals	Some use of SRL strategies to work towards goals	Poor use of SRL strategies to work towards goals		

Copyright © 2016 Pearson Education Inc. Made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode

Learner Attributes



LEARNER IMPACTS

Behavior

DESCRIPTION

Learner attributes are the various pieces of data that inform us about who our learners are. These attributes may provide valuable insights about how learners learn and how we can individualize their instruction to better suit those attributes. Attributes are generally joined together to form a learner profile (Le, 2009) which can be used to support diagnosing learner needs and providing a treatment to assist them (Herold, 2014). Though research into certain parts of learner profiles, such as aptitude treatment interaction and learning styles, has shown little effect on learning (Pashler, McDaniel, Rohrer, & Bjork, 2008), certain attributes as well as dynamic monitoring of attributes have been shown to have increased impact on student learning (Arroyo, Mehranian, & Woolf, 2010). This principle will look at the large array of different attributes we may collect and how we could utilize the data.

CAPABILITIES

- · Management: Cross-course portfolio/analytics/profile
- · Management: Learning analytics

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Content personalization to individual attributes
- Simple Technology: Diagnostics for understanding learner prior knowledge
- Content Support: Metatagging of content to enable attribute tracking

Learner Attributes



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong collection of relevant learner data from multiple sources	Some collection of relevant learner data from multiple sources	Poor collection of relevant learner data from multiple sources	Does NOT use effectively or is not	=
	Strong application of data towards the adaptation of products to learners	Some application of data towards the adaptation of products to learners	Poor application of data towards the adaptation of products to learners	a related activity	
Model	Strong application of the two-step approach built upon an initial learner profile that adapts over time based on data collection	Some application of the two-step approach built upon an initial learner profile that adapts over time based on data collection	Poor application of the two-step approach built upon an initial learner profile that adapts over time based on data collection	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	_
	Strong robustness of analysis design that does not rely on a single imperfect source, such as attribute treatment interaction (ATI) or learning styles alone	Some robustness of analysis design that does not rely on a single imperfect source, such as ATI or learning styles alone	Poor robustness of analysis design that does not rely on a single imperfect source, such as ATI or learning styles alone		=
Design	Strong consideration of appropriate attributes in the design of the learner profile Demographic Cognitive Motivational Interactive Metacognitive Strong consideration of how the learner profile will adapt over time through the collection, analysis, and adaptation from these attributes	Some consideration of appropriate attributes in the design of the learner profile Demographic Cognitive Motivational Interactive Metacognitive Some consideration of how the learner profile will adapt over time through the collection, analysis, and adaptation from these attributes	Poor consideration of appropriate attributes in the design of the learner profile Demographic Cognitive Motivational Interactive Metacognitive Poor consideration of how the learner profile will adapt over time through the collection, analysis, and adaptation from these attributes	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Data	Strong use of triangulated data from multiple sources, such as demograph- ics, achievement, diagnostics, self-as- sessment, and user interactions	Some use of triangulated data from multiple sources, such as demographics, achievement, diagnostics, self-assessment, and user interactions	Poor use of triangulated data from multiple sources, such as demograph- ics, achievement, diagnostics, self-as- sessment, and user interactions	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
	Strong use of metacognitive, motivational, and self-explanation data to improve learning	Some use of metacognitive, motivational, and self-explanation data to improve learning	Poor use of metacognitive, motivational, and self-explanation data to improve learning		

Metacognition



DESCRIPTION

Metacognition is "...thinking about the contents and processes of one's mind." (Winne & Azevedo, 2014, p. 126). Metacognitive awareness as a function of metacognitive regulation is a strong predictor of academic performance and achievement as it increases students' ability to transfer their learning to new contexts and tasks and continually become more strategic learners (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Azevedo, R. & Cromley, J. G., 2004; Schraw, 2008; Tobias & Everson, 2009).

Design recommendations focus on supporting and scaffolding metacognitive awareness and self regulation to help students be strategic learners as they become more aware of the status of their knowing, understanding, and executing, as well as increase in self-regulated learning skill and will by accepting greater accountability for their learning processes and outcomes (Lee, Lim, & Grabowski, 2010; Pintrich, 2004; Pintrich & Groot, 1990; Zimmerman, 1990).

CAPABILITIES

- Assessment: Short answer constructed response
- · Cognitive Tools: Peer review
- Cognitive Tools: Planning/outlining

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Adaptive scaffolds
- Simple Technology: Notifications/prompts
- Content Support: Instruction/practice monitoring learning

- Behavior
- Self-regulation
- Motivation

Metacognition



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Supports all of: self-awareness of learning, active use of learning strategies, accountability for learning	Supports two of: self-awareness of learning, active use of learning strategies, accountability for learning	Supports one of: self-awareness of learning, active use of learning strategies, accountability for learning	Supports none of: self-aware- ness of learning, active use of study strategies, accountability for learning	=
Model	Supports knowledge development in all of these forms: declarative, procedural, conditional	Supports knowledge development in two of these forms: declarative, procedural, conditional	Supports knowledge development in one of these forms: declarative, procedural, conditional	Supports knowledge development in none of these forms: declarative, procedural, condi-	
	Supports thinking development in all of these forms: monitoring, control, self-regulated learning (SRL)	Supports thinking development in two of these forms: monitoring, control, SRL	control, SRL	tional Supports thinking development in none of these forms: monitoring, control, SRL	=
Design	Supports and scaffolds metacognition by means of four or more of: realistic feedback, constructive feedback, suitable task difficulty, task autonomy, outcome attribution	Supports metacognition by means of three or more of: realistic feedback, constructive feedback, suitable task difficulty, task autonomy, outcome attribution	Supports metacognition by means of two or more of: realistic feedback, constructive feedback, suitable task difficulty, task autonomy, outcome attribution	Supports metacognition by means of one or fewer of: realistic feedback, constructive feedback, suitable task difficulty, task autonomy, outcome attribution	=
	Supports SRL by all of: minimizing cognitive load, providing adaptive scaffolding, training, practice and reflection on SRL skills	Supports SRL by two of: minimizing cognitive load, providing adaptive scaffolding, training, practice and reflection on SRL skills	Supports SRL by one of: minimiz- ing cognitive load, providing adap- tive scaffolding, training, practice and reflection on SRL skills	Does not support SRL by any of: minimizing cognitive load, providing adaptive scaffolding, training on SRL skills	
Validation	Triangulates data among at least three sources	Relies upon at least two different	Relies upon a single data source	Metacognition is not measured	
	Validates data by all of the follow- ing means: ensuring behaviors match conditions, evaluating how well strategies were executed, determining if/why strategies/fea- tures were not used	Validates data by two of the fol- lowing means: ensuring behaviors match conditions, evaluating how well strategies were executed, determining if/why strategies/ features were not used	Validates data by one of the following means: ensuring behaviors match conditions, evaluating how well strategies were executed, determining if/ why strategies/features were not used		=

Scaffolding



FOUNDATIONS

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Behavior
- Motivation
- Self-regulation

DESCRIPTION

Scaffolding enables not only the performance of a task more complex than the learner could handle alone, but enables learning to come from that experience (Reiser & Tabak, 2014). It also facilitates critical thinking skills, metacognition, and content understanding (which in turn impact motivation and achievement).

Scaffolding occurs when work is shared between the learner and a more knowledgeable other or agent such as contingency, fading, and transfer of responsibility (van de Pol et al., 2010). Design recommendations center around managing the learning process so that learners can engage in (often simplified) elements of disciplinary work in real problem contexts. Instructors focus learner attention and regularly prompt learners to explain and reflect on their work.

CAPABILITIES

- Instruction: Scaffolded worked example
- Cognitive Tools: Bibliography/citation creation
- Cognitive Tools: Planning/outlining

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Robust Technology: Adaptive scaffolded practice
- Simple Technology: Student input capabilities for shared explanations and reflections
- Content Support: Focus learner's attention on aspects of the problem they may take for granted

Scaffolding



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	The product strategy is aligned to scaffolding as a core principle of a learner-centered product. The product strategy currently integrates the use of an evidence-based model of scaffolding.	The product team is exploring scaffolding as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product. The product team is exploring integrating an evidence-based model for the scaffolding.	The product team considers scaf- folding to be an important LDP for creating a more learner- centered product. The product strategy considers scaf- folding at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model.	The scaffolding LDP does NOT align to the product strategy and is not neces- sary to explore further.	=
Scaffolding Application	The product uses a combination of learning strategy recommendations, and embedding of scaffolding in the design of scaffolding applications.	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more focus on enhancing the scaffolding of instructional content is needed to improve principle application.	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy. Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to improve the product.	=
Delivery	Scaffolding of instructional content on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/ reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to validate this principle with learners. Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services.	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product design & development.	=
Learner Char- acteristics	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development. Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of scaffolding LDP recommendations for creating assessments.	Product team is currently exploring how recommendations on designing assessments with scaffolding of instructional content in mind could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development. Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing assessments based on this LDP.	Formative/summative applications will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=

Self-Regulated Learning

(Motivation and Learning Strategies)

DESCRIPTION

Self regulated learning (SRL) is made up of instructional processes and learning strategies aligned to supporting both the will and skill elements of students' abilities to manage and improve their own learning process.

SRL is guided by metacognition (thinking about learning), strategic action (planning, monitoring, regulating, reflecting), and motivation to learn, and is predictive of higher learning achievement (Flavell, 1979; Pintrich, 2004). Design recommendations focus on scaffolding SRL in digital learning environments to help students be more aware of their learning progress, accountable for knowledge and skill development, and strategic in their use of learning tools and other efforts related to managing time and monitoring learning progress. (Azevedo, et al., 2004; Zimmerman, 1990)

CAPABILITIES

- · Adaptivity: Adaptive remediation
- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Management: Learner analytics

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Adaptive practice aligned to learning goals
- Simple Technology: Learning planning and monitoring tools
- Content Support: Instruction/practice of SRL skill building



- Attitudes
- Behavior
- Motivation
- · Self-regulation

Self-Regulated Learning (Motivation and Learning Strategies) SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	Supports all of: self-awareness of learning, active use of learning strat- egies, accountability for learning	Supports two of: self-awareness of learning, active use of learning strat- egies, accountability for learning	Supports one of: self-awareness of learning, active use of learning strat- egies, accountability for learning	Supports none of: self-awareness of learning, active use of learning strategies, accountability for learning Supports one or fewer of: planning, monitoring, regulating, reflecting across one or fewer of: cognition, affect, behavior, context	
	Supports all of: planning, monitoring, regulating, reflecting across at least one of: cognition, affect, behavior, context	Supports three of: planning, monitoring, regulating, reflecting across at least one of: cognition, affect, behavior, context	Supports two of: planning, monitoring, regulating, reflecting across at least one of: cognition, affect, behavior, context		=
Scaffolding and Feedback Instructional Strategies	Scaffolding and feedback designed to support at least four of: clarify performance, facilitate reflecting, deliver high-quality information, encourage dialogue, encourage positive motivation, close performance gap, provide improvement information to teachers	Scaffolding and feedback designed to support at least three of: clarify performance, facilitate reflecting, deliver high-quality information, encourage dialogue, encourage positive motivation, close performance gap, provide improvement information to teachers	Scaffolding and feedback designed to support at least two of: clarify performance, facilitate reflecting, deliver high-quality information, encourage dialogue, encourage positive motivation, close performance gap, provide improvement information to teachers	Scaffolding and feedback designed to support one or fewer of: clarify perfor- mance, facilitate reflecting, deliver high-quality informa- tion, encourage dialogue, encourage positive moti- vation, close performance gap, provide improvement information to teachers	=
Digital Design Applications	Students trained on SRL prior to learning Complex topics scaffolded well Interactive elements used to support SRL SRL behavior analyzed to support interventions Digital elements, like wikis, journals, discussion forums, used effectively to support SRL	Students trained on SRL after learning Complex topics poorly scaffolded Elements used to support SRL, but not making full use of interactivity Behavior analysis exists, but not used to support SRL interventions Digital elements, like wikis, journals, discussion forums used, but not to support SRL	Students trained on SRL, but poorly Complex topics not scaffolded Elements do not support SRL Behavior analysis not used Digital elements, like wikis, journals, discussion forums not used	Not applicable to the design of this tool/ capability	=

Critical Thinking

THE NATURE

OF KNOWLEDGE

DESCRIPTION

Critical thinking is "...purposeful, self-regulatory judgment which results in interpretation, analysis, evaluation, and inference, as well as explanation of...the considerations upon which that judgment is based..." (Facione, 1990, p. 2). Critical thinking is of increasing importance to learner achievement and employability as it requires the cultivation and application of higher-order thinking skills (e.g., analysis, evaluation, and/or creation) and dispositions (e.g., open-mindedness, curiosity) across various contexts. This principle provides an overview of the critical thinking literature and focuses on research-based recommendations for course design that supports the development and application of generic and domain-specific critical thinking skills and dispositions. Recommendations include providing explicit instruction aligned to critical thinking objective statements, incorporating authentic or anchored instruction and opportunities for dialogue and mentoring, and providing content and assessment that appropriately model and scaffold critical thinking skills and dispositions (Abrami et al., 2014; Halpern, 1998; Lai, 2011; Liu, Frankel, & Roohr, 2014; Nilson, 2013).

CAPABILITIES

- Adaptivity: Adaptive remediation
- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Management: Learner analytics

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Adaptive practice aligned to objectives
- · Simple Technology: Objectives informing content design
- Content Support: Showing learners performance by objective

- Achievement
- Attitudes
- Behavior

Critical Thinking



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	The product strategy is aligned to critical thinking as a core principle of a learner-centered product.	The product team is exploring critical thinking as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The product team considers critical thinking to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered	The critical thinking LDP does NOT align to the product strategy and is	
	The product strategy currently inte- grates the use of knowledge creation tools as a means to engage learners in critical thinking.	The product team is exploring integrating an evidence-based critical-thinking model.	product. The product strategy considers critical thinking at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model.	not necessary to explore further.	=
Critical Thinking Application	The product uses a combination of domain specific and explicit critical thinking instruction.	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more focus on enhancing critical thinking skills	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to improve the product.	
	Higher-order Bloom's Taxonomy skills are used to determine how to best apply this principle to improve product design.	is needed to improve principle application.	Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.		=
Critical Thinking Delivery	Critical thinking on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to validate this principle with learners.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product	
-		Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.	LD's validation services.	design & development.	=
Learner Characteristics	Design & development are cur- rently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development.	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.		

Video in Instruction and Assessment



DESCRIPTION

Digital videos can be used for both instruction and at various points in the assessment process. The following areas are well-supported by educational research:

- Video in instruction (e.g. Clark & Mayer, 2011; Mayer, 2009)
- · Video peer review (e.g. Falchikov & Goldfinch, 2000; Kavas & Ozdener, 2012; Wu & Kao, 2008)
- Video for reflection and self-assessment (e.g. Hartsell, 2013; Hirschel, Yamamoto, & Lee, 2012; Koole et al., 2012)
- Student video creation (e.g. Kearney & Schuck, 2008; Guo, Kim, & Rubin, 2014)
- Video for feedback and assessment (e.g. Tochon, 2001; Turner & West, 2013)
- Vicarious learning via video for changing affective states and attitudes (e.g. Martin & Briggs, 1986; Wetzel, Radtke, & Stern, 1994; Zimbardo & Leippe, 1991)

Yet, simply including videos in these situations does not positively impact learning unless the activities and/or content are explicitly aligned to well-articulated learning objectives (Clark & Mayer, 2011). Furthermore, there is little to no research support for instructional videos whose sole purpose is to interest or motivate learners. However, videos that both align with learning objectives AND provide interesting content CAN both motivate and impact learning.

CAPABILITIES

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

· Assessment: Project

- Cognitive Tools: Synchronous social learning: audio/video based
- Cognitive Tools: Timestamped video comments
- · Robust Technology: Video peer review system; collaborative online video editing
- · Simple Technology: Standalone instructional videos with assessment items
- Content Support: Instructional videos aligned with learning objectives

- Attitudes
- Behavior
- Motivation

Video in Instruction and Assessment

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Videos integrate multimodal elements, such as images, sound,	Videos fail to integrate several multi- modal elements	Videos only utilize a single multimedia element	Does NOT leverage multiple benefits of video usage	
	narration, and animation Videos are used to support assess- ment, feedback, demonstration, reflection, and/or interaction	Videos are underutilized to support multiple potential benefits	Videos only support a single potential benefit		=
Model	Videos are used to support authentic learning through a participation model in a real-world context	Videos are used to support authentic learning through the simulation model with realistic activities	Videos are poorly or unclearly used to support authentic learning	Does NOT leverage the benefits of authentic learning through video	=
Design	Strong use of technology to enhance students' ability to communicate around video	Some use of technology to enhance students' ability to communicate around video	Poor use of technology to enhance students' ability to communicate around video	Does NOT use design effectively	
	Videos are made with a brief time- frame in mind, such as 5-10 minutes	Videos are chunked into shorter sessions of 30-60 minutes	Videos are longer than is ideal and should be broken down further		=
	Strong alignment between authentic environment and video-based activities	Some alignment between authentic environment and video-based activities	Poor alignment between authentic environment and video-based activities		
Assessment	Strong use of criteria and/or stan- dardized instruments to support peer review	Some use of criteria and/or stan- dardized instruments to support peer review	Poor use of technology to enhance students ability to communicate around video	Does NOT assess effectively or not an assessment-based activity	
	Strong alignment between learning objectives and assessment tech-	Some alignment between learning objectives and assessment tech-	Videos are longer than is ideal and should be broken down further		=
	niques Strong use of constructive feed- back to guide and support effective learning strategies	niques Some use of constructive feedback to guide and support effective learning strategies	Poor alignment between authentic environment and video-based activities		

Copyright © 2016 Pearson Education Inc. Made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode

Sequencing and the Repetition of Content



DESCRIPTION

Sequencing is the efficient ordering of content in such a way as to help the learner achieve the objectives. Sequencing of instruction is important because it directly impacts how we learn and how we feel about learning. It affects the way information is processed and retained and, from a product development perspective, it helps to avoid inconsistencies and duplication of content (Morrison, Ross, & Kemp, 2004).

There is no one-size-fits all model to sequencing, but there are some proven approaches that have been found to be effective:

THE NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Behavior
- Motivation
- Self-regulation
- 1. Learner-Related: Considers learner characteristics such as prior experience, cognitive development, and motivation
- 2. World-Related: Considers sequencing based on the characteristics of the learning material itself
- 3. Concept-Related: Related concepts are presented together

With repetition, we're talking about the way we repeat information and practice it as a way to learn and remember it. Specific approaches to repetition/practice, namely distributed practice (when studying and/or practice is spread over multiple sessions over time) and interleaving (when learners study completely different examples of a given concept or topic that are spaced across time), have been found to improve learning (Taylor & Rohrer, 2010).

CAPABILITIES

- SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS
- · Cognitive Tools: Flash card and concept map creation
- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Instruction: Modularity
- · Robust Technology: Adaptive software
- · Simple Technology: Spaced practice
- Content Support: Opportunities for repeated practice

Sequencing and the Repetition of Content



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	The product strategy is aligned to sequence as a core principle of a learner-centered product. The product strategy is aligned to repetition as a core principle of a learner-centered product. The product strategy currently integrates the use of an evidence-based model of sequencing instruction.	The product team is exploring sequencing of instructional content and repetition as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product. The product strategy is exploring integrating an evidence-based model for the sequencing of instruction. The product strategy is exploring integrating a recommended evidence-based approach to repetition of content.	The product team considers sequence and repetition to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered product. The product strategy considers sequence and repetition at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model.	The sequence and repetition LDP does NOT align to the product strategy and is not necessary to explore further.	=
Sequence and Repetition Application	The product uses a combination of domain specific and explicit sequence and repetition instruction. Higher-order Bloom's Taxonomy skills are used to determine how to best apply this principle to improve product design.	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more focus on enhancing the sequence and repetition of instructional content is needed to improve principle application.	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy. Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to improve the product.	=
Instructional Delivery	Sequencing and repetition of instructional content on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to validate this principle with learners. Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services.	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product design & development.	=
Instructional Validation	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development. Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=

Memory and Learning



OF KNOWLEDGE

DESCRIPTION

"Memory is the means by which we draw on our past experiences in order to use this information in the present." (Sternberg, 1999). "Human memory is the continuously active system that receives, modifies, stores, retrieves, and acts upon information." (Klatzkty, 1980). The Memory and Learning LDP uses research from Anderson; Baddeley; Bruning, Schraw, Norby, & Ronning and others to show why understanding how learners encode, retrieve, store, modify, and make use of information is important when discussing the design and development of learning environments.

The LDP presents research on memory to provide insights on the following:

- · Limits on memory
- Memory capacity
- What causes information to be lost from memory
- $\bullet \;\;$ What happens when information is lost from memory

Recommendations include:

- Leveraging instructional design strategies for memory
- · Applying the principles of metacognition and self-regulated learning
- Designing learning activities and environments to:
 - ° Help students organize new information into meaningful chunks
 - $^{\circ}\,$ Make information processing easier by distributing it within working memory
 - Have students connect procedural knowledge to real-life contextualized situations by practicing and integrating new skills into complex problems
 - ° Distribute practice and retrieval

CAPABILITIES

- Cognitive Tools: Flash card and concept map creation
- · Assessment: Selected response
- · Assessment: Short answer, constructed response

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Design for encoding, retrieval, storing, and modifying learned material
- Simple Technology: Foundation for metacognition, authentic learning, self-regulated learning
- Content Support: Visuals, prior knowledge activation, analogies

- Achievement
- Behavior
- Self-regulation

Memory and Learning

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/Model	The product strategy is aligned to memory and retention as a core principle of a learner-centered product.	The product team is exploring memory/retention as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The product team considers memory and/or retention to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The memory LDP does NOT align to the product strategy and is not necessary to explore further.	_
	The product strategy currently integrates the use of educational technology tools as a means to maximize memory and retention.	The product strategy is exploring integrating an evidence-based model of memory/retention.	The product strategy considers memory and/or retention at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model.		
Memory Application	The product uses a computational cognitive model of memory to facilitate long-term retention.	area of the product and more focus on enhancing memory is needed to	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and	=
	A form of distributed practice is used to maximize retention.	improve principle application.	Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.	is NOT needed to improve the product.	
Delivery	Memory/retention on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to validate this principle with learners.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services.	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product design & development.	
		Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.			=
Learner Characteristics	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development.	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.		

Copyright © 2016 Pearson Education Inc. Made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode

Creative Thinking

THE NATURE

OF KNOWLEDGE

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitudes
- · Behavior

DESCRIPTION

Creative thinking can be defined as a metacognitive process of thinking about and generating novel or useful associations or ideas with the purpose of producing a plan, generating a solution, or identifying a model, pattern, process, structure, or product not clearly present before. Creative thinking is also known in the literature as divergent thinking (Hargrove, 2013).

Creative thinking must be supported by critical thinking in order for learners to increase the ability to refine creative ideas and hone solutions by using judgments to make decisions, solve problems, and take action, as appropriate (American Management Association, 2012).

CAPABILITIES

- Assessment: Open-ended assignments (file upload)
- · Assessment: Project
- · Assessment: Work sample/e-portfolio

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Student generated videos detailing business strategy pitches
- · Simple Technology: Concept mapping a story
- · Content Support: Problem-based instruction with student generated solution

Creative Thinking



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong support of novelty in the ideation and problem-solving process	Some support of novelty in the ideation and problem-solving process	Poor support of novelty in the ideation and problem-solving process	according to	
	Strong support of utility in the ideation and problem-solving process	Some support of utility in the ideation and problem-solving process	Poor support of utility in the ideation and problem-solving process	definition	=
	Strong emphasis on metacognitive strategies to support creative thinking	Some emphasis on metacognitive strategies to support creative thinking	Poor emphasis on metacognitive strategies to support creative thinking		
Core Process	Strong support of idea generation through brainstorming, problems, con- straints, or exploration	Some support of idea generation through brainstorming, problems, constraints, or exploration	Poor support of idea generation through brainstorming, problems, constraints, or exploration	Does NOT apply the process	
	Strong support of self-regulated learning (SRL) planning, monitoring, and evaluat- ing to reflect upon and improve ideas	Some support of SRL planning, monitor- ing, and evaluating to reflect upon and improve ideas	Poor support of SRL planning, moni- toring, and evaluating to reflect upon and improve ideas	effectively	=
	Strong support of attitudes that are flexible, motivated, and confident	Some support of attitudes that are flexi- ble, motivated, and confident	Poor support of attitudes that are flexible, motivated, and confident		
	Strong communication of goals to produce context-relevant and applicable concepts	Some communication of goals to produce context-relevant and applicable concepts	Poor communication of goals to produce context-relevant and applicable concepts		
Design	Strong support of metacognition through the design of activities	Some support of metacognition through the design of activities	Poor support of metacognition through the design of activities	Does NOT use design effectively	
	Strong support of creative thinking at both the individual and group levels	Some support of creative thinking at both the individual and group levels	Poor support of creative thinking at both the individual and group levels		=
	Strong application of relevant strategies from the literature	Some application of relevant strategies from the literature	Poor application of relevant strategies from the literature		
Assessment	Strong use of creative thinking rubrics and assessment that is tightly tied to	Some use of creative thinking assessment that is tightly tied to the context	Poor use of creative thinking assessment that is tightly tied to the context	ied to the context NOT use	
	the context Strong application of metacognition/ self-regulation in the assessment process	Some application of metacognition/ self-regulation in the assessment process	Poor application of metacognition/ self-regulation in the assessment process	effectively or is not a related activity	=
	Strong consideration of individual differences	Some consideration of individual differences	Poor consideration of individual differences		

Competency-Based Learning

THE NATURE

OF KNOWLEDGE

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Achievement
- Motivation

DESCRIPTION

Competency-based education (CBE) is an education model that "focuses on the demonstration and application of learning, rather than on the time spent taking courses" or generally any approach that "substitutes the [direct] assessment of student learning for time-based measures" ("Experimental Sites," 2014, p. 5). When developed and implemented correctly, CBE can be a reliable, valid indicator of learning and proficiency in regard to designated competencies. Furthermore, it can provide a more learner-centered, personalized, and efficient way of learning and demonstrating proficiency. This principle defines and describes models of CBE and provides research-based recommendations in the way of best practices in CBE curriculum design and implementation. Recommendations include adhering to principles of backward design, engaging in curriculum mapping, and the rigorous development, administration, and ongoing validation of direct assessment of learner competencies via formative and summative knowledge- and performance-based assessment ("Experimental Sites," 2014; McClarty & Gaertner, 2015).

CAPABILITIES

- Assessment: Project
- · Assessment: Work sample/e-portfolio
- · Management: Prerequisites

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Robust Technology: Adaptive instruction and assessment capabilities
- Simple Technology: Synchronous or asynchronous collaboration features/capabilities
- $\bullet \ \ \ \ \text{Content Support: Development and administration of performance-based assessment}$

Competency-Based Learning



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	The product strategy is aligned to competen- cy-based learning as a core principle of a learner-cen- tered product.	The product team is exploring competency-based learning as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The product team considers competen- cy-based learning to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The competency-based learning LDP does NOT align to the product strategy and is not necessary to explore further.	
		The product strategy is exploring integrating an evidence-based model of competency-based learning.	The product strategy considers competen- cy-based learning at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model.		=
Competency- based	The product uses empirically-based recommendations	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to improve the product.	
Learning Application	concerning competen- cy-based learning.	learner feedback is needed to improve principle application.	Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.		=
Competency- based Learning Delivery	The impact on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gath- ered/reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to validate this principle with learners.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services.	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product design & development.	=
		Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.			
Learner Characteristics	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development.	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product design & devel- opment.	
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.		=
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of competency-based learning LDP recommendations for creating assessments.	Product team is currently exploring how recommendations for designing assessments for competency-based learning could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development.	Formative/summative applications will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing competency-based learning assessments.		=

Data Visualization



DESCRIPTION

Exploratory data visualizations can be used to identify curves, lines, trends, and outliers, to reveal new information about the data. Explanatory data visualizations can be used to present information visually from data that could not be seen otherwise. If used properly, explanatory data visualizations can reduce and/or manage cognitive load by offloading information into the visual/pictorial channel. The data visualization principle includes Ware's Attributes of Preattentive Processing, the Gestalt Principles of Visual Perception, a list of common visual properties used to encode data, a graph selection matrix, and best practices/examples of common visualizations.

CAPABILITIES

- · Management: Discussion analytics
- · Management: Learning analytics
- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Robust Technology: Dashboard performance visualization/notification
- · Simple Technology: Dynamic data visualizations with student input
- Content Support: Instruction/practice of designing instructional data

- Attitudes
- · Behavior
- · Self-regulation

Data Visualization

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong basis in qualitative or quantitative data	Some basis in qualitative or quanti- tative data	Poor basis in qualitative or quanti- tative data	Does NOT qualify according to definition	
	Strong representation of associated data	Some representation of associated data	Poor representation of associated data		=
	Strong readability that communicates data to users	Some readability that communicates data to users	Poor readability that communicates data to users		
Development	Strong use of iterative revisions to improve visualization	Some use of iterative revisions to improve visualization	Poor use of iterative revisions to improve visualization	Does NOT apply the development process effectively	
	Strong use of research questions to drive data collection	Some use of research questions to drive data collection	Poor use of research questions to drive data collection		=
		Some consideration of the costs and benefits of using different formats and styles	Poor consideration of the costs and benefits of using different formats and styles		
Design	Strong use of simplification to reduce distraction and improve clarity	Some use of simplification to reduce distraction and improve clarity	Poor use of simplification to reduce distraction and improve clarity	Does NOT use design effectively	
	Strong use of emphasis to direct attention to the most important information	Some use of emphasis to direct attention to the most important information	Poor use of emphasis to direct attention to the most important information		=
	Strong application of the taxonomy of visual effectiveness	Some application of the taxonomy of visual effectiveness	Poor application of the taxonomy of visual effectiveness		
Type Selection	Strong consideration of the costs and benefits of using different formats and styles	Some consideration of the costs and benefits of using different formats and styles	Poor consideration of the costs and benefits of using different formats and styles	Does NOT make appropriate considerations	
	Strong consideration of many potential visualization types, as well as multiple types together, to convey message	Some consideration of many potential visualization types, as well as multiple types together, to convey message	Poor consideration of many potential visualization types, as well as multiple types together, to convey message		=

Copyright © 2016 Pearson Education Inc. Made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode

Online Information Literacy



OF KNOWLEDGE

DESCRIPTION

Information literacy (IL) is the ability to recognize when information is needed and having the ability to locate, evaluate, and effectively use the needed information. "The availability of information is extensive and offered through a variety of sources including libraries, media, and, increasingly, the Internet." Hence, online information literacy concerns information literacy in regard to Internet sources (Williams, 2010). The OIL principle uses research from Williams; ACRL, Taylor, & Dalal; and others to address the importance of online literacy.

Online literacy:

- Forms the basis for lifelong learning
- Is common to all disciplines, all learning environments, and all levels of education
- Enables learners to master content
- · Sharpens critical thinking
- Aids in learners becoming more self directed and assuming greater control over their own learning
- Provides the necessary tools for learners to discern information found through various sources of Internet information.

Recommendations include:

- Creating learner outcomes that address online literacy across disciplines
- Creating objectives that address online literacy across courses
- Include online literacy opportunities in assignments and assessments
- Include guideline rubrics to help instruct students on the importance of sources

CAPABILITIES

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Cognitive Tools: Bibliography/citation creation
- · Cognitive Tools: Asynchronous social learning: document based
- Cognitive Tools: Asynchronous social learning: text based

• Robust Technology: Incorporate information literacy standards with accreditation standards

- Simple Technology: Comparison rubrics within implementation strategies
- · Content Support: Incorporate online literacy into assessments/assignments

- Attitudes
- Behavior
- Self-regulation

Online Information Literacy

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong support of student capacity to locate, evaluate, and effectively use the needed information	Some support of student capacity to locate, evaluate, and effectively use the needed information	Poor support of student capacity to locate, evaluate, and effectively use the needed information	Does NOT apply or use effectively	=
Source Evaluation	Strong evaluation of course materi- als for currency, relevance, authority, accuracy, and purpose	Some evaluation of course materials for currency, relevance, authority, accuracy, and purpose	Poor evaluation of course materials for currency, relevance, authority, accuracy, and purpose	Does NOT apply or use effectively	
	Strong usage of CRAAP (currency, relevance, authority, accuracy, purpose) test to inform students on the importance of source evaluation, where appropriate	Some usage of CRAAP test to inform students on the importance of source evaluation, where appropriate	Poor usage of CRAAP test to inform students on the importance of source evaluation, where appro- priate		=
Design	Strong consideration of training options, such as a dedicated course vs. one-time training, vs. integration with existing course and teacher, vs. librarian instruction	Some consideration of training options, such as a dedicated course vs. one-time training, vs. integration with existing course and teacher, vs. librarian instruction	Poor consideration of training options, such as a dedicated course vs. one-time training, vs. integration with existing course and teacher, vs. librarian instruction	Does NOT apply or use effectively	=
	Strong application of multiple potential methods to instruct online literacy, as appropriate to context	Some application of multiple potential methods to instruct online literacy, as appropriate to context	Poor application of multiple po- tential methods to instruct online literacy, as appropriate to context		
Wikipedia	Strong use of objective criteria, such as CRAAP, when determining the quality of information	Some use of objective criteria, such as CRAAP, when determining the quality of information	Poor use of objective criteria, such as CRAAP, when determining the quality of information	Does NOT apply or use effectively	_
	Strong active participation in the wiki creation process to support literacy	Some active participation in the wiki creation process to support literacy	Poor active participation in the wiki creation process to support literacy		=

Copyright © 2016 Pearson Education Inc. Made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode

Learning Transfer



DESCRIPTION

Transfer refers to how past learning influences current and future learning, and how past or current learning is applied or adapted to similar or novel situations (Haskell, 2001). Transfer is the ultimate aim of education, as ensuring that the facts and skills learners learn are going to be usable in a variety of situations is the point of learning (Mckeough, Lupart, & Marini, 1995). Covering a spectrum of different forms of learning transfer, this LDP explores different learning strategies to increase transfer, how, when, and where transfer takes place, conditions and mechanisms for transfer, and assessment of transfer. Some examples of ways to maximize transfer include making it explicit to learners, modeling transfer to learners, and providing a broad variety of contexts to learners to learn and apply their understanding.

CAPABILITIES

- · Instruction: Active learning experience
- · Assessment: Software simulation
- Assessment: Project

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Robust Technology: Cross course linkage to identify transfer
- Simple Technology: Assessment engine providing variety in application
- Content Support: Contextually diverse example sets

- Behavior
- Achievement

Learning Transfer



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	The product strategy is aligned to learning transfer as a core principle of a learner-centered product.	The product team is exploring learning transfer as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The product team considers learning transfer to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The learning transfer LDP does NOT align to the product strategy and is not necessary to explore further.	=
		The product strategy is exploring in- tegrating an evidence-based learning transfer model.	The product strategy considers earning transfer at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model.		
Learning Transfer Application	The product uses empirically-based recommendations concerning learning transfer feedback.	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more focus on learning transfer is needed to	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is	=
		improve principle application.	Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.	NOT needed to improve the product.	
Learning Transfer Delivery	Learning transfer on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to validate this principle with learners.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services.	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product design & development.	=
•		Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.			
Learner Characteristics	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development.	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.		
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of learning transfer LDP recommendations for creating assessments.	Product team is currently exploring how recommendations for designing assessments for learning transfer could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development.	Formative/summative applications will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing learning transfer assessments.		

Cognitive Load and Multimedia 2 (Intrinsic)



DESCRIPTION

Cognitive load theory relates to the capacity of working memory and its effect on long-term memory schema acquisition. Cognitive load is divided into three categories: intrinsic load, extraneous load, and germane load. Intrinsic cognitive load stresses the capacity of learners' working memory. Since this type of cognitive load is dependent on the content to be learned, it cannot be reduced without reducing learning. It can, however, be managed. The following multimedia instructional methods outlined in *Digital design to manage intrinsic cognitive load* are both tested and actionable (Mayer, 2009).

- 1. Segmenting
- 2. Pre-training
- 3. Modality

The cognitive theory of multimedia learning has three underlying assumptions: the dual channel assumption (Clark & Paivio, 1991; Paivio, 1986, 2006; Baddeley, 1992, 1999); the limited capacity assumption (Baddeley, 1992, 1999; Sweller, 1994, 2005; Chandler & Sweller, 1991); and the active-processing assumption (Chambliss & Calfee, 1998; Cook & Mayer, 1980).

CAPABILITIES

- · Assessment: Software simulation
- Instruction: Player + item
- Instruction: Multimedia active reading

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Software simulation
- · Simple Technology: Standalone instructional multimedia with assessment items
- · Content Support: Instruction/practice of designing multimedia

LEARNER IMPACTS

- · Self-regulation
- Achievement

Cognitive Load and Multimedia 2 (Intrinsic)

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong application of multimedia methods to manage or reduce stress on the working memory capacity of learners	Some application of multimedia methods to manage or reduce stress on the working memory capacity of learners	Poor application of multimedia methods to manage or reduce stress on the working memory capacity of learners	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
	Strong use of objective multimedia instructional methods	Some use of objective multimedia instructional methods	Poor use of objective multimedia instructional methods		
Segmenting	Strong presentation of multimedia in appropriately sized chunks	Some presentation of multimedia in appropriately sized chunks	Poor presentation of multimedia in appropriately sized chunks	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	_
	Strong presentation of multimedia in user-paced segments	Some presentation of multimedia in user-paced segments	Poor presentation of multimedia in user-paced segments		=
Pre-training	Strong pre-training on the names of main concepts	Some pre-training on the names of main concepts	Poor pre-training on the names of main concepts	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	_
	Strong pre-training on the characteristics of main concepts	Some pre-training on the characteristics of main concepts	Poor pre-training on the characteristics of main concepts		
Modality	Strong presentation of audiovisuals together, rather than text with visuals	Some presentation of audiovisuals together, rather than text with visuals	Poor presentation of audiovisuals together, rather than text with visuals	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong presentation of narrated animations, rather than text with animations	Some presentation of narrated animations, rather than text with animations	Poor presentation of narrated animations, rather than text with animations		=
	Strong presentation of audiovisuals that capitalize on multiple sensory channels, rather than overloading any one channel	Some presentation of audiovisuals that capitalize on multiple sensory channels, rather than overloading any one channel	Poor presentation of audiovisuals that capitalize on multiple sensory channels, rather than overloading any one channel		

Cognitive Load and Multimedia 1 (Extraneous)



EFFECTIVE LEARNING

DESCRIPTION

Cognitive load theory relates to the capacity of working memory and its effect on long-term memory schema acquisition. Cognitive load is divided into three categories: intrinsic load, extraneous load, and germane load. Extraneous cognitive load stresses the capacity of learners' working memory. Since this type of cognitive load is caused by poor instructional design, it can be reduced with multimedia instructional methods. The following multimedia instructional methods outlined in *Digital design to reduce extraneous cognitive load* are both tested and actionable (Mayer, 2009).

- 1. Coherence
- 2. Signaling
- 3. Redundancy
- 4. Spatial contiguity
- 5. Temporal contiguity

The cognitive theory of multimedia learning has three underlying assumptions: the dual channel assumption (Clark & Paivio, 1991; Paivio, 1986, 2006; Baddeley, 1992, 1999); the limited capacity assumption (Baddeley, 1992, 1999; Sweller, 1994, 2005; Chandler & Sweller, 1991); and the active-processing assumption (Chambliss & Calfee, 1998; Cook & Mayer, 1980).

CAPABILITIES

- · Assessment: Software simulation
- · Instruction: Player + item
- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Software simulation
- Simple Technology: Standalone instructional multimedia with assessment items
- Content Support: Instruction/practice of designing multimedia

LEARNER IMPACTS

- · Self-regulation
- Achievement

Cognitive Load and Multimedia 1 (Extraneous)

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Coherence	Strong application of coherence in multimedia design	Some application of coherence in multimedia design	Poor application of coherence in multimedia design	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of only relevant audiovisuals	Some use of only relevant audiovisuals	Poor use of only relevant audiovisuals		=
	Strong use of concise text	Some use of concise text	Poor use of concise text		
Signaling	Strong application of signaling in multimedia design	Some application of signaling in multimedia design	Poor application of signaling in multimedia design	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of cues to highlight the organization of material	Some use of cues to highlight the organization of material	Poor use of cues to highlight the organization of material		=
	Strong use of cues to prioritize the most important material	Some use of cues to prioritize the most important material	Poor use of cues to prioritize the most important material		
Redundancy	Strong application of redundancy in multimedia design	Some application of redundancy in multimedia design	Poor application of redundancy in multimedia design	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of video that contains visuals with narration only OR text with visuals only	Some use of video that contains visuals with narration only OR text with visuals only	Poor use of video that contains visuals with narration only OR text with visuals only		=
Contiguity	Strong application of contiguity in multimedia design	Some application of contiguity in multimedia design	Poor application of contiguity in multimedia design	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong presentation of adjacent graphics and text	Some presentation of adjacent graphics and text	Poor presentation of adjacent graphics and text		=
	Strong presentation of corresponding audiovisuals in a synchronized format	Some presentation of corresponding audiovisuals in a synchronized format	Poor presentation of corresponding audiovisuals in a synchronized format		

Universal Design for Learning



THAT FOSTER EFFECTIVE LEARNING

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Behavior
- · Self-regulation

DESCRIPTION

Universal Design for Learning (UDL) is a set of guidelines for developing need meeting goals, methods, materials, and assessments in learning, customizing and adjusting to individual learner needs, reducing barriers to learning, and optimizing levels of challenge and support for all learners. UDL is an important set of guidelines to consider as it enables the development of learning environments that create a level playing field for all learners. Covering a broad swathe of different topic areas within content representation, system/learner actions and expressions, and engagement, different aspects focus on identifying the best design recommendations to optimize the learning environment in said categories.

CAPABILITIES

- · Assessment: Work sample/e-portfolio
- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Cognitive Tools: Asynchronous social learning: text based

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Robust Technology: Learner customizable learning environment
- Simple Technology: Visual adjustments to help learner view material optimally
- Content Support: Various alternatives for visual and auditory content

Universal Design for Learning

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong application of research-based practices to support learning outcomes	Some application of research-based practices to support learning outcomes	Poor application of research-based practices to support learning outcomes	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong application of design principles across recognition, strategic, and affective networks	Some application of design princi- ples across recognition, strategic, and affective networks	Poor application of design principles across recognition, strategic, and affective networks		=
Recognition	Strong provision of multiple options for perception	Some provision of multiple options for perception	Poor provision of multiple options for perception	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong provision of multiple options for languages and symbols	Some provision of multiple options for languages and symbols	Poor provision of multiple options for languages and symbols		=
	Strong provision of multiple options for comprehension	Some provision of multiple options for comprehension	Poor provision of multiple options for comprehension		
Strategic	Strong provision of multiple options for physical action	Some provision of multiple options for physical action	Poor provision of multiple options for physical action	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong provision of multiple options for expression and communication	Some provision of multiple options for expression and communication	Poor provision of multiple options for expression and communication		=
	Strong provision of multiple options for executive functions	Some provision of multiple options for executive functions	Poor provision of multiple options for executive functions		
Affective	Strong provision of multiple options for recruiting interest	Some provision of multiple options for recruiting interest	Poor provision of multiple options for recruiting interest	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong provision of multiple options for sustaining effort and persistence	Some provision of multiple options for sustaining effort and per- sistence	Poor provision of multiple options for sustaining effort and per- sistence		=
	Strong provision of multiple options for self-regulation	Some provision of multiple options for self-regulation	Poor provision of multiple options for self-regulation		

Readability



EFFECTIVE LEARNING

DESCRIPTION

Readability involves much more than a grade level. When designed and implemented correctly, readability can increase learners' comprehension, increase learners' level of engagement, and decrease learners' extraneous cognitive load. When we think of readability from a Learning Design perspective, it's helpful to break it down into four basic elements: content, style, structure, and design. A lot of these topics cross over from learning design into the areas of UX, visual design, and product development. (Clark & Mayer, 2011)

Readability can be improved by:

- · Including navigation tools that inform the learner of their location
- Using clear and concise headings
- · Removing extraneous content, images, links

CAPABILITIES

- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Assessment: Selected response
- Instruction: Item level hints

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Navigation, search tools
- Simple Technology: Hyperlinks that support objectives
- Content Support: Inclusion of clear headings

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Behavior
- Motivation
- · Self-regulation

Readability

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong application of readability across vital areas, such as learning design, visual design, and user experience design	Some application of readability across vital areas, such as learning design, visual design, and user experience design	Poor application of readability across vital areas, such as learning design, visual design, and user experience design	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related	_
	Strong evidence that readability design increases comprehension and engagement, while decreasing cognitive load	Some evidence that readability design increases comprehension and engagement, while decreasing cognitive load	Poor evidence that readability design increases comprehension and engagement, while decreasing cognitive load	activity	=
Model	Strong content consideration, including propositions, organization, coherence	Some content consideration, including propositions, organization, coherence	Poor content consideration, including propositions, organization, coherence	Does NOT use effectively or	
	Strong style consideration, including semantic elements, syntactic elements	Some style consideration, including semantic elements, syntactic elements	Poor style consideration, including semantic elements, syntactic elements	is not a related activity	_
	Strong design consideration, including typography, format, illustrations	Some design consideration, including typography, format, illustrations	Poor design consideration, including typography, format, illustrations		
	Strong structure consideration, including chapters, headings, navigation	Some structure consideration, including chapters, headings, navigation	Poor structure consideration, including chapters, headings, navigation		
Design	Strong application of coherence to align objectives and exclude extraneous content	Some application of coherence to align objectives and exclude extraneous content	Poor application of coherence to align objectives and exclude extraneous content	Does NOT use effectively or	
	Strong application of redundancy to present graphics with narration or text, but not both	Some application of redundancy to present graphics with narration or text, but not both	Poor application of redundancy to present graphics with narration or text, but not both	is not a related activity	
	Strong application of personalization by presenting in a conversational style	Some application of personalization by presenting in a conversational style	Poor application of personalization by presenting in a conversational style		=
	Strong application of contiguity by synchronizing verbal and non-verbal information	Some application of contiguity by synchro- nizing verbal and non-verbal information	Poor application of contiguity by synchro- nizing verbal and non-verbal information		
Online Strategies	Strong use of navigation and search tools to improve online usability	Some use of navigation and search tools to improve online usability	Poor use of navigation and search tools to improve online usability	Does NOT use	
	Strong use of concise, descriptive headings to identify sections and priorities	Some use of concise, descriptive headings to identify sections and priorities	Poor use of concise, descriptive headings to identify sections and priorities	effectively or is not a	
	Strong use of interactives and graphics that support objectives and minimize negative impact on comprehension	Some use of interactives and graphics that support objectives and minimize negative impact on comprehension	Poor use of interactives and graphics that support objectives and minimize negative impact on comprehension	related activity	=
	Strong segmentation of content into small chunks	Some segmentation of content into small chunks	Poor segmentation of content into small chunks		

Goal Setting in Student Progress



EFFECTIVE LEARNING

DESCRIPTION

Goal setting has been shown to have a strong impact on successful performance in learning environments. Through creating challenging goals for learners and allowing learners to incorporate their own goals into the learning process, learner motivation may be greatly increased, which can positively influence learner achievement (Locke & Latham, 2002). By using an achievement approach-based goal where learners attempt to better themselves, rather than to not do worse than they or others did previously, task engagement can be more efficient and effective (Elliot, Shell, Henry, & Maier, 2005).

CAPABILITIES

- · Management: Badging
- · Management: Learning analytics
- · Cognitive Tools: Visualized task completion

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Robust Technology: Individualized goal setting system
- · Simple Technology: Notification for supporting goal achievement
- · Content Support: Media elements enable multiple ways to meet goals

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitudes
- Behavior
- · Self-regulation

Goal Setting in Student Progress

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Goals strongly support the achievement of specific objectives Goals are set for short-term and long-term objectives	Goals and objectives are somewhat unclear Goals are set for short-term or long-term objectives	Goals and objectives are poorly linked Goals are poorly utilized based on timing	Does NOT apply goals well to achieve objectives	=
Model	Capability structure provides strong support for achievement and approach oriented goals Strong support for setting specific, challenging, attainable goals with deadlines	Capability structure provides some support for achievement and approach oriented goals Some support for setting specific, challeng- ing, attainable goals with deadlines	Capability structure provides poor support for achievement and approach oriented goals Poor support for setting specific, chal- lenging, attainable goals with deadlines	Does NOT leverage the benefits of the utilized platform	=
Design	Strong alignment between theoretical approach and instructional design Strong use of training to support goal and planning activities Strong alignment between personal and collective goals with appropriate team sizes Strong use of automated notifications for reminders, deadlines, activities, and other just-in-time purposes	Some alignment between theoretical approach and instructional design Some use of training to support goal and planning activities Some alignment between personal and collective goals with appropriate team sizes Some use of automated notifications for reminders, deadlines, activities, and other just-in-time purposes	Poor alignment between theoretical approach and instructional design Poor use of training to support goal and planning activities Poor alignment between personal and collective goals with appropriate team sizes Poor use of automated notifications for reminders, deadlines, activities, and other just-in-time purposes	Does NOT use design effectively	=
Assessment	Strong use of feedback to support a self-improvement orientation Strong alignment between learning objectives and assessment techniques Strong use of constructive feedback to guide and support effective learning strategies	Some use of feedback to support a self-improvement orientation Some alignment between learning objectives and assessment techniques Some use of constructive feedback to guide and support effective learning strategies	Poor use of feedback to support a self-improvement orientation Poor alignment between learning objectives and assessment techniques Poor use of constructive feedback to guide and support effective learning strategies	Does NOT assess effec- tively or not an assess- ment-based activity	=

Worked Examples



PRACTICES THAT FOSTER EFFECTIVE LEARNING

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Behavior
- Motivation
- Self-regulation

DESCRIPTION

Worked examples provide novice learners with an expert's solution to a problem. Typically, the solution is presented as a step-by-step problem-solving process that can be applied to similar future problems. Worked examples consist of a problem formulation, solution steps, and the final solution itself. The Worked Examples LDP presents research by Atkinson, Ward, & Sweller, and others, to demonstrate why worked examples are important and design principles should be used when creating worked examples.

Cognitive load theory (CLT) suggests that all people have a limited capacity for processing real-time information. Thus, instructional design should focus learners' attention and avoid overburdening learners with unnecessary information. Worked examples is an instructional method that reduces cognitive load, and makes complex problem-solving activities more accessible to novice learners. Worked examples are especially suited to complex problem-solving activities that can be broken down into steps to achieve a series of goals or subgoals.

CAPABILITIES

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

Recommendations include:

- Optimize intra-example features, inter-example features, and individual differences to enhance the effectiveness of worked examples.
- Minimize any split attention effects and reduce cognitive load by integrating modalities into a unified experience and presenting material in simple and intuitive ways.
- Use variability effectively by providing a limited range of different types of examples and problems.
- Consider the audience carefully, since novices benefit greatly from worked examples, whereas experienced/expert learners may not need them at all.

- · Assessment: Worked examples
- · Instruction: Scaffolded worked examples
- · Cognitive Tools: Asynchronous social learning: item based
- · Robust Technology: Formation of declarative knowledge structures
- · Simple Technology: Formation of early schema
- · Content Support: Complex problem-solving activities

Worked Examples

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Strong choice of context that requires complex problem-solving to justify the use of worked examples	Some choice of context that requires complex problem-solving to justify the use of worked examples	Poor choice of context that requires complex problem-solving to justify the use of worked examples	Does NOT qual- ify as a worked example	
Strong presentation of expert knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process	Some presentation of expert knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process	Poor presentation of expert knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process		
Strong integration of information to reduce split attention	Some integration of information to reduce split attention	Poor integration of information to reduce split attention	address design	
Strong focus that avoids overwhelming learners with too many sources of information	Some focus that avoids overwhelming learners with too many sources of information	Poor focus that avoids overwhelming learners with too many sources of information	from a cognitive load theory perspective	=
Strong coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load	Some coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load	Poor coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load	Does NOT use design effec- tively	
Strong breakdown of steps or goals to meaningfully represent salient chunks in the worked process	Some breakdown of steps or goals to meaningfully represent salient chunks in the worked process	Poor breakdown of steps or goals to meaningfully represent salient chunks in the worked process		=
Strong emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes	Some emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes	Poor emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes		
Strong consideration of prior knowledge to appropriately match activities to abilities	Some consideration of prior knowledge to appropriately match activities to abilities	Poor consideration of prior knowledge to appropriately match activities to abilities	Does NOT assess effec- tively or not	_
Strong consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities to abilities	Some consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities to abilities	Poor consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities to abilities	an assess- ment-based activity	
	Strong choice of context that requires complex problem-solving to justify the use of worked examples Strong presentation of expert knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process Strong integration of information to reduce split attention Strong focus that avoids overwhelming learners with too many sources of information Strong coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Strong breakdown of steps or goals to meaningfully represent salient chunks in the worked process Strong emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes Strong consideration of prior knowledge to appropriately match activities to abilities Strong consideration of individual differences to appropriately match	Strong choice of context that requires complex problem-solving to justify the use of worked examples Some choice of context that requires complex problem-solving to justify the use of worked examples Some presentation of expert knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process Some presentation of expert knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process Some integration of information to reduce split attention Strong focus that avoids overwhelming learners with too many sources of information Strong coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Strong breakdown of steps or goals to meaningfully represent salient chunks in the worked process Strong emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes Some emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes Some coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Some breakdown of steps or goals to meaningfully represent salient chunks in the worked process Some emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes Some consideration of prior knowledge to appropriately match activities to abilities Some consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities	Strong choice of context that requires complex problem-solving to justify the use of worked examples Some choice of context that requires complex problem-solving to justify the use of worked examples Some presentation of expert knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process Some presentation of expert knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process Some integration of information to reduce split attention Strong focus that avoids overwhelming learners with too many sources of information Strong coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Some breakdown of steps or goals to meaningfully represent salient chunks in the worked process Strong emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes Strong consideration of prior knowledge to apprropriately match activities of worked examples Some coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Some breakdown of steps or goals to meaningfully represent salient chunks in the worked process Strong emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes Strong consideration of prior knowledge to appropriately match activities to abilities Strong consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities Some consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities Some consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities Some consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities Some consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities Some consideration of individual differences to appropriately match activities	Strong coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Strong preparation of steps or goals to meaningfully represents alient chunks in the worked process Strong preparation of fine graphs or identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving bronzess Strong process Strong process Strong fine gration of information to reduce split attention Strong focus that avoids overwhelming learners with too many sources of information Strong coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Strong presentation of prior knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process Strong groupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Strong process Strong coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Strong process Strong consideration of prior knowledge through as tep-by-step problem-solving process Strong process Strong consideration of information to reduce split attention Some choice of context that requires complex problem-solving to justify the use of worked examples Poor presentation of expert knowledge through a step-by-step problem-solving process Some integration of information to reduce split attention Some focus that avoids overwhelming learners with too many sources of information Poor focus that avoids overwhelming learners with too many sources of information Poor coupling of modalities (text, audio, visual, etc.) into a unified experience to reduce cognitive load Strong processes Some emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes Some emphasis on identifying and applying the structure of successful problem-solving processes Some consideration of prior knowledge to appropriately match activities to abilities Strong consideration of individual d

Mastery Learning



EFFECTIVE LEARNING

DESCRIPTION

Mastery refers to the ability of a learner to demonstrate understanding in a domain as well as the process of incorporating corrective scaffolds such as feedback into the learning environment to help bring about that understanding in learners. By taking a mastery approach to learning, gauging and reporting of learner understanding can be done more regularly and to greater effect, as it can effectively be used as a way to improve cognitive and achievement outcomes, student self-efficacy, attendance, engagement, and participation with learners within adaptive learning systems (Guskey, 2007). Through alignment with specific learning objectives with assessment, instruction, and prescription (Gentile & Lalley, 2003), mastery may be utilized in a broad range of subjects to influence learner models to provide individualized learning environments (Baker & Siemens, 2014).

CAPABILITIES

- Adaptivity: Mastery + confidence based adaptivity
- · Adaptivity: Adaptive study plan
- Management: Prerequisites

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Mastery based adaptive learning algorithms
- Simple Technology: Spaced practice to prevent forgetting mastered concepts
- Content Support: Large content libraries of variety of material

LEARNER IMPACTS

Achievement

Mastery Learning

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/Model	The product strategy is aligned to mastery learning as a core princi- ple of a learner-centered product.	The product team is exploring mastery learning as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The product team considers mastery learning to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The mastery learning LDP does NOT align to the product strategy	_
		The product strategy is exploring integrating an evidence-based model of mastery learning.	The product strategy considers mastery learning at a high level but does not cur- rently align to an evidence-based model.	and is not necessary to explore further.	=
Mastery Learning Application	The product uses empirical- ly-based recommendations concerning mastery learning.	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more learner feedback is needed to improve princi-	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the	=
		ple application.	Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.	product and is NOT needed to improve the product.	
Mastery Learning Delivery	The impact on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to vali- date this principle with learners.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services.	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product design & development.	=
		Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.			
Learner Characteristics	Design & development are cur- rently using validation reports to further align the principle and the	using validation reports to how validation results and recom- 's ralign the principle and the ct strategy. how validation results and recom- in mendations could be used in product in design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development.	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	
	product strategy.		Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.		=
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of mastery learning LDP recommendations for creating assessments.	Product team is currently exploring how recommendations for designing assessments for mastery learning could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development.	Formative/summa- tive applications will NOT be used to in- form product design & development.	
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing mastery learning assessments.		=

Problem-Based Learning

PRACTICES THAT FOSTER EFFECTIVE LEARNING

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitudes
- Behavior
- Motivation
- Self-regulation

DESCRIPTION

Problem-based learning is the active approach to learning in which learners collaborate in understanding and solving complex, ill-structured problems (Barrows, 2000; Savery, 2006).

Problem-based learning (PBL) requires learners to share their current knowledge, negotiate among alternative ideas, search for information, and construct principled arguments to support their proposed solutions (Lu, Bridges, & Hmelo-Silver, 2014). PBL addresses a large range of cognitive and affective dimensions, with studies indicating that PBL students are more motivated and engage in deep approaches to learning and problem solving.

- As students engage with ill-structured problems, they develop skills in creativity, reasoning, and self-directed learning
- 2. Compared to traditional forms of instruction, PBL can enhance students' ability to transfer knowledge to new problems and to achieve more coherent understanding

CAPABILITIES

- Assessment: Open-ended assignments (multi-step)
- · Assessment: Project
- Instruction: Active learning experience

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Apply problem-based writing assignments with automated scoring techniques
- Simple Technology: Apply problem-based assignments that require instructor grading (e.g., using MediaShare)
- Content Support: Problem-based assignments aligned to learning objectives

Problem-Based Learning

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/Model	The product strategy is aligned to problem-based learning as a core principle of a learner-centered product.	The product team is exploring prob- lem-based learning as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The product team considers prob- lem-based learning to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-cen- tered product.	The problem-based learning LDP does NOT align to the product strategy and is not	
		The product strategy is exploring integrating an evidence-based model of problem-based learning.	The product strategy considers problem-based learning at a high level but does not currently align to an evi- dence-based model.	necessary to explore further.	=
Problem-based Learning Application	The product uses empirical- ly-based recommendations con- cerning problem-based learning.	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more learner feedback is needed to improve princi-	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to improve the product.	=
		ple application.	Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.		
Project-based Learning Delivery	vice aligned to this principle has al	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to vali- date this principle with learners.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to	=
		Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.	services.	inform product design & development.	
Learner Characteristics	Design & development are cur- rently using validation reports to further align the principle and the	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recom- mendations could be used in product	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development.	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product design &	
	product strategy.	design & development.	Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.	development.	=
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of problem-based learning LDP recommendations for creating assessments.	ve applications make proper use how recommendations for designing of problem-based learning LDP assessments for problem-based learn-	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development.	Formative/summa- tive applications will NOT be used to in- form product design	=
		development.	Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing problem-based learning.	& development.	

Grit

DESCRIPTION

Grit is "perseverance and passion for long-term goals" that occurs in a person at the trait level (i.e. a relatively stable characteristic rather than a temporary mood) (Duckworth & Quinn, 2009, p. 166). Although research on grit itself and its role in educational and/or professional contexts is in the preliminary stages, there is research to suggest that some aspects positively impact learner achievement (Duckworth & Quinn, 2009; Hochanadel & Finamore, 2015). This principle provides an overview of the existing research, as well as additional research that relates to and informs the aspects of grit, and research-based recommendations to inform aspects of course design hypothesized to cultivate the positive aspects of grit within learners. Recommendations include assessing grit via validated assessment methods and/or utilizing motivation research to inform characteristics of product design that bolster intrinsic motivation and growth mindset within learners (Christensen, 2014; Duckworth et al., 2007; Duckworth et al., 2011; Hochandel & Finamore, 2015; Yeager, Paunesku, Walton, & Dweck, 2013).

CAPABILITIES

- SAMPLE DESIGN
- Cognitive Tools: Planning/outlining
- · Cognitive Tools: Visualized task completion
- Instruction: Scaffolded worked example
- · Adaptivity: Adaptive remediation
- Robust Technology: Brief, targeted interventions to bolster growth mindset based on performance or self-reported levels of grit
- Simple Technology: Goal setting and learning strategy prompts/scaffolds
- Content Support: Feedback statements that encourage intrinsic motivation and growth mindset



EFFECTIVE LEARNING

LEARNER

- Attitudes
- Behavior
- · Self-regulation
- Achievement

Grit

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong support of consistent interests over time	Some support of consistent interests over time	Poor support of consistent interests over time	Does NOT use effectively or is not	
	Strong support of perseverance and effort	Some support of perseverance and effort	Poor support of perseverance and effort	a related activity	=
	Strong support of setting long- term goals and plans to pursue them	Some support of setting long-term goals and plans to pursue them	Poor support of setting long-term goals and plans to pursue them		
Model	Strong support of self-approach mindset to foster growth and	Some support of self-approach mind- set to foster growth and persistence	Poor support of self-approach mindset to foster growth and persistence	Does NOT use effectively or is not	
	persistence Strong consideration of task goals, team structure, competition, and other designs that may influence learner mindsets	Some consideration of task goals, team structure, competition, and other designs that may influence learner mindsets	Poor consideration of task goals, team structure, competition, and other designs that may influence learner mindsets	a related activity	=
Design	Strong consideration of develop- mental stage of target audience	Some consideration of developmental stage of target audience	Poor consideration of developmental stage of target audience	Does NOT use effectively or is not a	
	Strong evidence-based application of interventions, reward struc- tures, goal structures, or other related elements	Some evidence-based application of interventions, reward structures, goal structures, or other related elements	Poor evidence-based application of interventions, reward structures, goal structures, or other related elements	related activity	=
Assessment	Strong use of feedback and goal structure to support positive learning mindsets	Some use of feedback and goal structure to support positive learning mindsets	Poor use of feedback and goal structure to support positive learning mindsets	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
	Strong use of a validated scale for measuring grit	Some use of a validated scale for measuring grit (e.g. modified scale)	Poor use of a validated scale for measuring grit (e.g. untested scale)		

Inquiry-Based Learning

"Inquiry-based learning describes an environment in which learning is driven by a process of inquiry owned by the student. Starting with a scenario and with the guidance of a facilitator, students identify their own issues and questions. They then examine the resources they need to research the topic, thereby acquiring the requisite knowledge. Knowledge so gained is more readily retained because it has been acquired by experience and relation to a real problem" (Center for Excellence in Enquiry-Based Learning, 2010). The inquiry-based learning approach includes problem-based learning, project-based learning, and design-based learning. Inquiry-based learning "allows students to progress from simply holding and finding factual information to being able to apply new knowledge in novel and different ways" (Coffman, 2009). Unsurprisingly, research (Hattie, 2008) indicates that inquiry-based learning provides a significant, positive learning impact on process-based outcomes (e.g. tasks involving critical thinking, problem-solving, etc.). In contrast, inquiry-based learning has a much smaller—but still positive—impact on content-based outcomes (e.g. tasks involving memorization and conceptual knowledge). In short, inquiry-based learning is a robust, well-suited approach for process-based outcomes, particularly outcomes related to critical thinking, self-regulated/self-directed learning, problem-solving/problem-based learning. 21st century skills, scaffolding, metacognition, and collaborative learning. Best practices for designing and implementing inquiry-based learning include:



PRACTICES
THAT FOSTER
EFFECTIVE LEARNING

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Behavior
- Achievement
- · Self-regulation

- Make use of concept mapping and brainstorming to assist in exploring big idea questions
- Include scaffolding during inquiry activities
- Based on learning objectives, embed the digital tools necessary for learners to gather, analyze, and interpret data
- Use databases, raw data, primary source documents, images, and films to support inquiry activities
- Include interactive simulations and models that allow for inquiry to take place
- · Use journaling to capture information on learning changes
- Provide a digital repository for the collection of portfolio pieces
- Embed rubrics and checklists prominently within inquiry activities
- Provide feedback continually throughout the process
- · Collect log data from learner interaction with simulations and interactive models

For collaborative inquiry-based learning, additional best practices include:

- · Tools for synchronous communication between learners and experts in the field to get a real-world perspective on an issue or concept
- · Wikis, cloud computing, and other asynchronous and synchronous tools should also be used to support collaboration
- Assessment: Open-ended assignment (multi-step)
- Assessment: Project
- Assessment: Active learning experience

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

CAPABILITIES

- Robust Technology: Adaptive/personalized, content-agnostic software for collaborative inquiry
- · Simple Technology: Asking students to research an open-ended problem
- Content Support: Content focused on supporting the inquiry process

Inquiry-Based Learning

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	The product strategy is aligned to inquiry-based learning as a core principle of a learner-centered product.	re inquiry-based learning as a core LDP	The product team considers inqui- ry-based learning to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-cen- tered product.	The inquiry-based learning LDP does NOT align to the product strategy and is not necessary to explore	
		The product strategy is exploring integrating an evidence-based model of inquiry-based learning.	The product strategy considers inquiry-based learning at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model.	further.	=
Inquiry-based Learning Application	The product uses empirically-based recommendations concerning inquiry-based learning.	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more learner feedback is needed to improve principle application.	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy. Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to improve the product.	=
Inquiry-based Learning Delivery	The impact on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/reported on.	o this principle has been about partnering with LD team to tion about how this principle might need to be validate this principle with learners. be tested with learners using LD's order to infor		This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product	_
,		Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.	validation services.	design & development.	
Learner Characteristics	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development.	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.		
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of inquiry-based learning LDP recommendations for creating assessments.	Product team is currently exploring how recommendations for designing assessments for inquiry-based learning could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development.	Formative/summative applications will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing inquiry-based learning assessments.		

Writing to Learn

PRACTICES

PRACTICES THAT FOSTER EFFECTIVE LEARNING

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Motivation
- Self-regulation
- Achievement

DESCRIPTION

Writing to learn encompasses an instructional method for evoking self-regulated learning, critical thinking, and, depending on the implementation, collaborative learning. Writing to learn essentially involves a well-constructed writing task that prompts learners to execute higher order thinking skills to synthesize multiple factual or conceptual elements of a domain. When learners extend cognitive effort to think critically during a writing to learn task, they externalize ideas and may make new inferences while rereading or revising their response. In addition to well-constructed writing prompts, a writing to learn activity may also include a rubric for self- or peer-evaluation of a written response.

Design recommendations focus on the appropriate tools and task time. For example, if the task involves peer review, then a rubric can ensure a critical review of writing. If the task is collaborative (with multiple authors) then adequate tools for collaboration need to be used, such as a wiki page. Additionally, learners must be given appropriate time to collect thoughts and review/revise responses before submission.

Writing to learn as a learning principle was first discussed by Emig (1997) and Britton et al. (1975). Varieties and examples of writing to learn activities can be found in Comer, Clark, & Canelas (2014).

CAPABILITIES

- Assessment: Essay
- · Cognitive Tools: Asynchronous social learning: document based
- · Cognitive Tools: Planning/outlining

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Collaborative writing space and toolset for peer reviews
- Simple Technology: Short answer or journaling activities
- Content Support: Well-constructed prompts that provide topic(s) to write about as well as critical thinking guidance

Writing to Learn

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong emphasis across all of the plan- ning, translating, and reviewing phases of the writing process	Some emphasis across all of the plan- ning, translating, and reviewing phases of the writing process	Poor emphasis across all of the plan- ning, translating, and reviewing phases of the writing process	Does NOT qualify as a worked example	=
	Strong emphasis on effective communication through written works	Some emphasis on effective communication through written works	Poor emphasis on effective communication through written works		
Model	Strong use of planning to support recall, organized outlining, and commu- nication goals	Some use of planning to support recall, organized outlining, and communication goals	Poor use of planning to support recall, organized outlining, and communication goals	Does NOT address design from a cog- nitive load theory perspective	
	Strong use of translating to apply appropriate grammar, tone, style, etc. to support communication goals	Some use of translating to apply ap- propriate grammar, tone, style, etc. to support communication goals	Poor use of translating to apply appropriate grammar, tone, style, etc. to support communication goals		=
	Strong use of reviewing to detect er- rors, correct errors, and revise written works	Some use of reviewing to detect errors, correct errors, and revise written works	Poor use of reviewing to detect errors, correct errors, and revise written works		
Design	Strong use of evidence-based strate- gies to support high-quality writing and domain-specific knowledge modelling	Some use of evidence-based strategies to support high-quality writing and domain-specific knowledge modelling	Poor use of evidence-based strategies to support high-quality writing and domain-specific knowledge modelling	Does NOT use design effectively	
	Strong use of technology to facilitate the writing and peer review processes	Some use of technology to facilitate the writing and peer review processes	Poor use of technology to facilitate the writing and peer review processes		=
	Strong use of scaffolds, prompts, and other guidance techniques to support strategy development as individual differences dictate	Some use of scaffolds, prompts, and other guidance techniques to support strategy development as individual differences dictate	Poor use of scaffolds, prompts, and other guidance techniques to support strategy development as individual differences dictate		
Assessment	Strong application of peer review as part of the assessment process	Some application of peer review as part of the assessment process	Poor application of peer review as part of the assessment process	Does NOT assess effectively or	
	Strong application of self-assessment	Some application of self-assessment	Poor application of self-assessment	not an assess- ment-based activity	=
	Strong use of feedback to support formative development over time	Some use of feedback to support formative development over time	Poor use of feedback to support formative development over time	ment-pased activity	

Collaborative Learning



DESCRIPTION

Research clearly demonstrates that the outcomes of collaborative learning are superior to cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning (Goodyear, Jones, & Thompson, 2014; Hattie, 2008; Johnson & Johnson, 1999, 2008; Slavin, 1990; Webb & Palincsar, 1996). Additionally, according to Chi's ICAP Framework (2009), *interactive* activities (which involve social interaction) provide a more impactful learning experience than *constructive* activities (writing or creating an artifact), which in turn are most likely better than *active* activities (clicking to manipulate or advance media; multiple choice items), which are most likely better than *passive* activities (reading text, viewing images and/or videos).

Collaboration can be synchronous and/or asynchronous, as well as face-to-face, fully online, or a model blending face-to-face and online activities (Stahl, Koschmann, & Suthers, 2014), and all models can benefit learning if the activities are aligned to clearly articulated learning objectives. Best practices for designing collaborative learning include:

- 1. Clear, appropriate outcomes
- 2. Participation
- 3. Social grounding

- 4. Active learning conversation
- 5. Performance analysis and group processing
- 6. Promotive interaction with peers (Lou, Abrami, & D'Apollonia, 2001; Soller, 2001)

One well-supported strategy for incorporating many of these best practices is collaboration scripting (Goodyear, Jones, & Thompson, 2014).

CAPABILITIES

- · Management: Performance based grouping
- Cognitive Tools: Synchronous social learning: audio/video based
- · Cognitive Tools: Asynchronous social learning: learning document based
- Cognitive Tools: Peer review

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- $\bullet \ \ \text{Robust Technology: Content-agnostic, adaptive system for synchronous, scaffolded group meaning-making}$
- Simple Technology: Class/course wiki
- · Content Support: Collaboration scripting

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Achievement
- Attitudes
- Self-regulation
- Motivation

Collaborative Learning

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Some application of group work based on empirical evidence Some use of social contexts that place learners in the ZPD Some use of authentic tasks that allow learners to socially construct	Poor application of group work based on empirical evidence Poor use of social contexts that place learners in the ZPD	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
place learners in the ZPD Some use of authentic tasks that			
			=
meaning	Poor use of authentic tasks that allow learners to socially construct meaning		
Some applications of the Four Ts model in making design decisions	Poor applications of the Four Ts model in making design decisions	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity.	
 Tasks: nature, scope, sequence Team: division of labor, structure, interactions Time: constraints Tools: needs and availabilities 	 Tasks: nature, scope, sequence Team: division of labor, structure, interactions Time: constraints Tools: needs and availabilities 		=
Some encouragement of social interactions and discussion	Poor encouragement of social interactions and discussion	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
Some alignment between learning outcomes and social design	Poor alignment between learning outcomes and social design		=
Some alignment between group size and activity type	Poor alignment between group size and activity type		
Some articulation of outcomes and expectations	Poor articulation of outcomes and expectations	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
Some provision of feedback at both	Poor provision of feedback at both		=
_	interactions Time: constraints Tools: needs and availabilities Some encouragement of social interactions and discussion Some alignment between learning outcomes and social design Some alignment between group size and activity type Some articulation of outcomes and	interactions Time: constraints Tools: needs and availabilities Some encouragement of social interactions and discussion Some alignment between learning outcomes and social design Some alignment between group size and activity type Some articulation of outcomes and expectations interactions Time: constraints Tools: needs and availabilities Poor encouragement of social interactions and discussion I Poor alignment between learning outcomes and social design I Poor alignment between group size and activity type I Poor articulation of outcomes and expectations	interactions Time: constraints Tools: needs and availabilities Tools: needs and availabilities

Peer Tutoring



DESCRIPTION

Peer tutoring refers to the act of a learner or learners engaging in prescribed role taking as tutor or tutee to facilitate peer learning (Salkind, 2008). Upon appropriate implementation, there is evidence to suggest peer tutoring positively impacts student attitudinal, developmental, and academic outcomes (Topping, 2005). This principle provides an overview of peer tutoring practices and research literature, and research-based recommendations in the way of course design to facilitate best practices in peer tutoring implementation. Recommendations include ensuring alignment between peer tutoring strategies employed and objective statements, providing the appropriate training, monitoring, and/or structured protocols to support appropriate peer tutoring practices, and utilizing technology to facilitate asynchronous and synchronous interactions between peers.

CAPABILITIES

- Management: Performance based grouping
- · Cognitive Tools: Synchronous social learning: item based
- · Cognitive Tools: Peer review

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Personalized learning environment
- Simple Technology: Targeted study aids
- · Content Support: Extensive content flexibility

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitudes
- Behavior
- Motivation
- · Self-regulation

Peer Tutoring

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/Model	The product strategy is aligned to peer tutoring and assessment as a core principle of a learner-centered product.	The product team is exploring peer tutoring and/or assessment as a core LDP for creating a more learner-cen- tered product.	The product team considers peer tutoring and/or assessment to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered product.	The peer tutoring and assessment LDP does NOT align to the product	
	The product strategy currently integrates an evidence-based model for peer tutoring and/or assessment.	The product strategy is exploring integrating an evidence-based model for peer tutoring and/or assessment.	The product strategy considers peer tutoring and/or assessment at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based	strategy and is not necessary to explore further.	=
	The product strategy currently integrates the use of an evidence-based model of peer tutoring and assessment.	The product strategy is exploring integrating a recommended evidence-based approach to peer tutoring and/or assessment.	model.		
Peer Tutoring and Assessment Application	The product uses research-support- ed strategies of peer tutoring and/ or assessment.	area of the product and more focus on enhancing the application and	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy. Product team has applied similar principles	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to im- prove the product.	
	The application applies digital design recommendations for peer tutoring and/or assessments.		to their product strategy.		=
Delivery	Information on the effect of peer tutoring and/or assessment on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/ reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to vali- date this principle with learners. Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services.		=
Learner Characteristics	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development. Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.	Validation data will NOT be used to in- form product design & development.	=
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of peer tutoring and/or assessment LDP recommendations for creating assessments.	Product team is currently exploring how recommendations on designing assessments with peer tutoring and/or assessment in mind could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development. Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing assessments based on this LDP.	Formative/summative applications will NOT be used to inform product design & development.	=

Pedagogical Agents



DESCRIPTION

Pedagogical agents are life-like animated characters that are embedded in instructional applications to support learning. Agents may be used to help stimulate social interactions with learners in a way that facilitates learning through collaboration, sharing of tasks, providing information, and encouraging learners (Kim & Baylor, 2006). This principle will explore the many design considerations that need to be taken into account when developing pedagogical agents such as how the agent is represented, the role the agent plays, down to detail levels of what an agent's age, weight, and personality should be (Heidig & Clarebout, 2011).

CAPABILITIES

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Instruction: Active learning experience
- · Robust Technology: Personal one-on-one artificial tutor
- Simple Technology: Learning guide that provides feedback and basic cues
- Content Support: Instructional content to show learners

LEARNER IMPACTS

- · Self-regulation
- Motivation

Pedagogical Agents

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong application of empirical evidence in the design of agents	Some application of empirical evidence in the design of agents	Poor application of empirical evidence in the design of agents	Does NOT apply effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong application of a life-like character who is embedded into the instructional environment	Some application of a life-like character who is embedded into the instructional environment	Poor application of a life-like character who is embedded into the instructional environment		=
Model	Strong application of a coherent design process, such as pedagog- ical agents levels of design (PALD)	Some application of a coherent design process, such as PALD model, to justify agent design	Poor application of a coherent design process, such as PALD model, to justify agent design	Does NOT apply effectively or is not a related activity	
	model, to justify agent design Strong specification of the global, medium, and detail levels of agent design to support learning goals	Some specification of the global, medi- um, and detail levels of agent design to support learning goals	Poor specification of the global, medium, and detail levels of agent design to support learning goals		=
Design	Strong alignment between learning theory and pedagogical agent	Some alignment between learning the- ory and pedagogical agent design	Poor alignment between learning theory and pedagogical agent design	Does NOT apply effectively or is not a related activity	
	design Strong usage of instructional benefits of agents, as identified by the literature	Some usage of instructional benefits of agents, as identified by the literature	Poor usage of instructional benefits of agents, as identified by the literature		=
Assessment	Strong consideration of individ- ual differences, such as prior knowledge, in the assessment of performance	Some consideration of individual differences, such as prior knowledge, in the assessment of performance	Poor consideration of individual differences, such as prior knowledge, in the assessment of performance	Does NOT apply effectively or is not a related activity	
		Some use of clear feedback	Poor use of clear feedback		_
	Strong use of clear feedback	Some provision of assistance to learn-	Poor provision of assistance to learners to ensure they can utilize feedback messages		
	Strong provision of assistance to learners to ensure they can utilize feedback messages	ers to ensure they can utilize feedback messages			

Arguing to Learn



LEARNER IMPACTS

Behavior

DESCRIPTION

Argumentation is the means by which we rationally resolve questions, issues, and disputes, and solve problems. Embedding and fostering argumentative activities in learning environments promotes productive ways of thinking, conceptual change, and problem solving (Jonassen & Kim, 2010). Although science educators have focused on the roles of argumentation more extensively than other disciplines, argumentation is an essential way of thinking about any discipline including history, sociology, and mathematics.

We can encourage argumentation in our courses by supporting the development of good reasoning skills, using case studies, role play scenarios, and similar authentic activities to encourage students to develop arguments, and using web-based argumentation templates to facilitate the performance and usage of argumentation (Walker & Sampson, 2013; Andriessen & Baker, 2014).

CAPABILITIES

- · Assessment: Essay
- Management: Discussion analytics
- Cognitive Tools: Asynchronous social learning: text based

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Robust Technology: Argument simulations
- Simple Technology: Scaffolded argumentation
- Content Support: Rubrics

Arguing to Learn

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong emphasis of the require- ment of arguments having at least a claim that is supported by reasons	Some emphasis of the requirement of arguments having at least a claim that is supported by reasons	Poor emphasis of the requirement of arguments having at least a claim that is supported by reasons	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong emphasis that counterar- gument should address the pros/ cons of the original claim and the counterclaim	Some emphasis that counterargument should address the pros/cons of the original claim and the counterclaim	Poor emphasis that counterargument should address the pros/cons of the original claim and the counterclaim		=
Model	Strong application of the steps of argument-driven inquiry (ADI) guide the instructional design of activities	Some application of the steps of ADI guide the instructional design of activities	Poor application of the steps of ADI guide the instructional design of activities	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong emphasis of Toulmin's argument pattern (TAP) compo- nents model what students should include in good arguments	Some emphasis of TAP components model what students should include in good arguments	what students should include in good arguments		=
Design	Strong application of empirical methods for supporting argumen- tation in learning environments	Some application of empirical methods for supporting argumentation in learning environments	Poor application of empirical methods for supporting argumentation in learning environments	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong consideration of existing methods to determine a good fit per the context	Some consideration of existing methods to determine a good fit per the context	Poor consideration of existing methods to determine a good fit per the context		=
Assessment	Strong statement of clear assessment criteria provided to	Some statement of clear assessment criteria provided to students	Poor statement of clear assessment criteria provided to students	Does NOT use effectively or is not	
	students Strong consideration of individual differences	Some consideration of individual differences	Poor consideration of individual differences	a related activity	=

Student-Centered Learning

LEARNING

TOGETHER

DESCRIPTION

SCL is an "environment that allows learners to take some real control over their educational experience and encourages them to make important choices about what and how they will learn" (Doyle, 2008. p. xv).

An SCL approach examines teaching actions (method, assignment, and/or assessment) in regard to the question: "Given the context of the learner, the course, and the delivery method, will this teaching action optimize the learner's opportunity to learn?" (Doyle, n.d). The Student-Centered Learning LDP uses research from Doyle; Hirumi; Olson; and others to illustrate how SCL impacts the digital learning environment through 1) the design of learning and 2) the implementation of learning.

The most impact that can be made on SCL is a change in attitude to refocus a learner's attitude from one of a fixed mindset to a growth mindset, and to refocus an instructor's role from that of a teacher to a facilitator of learning through essential elements.

The essential elements of SCL include:

- · Complex, interesting tasks
- · Identification of resources to address tasks
- · Discussion with peers and the teacher
- Reflection and refinement based on feedback
- · Self-guided objectives, activity, and assessment
- · Teachers working as facilitators

Recommendations include:

- Use SCL approaches to change instructor and learner attitudes
- · Incorporate direct instruction with components of SCL
- Incorporate SCL implementation components in implementation guidelines
- · Design to support components of SCL
 - Complex, interesting tasks
 - Identification of resources to address tasks
 - · Discussion with peers and the teacher
 - · Reflection and refinement based on feedback
 - Reflection of objectives, activity, and assessment to personal goals

CAPABILITIES

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Assessment: Project
- Cognitive Tools: Peer review
- · Adaptivity: Mastery + confidence based adaptivity
- Robust Technology: Authentic learning opportunities through simulations and scenarios
- Simple Technology: Feedback for constructed response items through rubrics
- · Content Support: Tie learner personal goals to objectives

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitudes
- Behavior
- Motivation
- · Self-regulation

Student-Centered Learning

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong support of the essential elements of SCL Complex, interesting tasks Identification of resources to address tasks Discussion with peers and the teacher Reflection and refinement based on feedback Self-guided objectives, activity, and assessment Teachers work as facilitators	Some support of the essential elements of SCL	Poor support of the essential elements of SCL	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Model	Strong consideration for the differ- ences between teacher-orientated and student-centered environments	Some consideration for the differences between teacher-orientated and student-centered environments	Poor consideration for the differences between teacher-orientated and student-centered environments	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity.	=
	Strong application of the 8 events of SCL in the design of course activities	Some application of the 8 events of SCL in the design of course activities	Poor application of the 8 events of SCL in the design of course activities		_
Design	Strong alignment between SCL assumptions and functions	Some alignment between SCL assumptions and functions	Poor alignment between SCL assumptions and functions	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of evidence-based design approaches, such as scaffolding, multimodal representations, and personal relevance	Some use of evidence-based design approaches, such as scaffolding, multimodal representations, and personal relevance	Poor use of evidence-based design approaches, such as scaffolding, multimodal representations, and personal relevance		=
Adoption	Strong consideration of student and teacher attitudes towards SCL	Some consideration of student and teacher attitudes towards SCL	Poor consideration of student and teacher attitudes towards SCL	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong application of strategies to address adoption challenges	Some application of strategies to address adoption challenges	Poor application of strategies to address adoption challenges		=

Foundations of Adaptive Learning (Personalized Learning)

DESCRIPTION

Research into adaptive learning has shown positive impact on learning, especially within micro-adaptive systems which have been demonstrated to be almost as effective as a human tutor (VanLehn, 2011). Adaptive learning technologies provide an environment that can intelligently adjust to individual learner needs by presenting appropriate information, instructional materials, scaffolds, feedback, and recommendations based on learner characteristics and particular situation.

Adaptive learning is broken up into five different categories:

- Analytics: The base functionality that supports other forms of adaptive learning but may also be used to display important information to learners and instructors so they may adapt their own learning (Baker & Siemens, 2014).
- 2. Local: Targeted feedback, hints, and remedial content (Durlach & Ray, 2011).
- 3. Dispositional: Adaptation based on individual student variables such as aptitudes (Pashler, McDaniel, Rohrer, & Bjork, 2008).
- 4. Macro: Individualized task selection based on learner understanding (Lee & Park, 2008).
- 5. Micro: Individualized scaffolding mechanisms to assist learning (Corbett, Koedinger, & Anderson, 1997).

Such categories may be combined to provide greater levels of adaptive learning to support individual learners.

CAPABILITIES

- Adaptivity: Adaptive spacing
- · Adaptivity: Adaptive study plan
- · Adaptivity: Mastery and confidence based adaptivity

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Personalized learning environment
- · Simple Technology: Targeted study aids
- Content Support: Extensive content flexibility



LEARNER IMPACTS

- Self-regulation
- Achievement
- Motivation

Foundations of Adaptive Learning (Personalized Learning) SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong consideration for diversity in learners, methods, modes, media, and other factors Strong use of technology to facilitate the adaptation of learning experiences to individuals	Some consideration for diversity in learners, methods, modes, media, and other factors Some use of technology to facilitate the adaptation of learning experiences to individuals	Poor consideration for diversity in learners, methods, modes, media, and other factors Poor use of technology to facilitate the adaptation of learning experiences to individuals	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Model	Strong alignment between learning objectives and potential types of adaptivity, such as content agnostic, content level, and intelligent Strong implementation of micro, macro, and local adaptivity where appropriate in the learning design	Some alignment between learning objectives and potential types of adaptivity, such as content agnostic, content level, and intelligent Some implementation of micro, macro, and local adaptivity where appropriate in the learning design	Poor alignment between learning objectives and potential types of adaptivity, such as content agnostic, content level, and intelligent Poor implementation of micro, macro, and local adaptivity where appropriate in the learning design	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Design	Strong application of key adaptive learning principles: • Misconception identification • Masterly learning • Varied feedback • Spaced practice • Self-regulated learning (SRL) • Shared control • Affective elements • Application variety • Segmented content • Signaling	Some application of key adaptive learning principles:	Poor application of key adaptive learning principles:	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Assessment	Strong use of timely and relevant feed- back to facilitate learner improvement Strong use of data collection methods to support adaptivity, assessment, and feedback	Some use of timely and relevant feed- back to facilitate learner improvement Some use of data collection methods to support adaptivity, assessment, and feedback	Poor use of timely and relevant feed- back to facilitate learner improvement Poor use of data collection methods to support adaptivity, assessment, and feedback	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=

Mobile Learning: Learner Affordances

LEADAING

LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitude
- Behavior
- Motivation
- Self-regulation

DESCRIPTION

Mobile learning is defined as supports for people learning on the move in personal learning settings, such as on a phone or tablets, as well as in public learning settings, such as museums. The mobile context permits deeper constructivist, "learning by doing" approaches to be employed, as well more contextual learning, as it is now possible to take the learning process out of the classroom into authentic, real-world environments. (McQuiggan, Kosturko, McQuiggan, & Sabourin, 2015).

The mobile learning environment also provides the learner with more control over which devices and support apps they choose to best enable their personal learning process.

CAPABILITIES

- · Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Management: Learner analytics
- Cognitive Tools: Timestamped video comments

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Identifying tree species with LeafSnap.com
- Simple Technology: Notifications and prompts
- Content Support: Mobile flashcards

Mobile Learning: Learner Affordances

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	The product strategy is aligned to mobile learning as a core principle of a learner-centered product.	The product team is exploring mobile learning as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product. The product strategy is exploring integrating an evidence-based model of mobile learning.	The product team considers mobile learning to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered product. The product strategy considers mobile learning at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model.	The mobile learning LDP does NOT align to the product strategy and is not necessary to explore further.	=
Mobile Learning Application	The product uses empirically-based recommendations concerning mobile learning.	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more learner feedback is needed to improve principle application.	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy. Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to improve the product.	=
Mobile Learning Delivery	The impact on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to validate this principle with learners. Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services.	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product design & development.	=
Learner Character- istics	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development. Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product design & development.	=
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of mobile learning LDP recommendations for creating assessments.	Product team is currently exploring how recommendations for designing assessments for mobile learning could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development. Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing mobile learning assessments.	Formative/summative applications will NOT be used to inform product design & develop.	=

Motivation Design

LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Achievement
- Attitudes
- Behavior
- · Self-regulation

Learner motivation can impact multiple dimensions of a learning experience, including the quality of learning, academic performance, involvement in activities, task choices, and persistence (Eccles, 1983; Pintrich, 2003). Thus, leveraging empirical research on motivation and learning stands to foster positive, productive learning environments. A vast body of research suggests the following best practices:

- Fostering intrinsic motivation for a task is more advantageous for learning than extrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000)
- Giving learners autonomy and choice in their learning paths/tasks is more motivating than forcing them to follow one learning path/task (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Pintrich, 2003; Zuckerman, Porac, Lathin, Smith, & Deci, 1978)
- Positive feedback that is based on a learner's competency or mastery is more motivating than negative feedback (Boggiano & Ruble, 1979; Deci, 1971; Deci & Cascio, 1972; Fisher, 1978; Ryan, 1982)
- Learning environments that help learners increase their self-efficacy in a certain domain, skill, or task are more advantageous than those that do not (Bandura, 1977)
- Illustrating to learners that they are able to change and improve their skills and abilities—called "incremental self-theory"—yields more positive results than environments that emphasize unchangeable inborn/natural abilities (Dweck, 1999)
- Learning environments that attribute learner success to their own efforts and persistence have more positive learning impacts than environments attributing success to unchangeable or external factors such as the learner's intelligence, luck, or ease/difficulty of tasks (Weiner, 1974)
- Focusing learners on pursuing both mastery and performance goals is more likely to have a positive impact than focusing on only one or neither (Pintrich, 2003; Plante, O'Keefe, Théorêt, 2012; Senko, Hulleman, & Harackiewicz, 2011)
- When learners view a task as important, interesting, or useful, positive outcomes are more likely than when learners view a task as unimportant, uninteresting, or useless (Eccles, 1983; Pintrich, 2003)

CAPABILITIES

DESCRIPTION

- Adaptivity: Mastery + confidence based adaptivity
- · Instruction: Active learning experience
- · Management: Badging
- · Management: Learner analytics

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Adaptive engines tracking mastery and performance
- Simple Technology: Feedback attributing a high score to student skill/persistence
- · Content Support: Personally relevant/interesting content

Motivation Design



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong application of motivation as a process, rather than a product Strong use of goal-driven actions in activities that are physical or mental Strong applications of techniques that both instigate and sustain motivation	rather than a product		Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Expectancy- Value	Strong emphasis on fostering intrinsic motivation in activities, but not at the exclusion of extrinsic motivation Strong emphasis on fostering realistic expectations for success Strong use of methods that foster intrinsic motivation and realistic expectations, such as: • Choices • Suitable difficulty • Informational constraints • Transparent evaluation • Self-regulated learning (SRL) strategies	Some emphasis on fostering intrinsic motivation in activities, but not at the exclusion of extrinsic motivation Some emphasis on fostering realistic expectations for success Some use of methods that foster intrinsic motivation and realistic expectations, such as: Choices Suitable difficulty Informational constraints Transparent evaluation SRL strategies	Poor emphasis on fostering intrinsic motivation in activities, but not at the exclusion of extrinsic motivation Poor emphasis on fostering realistic expectations for success Poor use of methods that foster intrinsic motivation and realistic expectations, such as: • Choices • Suitable difficulty • Informational constraints • Transparent evaluation • SRL strategies	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Goal Orientations	Strong emphasis on fostering incremental views of intelligence Strong emphasis on fostering mastery goals in activities, but not at the exclusion of performance goals Strong application of learning environment to allow learners with different goals to succeed	Some emphasis on fostering incremental views of intelligence Some emphasis on fostering mastery goals in activities, but not at the exclusion of performance goals Some application of learning environment to allow learners with different goals to succeed	Poor emphasis on fostering incremental views of intelligence Poor emphasis on fostering mastery goals in activities, but not at the exclusion of performance goals Poor application of learning environment to allow learners with different goals to succeed	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Assessment	Strong application of multiple methods for measuring and assessing motivation to triangulate data Strong use of transparent, positive feedback that matches student achievement Strong application of one or more of the following measurement techniques: Task choice Involvement Persistence Achievement	Some application of multiple methods for measuring and assessing motivation to triangulate data Some use of transparent, positive feedback that matches student achievement Some application of one or more of the following measurement techniques: Task choice Involvement Persistence Achievement	Poor application of multiple methods for measuring and assessing motivation to triangulate data Poor use of transparent, positive feedback that matches student achievement Poor application of one or more of the following measurement techniques: Task choice Involvement Persistence Achievement	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=

Simulations



DESCRIPTION

Over the past 25 years the use of simulations has been found to be engaging as learning and assessment tools (Behrens, DiCerbo, & Ferrara, 2012; Gegenfurtner, Quesada-Pallarès, & Knogler, 2014; Mitchell & Savell-Smith, 2004; Pai-Hsing Wu et al., 2014; Quellmalz et al., 2012; Shute & Ventura, 2013). A digital simulation can be defined as a technology modeling a system or a process where a user can manipulate parameters in the system (De Jong & Van Joolingen, 1998). In a simulation, processes, systems, and functions of real-life phenomena are simulated in real time in an authentic and complex manner, which in turn helps learners to critically engage with the learning material (Holladay & Quiñones, 2003). Common examples of simulations involve pilot training in flight simulators (Jacobs, Prince, Hays & Salas, 1990; Wong, Meyer, Timson, Perfect, & White, 2012), decision making in business simulations (Lainema & Nurmi, 2006; Siewiorek & Gegenfurtner, 2010), medical diagnosis using simulated patients (Consorti, Mancuso, Nocioni, & Piccolo, 2012; Cook, Erwin, & Triola, 2010; Iseli, Koenig, Lee, & Wainess, 2010), and physics learning in 2D physics simulation environments (Shute & Ventura, 2013). Digital simulations are

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitude
- Behavior
- Motivation
- Self-regulation

becoming increasingly popular in professional training for developing complex cognitive skills (Helle et al., 2011; Mayer, Dale, Fraccastoro, & Moss, 2011; Rogers, 2011; Siewiorek, Gegenfurtner, Lainema, Saarinen, & Lehtinen, 2013; Tynjälä, Häkkinen, & Hämäläinen, 2014; Wang & Wu, 2008).

Best practices for designing simulations for learning include:

- · Match simulations to learning goals
- Make learning essential to simulation progress
- · Build in proven instructional strategies
- · Build in guidance and structure
- · Manage complexity
- Make relevance salient

CAPABILITIES

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Assessment: Software simulation
- Instruction: Active learning experience
- · Robust Technology: Flight simulator
- Simple Technology: 2D physics simulations in a digital environment
- Content Support: Using the Evidence-Centered Design (ECD) approach

Simulations



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong application of technology to model a system or process	Some application of technology to model a system or process	Poor application of technology to model a system or process	Does NOT use effectively or	
	Strong integration of user control to manipulate the simulation	Some integration of user control to manipulate the simulation	Poor integration of user control to manipulate the simulation	is not a related activity	=
	Strong use of simulation to engage learners in an authentic context	Some use of simulation to engage learners in an authentic context	Poor use of simulation to engage learners in an authentic context		
Model	Strong use of simulation to foster experimentation, discovery, construction, and collaboration	Some use of simulation to foster experimentation, discovery, construction, and collaboration	Poor use of simulation to foster experimentation, discovery, construction, and collaboration	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related	_
	Strong use of simulation to conduct authentic tasks within a situated environment	Some use of simulation to conduct authentic tasks within a situated environment	Poor use of simulation to conduct authentic tasks within a situated environment	activity	=
Design	Strong selection of an appropriate simulation type for the context • Virtual world • Virtual modeling • Experimental sandbox • Reactive branching • Adaptive branching	Some selection of an appropriate simulation type for the context • Virtual world • Virtual modeling • Experimental sandbox • Reactive branching • Adaptive branching	Poor selection of an appropriate simulation type for the context • Virtual world • Virtual modeling • Experimental sandbox • Reactive branching • Adaptive branching	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
	Strong evaluation of design risks to optimize the simulation	Some evaluation of design risks to optimize the simulation	Poor evaluation of design risks to optimize the simulation		
	Strong use of evidence-based principles to design the simulation	Some use of evidence-based principles to design the simulation	Poor use of evidence-based principles to design the simulation		
Assessment	Strong application of assessment within the simulation environment	Some application of assessment within the simulation environment	Poor application of assessment within the simulation environment	Does NOT use effectively or	
	Strong evidence of value-added validity beyond traditional assessments	Some evidence of value-added validity beyond traditional assessments	Poor evidence of value-added validity beyond traditional assessments	is not a related activity	=
	Strong use of both product and process data for assessment and feedback	Some use of both product and process data for assessment and feedback	Poor use of both product and process data for assessment and feedback		

Games and Virtual Worlds

LEARNING

ENVIRONMENTS

DESCRIPTION

Well-designed games include features that make them intrinsically motivating and thus engaging (Fullerton, 2008; Malone & Lepper, 1987; Shute, Rieber, & Van Eck, 2011). Some of the features of good games include adaptive challenges, goals, and rules, interactive problem solving, control (of learning and the game environment), ongoing feedback, and sensory stimuli. There is growing evidence of video games and simulations supporting learning (Coller & Scott, 2009; Tobias & Fletcher, 2011; for a review see Wilson et al., 2009). An additional advantage of using video games and simulations in education is the vast amount of data that can be used for assessment purposes (Dede, 2005; DiCerbo & Behrens, 2012; Quellmalz, Timms, Silberglitt, & Buckley, 2012; Shute & Ventura, 2013). Formative assessments embedded within a video game can enable us to more accurately provide feedback and change gameplay to maximize learning according to the ability level of the player.

CAPABILITIES

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

• Instruction: Active learning experience

- Robust Technology: Online 3D virtual worlds
- Simple Technology: 2D HTML games
- Content Support: Using the Evidence-Centered Design (ECD) approach

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitude
- Behavior
- Self-regulation
- Achievement

Games and Virtual Worlds



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	The product strategy is aligned to game- based learning as a core principle of a learner-centered product	The product team is exploring game-based learning as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product	The product team considers game-based learning to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered product	The game-based learning LDP does NOT align to the	
		The product strategy is exploring integrating an evidence-based model of game-based learning	The product strategy considers game-based learning at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model	product strategy and is not neces- sary to explore further	=
Game-based Learning	The product uses empirically-based recommendations concerning game-based learning	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more learner feedback is	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy	This principle is NOT currently	
Application		needed to improve principle application	Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy	being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to improve the product	=
Game-based Learning Delivery	The impact on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/reported on	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to validate this principle with learners.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services	does NOT need to be validated in	=
		Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with		order to inform product design & development	
Learner Character- istics	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development	Validation data will NOT be used to inform product	
			Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports	design & develop- ment	=
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of game-based learning LDP recommendations for creating assess-	Product team is currently exploring how recommendations for designing assessments for game-based learning could be	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development	Formative/sum- mative applica- tions will NOT be	
ppdeloiis	ments.	used in product design & development	Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing game-based learning assessments	used to inform product design & development	=

Authentic Learning

DESCRIPTION

Authentic learning involves using real-world problems to encourage open-ended inquiry, and social and self-directed learning. It results in something that can stand alone as a valuable product in its own right. Authentic learning may be more important than ever as it clearly supports the 4Cs of 21st century skills—collaboration, critical thinking, communication, and creativity (Lombardi, 2007). Research shows that active engagement in authentic disciplinary practices results in enhanced learning outcomes (Sawyer, 2014).

Authentic learning environments provide authentic contexts and activities, access to expert performances, provide multiple roles and perspectives, promote reflection and articulation, provide coaching and scaffolding, and support collaborative construction of knowledge (Herrington & Oliver, 2000).

Learners do not naturally know how to engage in authentic practices. We must carefully structure the learning environment and activities in ways that are accessible and that follow a developmental progression. Using methods such as modeling, coaching, scaffolding, and fading can help facilitate skill development.

CAPABILITIES

- · Assessment: Project
- · Assessment: Work sample/e-portfolio
- · Assessment: Software simulation

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- · Robust Technology: Simulation
- · Simple Technology: Online portfolio
- Content Support: Online discussion forum



LEARNER IMPACTS

- Behavior
- Motivation

Authentic Learning



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong use of real-world problems that mimic the work of professionals	Some use of real-world problems that mimic the work of professionals	Poor use of real-world problems that mimic the work of professionals	Does NOT use effectively or	
	Strong support of open-ended inquiry, thinking skills, and metacognition	Some support of open-ended inquiry, thinking skills, and metacognition	Poor support of open-ended inquiry, thinking skills, and metacognition	is not a related activity	
	Strong engagement of students in discourse and social learning in a community of learners	Some engagement of students in discourse and social learning in a community of learners	Poor engagement of students in discourse and social learning in a community of learners		=
	Strong empowerment through student choice to direct learning in relevant project work	Some empowerment through student choice to direct learning in relevant project work	Poor empowerment through student choice to direct learning in relevant project work		
Design	Strong application of the characteristics of authentic learning design	Some application of the characteristics of authentic learning design	Poor application of the characteristics of authentic learning design	Does NOT use effectively or	
	Strong application of the elements of situated learning design	Some application of the elements of situated learning design	Poor application of the elements of situated learning design	is not a related activity	=
	Strong application of the step-by-step process from the framework for authentic constructivist learning environments	Some application of the step-by-step process from the framework for authentic constructivist learning environments	Poor application of the step-by-step process from the framework for authentic constructivist learning environments)-	
Digital Learning	Strong consideration of alternative technologies, such as found in prior implementations, mobile learning, and wikis	Some consideration of alternative technologies, such as found in prior implementations, mobile learning, and wikis	Poor consideration of alternative technologies, such as found in prior implementations, mobile learning, and wikis	effectively or is not a related	
	Strong support of collaboration and student-centered learning through technology	Some support of collaboration and student-centered learning through technology	Poor support of collaboration and student-centered learning through technology	activity	=
Assessment	Strong emphasis on authentic assess- ment as evaluating student knowledge that is put into practice	Some emphasis on authentic assessment as evaluating student knowledge that is put into practice	Poor emphasis on authentic assessment as evaluating student knowledge that is put into practice	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related	
	Strong use of supporting techniques, such as peer review, self assessment, and instructor feedback simultaneously	Some use of supporting techniques, such as peer review, self assessment, and instructor feedback simultaneously	Poor use of supporting techniques, such as peer review, self assessment, and instructor feedback simultaneously	activity	=
	Strong application of existing tools and processes, such as authentic self and peer assessment for learning (ASPAL) and wikis	Some application of existing tools and processes, such as ASPAL and wikis	Poor application of existing tools and processes, such as ASPAL and wikis		

Mobile Learning: Device and Collaboration



DESCRIPTION

The near ubiquity of mobile devices in the general population has provided the technological tools to support seamless, just-in-time, lifelong learning applications. Mobile learning is a response to the proliferation of these devices and has led to an ongoing convergence between learning and technology (Kosturko, McQuiggan, & Saborurin, 2015). Design recommendations center on aligning mobile learning implementations to learning goals and objectives and leveraging activities that take advantage of the hardware and software affordances of mobile devices.

Learning while interacting with instructors and peers is an integral part of the mobile learning experience with the potential to develop collective cognitive responsibility and enhance 21st century communication and collaboration skills. (Dolan 2005; see also Bransford, et al., 1999; Churchill, et al., 2001; Dillenbourg, 1999; Zurita, et al., 2003; Zurita & Nussbaum, 2004).

CAPABILITIES

- · Management: Performance based grouping
- Cognitive Tools: Synchronous social learning: audio/video based
- Cognitive Tools: Flashcard and concept map creation

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Context-aware augmented reality field trips
- Simple Technology: Notifications and prompts
- Content Support: Culture and language learning practice scenarios

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitude
- Behavior
- Motivation
- · Self-regulation

Mobile Learning: Device and Collaboration



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Purpose/ Model	The product strategy is aligned to mobile learning as a core principle of a learner-centered product.	The product team is exploring mobile learning as a core LDP for creating a more learner-centered product. The product strategy is exploring integrating	The product team considers mobile learning to be an important LDP for creating a more learner-centered product. The product strategy considers mobile	The mobile learn- ing LDP does NOT align to the prod- uct strategy and is	=
		an evidence-based model of mobile learning.	learning at a high level but does not currently align to an evidence-based model.	not necessary to explore further.	
Mobile Learning Application	The product uses empirically-based recommendations concerning mobile learning.	Principle is applied only to a specific area of the product and more learner feedback is needed to improve principle application.	Product team thinks applying this principle would add value to their product strategy. Product team has applied similar principles to their product strategy.	This principle is NOT currently being applied to any area of the product and is NOT needed to improve the product.	=
Mobile Learning Delivery	The impact on a capability or service aligned to this principle has been gathered/reported on.	Product team is in early discussions about partnering with LD team to validate this principle with learners. Product team has specific capabilities they need to validate this principle with.	Product team needs more information about how this principle might be tested with learners using LD's validation services.		=
Learner Character- istics	Design & development are currently using validation reports to further align the principle and the product strategy.	Product team is currently exploring how validation results and recommendations could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include validation data to inform product design & development. Product team needs a consultation to learn more about validation services and results reports.	This principle does NOT need to be validated in order to inform product design & development.	=
Formative/ Summative Applications	The formative and summative applications make proper use of mobile learning LDP recommendations for creating assessments.	Product team is currently exploring how recommendations for designing assessments for mobile learning could be used in product design & development.	Product team feels there is time in the schedule to include time spent on assessment application design & development. Product team needs a consultation to learn more about designing mobile learning assessments.	Formative/sum- mative applica- tions will NOT be used to inform product design & develop.	=

Global Learning

MOVING LEARNING SCIENCES RESEARCH INTO THE CLASSROOM

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Achievement
- Attitudes
- Motivation
- · Self-regulation

As products developed in one locale get used in another, we have to carefully think through how this impacts the learning experience. Global learning design ensures products are built on well-researched learning principles, links learning to learners' prior knowledge and contextualizes it within their lives, helps measure learning efficacy and impact on a global scale, and provides a framework for adaptive, custom, and modular learning to meet local needs.

Global learning design requires:

- 1. Developing from global learning principles
 - a. New learning builds on prior knowledge
 - b. Learning builds from foundational facts to organized concepts
 - c. Memory is the residue of thought and requires more than just "time-on-task"
 - d. Formative assessment is essential, since it helps learners to explore, explain, extend, and evaluate their progress
 - e. Learning depends on the interaction of learners' developmental level with the social, emotional, and intellectual climate of the course
- 2. Globalizing: Internationalizing + localizing or customizing
 - a. User experience (language, text/formatting, layout, color)
 - b. Content (graphics, translation, examples, metaphor)
 - c. Implementation (bandwidth, mobile use, implementation preference, policy)
 - d. Educational culture (time, assessment/grading, competition/collaboration, error focus, source of knowledge, communication, ICT competency)
- 3. Validating ecologically

For best globalization design, we recommend creating a locale reference guide that describes the learning scenario of the target audience culture/country, analyzing the product for areas of potential conflicts with that target locale, and then determining whether the change will require light localization, deep localization, customization, or whether the market may need further preparation to be ready for the product.

- Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Instruction: Active learning experience
- · Instruction: Player + item
- Robust Technology: User- (instructor, student, GEO) customizable authoring environment to make content, theme, and implementation modifications
- · Simple Technology: Regional variations with slight modifications for things like sizes of buttons, icons, layout, language, brand, etc.
- Content Support: Segmented content to allow swappable localization (pictures, colors, examples); integration with user-uploaded content

CAPABILITIES

DESCRIPTION

SAMPLE DESIGN **IMPLEMENTATIONS**

Global Learning



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong incorporation of well-re- searched learning principles	Some incorporation of well-re- searched learning principles	Poor incorporation of well-re- searched learning principles	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of contextualized learning linked to learners' prior	Some use of contextualized learning linked to learners' prior knowledge	Poor use of contextualized learning linked to learners' prior knowledge		=
	knowledge Strong application of modular and open learning resources	Some application of modular and open learning resources	Poor application of modular and open learning resources		
Model	Strong application of the three-stage process for global design	Some application of the three-stage process for global design	Poor application of the three-stage process for global design	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong application of global design principles	Some application of global design principles	Poor application of global design principles		=
	Strong globalization through internationalization and localization	Some globalization through internationalization and localization	Poor globalization through internationalization and localization		
	Strong ecological validation through research and evaluation	Some ecological validation through research and evaluation	Poor ecological validation through research and evaluation		
Design	Strong application of design principles	Some application of design principles	Poor application of design principles	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong adaptation of context to different cultures and locales	Some adaptation of context to different cultures and locales	Poor adaptation of context to different cultures and locales	,	=
	Strong evidence that design has achieved ecological validity	Some evidence that design has achieved ecological validity	Poor evidence that design has achieved ecological validity		
Assessment	Strong use of formative assess- ment to evaluate and improve	Some use of formative assessment to evaluate and improve learning	Poor use of formative assessment to evaluate and improve learning	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	learning Strong use of feedback on the	Some use of feedback on the instructor, peer, and self levels	Poor use of feedback on the instructor, peer, and self levels		=
	instructor, peer, and self levels Strong use of metacognitive instructional strategies to help instructors assist students	Some use of metacognitive instructional strategies to help instructors	Poor use of metacognitive instructional strategies to help instructors assist students		

Pedagogical Implementation Model

DESCRIPTION

According to Fullan & Langworthy (2014), "the foundation of [instructor] quality is [an instructor's] pedagogical capacity—their repertoire of teaching strategies and their ability to form partnerships with students in mastering the process of learning" (p.3).

The Pedagogical Implementation Model LDP addresses the aspects of learning sciences researched implementation practices that are within an instructor's purview. The model provides examples of how product teams may utilize these implementation practices to bolster their product implementation. The LDP presents research that addresses four components of implementation; delivery, communication, assessment, and specific areas of focus.

CAPABILITIES

- Cognitive Tools: Synchronous social learning: text based
- · Cognitive Tools: Peer review
- Management: Group formation

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Just-in-time instructor implementation tips
- · Simple Technology: Elaboration of instructor-learner communication methods
- Content Support: Learning science based areas of focus



INTO THE CLASSROOM

LEARNER

- IMPACTSAttitudes
- Behavior
- Motivation

Pedagogical Implementation Model



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong leverage of a repertoire of teaching strategies	Some leverage of a repertoire of teaching strategies	Poor leverage of a repertoire of teaching strategies	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong support for instructor to form partnerships with students in mastering the learning process	Some support for instructor to form partnerships with students in mastering the learning process	Poor support for instructor to form partnerships with students in mastering the learning process		=
Model	Strong application of the pedagogical implementation model	Some application of the pedagogical implementation model	Poor application of the pedagogical implementation model	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong application within the levels of the pedagogical implementation model • Delivery methods • Instructor-learner communication • Assessment strategy • Area of focus	Some application within the levels of the pedagogical implementation model • Delivery methods • Instructor-learner communication • Assessment strategy • Area of focus	Poor application within the levels of the pedagogical implementation model • Delivery methods • Instructor-learner communication • Assessment strategy • Area of focus		=
Design	Strong contextual consideration for dif- ferent delivery methods, such as online, face to face, and hybrid	Some contextual consideration for dif- ferent delivery methods, such as online, face to face, and hybrid	Poor contextual consideration for dif- ferent delivery methods, such as online, face to face, and hybrid	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of communication-oriented activities to support student performance	Some use of communication-oriented activities to support student performance	Poor use of communication-oriented activities to support student performance		=
	Strong balance between instructor's managerial, social, instructive, and technical roles	Some balance between instructor's managerial, social, instructive, and technical roles	Poor balance between instructor's managerial, social, instructive, and technical roles		
Assessment	Strong emphasis on feedback as the purpose of assessment	Some emphasis on feedback as the purpose of assessment	Poor emphasis on feedback as the purpose of assessment	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong use of assessment at multiple points throughout the learning process	Some use of assessment at multiple points throughout the learning process	Poor use of assessment at multiple points throughout the learning process		
	Strong application of formative and summative assessment	Some application of formative and summative assessment	Poor application of formative and summative assessment		=
	Strong use of multiple measures, peer evaluation, rubrics, and exemplars, where appropriate	Some use of multiple measures, peer evaluation, rubrics, and exemplars, where appropriate	Poor use of multiple measures, peer evaluation, rubrics, and exemplars, where appropriate		

Learning Strategies

DESCRIPTION

Learning strategies are the intentional use of one or more cognitive processes to accomplish a particular learning task. Tools and capabilities can be used to apply learning strategies appropriately and consistently. Research indicates that learners need to be able to determine the appropriate way of cognitively processing the material to be learned (Ormrod, 2012).

Research shows that learners who can apply learning strategies effectively

- · Are less likely to drop out of online courses
- · Are more likely to increase levels of self-efficacy
- · May increase their levels of comprehension
- · May improve their test scores
- · May improve their GPA

Issues arise because learners do not always know

- · How to apply a learning strategy
- What learning strategy to apply
- · When to apply the learning strategy

The Learning Strategies LDP presents research by Ormrod; Lee, Choi, & Kim; Mueller & Oppenheimer, and others to illustrate seven specific learning strategies that may have an impact on learners, discussing when and how these strategies can be applied in a digital environment.

CAPABILITIES

- Instruction: Multimedia active reading
- · Cognitive Tools: Annotating/highlighting
- Cognitive Tools: Flashcard and concept map creation
- Assessment: Open ended assignment (single step)

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- Robust Technology: Digital calendaring, concept maps, and constructed flashcards
- · Simple Technology: Highlighting, notetaking, underlining
- · Content Support: Objectives, content headings, key terms/vocabulary



MOVING LEARNING SCIENCES RESEARCH INTO THE CLASSROOM

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Behavior
- Self-regulation
- Motivation

Learning Strategies



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong encouragement of multiple strategy use by learners during the educational process Strong use of appropriate tools and capabilities to support learning strategies	Some encouragement of multiple strategy use by learners during the educational process Some use of appropriate tools and ca- pabilities to support learning strategies	Poor encouragement of multiple strategy use by learners during the educational process Poor use of appropriate tools and capa- bilities to support learning strategies	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Model	Strong consideration of information processes through information processing theory (IPT) theory • Sensory memory • Working memory • Long-term memory Strong support for self-regulated learning (SRL) processes • Planning • Monitoring • Regulating • Reflecting	Some consideration of information processes through IPT theory • Sensory memory • Working memory • Long-term memory Some support for SRL processes • Planning • Monitoring • Regulating • Reflecting	Poor consideration of information processes through IPT theory • Sensory memory • Working memory • Long-term memory Poor support for SRL processes • Planning • Monitoring • Regulating • Reflecting	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Design	Strong use of scaffolding to align learner capabilities with activities	Some use of scaffolding to align learner capabilities with activities	Poor use of scaffolding to align learner capabilities with activities	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong incorporation of learning strategy opportunities across activities • Time management • Elaboration • Note taking • Identifying information • Summarizing • Comprehension monitoring • Mnemonics	Some incorporation of learning strategy opportunities across activities • Time management • Elaboration • Note taking • Identifying information • Summarizing • Comprehension monitoring • Mnemonics	Poor incorporation of learning strategy opportunities across activities • Time management • Elaboration • Note taking • Identifying information • Summarizing • Comprehension monitoring • Mnemonics		=
	Strong use of writing prompts to facili- tate strategy use Strong use of scheduling to facilitate	Some use of writing prompts to facilitate strategy use Some use of scheduling to facilitate	Poor use of writing prompts to facilitate strategy use Poor use of scheduling to facilitate time		
	time management	time management	management		
Assessment	Strong alignment between learning design, learning strategy expectations, and assessments	Some alignment between learning design, learning strategy expectations, and assessments	Poor alignment between learning design, learning strategy expectations, and assessments	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
	Strong use of learners' strategy arti- facts as part of performance assess- ment, feedback, and remediation	Some use of learners' strategy arti- facts as part of performance assess- ment, feedback, and remediation	Poor use of learners' strategy artifacts as part of performance assessment, feedback, and remediation		=

21st Century Skills

DESCRIPTION

21st century learning is focused on helping learners develop the broad set of knowledge, skills, work habits, and character traits necessary to succeed in the 21st century. A 2013 Pearson Foundation study found that students with high 21st century skill development are twice as likely to have higher work quality compared to those who had low 21st century skill development. Several 21C Skills frameworks exist, but all emphasize the importance of non-cognitive skill development (i.e. collaboration, communication, creativity, and critical thinking).

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills (P21) suggests incorporating these six key design elements to foster 21st century learning:

- 1. Emphasize core subjects
- 2. Emphasize learning skills
- 3. Use 21st century tools to develop learning skills
- 4. Teach and learn in a 21st century context
- 5. Teach and learn 21st century content
- 6. Use 21st century assessments that measure 21st century skills

CAPABILITIES

- Cognitive Tools: Synchronous social learning: text based
- · Cognitive Tools: Bibliography/citation
- Cognitive Tools: Planning/outlining
- · Cognitive Tools: Timestamped video comments

SAMPLE DESIGN IMPLEMENTATIONS

- $\bullet \quad \hbox{Robust Technology: Collaborative scenario-based games/simulations}$
- Simple Technology: Learner-created videos
- Content Support: Inclusion of open-ended or ill-structured tasks



INTO THE CLASSROOM

LEARNER IMPACTS

- Attitudes
- Behavior
- · Self-regulation

21st Century Skills

SELF-ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT



Principle Criteria	Integration (4-5 points)	Exploration (2-3 points)	Consideration (1 point)	Not Applicable (0 Points)	Total Points
Definition	Strong support of key 21st century skills, including collaboration, digital literacy, critical thinking, and prob- lem solving	Some support of key 21st century skills, including collaboration, digital literacy, critical thinking, and prob- lem solving	Poor support of key 21st century skills, including collaboration, digital literacy, critical thinking, and prob- lem solving	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Model	Strong use of an evidence-based model to guide learning design, such as P21, ISTE, ETS	Some use of an evidence-based model to guide learning design, such as P21, ISTE, ETS	Poor use of an evidence-based model to guide learning design, such as P21, ISTE, ETS	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	=
Design	Strong application of the Three Rs (reading, writing, arithmetic) in learning activities	Some application of the Three Rs (reading, writing, arithmetic) in learn- ing activities	Poor application of the Three Rs (reading, writing, arithmetic) in learn- ing activities	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong application of the Four Cs (collaboration, communication, creativity, critical thinking) in learning activities	Some application of the Four Cs (collaboration, communication, creativity, critical thinking) in learning activities	Poor application of the Four Cs (collaboration, communication, creativity, critical thinking) in learning activities		=
Assessment	Strong use of an evidence based assessment framework to guide learning design, such as CWRA, PISA, Key Stage 3	Some use of an evidence based assessment framework to guide learning design, such as CWRA, PISA, Key Stage 3	Poor use of an evidence based assessment framework to guide learning design, such as CWRA, PISA, Key Stage 3	Does NOT use effectively or is not a related activity	
	Strong triangulation through multi- ple assessment measures	Some triangulation through multiple assessment measures	Poor triangulation through multiple assessment measures		=
	Strong use of complex tasks in authentic contexts	Some use of complex tasks in authentic contexts	Poor use of complex tasks in authentic contexts		

Copyright © 2016 Pearson Education Inc. Made available under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode

- Abrami, P. C., Bernard, R. M., Borokhovski, E., Waddington, D. I., Wade, C. A., & Persson, T. (2014). Strategies for teaching students to think critically: A meta-analysis. Review of Educational Research.
- American Educational Research Association, American Psychological Association, & National Council on Measurement in Education. (2014). Standards for educational and psychological testing. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- American Management Association. (2012). Executive summary: AMA 2012 critical skills survey.
- Anderson, J. R. (1996). ACT: A simple theory of complex cognition. American Psychologist, 51, 355-365.
- Anderson, L. W. (2001). A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: a revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives (Complete ed.). New York: Longman.
- Andriessen, J., & Baker, M. (2014). Arguing to learn. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (pp. 439–460). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Arroyo, I., Meheranian, H., & Woolf, B. P. (2010). Effort-based Tutoring: An Empirical Approach to Intelligent Tutoring. In EDM (pp. 1–10). Citeseer.
- Association of College & Research Libraries. (2000). Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency
- Atkinson, R. K., Derry, S. J., Renkl, A., & Wortham, D. (2000). Learning from examples: Instructional principles from the worked examples research. *Review of educational research*, 70(2), 181-214.
- Azevedo, R., & Cromley, J. G. (2004). Does training on self-regulated learning facilitate students' learning with hypermedia? *Journal of educational psychology*, 96(3), 523-525.
- Baddely, A. D. (1992). Working memory. Science, 255(5044), 556-599.
- Baddely, A. D. (1998). Human memory: Theory and practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Baddely, A. D. (1999). Essentials of Human Memory. Hove.
- Baddely, A. D. (2001). Is working memory still working? American Psychologist, 56, 851-864.
- Baker, R., & Siemens, G. (2014). Educational Data Mining and Learning Analytics. In R. K. Sawyer (ed.) The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 253-272.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. Psychological Review, 84(2), 191–215. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/847061
- Barrows, H. S. (2000). Problem-based learning applied to medical education. Southern Illinois University School of Medicine.
- Behrens, J., DiCerbo, K., & Ferrara, S. (2012). Intended and Unintended Deceptions in the Use of Simulations. Invitational Research Symposium on Technology Enhances Assessments. *ETS*.

- Bennett, R. E. (2011). Formative assessment: A critical review. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy, & Practice, 18, 5-25.
- Boggiano, A. K., & Ruble, D. N. (1979). Competence and the overjustification effect: A developmental study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37(9), 1462–1468. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.37.9.1462
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (1999). How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Britton, J. N., Burgess, T., Martin, N., McLeod, A., & Rosen, H. (1975). The development of writing abilities (pp.11-18).
 London: MacMillan Educational for the Schools Council.
- Bruning, R. H., Schraw, G. J., Norby, M. N., & Ronning, R. R. (2004). *Cognitive Psychology and Instruction*. Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Center for Excellence in Enquiry-Based Learning (2010). What is Enquiry-Based Learning. Retrieved from http://www.ceebl.manchester.ac.uk/ebl
- Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (1991). Cognitive load theory and the format of instruction. Cognition and instruction, 8(4), 293-332.
- · Chambliss, M., & Calfee, R. (1998). Textbooks for learning: Nurturing children's minds. Blackwell Publishing.
- Christensen, R., & Knezek, G. (2014). Comparative Measures of Grit, Tenacity and Perseverance. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 8(1).
- Churchill, E. F., Snowdon, D. N., & Munro, A. J. (Eds.). (2012). Collaborative virtual environments: digital places and spaces for interaction. Springer Science & Business Media.
- · Clark, J. M., & Paivio, A. (1991). Dual coding theory and education. Educational psychology review, 3(3), 149-210.
- Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2011). Applying the Coherence Principle. E-Learning and the science of instruction: proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning (3 ed.,). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2011). e-Learning and the Science of Instruction: Proven Guidelines for Consumers and Designers of Multimedia Learning (3rd edition.). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Coffman, T. (2009). Engaging students through inquiry-oriented learning and technology. R&L Education.
- Cohen, S. (1987). Instructional alignment: Searching for a magic bullet. Educational Researcher, 16(8), 16–20.
- Coller, B. D., & Scott, M. J. (2009). Effectiveness of using a video game to teach a course in mechanical engineering. *Computers & Education*, 53(3), 900-912.
- Comer, D. K., Clark, C. R., & Canelas, D. A. (2014). Writing to Learn and Learning to Write across the Disciplines: Peer-to-Peer Writing in Introductory-Level MOOCs. *International Review Of Research In Open & Distance Learning*, 15(5), 26-82.

- Consorti, F., Mancuso, R., Nocioni, M., & Piccolo, A. (2012). Efficacy of virtual patients in medical education: A meta-analysis of randomized studies. Computers and Education, 59(3), 1001–1008. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2012.04.017
- Cook, D. A., Erwin, P. J., & Triola, M. M. (2010). Computerized virtual patients in health professions education: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Academic Medicine: Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, 85(10), 1589–1602. doi:10.1097/ACM.0b013e3181edfe13
- Cook, L. & Mayer, R.E. (1980). Effects in Shadowing on Prose Comprehension and Problem Solving. Memory and Cognition, Vol 8. 101-109.
- Corbett, A. T., Koedinger, K. R., & Anderson, J. R. (1997). Intelligent tutoring systems. In Helander, M. G., Landauer, T. K., & Prabhu, P. V. (Ed.s) *Handbook of Human-Computer Interaction*, (pp. 849-874). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Science B. V.
- Darling-Hammond & Adamson. Beyond Basic Skills: The Role of Performance Assessment in Achieving 21st Century Standards of Learning. Stanford Center for Opportunity Policy in Education, 2010.
- Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 18(1), 105–115. Retrieved from http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/psp/18/1/105
- Deci, E. L., & Cascio, W. (1972). Changes in Intrinsic Motivation as a Function of Negative Feedback and Threats. In
 Eastern Psychological Association Meeting. Boston, MA, US. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED063558
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The" what" and" why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227–268. Retrieved from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/ S15327965PLI1104 01
- Dede, C. (2005). Planning for neomillennial learning styles: Implications for investments in technology and faculty.
 Educating the net generation, 5.
- Dede, C. (2009). Comparing Frameworks for "21st Century Skills." Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- De Jong, T. & Van Joolingen, W. R. (1998). Scientific discovery learning with computer simulations of conceptual domains. Review of Educational Research, 68, 179–201.
- DiCerbo, K. E., & Behrens, J. T. (2012). Implications of the digital ocean on current and future assessment. Computers
 and their impact on state assessment: Recent history and predictions for the future, 273-306.
- Dick, W., Carey, L., & Carey, J. (2015). The Systematic Design of Instruction (8 ed.). New York: Pearson.
- Dillenbourg, P. (1999). What do you mean by collaborative learning. Collaborative-learning: *Cognitive and computational approaches*, 1, 1-15.

- Dolan, D., Holmes, B., Leahy, D., Lych, P., Ward, T., & Amghar, Y. (2005). European Tutots-inductive models for online lecturing in synchronous collaborative environments. Recent Research Developments in Learning Technologies, 2, 476-479.
- Doyle, T. (2008). Helping students learn in a learner-centered environment: A guide to facilitating learning in higher education. Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Duckworth, A. L., Grant, H., Loew, B., Oettingen, G., & Gollwitzer, P. M. (2011). Self-regulation strategies improve self-discipline in adolescents: Benefits of mental contrasting and implementation intentions. *Educational Psychology*, 31(1), 17-26.
- Duckworth, A. L., & Quinn, P. D. (2009). Development and Validation of the Short Grit Scale (Grit-S). Journal Of Personality Assessment, 91(2), 166-174. doi:10.1080/00223890802634290
- Durlach, P. J., & Ray, J. M. (2011). Designing Adaptive Instructional Environments: Insights from Empirical Evidence (No. Technical Report 1297). Arlington, VA: US Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences. Retrieved from http://www.adlnet.gov/wp-content/uploads/2011/11/TR-1297.pdf
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. Psychological Review, 95(2), 256–273. doi:10.1037//0033-295X.95.2.256
- Eccles, J. S. (1983). Expectancies values and academic behaviors. In J. T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and Achievement Motives: Psychological and Sociological Approaches*. San Francisco, CA, USA: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Elliot, A. J., Shell, M. M., Henry, K. B., & Maier, M. A. (2005). Achievement goals, performance contingencies, and performance attainment: An experimental test. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(4), 630.
- Emig, J, (1977). Writing as a mode of learning. College Composition and Communication, 28, 122-128.
- Experimental sites concept paper: Competency-based education. (2014, January).
- Facione, P. A. (1990). Critical thinking: A statement of expert consensus for purposes of educational assessment and instruction. Millbrae, CA: The California Academic Press.
- Falchikov, N., & Goldfinch, J. (2000). Student Peer Assessment in Higher Education: A Meta-Analysis Comparing Peer and Teacher Marks. Review of Educational Research, 70(3), 287–322.
- Fisher, C. D. (1978). The effects of personal control, competence, and extrinsic reward systems on intrinsic motivation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 21(3), 273–288. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(78)90054-5
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive–developmental inquiry. *American psychologist*, 34(10), 906.
- Fullan, M. & Langworthy, M. (2014). A Rich Seam: How New Pedagogies Find Deep Learning. London: Pearson.
- Fullerton, T. (2008). Game design workshop: a playcentric approach to creating innovative games. CRC press.

- Gegenfurtner, A., Quesada-Pallarès, C., & Knogler, M. (2014). Digital simulation-based training: A meta-analysis. British Journal of Educational Technology, 45 (6), 1097-1114.
- Gentile, J. R., & Lalley, J. P. (2003). Standards and mastery learning. Aligning teaching and assessment so all children can learn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Goodyear, P., Jones, C., & Thompson, K. (2014). Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning: Instructional Approaches, Group Processes and Educational Designs. In *Handbook of Research on Educational Communications and Technology* (pp. 439–451). doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5
- Guo, P. J., Kim, J., & Rubin, R. (2014). How Video Production Affects Student Engagement: An Empirical Study of MOOC Videos. L@S 2014 - Proceedings of the 1st ACM Conference on Learning at Scale, 41–50.
- Guskey, T. R. (2007). Closing achievement gaps: revisiting Benjamin S. Bloom's "Learning for Mastery." Journal of Advanced Academics, 19(1), 8-31.
- Halpern, D. F. (1998). Teaching critical thinking for transfer across domains: Dispositions, skills, structure training, and metacognitive monitoring. American Psychologist, 53(4), 449–455.
- Hargrove, R. (2013). Assessing the long-term impact of a metacognitive approach to creative skill development. *International Journal of Technology & Design Education*, 23(3), 489-517. doi:10.1007/s10798-011-9200-6
- Hartsell, T. T. (2013). The Effectiveness of Using Digital Movies as a Form of Reflection. *Journal Of Educational Technology Development & Exchange*, 6(1), 31–46.
- · Haskell, R. E. (2001). Transfer of learning: Cognition, instruction, and reasoning. Academic Press.
- Hattie, J. (2008). Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. New York, NY, USA: Routledge.
- Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research, 77, 81-112.
- Heidig, S., & Clarebout, G. (2011). Do pedagogical agents make a difference to student motivation and learning?.
 Educational Research Review, 6(1), 27-54.
- Helle, L., Nivala, M., Kronqvist, P., Gegenfurtner, A., Björk, P., & Säljö, R. (2011). Traditional microscopy instruction versus process-oriented virtual microscopy instruction: a naturalistic experiment with control group. *Diagnostic Pathology*, 6(1), 1.
- Holladay, Courtney L., and Miguel A. Quiñones (2003), Practice Variability and Transfer of Training: The Role of Self-Efficacy Generality, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 1094-1103.
- Iseli, M. R., Koenig, A. D., Lee, J. J., & Wainess, R. (2010, August). Automated assessment of complex task performance in games and simulations. In *Proceedings of the Interservice/Industry Training, Simulation and Education Conference*, Orlando, FL.

- Herold, B. (2014, October 22). Push for "Learner Profiles" Stymied by Barriers Education Week. Education Week. Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2014/10/22/09pl-learner-profiles.h34.html
- Herrington, J., & Oliver, R. (2000). An instructional design framework for authentic learning environments. *Educational technology research and development*, 48(3), 23-48.
- Hirschel, R. R., Yamamoto, C., & Lee, P. (2012). Video Self-Assessment for Language Learners. Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal, 3(3), 291–309.
- Hochanadel, A., & Finamore, D. (2015). Fixed and Growth Mindset in Education and How Grit Helps Students Persist in the Face of Adversity. *Journal of International Education Research*, 11(1), 47-50.
- Hirumi, A. (2002). Student-Centered, Technology-Rich Learning Environments (SCenTRLE): Operationalizing Constructivist Approaches to Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Technology And Teacher Education*, 10(4), 497-537.
- Jacobs, J., Prince, C., Hays, R., & Salas, E. (1990). A meta-analysis of the flight simulator training research. Naval Training Systems Center Orlando Fl., No. NTSC-8.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1999). Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive and individualistic learning (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2008). Cooperation and the use of technology. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. van Merrienboer, & M. Driscoll (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology* (3rd ed., pp. 1017–1044). Taylor & Francis.
- Jonassen, D., & Kim, B. (2010). Arguing to learn and learning to argue: design justifications and guidelines. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 58(4), 439-457. doi:10.1007/s11423-009-9143-8
- Kavas, G., & Özdener, N. (2012). Effects of Video-Supported Web-Based Peer Assessment on Microteaching Applications: Computer Teacher Candidates Sample. Creative Education, 3(7), 1221–1230.
- Kearney, M., & Schuck, S. (2005). Students in the Director's Seat: Teaching and Learning with Student-generated Video. In EDMEDIA (pp. 2864–2871).
- Kim, Y., & Baylor, A. (2006). A Social-Cognitive Framework for Pedagogical Agents as Learning Companions. Educational Technology Research & Development, 54(6), 569-596. doi:10.1007/s11423-006-0637-3
- Koole, S., Dornan, T., Aper, L., De Wever, B., Scherpbier, A., Valcke, M., Derese, A. (2012). Using video-cases to assess student reflection: Development and validation of an instrument. BMC Medical Education.
- Lai, E. (2011). Critical thinking: A literature review. Pearson report series. Retrieved from http://images.pearsonas-sessments.com/images/tmrs/CriticalThinkingReviewFINAL.pdf
- Lai, E. & Viering, M (2012). Assessing 21st Century Skills: Integrating Research Findings National Council on Measurement in Education, Vancouver, B.C.

- Lainema, T., & Nurmi, S. (2006). Applying an authentic, dynamic learning environment in real world business. Computers and Education, 47(1), 94–115. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2004.10.002
- · L'Allier, James J. (1997). Frame of Reference: NETg's Map to the Products, Their Structure and Core Beliefs. NetG.
- Le, D., Nguyen, A., Nguyen, D., & Hunger, A. (2009). Building learner profile in Adaptive e-Learning Systems. The 4th International Conference on E-Learning (ICEL 2009). Retrieved March 19, 2015, from http://www.researchgate.net/publication/236607471 Building learner profile in Adaptive e-Learning Systems
- Lee, H. W., Lim, K. Y., & Grabowski, B. L. (2010). Improving self-regulation, learning strategy use, and achievement with metacognitive feedback. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 58(6), 629-648.
- Lee, J., & Park, O. (2008). Adaptive Instructional Systems. In J. M. Spector, M. D. Merrill, J. van Merrienboer, & M. P. Driscoll (Eds.), Handbook of research on educational communications and technology (3rd ed., pp. 470–484). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lee, Y., Choi, J., & Kim, T. (2013). Discriminating Factors between Completers of and Dropouts from Online Learning Courses. British Journal of Educational Technology, 44(2), 328–337.
- Levy, F., & Murnane, R. J. (2004). The new division of labor: How computers are creating the next job market. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Lipnevich, A. A., & Smith, J. K. (2009). Effects of differential feedback on students' examination performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, 15, 319-333
- Locke, E.A., & Latham, G.P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation: A 35-year odyssey. American Psychologist, 57, 705–717.
- Lombardi, M. M. (2007). Authentic learning for the 21st century: An overview. Educause learning initiative, 1(2007), 1-12.
- Lou, Y., Abrami, P. C., & D'Apollonia, S. (2001). Small Group and Individual Learning with Technology: A Meta-Analysis. Review of Educational Research, 71(3), 449–521. doi:10.3102/00346543071003449
- Lu, J., Bridgés, S., & Hmelo-Silver, C. E. (2014). Problem-Based Learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.) The Cambridge hand-book of the learning sciences, (pp. 298-318). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lui, O. L., Frankel, L., & Roohr, K. C. (2014). Assessing critical thinking in higher education: Current state and directions for next-generation assessment (Research Report No. ETS-RR-14-10). Retrieved from: http://www.ets.org/research_reports/publications/report/2014/jsjg
- Malone, T. W., & Lepper, M. R. (1987). Making learning fun: A taxonomy of intrinsic motivations for learning. Aptitude, learning, and instruction, 3(1987), 223-253.

- Martin, B. L., & Briggs, L. J. (1986). The cognitive and affective domains: Integration for instruction and research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Educational Technology Publications.
- Marzano, R. A. Theory-Based Meta-Analysis of Research on Instruction, 127-128. Retrieved May 5, 2014, from http://www.peecworks.org/peec/peec_research/l01795EFA.2/Marzano%20Instruction%20Meta_An.pdf
- Mayer, B. W., Dale, K. M., Fraccastoro, K. A., & Moss, G. (2011). Improving transfer of learning: relationship to methods of using business simulation. Simulation & Gaming, 42(1), 64-84.
- Mayer, R. E. (2009). *Multimedia Learning*, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, R. E. (2011). Applying the science of learning. Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
- McClarty, K. L., & Gaertner, M. N. (April, 2015). Measuring mastery: Best practices for assessment in competency-based education. Retrieved from https://www.aei.org/publication/measuring-mastery-best-practices-for-assess-ment-in-competency-based-education
- McKeough, A., Lupart, J. L., & Marini, A. (Eds.). (1995). Teaching for transfer: Fostering generalization in learning. Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.
- McQuiggan, S., Kosturko, L., McQuiggan, J., & Sabourin, J. (2015). Mobile Learning: A Handbook for Developers, Educators, and Learners. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- Messick, S. Meaning and Values in Test Validation: The Science and Ethics of Assessment. Educational Researcher, 18, 5-11.
- Mueller, P., & Oppenheimer, D. (2014). The Pen is Mightier than the Keyboard: Advantages of Longhand over Laptop Notetaking. Psychological Science, DOI: 10.1177/0956797614524581
- Meyer, G. F., Wong, L. T., Timson, E., Perfect, P., & White, M. D. (2012). Objective fidelity evaluation in multisensory virtual environments: auditory cue fidelity in flight simulation. *PloS one*, 7(9). http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0044381
- · Mitchell, A., & Savill-Smith, C. (2004). The use of computer and video games for learning: A review of the literature.
- Morrison, G. R., Ross, S. M., & Kemp, J. E. (2004). Designing Effective Instruction. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.
- Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. M. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model of seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in Higher Education, 31, 199-218.
- Nilson, Linda B. (2013). Creating Self-Regulated Learners. Stylus: Sterling, VA.
- Olson, D.R. (2003). Psychological theory and educational reform: How school remakes mind and society. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ormrod, J. (2012). *Human Learning* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Paivio, A. (1986). Mental Representations. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Paivio, A. (2006). Mind and its evolution; a dual coding theoretical interpretation, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Pai-Hsing Wu, Hsin-Kai Wu, & Ying-Shao Hsu. (2014). Establishing the Criterion Related, Construct, and Content Validities of a Simulation-based Assessment of Inquiry Abilities. *International Journal of Science Education*, 36:10, 1630-1650.
- Partnership for 21st Century Skills. Learning for the 21st Century. Retrieved from http://www.p21.org/storage/documents/P21_Report.pdf
- Pashler, H., McDaniel, M., Rohrer, D., & Bjork, R. (2008). Learning styles concepts and evidence. Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 9(3), 105–119.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. Educational psychology review, 16(4), 385-407.
- Pintrich, P. R. (2003). Motivation and Classroom Learning. In Handbook of Psychology. John Wiley & Sons. doi:10.1002/0471264385.wei0706.
- Pintrich, P. R., & De Groot, E. V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. *Journal of educational psychology*, 82(1), 33.
- Plante, I., O'Keefe, P. A., & Théorêt, M. (2012). The relation between achievement goal and expectancy-value theories in predicting achievement-related outcomes: A test of four theoretical conceptions. *Motivation and Emotion*, 37(1), 65–78. doi:10.1007/s11031-012-9282-9
- Polsani, P. R. (2006). Use and abuse of reusable learning objects. Journal of Digital information, 3(4).
- Quellmalz, E. S., Timms, M. J., Silberglitt, M. D., & Buckley, B. C. (2012). Science assessments for all: Integrating science simulations into balanced state science assessment systems. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 49(3), 363–393.
- Reiser, B. J., & Tabak, I. (2014). Scaffolding. In The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences, R. Keith Sawyer (Ed.), Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Rogers, L. (2011). Developing simulations in multi-user virtual environments to enhance healthcare education. British Journal of Educational Technology, 42(4), 608-615.
- Rotherham, A. & Willingham, D. 21st Century Skills: The Challenges Ahead. *Educational Leadership* [serial online]. September 1, 2009;67(1):16-21. Available from: ERIC, Ipswich, MA. Accessed March 11, 2015.
- Ryan, R. M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(3), 450–461. Retrieved from http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/psp/43/3/450

- Salkind, N. J. (Ed.). (2008). Encyclopedia of educational psychology. (Vols. 1-2). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963848
- Savery, J. R. (2006). Overview of problem-based learning: Definitions and distinctions. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-based Learning*, 1(1), 3.
- Sawyer, R. K. (Ed.). (2014). The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences. Cambridge University Press.
- Schraw, G. (1998). Promoting General Metacognitive Awareness. Instructional Science, 26(1-2), 113-25.
- Senko, C., Hulleman, C. S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2011). Achievement Goal Theory at the Crossroads: Old Controversies, Current Challenges, and New Directions. *Educational Psychologist*, 46(1), 26–47. doi:10.1080/00461520.2011.538 646
- Siewiorek, A., & Gegenfurtner, A. (2010). Leading to Win: The Influence of Leadership Styles on Team Performance during a Computer Game Training. In *Proceedings of the 2010 International Conference of the Learning Sciences* (Vol. 1, pp. 524–531.
- Siewiorek, A., Gegenfurtner, A., Lainema, T., Saarinen, E., & Lehtinen, E. (2013). The effects of computer simulation game training on participants' opinions on leadership styles. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(6), 1012-1035.
- Shute, V. J. (2007). Focus on formative feedback (Research Report No. ETS-RR-07-11). Retrieved from: http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/RR-07-11.pdf
- Shute, V. J., Rieber, L., & Van Eck, R. (2011). Games... and... learning. Trends and issues in instructional design and technology, 3.
- Shute, V. J. & Ventura, M. (2013). Stealth Assessment: Measuring and Supporting Learning in Video Games. Cambridge, MA: The MIT press.
- Silva, E. (2009). Measuring Skills for 21st-Century Learning. Phi Delta Kappan, 90(9), 630-634.
- Slavin, R. (1990). Cooperative learning: Theory research and practice. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice Hall.
- Stahl, G., Koschmann, T., & Suthers, D. (2014). Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge Handbook of the Learning Sciences (2nd ed.). New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1999). Cognitive psychology (2nd ed.). Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Sullivan, B. (2012). Developing 21st Century Skills with Student-created Videos. Ubiquitous Learning: An International Journal, 5(1), 49-55.
- Sweller, J. (1994). Cognitive load theory, learning difficulty, and instructional design. *Learning and instruction*, 4(4), 295-312.

- Sweller, J. (2005) Implications of cognitive load theory for multimedia learning. in R. E. Mayer (Ed.). *The Cambridge Handbook of Multimedia Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, A., & Dalal, H. A. (2014). Information Literacy Standards and the World Wide Web: Results from a Student Survey on Evaluation of Internet Information Sources. *Information Research: An International Electronic Journal*, 19(4).
- Taylor, K., & Rohrer, D. (2010). The effect of interleaving practice. Applied Cognitive Psychology, 24, 837–848.
- Tobias, S., & Everson, H. (2009). The Importance of Knowing What You Know. In Hacker, D., Dunlosky, J., & Graesser, A. (eds.) Handbook of Metacognition in Education (107-127). New York: Routledge.
- Tobias, S., & Fletcher, J. D. (Eds.). (2011). Computer games and instruction. IAP.
- Tochon, F.V. (2001). "Education-Research": New Avenues for Digital Video Pedagogy and Feedback in Teacher Education. International Journal of Applied Semiotics, 2(1-2), 9-28.
- Topping, K. J. (2005). Trends in peer learning. Educational psychology, 25(6), 631-645.
- Turner, W., & West, J. (2013). Assessment for" Digital First Language" Speakers: Online Video Assessment and Feedback in Higher Education. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 25(3), 288-296.
- Tynjälä, P., Häkkinen, P., & Hämäläinen, R. (2014). TEL@ work: Toward integration of theory and practice. British Journal of Educational Technology, 45(6), 990-1000.
- Van de Pol, Janneke, Volman, Monique, & Beishuizen, Jos. (2010). Scaffolding in Teacher-Student Interaction: A
 Decade of Research. Educational Psychology Review, 22:271–296.
- VanLehn, K. (2011). The Relative Effectiveness of Human Tutoring, Intelligent Tutoring Systems, and Other Tutoring Systems. Educational Psychologist, 46(4), 197–221. doi:10.1080/00461520.2011.611369
- Ventura, M., & Shute, V. (2013). The validity of a game-based assessment of persistence. Computers In Human Behavior, 29(6), 2568-2572. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2013.06.033
- Walker, J. P., & Sampson, V. (2013). Learning to Argue and Arguing to Learn: Argument-Driven Inquiry as a Way to Help Undergraduate Chemistry Students Learn How to Construct Arguments and Engage in Argumentation During a Laboratory Course. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 50(5), 561-596. doi:10.1002/tea.21082
- Wang, S. L., & Wu, P. Y. (2008). The role of feedback and self-efficacy on web-based learning: The social cognitive perspective. Computers & Education, 51(4), 1589-1598.
- Webb, N., & Palincsar, A. (1996). Group processes in the classroom. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), Handbook of Educational Psychology (pp. 841–873). New York, NY, USA: Macmillan.
- Weiner, B. (1974). Achievement motivation and attribution theory. Morristown, NJ, USA: General Learning Press.
- Wetzel, C. D., Radtke, P. H., & Stern, H. W. (1994). Instructional effectiveness of video media. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Wiliam, D. (2007). Five "key strategies" for effective formative assessment. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Assessment Research Brief, 1-4.
- Wiliam, D. (2007). What does the research say the benefits of formative assessment are? The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Assessment Research Brief, 1-3.
- Williams, S. (2010). New Tools for Online Information Literacy Instruction. Reference Librarian, 51(2), 148-162. doi:10.1080/02763870903579802
- Wilson, K. A., Bedwell, W. L., Lazzara, E. H., Salas, E., Burke, C. S., Estock, J. L., ... & Conkey, C. (2009). Relationships between game attributes and learning outcomes review and research proposals. *Simulation & gaming*, 40(2), 217-266.
- Winne, P., & Azevedo, R. (2014). Metacognition. In R. K. Sawyer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of the learning sciences (2nd ed.) (pp. 130-71). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, C. C., & Kao, H. C. (2008). Streaming videos in peer assessment to support training pre-service teachers. Educational Technology & Society, 11(1), 45-55.
- Yeager, D. S., Paunesku, D., Walton, G. M., & Dweck, C. S. (2013). How can we instill productive mindsets at scale? A
 review of the evidence and an initial R&D agenda. White paper prepared for the White House meeting on Excellence in education: The importance of academic mindsets. May 10, 2013.
- Zimbardo, P. G., & Leippe, M. R. (1991). *The psychology of attitude change and social influence*. Mcgraw-Hill Book Company.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulated learning and academic achievement: An overview. Educational psychologist, 25(1), 3-17.
- Zuckerman, M., Porac, J., Lathin, D., & Deci, E. L. (1978). On the Importance of Self-Determination for Intrinsically-Motivated Behavior. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 4(3), 443–446. doi:10.1177/014616727800400317
- Zurita, G., & Nussbaum, M. (2004). Computer supported collaborative learning using wirelessly interconnected handheld computers. *Computers & education*, 42(3), 289-314.
- Zurita, G., Nussbaum, M., & Shaples, M. (2003). Encouraging face-to-face collaborative learning through the use of handheld computers in the classroom. In *International Conference on Mobile Human-Computer Interaction* (pp. 193-208). Springer Berlin Heidelberg.