**Case Study Facilitation Materials**

Jennie Davenport/Pedro Lopez Case (The ID CaseBook, Ch. 11)

EDCI 672000, Dr. B. Watson - Week 5, ending November 18, 2012

Team 4: Freddi Rokaw, Martha Harms, and Jason Terrell

Following are the materials that were required for facilitating the case study of the Jennie Davenport/Pedro Lopez Case from *The ID CaseBook*, Chapter 11.

**Objectives**

1. Identify the key stakeholders and what is at risk for each.
2. Identify what elements of instruction worked well in the M2M project.
3. Identify what elements will be difficult to translate to IM2M instruction.
4. Analyze potential sensitivity issues with an online version of the M2M.
5. Analyze design issues with converting the M2M to IM2M.
6. Analyze potential solutions and how each could affect stakeholder interests.

*Strategies or Questions for Objectives:*

1. Who are the key stakeholders and what do they each have to gain or lose?
2. What elements of the M2M instruction were essential to its success?
3. What elements of the M2M instruction might be difficult to convert to online instruction?
4. Role Play – if you were a participant in the IM2M, how would you feel about sharing sensitive information over the Internet – either your own personal information, information from others, or “hot cognitions”?
5. Role Play – if you are Pedro, Jennie, or Essex, consider the problems with designing an IM2M conversion from M2M. How will essential instructional items need to be addressed to keep the integrity of the M2M program intact?
6. Role Play – Time for a final meeting. You will play the role of Jennie, Pedro or Essex. Jennie presents a potential solution. Discuss the solutions with each of your personal interests in mind and apparent in your responses.

*Evidence of Learner Achievement:*

1. Given the discussion question, learners will demonstrate they understand who the key stakeholders are and what their interests/at risks are for each in their responses to the question.
2. Given the discussion question, learners will demonstrate the essential elements of M2M instruction in their responses to the question.
3. Given the discussion question, learners will demonstrate they understand how the M2M instruction will be difficult to convert to IM2M in their responses to the question.
4. Given a role and a perspective, learners will discuss potential sensitive information issues being transmitted over the internet. Through this discussion, learners will examine these issues in depth.
5. Given a role and a perspective, learners will discuss potential problems with converting M2M to IM2M. Through this discussion, learners will examine these problems in depth.
6. Given a role and a perspective, learners will discuss potential solutions. Through this discussion, learners will examine these solutions in depth from the perspective assigned to them.

**Literature & Summary**

1. **The ID CaseBook: Jennie Davenport and Pedro Lopez (Book chapter)**

*Citation*: Ertmer, P. A., & Quinn, J. (2007). *The ID CaseBook: Case studies in instructional design* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

*Description:* Chapter 11 (pp. 90-96) provides the basis for the case being analyzed.

1. **Foundations of Communities of Practice: Enablers and Barriers to Participation (Journal article)**

*Citation*: Guldberg, K. & Mackness, J. Foundations of communities of practice: enablers and barriers to participation. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, (2009), 25, pp. 528-538.

*Description:* This research paper uses Wenger’s “Community of Practice” theory in relation to technology-enhanced learning environments. It identifies the positive and negative issues involved with participation in online social constructivist environments. It also speaks to specific design issues for development of such a community.
2. **Patterns of Engagement in Authentic Online Learning Environments (Journal article)**

*Citation*: Herrington, J., Oliver, R. and Reeves, T. C. (2003). Patterns of engagement in authentic online learning environments.  Australian Journal of Educational Technology, 19(1), 59-71.  <http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet19/herrington.html>

*Description:* This paper offers insight into the use of authentic activities in the online learning environment. It provides a review of literature, a description of research and preliminary findings of “suspending disbelief” for the purpose of engagement in authentic tasks. It also proposes the 10 characteristics of authentic activities, based on educational theory and research.
3. **Adapting a Face-to-Face Role-Playing Simulation for Online Play (Case study)**

*Citation*: Bos, Nathan & Shami, N. Sadat.  Adapting a face-to-face role-playing simulation for online play.   Educational Technology Research and Development, Vol. 54, No. 5 (Oct., 2006), pp. 493-521.

*Description:* This case study addresses the specific design challenges in adapting face-to-face settings for asynchronous online usage. The case is based on the example of using an interactive role-playing game and adapting it for online play.

Jennie Davenport/Pedro Lopez Case Analysis Feedback Form (Rubric)

| Problem Finding (5 points) |
| --- |
| Criteria | Feedback | Score |
| Have you identified the key stakeholders and their points of view, without prejudice or blaming? | Yes/No | 1/1 |
| * Did you identify Dr. Essex as the client/SME?
 | Yes/No |
| * Did you identify Pedro as having significant input to the NHF proposal & acknowledge his ID experience?
 | Yes/No |
| * Did you identify Jennie as an independent instructional design consultant & acknowledge her ID experience?
 | Yes/No |
| * Did you identify high-risk gay & bisexual men (that had been recruited as volunteers) as the targeted audience? Specifically, men who use the Internet to meet partners?
 | Yes/No |
| * Have you identified key challenges in the case and prioritized them?
 | Yes/No | 3/3 |
| * Have you identified the key design challenges and what is at risk for each?
 | Yes/No |
| * + - Did you recognize that the training must be converted from F2F workshop to an asynchronous, highly interactive on-line environment?
 | Yes/No |
| * + - Have you identified behavioral change as a learning objective?
 | Yes/No |
| * + - Did you identify the need to develop detailed measures of effectiveness based on evaluation criteria to assess changes in behavior?
 | Yes/No |
| * Have you identified other case-specific challenges that will impact how Denny addresses the design issues?
 | Yes/No |
| * + - Did you consider the differing backgrounds and instructional design approaches of Pedro and Jennie?
 | Yes/No |
| * + - Did you identify what elements will be difficult to translate to IM2M instruction (e.g. “hot cognition”, privacy, sensitive subjects, emotion, the “10 components”)?
 | Yes/No |
| * + - Did you recognize any communication issues between the stakeholders?
 | Yes/No |
| * Have you explained why you chose to prioritize the issues as you did?
 | Yes/No |
| * Have you explained how the readings and your previous experiences contributed to your understanding and analysis of the case?
 | Yes/No | 1/1 |
| * Total Problem Finding Score
 | 5/5 |

| Problem Solving (5 points) |
| --- |
| Criteria | Feedback | Score |
| Did you propose at least two reasonable solutions that address the challenges described above? | Yes/No | 2/2 |
| * Did you consider the NHF proposal as a resource for your proposed solution?
 | Yes/No |
| * Did you include the components of training that Dr. Essex has requested for IM2M?
 | Yes/No |
| * Did you discuss how the training might be designed in a way that allows for active participation, while maintaining the privacy and respect of the participants?
 | Yes/No |
| Did you identify the pros and cons to each solution? Did you consider what might interfere with your proposed solutions? | Yes/No | 1.5/1.5 |
| * Did you consider the risks associated with the solution?
 | Yes/No |
| * Did you consider other potential consequences and how they should be addressed?
 | Yes/No |
| * Did you consider how the solution would affect the interests of the stakeholders?
 | Yes/No |
| Did you describe which solution is “best?” Did you provide a strong rationale for choosing your solution? | Yes/No | 1.5/1.5 |
| * Is your solution reasonable – could an outside consultant effectively carry them out?
 | Yes/No |
| * Do you describe how you would address the possible obstacles outlined in the previous point?
 | Yes/No |
| * Do you provide for flexibility in your proposed solution?
 | Yes/No |
| * Total Problem Solving Score
 | * 5/5
 |
| * Total Case Analysis Score
 | * 10/10
 |

**Blackboard Discussion Synthesis**

The Blackboard Discussion Forum was introduced as such on Sunday of Week 5:

Conduct a stakeholder meeting to brainstorm ideas for the IM2M project.  Here are some points to get you started:

* Is it possible to include Professor Essex's specific methods and content in M2M to IM2M?
* If so, what might that workshop look like?
* Why should all stakeholders approve your proposed solutions?

Role assignments were as follows:

**Final Meeting A:**

*Facilitator*: Martha Harms

Jennie Davenport – Mary Hokana

Pedro Lopez – Tim Ludden

Professor Clark Essex – Jason Terrell (Team 4 Facilitator member)

**Final Meeting B:**

*Facilitator: Freddi Rokaw*

Jennie Davenport – Debora Weaver

Pedro Lopez – Lauren Holub

Professor Clark Essex – Leilani Sta. Cruz

Keeping to the same teams, the second part of the discussion forum began on Thursday of week 6 and included the following questions:

**Team A (Martha’s team):**

As we head toward building a solution and determining what the online version of IM2M should “look like,” we need to consider all the problems in the case that you have identified below. Some of you put some solutions in your posts already, but let’s start a new thread of discussion and not “bury” those solutions, rather, let’s list how we will design instruction to solve these problems. Problems we cannot solve, let’s try to design instruction that will “substitute” for the elements that will not translate well.

Problems with translating M2M into IM2M:

* Communication between the ID Jennie, the SME Essex, and the ID/SME Pedro.
* Specifically ensuring effective evaluation of the IM2M
* Legal aspects of translating some elements of the current M2M program into an online format
* Specifically dealing with “hot cognitions” and other ethical concerns about sharing sexual information online
* Replicating personal and emotional connections between M2M participants
* Specifically non-verbal cues and having counselors available during “training”
* Simplicity of the technological interface of the IM2M program
* Specifically addressing any special technology skills necessary to participate in IM2M

**Summary from Team A:**

Tim, Mary, and Jason did a great job discussing the issues in this case and hammering out potential solutions.

A summary of potential solutions addressed the issues effectively and included:

* adapting evaluations from M2M for IM2M to solve the evaluation problem
* develop hot cognitions appropriate for the web with the help of the SME and a legal consultant -- keeping the cost of such consulting in mind
* using digital "signage" to display emotions in the IM2M to help replicate the face to face non-verbals that will be missing
* a manual or "how to" to keep the technology level at a simple enough point for users
* ensuring IM2M is a "closed" course for participants only -- perhaps by having an application or registration process to solve the problem of sensitive materials being discussed on the web.
* the manual should clearly state the expectations of behavior for the participants
* the application process should be involved enough to build trust between the facilitator and the participants, which would then filter into trust between the participants themselves.

**Team B (Freddi’s team):**

“On page 93 of the case study, Pedro describes Jennie's previous training designs as being content-based and mostly about "delivering information."  Pedro thinks the IM2M workshop has a unique objective and needs to address the desired learning outcomes in a different way.

What is Pedro referring to exactly, and how might those differences affect the actual design of the course?”

**Summary from Team B:**

Part 1 of the week had the team members identify their roles in the process. Although they did not interact with each other (see my reflection paper), they identified the following:

*Pedro*

* Has the same goals as Professor Essex
* Recognizes the topic as very personal and also involves privacy issues
* Wants to foster an environment that promotes sharing in a positive and reinforcing way to build relationships and trust
* Recognizes the previous internet and technology experience of future participants in IM2M
* Recognizes that the content and delivery methods need to be structured differently than the F2F workshop
* Willing to collaborate and discuss with other stakeholders

*Jennie*

* States the objectives for the F2F and online workshops are the same
* Acknowledges the success of the current F2F workshop
* Recognizes that participants will have full access and familiarity with the online tools based on their previous experience
* Stresses the need to be strategic in designing the online workshop
* Willing to collaborate and discuss with other stakeholders

*Professor Essex*

* Recognizes the differences between the F2F and online versions of his workshop
* Wants his online version to be state-of-the-art
* Places great trust in the abilities of Jennie and Pedro, whom he has recruited, to select the appropriate information, determine the materials to use and design activities to include
* Is willing to make suggestions for the development of the design strategy

Part 2 of the discussion forum was designed to identify specific design issues and propose potential solutions for the case study. These are some of the ideas that came across from the group:

* Content of the online training will be difficult to translate to online, especially “hot cognitions” and physical activities
* Personal information and privacy issues are at risk
* Learning objectives include behavioral change as opposed to content-based knowledge
* Use (and further research) of the Trans-theoretical model as a design system to combine differing learning objectives (behavioral vs. content-based learning)
* Learning objectives will stay the same, but the content and delivery need to be structured differently
* Activities should foster an environment that not only recognizes the personal nature of the learning process, but also encourages sharing of experiences and provides encouragement. This will help to build relationships and earn trust in order to influence behavior change
* It is important not to lose the intimacy structure that is so successful in the F2F workshop
* Decisions need to be made about appropriate information, materials to use and activities to include in a way that is considered “state-of-the-art”
* Steps in the design process that need to be addressed are content, materials and activities

**Group Synthesis (from both teams):**

This case was very different from some of the other cases the class has been asked to evaluate. With the other cases, there were many aspects that our fellow students were able to personally identify with and their responses to discussion questions often related back to their personal experiences. However, with this particular case, considering the subject matter and the design challenge at hand, our discussion participants had to rely much more heavily upon evidence from the text than on personal experiences.

As a result, participants really had to focus on what each “character” in the text was saying, how that character related to the case, and what the concerns for each character were. When you examine the responses in the discussion windows, it is apparent that the members of each group did not draw very much from their own experiences. Perhaps this made this particular case more objective. Without the personal experience to color their impressions, participants focused very clearly on the design issues and how to solve them.

Both groups understood the core issues of privacy on the web, the sensitivity of the subject matter, the legal problems with moving such an instructional unit to the internet, as well as the difficulty in translating the face to face experience into an effective and emotional internet piece of instruction, yet still maintain the support system the face to face instruction prided itself upon.

At the end of the discussion, and after considering the many facets of the case, it appears that the participants clearly understood the essential design issues, identified the key stakeholders and their investments, and analyzed potential solutions.