Amanda Haas
Reflection Paper 2
TIP529/Spring 2017

While reading about the instructional design process, I thought a lot about how the steps apply to my teaching. For example, I teach a lesson on evaluating websites that covers URL anatomy, authority, purpose, content, and currency. Following the ABCD process of writing an objective, my objectives reads: given a website the students will identify the author of the website with 100% accuracy; and given a website the student will evaluate the author's potential for bias with 90% accuracy. Under Bloom's Taxonomy, the first objective has a level of comprehension (Morrison, 108). The second objective has a level of evaluation (Morrison, 108). Both fall under the cognitive domain, but one is procedural and covers how to identify the author of the website (Morrison, 102, 115-116). The other is an abstract concept where the expectation is for the students to evaluate the author for bias (Morrison, 76). Both require students to apply their knowledge (Morrison, 116).

As I read about instructional sequencing, I identified the most with Posner and Strike's learning-related sequencing scheme. For example, when I teach students how to evaluate a website, I start with what is familiar, the URL (Morrison, 125). I identify prerequisite information which in this case are the parts of a URL, and then teach the students how the domain can be an indicator for credibility (Morrison, 125). The lesson moves forward in difficulty (Morrison, 125). I teach them how to look at currency, content, purpose, and finally authority which is the most difficult part of evaluating a website. The lesson on evaluating websites is geared toward 6th and 7th grade students who are developmentally ready for this topic (Morrison, 125). I also teach this lesson right before they start their first research project, so the topic is of interest to them (Morrison, 125).

In chapter 7, Designing the Instruction: Strategies, I agree that "an effective instructional strategy must consider the learner's prior knowledge and offer the appropriate level of challenge" (Morrison, 139). This makes me think about a lesson I taught recently on topics and subtopics. The students had prior knowledge in classifying a topic and its subtopics. The objective for the lesson was: given a subtopic the student will demonstrate how to find that subtopic in a book with 100% accuracy. This is a psychomotor procedural application (Morrison, 140). The prescription for teaching a psychomotor procedure as an application first requires me to demonstrate or model the procedure (Morrison, 147). In this lesson, I modeled the following example. The subtopic we were expected to find in a book in our library was Lake Alaotra. First we used Google to find information that would help us broaden our topic. We found the lake is located in Madagascar. Next, we used OPAC to search for books on Madagascar; then we used the call number to find the book on the shelf. After we had the book, we looked in the index to see if our subtopic was in the book. The generative strategies I used next were to have

the students repeat back to me the steps in the procedure, and then each student was given their own unique subtopic as practice of the procedure (Morrison, 149).

While reviewing Designing the Instructional Message, I realized most of my lessons' pre instructional strategies are to explain the objectives to the students. I usually say something such as,"by the end of the lesson today you will be able to…" While designing materials for my presentation whether it's a slideshow, worksheet, blog post or some combination, I do consider the design. I have some knowledge in design with regards to whitespace and text combinations. I tend to refer to the Canva Design School for font pairings. The typographical signals mentioned in chapter 8, are also familiar to me.

In addition to considering the design of the message, I also consider the heuristics for developing my instruction. "Each time we develop instructional materials, we learn something new" (Morrison, 189). This is my seventeenth year of teaching, and I have never repeated my curriculum exactly. At the end of each lesson, I make notes to myself about what I want to change for next year when I teach that particular lesson again. Each of the heuristics provided in chapter 9, Developing Instructional Materials, are great reminders about what works and why. When I teach lessons on digital citizenship, I find myself using a lot of examples to help make the lesson concrete (Morrison, 191). For example, I recently finished teaching students about scams and schemes through technology. I'm fairly confident my students now think I am the biggest target on the planet because of the amount of examples I have, but the lesson appears to have worked. All week students brought me examples of scams they had received. One of the hardest heuristics to master is pacing (Morrison, 192). Learning how many examples and problems to give students comes with practice. To this day, if I teach something new, I struggle with the pacing until I have taught it a couple of times.

I use the group presentation style of teaching but not in the truest sense (Morrison, 203). I know I can't hold students attention for too long, so I give opportunities for pair sharing, group discussion, and there is always an activity that shows me the behavior I expected from my instructional objective. With middle school students, I also review a lot of terminology. I try to define or ask for definitions for words that even I think they will probably know. Although, last week I missed one. I assumed they would know what annually meant. Luckily a student in the first class asked, so for my remaining classes, I defined the word when it came up.

As I read chapter 10, Design Considerations for Technology-Based Instruction, I thought a lot about our new virtual reality lessons. I have thirteen VR devices right now and hope to have a complete classroom set to check out to teachers by early March. The lessons in Google Expeditions and New York Times VR are the best I have found, but I am looking for more. The questions I am trying to answer are how well do these lessons help "teachers and students achieve the desired instructional goals," and will virtual reality improve comprehension (Morrison, 224, 227). The prescriptions teachers use in their lessons will help answer these questions. For example, if a teacher expects the students to paraphrase how smoking affects the lungs as part of her instructional objective, then part one of the principle and rule prescription is

to present the information to the learner (Morrison, 142). The teacher could use the Google Expedition lesson on the respiratory system where students get a 360^0 view of it through virtual reality goggles while the teacher verbally gives the students information on the system and asks them questions about it. Part two of the prescription is the generative strategy that increases the depth of processing (Morrison, 142). In this case, according to her objective students will recall the information by paraphrasing in their own words. "It is the strategy or method that makes the difference (in the comprehension of the material), not the technology" (Morrison, 227). In my opinion, this is the most important concept to remember when using technology in a lesson. Although, I do hope the presentation of the material through virtual reality will help students understand the material better when it is initially presented to them.

Chapters 5-10 were great reminders to me on how to create effective lessons and made me think about why my good lessons work with students. In particular, I thought about my instructional objectives. The examples I used had me classifying them as cognitive, psychomotor, or affective and then figuring out the prescriptive for teaching the objective. In addition, I referred to Bloom's Taxonomy throughout to help me determine the comprehension level of the objective.

Works Cited

Morrison, Gary R., Steven M. Ross, Howard K. Kalman, and Jerrold E. Kemp. *Designing Effective Instruction*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2013. Print.

"The Ultimate Guide to Font Pairing." *Design School*. 30 June 2016. Web. 04 Feb. 2017, https://designschool.canva.com/blog/the-ultimate-guide-to-font-pairing/?utm_campaign=Weekly%20Newsletter%20%E2%80%93%20Fonts%20&utm_content=a&utm_medium=email&utm_source=vero&utm_term=Newsletter&vero_conv=NyWhOXzGZcqwnLGpJKMWZ_KuUXKUyhG1Kyks7R1dlkAo0R-1X_cXJ1zbMwq08Xb9YYEFc_JL57kB6FA76NiRUL6Uxm7X5IQS&vero_id=uabd6039ija.