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INTRODUCTION

As instructional designers we are constantly being bombarded with new technologies and new trends. It’s difficult to distinguish which are fads, and which are worthy of our investments of time and resources. The safest, and often most expedient course of action is to continue to focus on the delivery technology we know is NOT a fad, the traditional classroom. After all we’ve been using the traditional classroom forever, how can we possibly go wrong teaching in a classroom in front of an audience?

As new technologies, like the virtual classroom, eLearning, and social media, are introduced, we continue to play it safe by trying to make these technology experiences replicate the classroom.

There are two issues with these assumptions:

1. The classroom has been utilized for so long (centuries!) not because it is the most effective means of teaching, but because it was the best “technology” that was available at the time. However, this setting is often the least optimal for delivering a particular piece of content.
2. As the use of various learning technologies becomes commonplace in training departments, a perception has been building that implies that you can force fit any content into any technology.

But can you really teach ANY content using ANY technology? This seems to be the perception as the use of various learning technologies become commonplace in training departments. A group purchases WebEx™ (or Articulate®, or....), so everything needs to be delivered using that platform.

There are several fundamental problems with this perception:

1. We are looking at entire programs (i.e. project management or sales training) and attempting to force the entire program into one delivery modality.
2. There’s an implied assumption that all delivery modalities treat all types of content in the same way.

So what’s the solution? From an instructional design perspective we should be looking to develop much more of a blended program than trying to fit all content into one convenient delivery modality. At its essence, instead of making a design decision to teach project management via a specific tool, we need to break project management into its component learning objectives and match each learning objective to the best technology available.

PLANNING YOUR BLEND: A THREE STEP APPROACH

Creating a successful blended program takes planning. A lot of planning, on paper (okay, digital paper), before developing any materials. The cost of poor planning for a blended learning solution is potentially higher than the cost for a poorly planned classroom program.

Let’s think about that for a moment. If you execute a poorly planned two-day classroom program, you’ll know about it in two days; and the cost of redevelopment is probably limited to leader guides and participant guides, and the impacted audience is probably less than 20 participants.

However, if you execute an a poorly planned blended program with an equivalent amount of content, you may not know the program was not working for weeks, and multiple cohorts may
have begun the learning process before you realize it isn’t working. Changes may mean new storyboards, more programming, new technologies, etc. The more complex your blend is, the higher the cost of poor planning.

To plan your blend, take a three-step approach:

- **Step 1:** Validate learning objectives and assessment techniques
- **Step 2:** Map learning objectives to delivery technologies using Bloom’s Digital Taxonomy of Learning
- **Step 3:** Flip the classroom to maximize collaborative impact

**Step 1: Validate learning objectives and assessment techniques**

When considering how to construct your blend and what technologies to use, you need to start with a clear definition of what it is you're teaching, why you're teaching, how you will assess student mastery, and how much collaboration is required in order for the program to be successful.

A clear definition of what is being taught starts with a re-examination of your instructional goal. It is critical that the instructional goal be accurate and complete at the very beginning; otherwise you may build the wrong class.

For example, your instructional goal might be to develop a world-class sales training program. This sounds very straightforward, however, it actually isn’t complete enough. You would use a different design to create training for a sales team that sells over the phone as compared to training for a sales team that needs to sell in a face-to-face environment. If you tell your instructional designers to create a world-class sales training program, and they include face-to-face presentation skills, how to dress, how to make a good first impression by shaking hands and other physical interpersonal actions, none of these skills would actually be relevant to a sales team that never meets face-to-face with a customer.

After the goal is determined, take a look at your performance objectives. The performance objectives indicate what learners will be able to do at the end of the training. Even if you are converting to a blend from a face-to-face environment, take this opportunity to validate your performance objectives to ensure that they are still valid.
Here’s the key step in the planning process: how can you assess that the learning objectives are being met? The reason this is so important is that the assessment techniques determine potential delivery technologies.

There is generally a direct correlation between the type of assessment you will use and the type of technology you will use to deliver the content associated with that assessment.

For example, if your assessment is a self-paced instrument that tests the students recall of content, you can probably teach that content in a self-paced format. If students are required to collaborate with other students in order to be assessed, you will probably require a collaborative technology to deliver content. Collaborative technologies can be live (traditional classrooms and virtual classrooms) or not live (discussion board postings and some forms of social media).

Remember, blended learning is not only about matching content to the most appropriate delivery medium, but doing it at the learning objective level. It’s the assessment technique that marries these two concepts.

You don’t need to create the assessment instruments at this point. I’m not suggesting you create a 100 question test, or design a role-play. Just identify the types of assessments that could be used to ensure the desired level of student mastery is being met.

As you ascertain the different potential technologies (self-paced, live, collaborative), you are starting to identify the different modules in your blend.
Step 2: Map Learning Objectives to Delivery Technologies using Bloom’s Digital Taxonomy of Learning

Now that you have identified what you are teaching through the learning objectives, and how you might assess mastery, it’s time to decide what technology fits best for each objective.

The best approach I have found to match learning objectives to the most appropriate delivery technology is to use a new take on Bloom’s Taxonomy.

Originally developed in the 1950’s, the intent of Bloom’s Taxonomy was to categorize types of learning objectives to define a level of mastery in a classroom. Using Bloom’s Taxonomy, depending on the desired outcome, you would categorize your learning objectives into one of the six levels of learning and then use appropriate activities that corresponded to those levels of learning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery.
For example, at the original knowledge level of learning, a student can recall knowledge by performing such activities as creating a list or creating a list of defining features.

This really works.

In fact, even those of us who have become instructional designers without prior training in the field can create very effective programs by using this simple, yet powerful, framework.

As content delivery moved out of the traditional classroom and into more collaborative learning technologies, Bloom’s Taxonomy was badly in need of some reconstructive surgery. In 2009, Andrew Churches repackaged the taxonomy to take advantage of tools that can help us master different levels of learning in ways that were not previously possible.

What follows is a high-level summary of each of the six levels of learning contained in Churches’ digital taxonomy. Some content for this section is provided by: http://edorigami.wikispaces.com/Bloom’s+Digital+Taxonomy.

**Remembering**

“Retrieving, recalling or recognizing knowledge from memory. Remembering is when memory is used to produce definitions, facts or lists, or recite or retrieve material.”

Remembering is the level of learning where we become familiar enough with concepts that we can recognize when they are being used in another context.

When we deal with the Remembering domain, we find ourselves using the tools available for self-directed learning. Web technologies like Google can help us to define terms. We can create an Articulate Storyline module that helps us to list important steps in a sequence. We can use books, PDF documents, and other web tools to read and then recall key concepts.

Usually we don’t need to collaborate with other people to remember concepts. Since Remembering doesn’t require collaboration, and
testing to ensure Remembering has taken place can occur in a self-paced format, learning objectives that use keywords such as “recognize,” “list,” “identify,” “define,” and “locate” can be delivered in a self-paced format.

A very conventional and inexpensive way to deliver knowledge-based content is via a virtual classroom webinar. We’ve all attended them (or pretended to attend them). A hundred people or more log on to the same virtual session at the same time, listen to what experts have to say, and, if permitted, ask questions where appropriate to verify understanding. The Remembering level of learning seemingly aligns itself well with these large scale webinars.

I say ‘seemingly’ because we are not conducting any sort of assessment to ascertain if content is actually being retained. With most webinars, we hope that people will log in, pay attention, and remember what is said. “Hope” is probably not an effective measurement technique.

But we need to remember that this type of online session is not what we would traditionally define as “training.” This is simply information dissemination. It’s important. It’s useful. But it rarely gets us beyond knowledge, or perhaps bridging into the next level of learning.

Testing at the Remembering level of learning would most likely be very objective. Assessment answers can be easily identified as correct or incorrect. Feedback on test responses is directive and instructional in nature.

**Remembering Example**

a) Learning objective: Identify common “slip and fall” areas on a college campus.

b) Assessment activity: Provide a campus map and have learners follow the map to the top five “slip and fall” areas.

c) Potential delivery technologies: A self-paced e-learning module which allows learners to interact with a campus map.

**Understanding**

“Constructing meaning from different types of function be they written or graphic.”

The Understanding level of learning occurs when the learner can not only recall knowledge, but can explain it in context to someone else.

Paradoxically, the word “understanding” is one we typically try to avoid using when talking about learning objectives. The argument is that it is difficult to test for Understanding. How do we know what Understanding looks like?
While we should not use the word as one of our learning objectives, we can use it to define this level of learning. The Understanding level of learning is taking what we recall and making that data meaningful. For instance, we take the definition of project management, and apply it to a project manager job description.

When we have short, stand-alone e-learning modules that can be taken on demand, we may be in the realm of fostering Understanding. We are moving beyond mere recall, and into connecting pieces of new knowledge together. Self-paced formats are often more appropriate than live delivery mediums for this level of learning.

There is probably a higher level of discussion or structured thought in achieving Understanding than was present in getting to Remembering. It’s not just a lot of data, the data suddenly becomes useful.

Understanding is not characterized by practicing a new skill or attempting to change behavior. It is a foundational understanding of key concepts that can not only called upon but actually used later.

**Understanding Example**

a) Learning objective: Based on seasonal weather conditions, anticipate specific “slip and fall” hazards that are unique to a campus.

b) Assessment activity: Learners will photograph five “slip and fall” hazards on their campus, and create a short presentation with the intent of informing the safety committee of these tests.

c) Potential delivery technologies: A discussion board where learners can get more information about the topic, post their individual presentations, and review the presentations posted by others.

There is some debate as to whether Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning needs to occur in a linear fashion. For example, mastering the Applying level needs to occur before you can master the Evaluation level.

I consider Remembering and Understanding as foundational levels of learning and believe that they do need to come first. However, the next four domains (Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating, and Creating) may occur in any order, and we may not need to require each individual level of learning for a particular curriculum.
Applying

“Carrying out or using a procedure through executing or implementing. Applying is related and refers to situations where learned material is used through products like models, presentation, interviews and simulations.”

The Applying level of learning takes us beyond foundational information and into the realm of training. Learners are starting to practice tasks, apply new skills, and correct mistakes. They can execute a checklist, create a table in Microsoft® Word, enter data into a claims management system, or collaborate on a file in Microsoft® SharePoint.

Note that the verbs we are using are very action oriented, and can only be tested by the learner actually doing something. Generally, as we move into the Applying level of learning, we are starting to consider adding more collaborative activities into our learning plans. Activities such as discussions about how to apply key concepts, getting feedback on a presentation created, or working in breakout rooms to prioritize budget items support Applying.

Some start to see the social aspects of learning incorporated as we move out of Understanding and into Applying. While learning objectives in the Remembering and Understanding domains may have been delivered in a self-paced format or in a webinar format where interaction with others was limited and learners were expected to assimilate knowledge on their own, moving into Applying would often require live interaction.

Applying Example

a) Learning objective: After identifying “slip and fall” hazards on your college campus, propose preemptive safety fixes to minimize the risk to students.

b) Assessment activity: Learners will create a proposal that identifies the hazards, lists the cause of each hazard, and provide suggestions on how to mitigate the hazard risk.

c) Potential delivery technologies: Learners will participate in a virtual classroom discussion to learn how to identify and mitigate potential hazards and how to create effective arguments that support that mitigation.
Analyzing

“Breaking material or concepts into parts, determining how the parts relate or interrelate to one another or to an overall structure or purpose. Mental actions include differentiating, organizing and attributing as well as being able to distinguish between components.”

If the Applying level allows us to take new concepts and use them in a collaborative format, the Analyzing level starts to help us make cognitive decisions. For example, instead of just creating a budget and prioritizing budget items, Analyzing allows us to make decisions based on the data contained in that budget. We aren’t just prioritizing items; we conduct and provide the analysis behind the decision-making.

I’m sure you can see how this requires an activity that is more facilitated than, for example, Understanding objectives. Discussion boards, virtual classrooms, and live classrooms are often used for analysis.

Other learning technologies that can support analysis include simulations. For example, the military uses aircraft simulators to help pilots learn to make reliable decisions during combat situations. Similarly, we can use simulations to analyze data to determine whether or not to bring a drug to market. While simulations are not necessarily facilitated, the impact of not “passing the test” is significant. Learners can fail. The pilot can crash a plane. The pharmaceutical marketing trainee may bring a drug to market before it is ready. Or the financial trainee may create a budget that doesn’t meet the needs of the department.

Creating and delivering training and assessments that meet the Analyzing level of learning take more time, more resources and more quality control. If your objective is, “Navigate a jet fighter in combat situations,” then learners will need to practice those skills to successfully master that objective. Without the practice component, they will remain in the Remembering and Understanding levels at best.

Analyzing Example

a) Learning objective: Decide which hazard mitigation is most appropriate for a particular situation.

b) Assessment activity: Learners will compare three “slip and fall” mitigation solutions and conduct a cost-benefit analysis in order to determine the best solution.

c) Potential delivery technologies: The virtual classroom combined with videos and job aids provide background information on the various mitigation solutions.

This is where many virtual and blended program designs often start to fall apart.
We desire the outcome of the program to be at a high level. For example, we want learners to not only create a budget; we want them to be able to analyze the impact of that budget on the department. However, another common requirement is that the program be short in duration. These two outcomes are often mutually exclusive.

The end result is that the same content that took a full day in a face-to-face classroom is now delivered in less than half that time in the virtual classroom. How? Well, the practice opportunities, the collaboration, and the assessments were all removed. We meet the content requirements by filling the slides with words. However, by removing all of those pieces we are staying in the Remembering and Understanding levels of learning and therefore are not providing the structure necessary to facilitate the other levels of learning.

And then, when this doesn’t work, we look at it as a failure in technology as opposed to a failure in design and implementation.

**Evaluating**

“Making judgments based on criteria and standards through checking and critiquing.”

Evaluating is a means of making a decision. A decision can be made individually or collaboratively as part of a group. Yes, ultimately, the learner can be making these decisions individually, in which case coaching or social media tools like discussion boards can be used very effectively. If, however, the learner will eventually be collaborating on a decision as part of a group, this learning objective should be taught in a more collaborative format.

Evaluating is not about providing information to make a decision, but actually making that decision. The outcome is not the presentation of facts, but interpreting facts and applying them to make a judgment. (The process of a trial by jury is often used as an example of an evaluation activity.)

To get to the Evaluating level obviously we need understanding of basic concepts and we need to be able to review and analyze facts. But do we need to actually create the presentation to analyze the facts? Probably not.

The objectives in leadership curricula often fall into the Evaluating level of learning. Leaders need to provide feedback based on facts and on the impact of particular actions on the organization as a whole. Managers need to make recommendations regarding promotions, team leadership roles, and raises.
**Evaluating Example**

a) Learning objective: Determine the best vendor to mitigate identified “slip and fall” hazards.

b) Assessment activity: Learners will research vendors and then make a recommendation to the safety committee based on their research.

c) Potential delivery technologies: The virtual classroom combined with videos and job aids provide background information on the various vendors. Web searches, scavenger hunts, and referral checking will supplement the more structured training.

**Creating**

“Putting the elements together to form a coherent or functional whole; reorganizing elements into a new pattern or structure through generating, planning or producing.”

With all the tools that are readily available to learners today, the Creating level of learning can be a lot of fun. Learners can create videos, wikis, podcasts, and a variety of other ‘projects’ using low-cost technologies organizations often have already available.

An argument made by many practitioners is that learning should start with Creating. For instance, allow people to create a presentation to explain their current understanding and their current point of view on a particular topic, and then use the other levels of learning to build on their ideas, identify misunderstandings, and
really make sure the learning crystallizes.

The idea behind Creating is building something new, not regurgitating what was taught in class. This makes sense.

As we know, the classroom is a controlled environment. When learners go out into the real world and apply what they’ve learned, the situations aren’t going to be as clean as the simulations or case studies we provided to them in the classroom. Allowing them to create something new that applies to personal situations is an exciting capstone to any curriculum.

**Creating Example**

a) Learning objective: Design a hazard mitigation plan for the new student center on campus.
b) Assessment activity: Create a hazard mitigation plan that includes budget, design, vendor recommendations, and evaluation protocols.
c) Potential delivery technologies: The virtual classroom combined with videos and job aids provide background information. Web searches, scavenger hunts, and referral checking will supplement the more structured training.

*Everything Old is Again*

When I first discovered Bloom’s Taxonomy (totally by accident, when trying to find a way to explain constructing learning objectives to a class participant), the simplicity of the model appealed to me. But I knew something was missing – the applicability to current learning technologies and industry trends.

The new Digital Taxonomy is not only transformational, in that it incorporates collaboration and new learning methods into its construction, but accessible. It is relatively easy to construct examples based on a particular curriculum to illustrate the need for a blend of technologies instead of creating a ‘one size fits all’ scenario, and allows us to advocate for the best technological fit for our content.
Step 3: Flip the Classroom to Maximize Collaborative Impact

Finally, let’s talk about flipping the classroom. The flipped classroom concept originated with K-12 educational systems, where traditionally students go to a class, learn from the teacher, and then go home to complete homework. Perhaps they build a model of a cell, or write a report about the American Civil War. Because they are at home, they naturally turn to their parents and siblings for help. But the parents and siblings are not necessarily experts at biology or American history. Traditional homework doesn’t set the student up for success.

The flipped classroom model attempts to solve this problem. It takes the lecture aspect of the classroom and turns knowledge-oriented content into self-directed work. The content might be delivered via an online video. Or via a textbook or ebook. Students learn on their own, and come to class to ask the expert questions about the content, complete project work, and apply knowledge.

Since project work isn’t completed in a vacuum, we can kick it up a level. Students can collaborate in groups, with an expert to moderate, to create projects and interactions that reach a higher level of learning than they may have on their own.

How does flipping the classroom apply to blended learning? Blended learning is not only about matching content to the most appropriate delivery medium, but doing it at the learning objective level. If you follow the process of using learning objectives and assessment techniques to determine the best delivery method for each objective, using a model like Boom’s Digital Taxonomy for guidance, you will be delivering a program that has students mastering knowledge-based objectives using self-paced technologies, and moving towards more collaborative and live technologies as they move into application of skills, analysis of skills, and beyond.

Implementing a flipped classroom isn’t a fad. When thoughtful instructional design is applied to a blended learning program, a flipped classroom is the result.

If you’re interested in learning more about flipping the classroom and blended learning, I recommend our Blended Learning Design Certificate course described on the next page.
Blended Learning Design Certificate

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Do you want to maximize training opportunities while minimizing costs? After a decade of ineffective programs, organizations are looking for instructional design techniques to create blended programs that meet, or even exceed, the results achieved in more traditional settings.

Currently trending in the blended learning design space are two concepts: How to "flip the classroom" to maximize valuable collaboration time, and how to apply the latest thinking on Bloom's Taxonomy to determine how best to deliver content in this new environment. This workshop will examine both of these concepts and their relationship to blended learning. The application of these concepts will make your training programs as impactful as possible, and help you get the most out of your technology investments.

AUDIENCE

This course is targeted towards Training Directors/Managers, Instructional Designers, Learning Consultants, Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), and Program Managers. The audience is expected to have a basic understanding of instructional design principles and processes.

PROGRAM LEVEL OBJECTIVES

On completion of this course, you will be able to:

- Conduct an analysis to determine what technologies are available at your organization and how your audience already uses them.
- Use a worksheet to design an impactful blended learning solution.
- Map learning objectives to the appropriate learning technologies using a modern application of Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning.
- Utilize best practices to design exercises for popular learning technologies, including virtual classrooms, mobile and social learning, simulations, eLearning and games.
- Avoid the top ten challenges to implementing a blended learning program.
- "Flip the classroom" to maximize collaborative impact.

For the complete Blended Learning Design Certificate data sheet and pricing, download our Courses and Services Catalog at http://www.insynctraining.com/service-catalog/20
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Virtual Classroom Experts Maximize Impact, ROI

InSync Training

Corporate employers invest more than $160 billion annually in employee training. Much of that amount is spent on live virtual-training programs, particularly for workforces spread across the globe.

Not all webinars, however, are created equal.

Jennifer Hofmann, veteran corporate training consultant and a leading expert on virtual learning for over 20 years, says employers pay a high price for subpar training sessions. In fact, the hidden costs for subpar training far exceed the $160 billion employers spend. She founded InSync Training in 1999 to banish boring webinars and help businesses extract significant value from their e-learning platforms and build core competencies for their virtual-learning training teams.

InSync is currently managing Cisco Systems’ 10-week new hire sales training program—the Cisco Sales Associate Program (CSAP)—using Cisco’s own TelePresence and WebEx virtual learning tools. For InSync’s broad support of Cisco’s training needs since 2000, the firm was awarded an Excellence in Practice award by ASTD, the world’s largest organization of training and development professionals.

“In just talking to a PowerPoint presentation for an hour doesn’t cut it,” she says. “If you lose participants’ interest and attention, they don’t absorb, process and retain what they hear. Companies see little return on their investment. We set out to change all that.”

Best-Practices Pioneer in a Booming Industry

For the past 15 years, Hofmann and her team have been the standard bearers of the online classroom experience. Today, with new competitors continuing to enter the marketplace, InSync maintains its thought leadership position and enjoys $10 million in annual revenues. In 2013, the firm ranked #741 among the Inc. 5000 and was the #10 fastest-growing education company in the U.S.

“Our business surged in 2008, when companies hit by the recession needed to take advantage of their existing virtual learning technologies,” Hofmann says. “We introduced them to the best practices we’d developed for the virtual classroom, which proved just as engaging and effective as traditional classroom training. Companies that work with us recognize the value of live online-training programs immediately.”

Design, Support and Delivery Worldwide

InSync’s instructional designers and professional facilitators—leveraging deep expertise in virtual-learning technologies, cognitive psychology, sales and leadership training, and other key specialties—support clients’ corporate training needs in a variety of ways.

Traditional “train the trainer”—InSync helps virtual-classroom facilitators connect with students in a whole new way to ensure every training session meets workforce and organizational needs.

Instructional design—InSync has the expertise, reach and resources to provide seamless, end-to-end course creation as well as consulting and assessment in the field.

Facilitators and producers at the ready—InSync’s program facilitators and producers, who deliver both tech support and instructional excellence, help manage and deliver virtual-training sessions that are exciting, impactful and memorable.

“We’re a global organization,” Hofmann says. “We start on Sunday evening, supporting training in China, and we don’t stop until training ends in California on Friday afternoon. We are there wherever and whenever client training takes place.”