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Evaluation Checklist (8 Points)

Consistency with the guidelines (2 points)

Over all I feel the discussion of the Jack Waterkamp case went very well. Our group laid out objectives as follows:

Objectives for Peers to accomplish:

After analyzing and discussing this case, classmates will be able to:

- Illustrate the role project management has in the instructional design process.
- Demonstrate how to manage risks such as schedule, changes, and personalities that often impede the instructional design process.
- Outline the importance of communication in project development.

Our intent was to make sure the discussion was in alignment with these objectives and I feel that it succeeded. Our questions for the discussion were developed to motivate participants to analyze the role of project manager and how to have crucial conversations with stakeholders. At various points in the discussions, charts and schedule ideas came out to illustrate ways to manage the risks of such a large scope change, that the case characters were dealing with.

I feel that a weakness was not knowing how to bring the group back in to focus on our objectives. Once the objectives had been discussed it was a bit of a “free for all”. I am not sure if that is ok or not but to the positive side I feel the more free flowing thoughts there are going the more of a brainstorming atmosphere is created. I think most of us are used to group thinking in this way however in this
environment it can lead to tangents that make it difficult to real the crowd back to a focus. I think as facilitators we tried to accomplish this but maybe need more experience in this effort.

In the end I do feel positive that everyone contributed in a meaningful way and that our objectives were accomplished.

**Reflection on aspects of the way the discussion was facilitated (6 points)**

I feel that our group was equally involved in the discussion. We checked in with each other via email to make sure there were no questions or to discuss how we thought facilitation was going so far. We all had the chance during those moments to nudge others if we thought they were not contributing but I never felt they were not. They were a great group! We talked about the discussion domination factor and reminded each other that we need to sit back and let the discussion go. That was difficult because I wanted to jump in and offer my opinion to the discussion but to come up with inquires to further my own interest was a stretch as a facilitator.

Our opening question: *What are the key interaction points in the Jack Waterkamp case and how can Jack use a project management framework to manage these points? (Example: How does Jack balance project management with instructional design? Where should his focus be and what should he be tracking to ensure progress.)*

I feel we did a good job of opening with this question because I never thought of the role an ID professional played as project manager and I hoped that would sparked some interest for the rest of the participants. I feel though that the questions in parenthesis limited the original question. My intent with this question was to have participants think about this role as project manager and how this case
projected the need for this type of management, who should be that PM and how could they use this method to get this case under control. By interaction points I was hoping to pull out the points where the case characters were interacting with the project specifically. I feel the other questions may have thrown this off but this was a compromise within our facilitation group. I feel this topic is very relevant to the course because it is an important piece of the instructional designers “tool kit”.

I think the discussion participants had fun with the conversation portion of the discussion. Role playing is an important part of discovering what the case characters are really saying and brings new insight when you hear other participant’s perspective on this. As was evident in the discussion, the participants had different interpretations of the character interactions than others. I found this very interesting. I feel this is because we all bring our experience dealing with individuals to the table and this reflects in our perceived interactions with the characters of the case. Two of our participants had an “Ah Ha” moment in with this very scenario. One said they had not thought of a character interaction the way the other had presented it. That was fun to see!

The instructional strategies and the media we used were experimental in nature. The goanimate I feel was a very nice way to spice up the role playing. I realize this may have been a stretch for some who had not used this before which means a new learning experience on top of the analysis. I am always up for a brain stretch but this may have added more stress to some individuals and I hope it was worth it to them. I really enjoyed watching the role plays in this way. Some participants really expanded the capacity of the goanimate program and others did the bare minimum. I think that is great and maybe some learned to take a risk with expression of ideas and felt safe because they put the roles onto inanimate characters instead of taking it on themselves. I feel we all responded to the roles and a nice
discussion ensued on how to have crucial conversations between the individual characters in the case which is something the characters were not doing and really needed to. It was a key activity in our objective, “Outline the importance of communication in project development,” and helped the participants think about those important conversations and how issues could be resolved just by talking it out.

My Action Plan

I would love to be able to develop facilitation skills. I think there are many newances to doing this and perhaps a course in itself. I know there are certificate programs in the professional world that develop individuals to become facilitators like the International Association of Facilitators (http://www.iaf-world.org/index/certification/certification.aspx), however I would just like to be able to know how to help coach others and bring out what they mean to say in conversations and problem solving. I need to be able to listen better and pick out key words that mean what the individual is trying to say. I feel this would help to foster better communication within groups and with my own relationships with individuals.