Expert Reviewer Consent Form

Title of Research:
A Model of Expert Instructional Design Heuristics Incorporating Design Thinking Methods

Principal Investigators:
Dr. Ken Potter, Virginia Tech
Kristin Machac, Doctoral student at Virginia Tech

I. Purpose
The purpose of this study was to identify design thinking methods that aligned with heuristics of expert instructional design practitioners, and to design and develop a new model of heuristics and design thinking methods, which could assist novice designers as they enter the instructional design field. The model represents a synthesis of the results of a literature review, which included identification of common stages of instructional design models, challenges among novices entering the instructional design field of practice, heuristics of expert instructional designers, and a review of design thinking origins, processes, and methodologies.

II. Procedure
If you agree to participate in this study, you will be an expert reviewer for this study. The expert review consists of questions regarding the model of expert instructional design heuristics incorporating design thinking techniques. The expert reviewer will examine the validity and feasibility of the model. The expert reviewer will provide written feedback regarding the model via email and within the designated expert reviewer comment cells within the Microsoft Excel tables.

III. Risks
The risks associated with participation in this study are minimal. Risks to participants are no greater than the risks associated with normal conversation. You have the right to withdraw from participation at any time by notifying the researcher in writing or in-person of your desire to withdraw. The researcher will work to ensure all materials collected through this study are stored securely and remain confidential.

IV. Benefits
There are no direct benefits to you for participation in this study. No guarantee of benefits has been made to encourage you to participate in this study.

V. Extent of Anonymity and Confidentiality
The results of this study will be kept strictly anonymous and confidential. Your written consent is required for the researcher to release any data identified with you as an individual to anyone other than personnel working on the study. The information you provide will have your name removed and only a pseudonym will identify you during analyses and any written reports of the research; you reserve the right to choose this pseudonym. Data will be kept for approximately one year after the conclusion of the study.

VI. Compensation
Your participation is voluntary and unpaid.

VII. Freedom to Withdraw
You may withdraw from the research project at any time and for any reason. You are free not to answer any questions or respond to experimental situations without penalty. To withdraw please inform the researcher listed at the bottom of this form.

VIII. Subject's Responsibilities

I voluntarily agree to participate in the research. I have the following responsibilities: to review the model of expert instructional design heuristics incorporating design thinking techniques; and to respond to a set of questions to provide feedback through email including follow-up reviews if needed.

IX. Subject's Permission
I have read the Consent Form and conditions of this project. I have had all my questions answered. I hereby acknowledge the above and give my voluntary consent:

Renée LeClair   1/4/21
Subject signature   **Date**

Should I have any pertinent questions about this research or its conduct, I may contact:

Dr. Ken Potter   540-231-7039   kpotter@vt.edu
Kristin Machac   540-354-7650   marober5@vt.edu

Evaluation Questions for Expert Review

Heuristics of instructional designers

1. Do you agree with the researcher's identification of instructional design heuristics in Table Set 2 of the Expert Reviewer MS Excel spreadsheet?

2. Based on your expertise, are there instructional design heuristics that should be added or removed from Table Set 2?

Instructional design processes: ADDIE

1. Do you agree or disagree with the use of ADDIE within the model?

   Yes, the organization here is helpful and some things to consider:

   - For novice individuals having some reference as to what 'best practices' for the non-actionable heuristics may/would look like may be helpful.
     - Examples of how best to communicate visually could potentially be linked with table set four:
       - What would best practices for stakeholder mapping or empathy mapping actually look like? What are the nuts and bolts of the visualization ?
       - What resources do I need to produce one of these products for a client? (i.e. could use mural/post in notes/ wall canvas etc.)
     - Similar for setting expectations – is this typically in writing, verbal, or in the form of a contract.

2. Do you agree with the alignment between the stated instructional design heuristics and their placement within the stages of the ADDIE framework identified in Table Set 2?

   - The alignment with ADDIE is helpful and useful practically. Are there any elements missing/left our as function of using ADDIE (vs. pebble in a pond etc).
   - Beyond ADDIE being very versatile and known are there any potential issues that should be presented upfront that may be limitations of the model?

Design thinking

1. Given the stated heuristics, do you agree with the researcher's selection of design thinking methods in Table Set 3? Please explain each selection for which you disagree.

   - I am not well versed enough in the methods here to disagree; however it is unclear why in some cases for heuristics that appear in several different research types a different mythology is preferred. Is this more a function of the research method?
     - For example, Frame insights is in several research types and is also paired with several methods.
     - Is there an advantage of one method over another OR do the methods differ due to the differences in reseach?

2. Given the stated heuristics, do you agree with the researcher's recommendations for individual methods and method combinations in Table Set 4? Please explain each selection for which you disagree.

Model Usability:

1. To what degree was the model organized in a logical way that made it easy to understand?

   Yes, the model is helpful. For me to visualize the process as a concept map would be very helpful with the methods linked to the heuristics. This would help me (personally) see the overlap and potentially simplify this. In a table format it is difficult to see the overlap.

   Potentially have an example 'process' would also be helpful to demonstrate the use/how the framework is / was used to address a real-world problem.

2. To what degree will this model assist novice designers in their ability to design, communicate, manage, and evaluate new and existing instructional design projects?

   The review process here is immensely helpful and includes steps that are not emphasized or under appreciated. The ADDIE framework is presented but neglects the heuristics which are essential to making the process flow and become usable.

3. In what ways do you suggest the model could be improved?

   One thing that would assist with the user-friendly nature would be to translate the 20 Design heuristics identified into potential questions that would be asked to assist the process.

   For example, "identify problems". You could as a client, 'What's your problem?' but that would not likely lend itself to producing the results you need so how as a designer to you ask this? What is the approach or how to you frame the conversation?

   Asking the right questions is essential to the process but knowing how to do this also a skill .

4. Please provide any additional comments or feedback you feel is appropriate and would be beneficial for this study.

   Suggestions above are likely beyond the project but may be helpful for novices looking to use this as an assistive framework.