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Dick and Carey Instructional Design Model

Identify Instructional Goals

Develop and Conduct Informative Evaluation

Develop and Select Instructional Material

Develop Instructional Strategy

Develop Criterion Referenced Tests

Identify Entry Behaviors

Revise Instruction

Write Performance Objectives

Conduct Instructional Analysis

Develop and Conduct Summative Evaluation

Understanding by Design

Stage 1. Identify desired results.

Stage 2. Determine acceptable evidence.

Stage 3. Plan learning experiences and instruction.

The first page shows a graphic of Understanding by Design and the Dick and Carey Instructional Design model. The first apparent difference is the seeming simplicity of the UBD model. The second apparent difference is the linear appearance of UBD as opposed to the recycling appearance of Dick and Carey. However, on closer examination, both of these models are more similar than different. I begin my explanation via ADDIE. Although Dick and Carey use ‘Identify Instructional Goals’, while UBD uses ‘Identify desired results’, both terms have the same intent. We need to start with an analysis of what it is we want to teach. UBD is famous for the use of the term backward design. This means the results of the learning are the first item to analyze. Identifying instructional goals may be different language, but the intent is the same. The first step in instructional design should be to decide what to teach.

The next step in UBD is to determine acceptable evidence of learning. The Dick and Carey model contains more detailed information on this step. Constructing instructional analysis and identifying entry behaviors are both necessary before writing performance objectives. The UBD model appears to give little information on these processes, but Tomlinson and McTighe (2006) certainly provide a wealth of detail on this step in their book. The ADDIE acronym has overlap in the analysis and design phases. Writing performance objectives could be considered design and development, but it is also part of the analysis process that must take place before developing instruction.

The Dick and Carey model includes a lot of detail on the development of instruction phase. This is the significant difference between the two graphical representations of the models. UBD has one line – ‘Plan learning experiences and instruction’. Where the Dick and Carey model shows more looping between the design and assess or analyze steps in ADDIE. Although these ideas are covered in Tomlinson and McTighe, the outline of the model doesn’t show it. In fact, when analyzing UBD from the ADDIE perspective, it appears instruction never even takes place. This, of course, is misleading as the whole point of UBD is to get the job done (instruction) and then check to see if your objectives have been met.

The Dick and Carey model shows the implementation and evaluation part of the ADDIE format. The inclusion of both formative and summative assessment is a major difference between the models. Again, this material is contained in the literature on UBD, but does not appear on their model’s outline.

Last week I assumed my project was going to involve UBD since I was already familiar with the approach. But after reading the introductory chapter in Dick and Carey, I’ve decided I want to use their model. I like and understand the simplicity of ADDIE. I think that the outline of the Dick and Carey model is logical and practical.
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