I came into LST 403 thinking it was going to be a boring theories class. Man, was I wrong! We learned more then Gagne’s theories or Bloom’s taxonomy. We learned about what a true instructional design(er) accomplishes. How designers think when starting a task, what they need in order to create, and how they would implement their idea was eye opening. Throughout the course, the constant themes of iterative, constructivism, innovation, and originators were woven in the content. These terms, in my opinion, describe instructional design. The ID field is constantly learning, with a plethora of variation, in what can be created. ID’s can create [schools](http://vittra.se/Default.aspx?alias=vittra.se/english), new [pedagogies](http://Q2L.org/) for teaching, and even groundbreaking [games](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A-CCEy3u2WM). Instructional designers are able to do this because they know how people learn. More so, they have the ideas on how to help people learn better. IDers develop objectives and ensure the content and assessment match. This is done through constant revision and rewrites so the content is shaped for learners needs.

I really enjoyed how our class discussions and projects followed a similar format. Being able to go in and out of CMaps as we were learning helped me apply the ideas. I could revise and rewrite, go back and check if my assessment would work, or even if the implementation would be possible. Constantly applying these skills strengthened my overall thinking. I would have a dual working memory as I went through the projects. One side was remembering how to apply the ideas of ID while the other side was trying to create an education tool with the correct content. I was constantly zooming in and out of each perspective. Stretching my brain to think about how Don and Susan were going to create PD in remote areas, was either going to kill me or make me grow. Luckily, I sprouted. I think I was able to do this because of the diverse perspectives approach.

I am still left wondering if there will ever be a cohesive line of theory to follow. The rational side of me hopes so, because I think consistency is a good thing. However, the creator in me does not like the idea of cohesion. The fluidity of dipping in and out of various ideas is liberating. In my opinion, I think this is where state-of-the-art design comes from.