

ADDIE & the *Decoding the Code* Learner Profile

A look at how the ADDIE model holds up against the realities of building a structured literacy minicourse for the secondary educators who will actually take it.

STUDENT	COURSE	UNIT
Tenneh C. Freeman	LDTC 605 • UMGC	2 • ADDIE

PART 1 • THE MODEL

The ADDIE Model, phase by phase

ADDIE is a systematic framework for building learning experiences. Each phase produces something the next phase needs.

01	Analyze Identify the learner, the gap, the context, and the constraints before anything else gets built.
02	Design Translate the analysis into measurable objectives, a sequence, and an assessment plan.
03	Develop Build the actual course assets: video, readings, activities, and assessments.
04	Implement Launch the course, train facilitators if needed, and put it in front of learners.
05	Evaluate Measure whether learners hit the objectives and whether the design itself held up under use.

PART 2 • WHY IT MATTERS

Implications for instructional design

ADDIE changes when the work happens, what gets documented, and what counts as a finished product.

Front-loaded analysis Forces the analysis work to happen before the build, not after launch when problems surface.	Shared vocabulary Creates a common language for designers, SMEs, and stakeholders so everyone discusses the same project.
Objective alignment Aligns objectives, activities, and assessments so what gets taught is what gets measured.	Documented design trail Produces a record that can be revised, defended, or replicated across cohorts and courses.

PART 3 • APPLIED TO DECODING THE CODE

Where ADDIE supports — and challenges — the design

The model is a strong fit for the analysis and alignment my minicourse needs, but its linear shape puts friction on the iteration teacher PD actually requires.

STRENGTHS Where ADDIE works for my minicourse ▶ The Analyze phase forces me to interview practicing 6–12 teachers about what they already know about structured literacy, rather than designing from my own credentials. ▶ The Design phase keeps every module mapped to a measurable teacher outcome (identify a reading profile, select an instructional move, apply it the following week). ▶ The Evaluate phase gives me a way to measure whether teachers transfer the strategies into their classroom — not just whether they finished the modules.	LIMITATIONS Where ADDIE pushes back ▶ The linear sequence assumes the course can be handed off intact at Implementation. In reality, what works on one campus often flops on another. ▶ Treating Evaluate as the final phase undersells how much formative feedback matters during a PD rollout, where one bad module can lose an entire cohort. ▶ Heavy upfront planning delays getting prototype modules in front of teacher beta-testers — the audience best positioned to tell me whether the content lands in a real classroom.
--	---

PART 4 • THE IDD

Target audience & learner profile

Decoding the Code is built for practicing secondary educators — not pre-service candidates, not elementary teachers, not corporate learners. Every design choice flows from who they actually are.

DEMOGRAPHICS Who they are • Practicing middle and high school educators (Grades 6–12) • General education, special education, and content-area teachers • ELAR, social studies, and science classrooms • Urban, suburban, and rural campuses across U.S. districts • Experience range from first-year to 25+ year veterans	BACKGROUND What they bring • Standard or alternative state teaching certifications • Most have no formal training in the Science of Reading • Some carry exposure to balanced literacy or three-cueing • Strong content expertise, limited reading-science knowledge • Know the legal definition of dyslexia but lack the toolkit
SKILLS & DISPOSITIONS How they learn • Comfortable navigating Canvas, Schoology, Google Classroom • Used to short, asynchronous PD on conference periods • Time-pressed — PD sits on top of full teaching loads • Cautious of “another initiative” added to their plate • Quiet frustration about not knowing how to help struggling readers	CONTEXT Where they sit in the system • Often inherit students reading 2–4 grade levels below expectation • Operate inside RTI / MTSS frameworks but with limited support • Held accountable for state assessment outcomes (e.g., STAAR ELAR) • Serve students with diagnosed dyslexia and 504/IEP plans • Need PD that converts to classroom moves the same week
WHAT MOVES THEM — CPE / CEU hours required for certification renewal — Visible classroom application they can use the same week — Connection to their actual students by name and reading profile — Respect for their professional experience as adult learners	WHAT GETS IN THE WAY — Limited time during the contract day — Initiative fatigue from PD that did not transfer to practice — Discomfort admitting gaps in foundational reading knowledge — Variable district support for structured literacy adoption

REFERENCES

APA 7 Citations

Branch, R. M. (2009). *Instructional design: The ADDIE approach*. Springer.

Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute.

International Dyslexia Association. (2020). *Dyslexia basics*. <https://dyslexiaida.org/dyslexia-basics/>

Molenda, M. (2015). In search of the elusive ADDIE model. *Performance Improvement*, 54(2), 40–42.

Texas Education Agency. (2024). *The dyslexia handbook: Procedures concerning dyslexia and related disorders*. Texas Education Agency.