IBL Design rules tested and discussed

Extracted from:

Translation
RDA1: Encourage responsibility towards peers of a share of knowledge
RDA2: Build the design around a common goal of deepening conceptual biology
RDA3: Defer justification of scientific knowledge to resources, firmly maintain educational authority with the teacher

RD4: Gradually devolve to students the validation of their knowledge
RD5: Expose to peers ideas during elaboration process and encourage socio-cognitive confrontation
RD6: Let the "good questions" emerge from confrontations with authentic resources in the paradigm; create this confrontation if necessary
RD7: Confrontation with authentic resources investigation leads to the paradigm that produces them
RD8: Questions negotiated in reference to the objectives drive investigation
RD9: Objectives, activities and assessment are aligned and shared with students
RD10: Responses should address the concept defined by the question: conceptual coherence of questions and corresponding answers
RD11: The educational effects appear over time once the IBL didactical contract has evolved.
RD12: Changes in attitude and didactic contract result from perceived effects of actions and situations experienced by students
RD13: Teacher expresses confidence that students can develop valuable knowledge
RD14: Teacher insures at least one question colonizes each major sector of the conceptual field and avoids conceptual shadows
RD15: The centripetal effect can ensure that vague questions develop towards "good" questions within the paradigm
RD16: The moment for transition between activities can be established by observing the colonization of the conceptual field and the emergence of epistemic complexity
RD17: Allow students the choice of themes and questions start to build commitment and motivation, and affirm the guiding questions most direct reference to the objectives and structure of knowledge
RD18: A conceptual artifact allowing all participants to co-write distance, making revisions, and identifying changes can scaffold the design
RD19: Breaking down the curriculum field in slightly overlapping themes distributed to investigation groups promotes positive interdependence and responsibility towards peers
RD20: Students are responsible for the written report of a sub-theme in a document vital for the group
RD21: Formative assessment caring and encouraging that supports learning objectives to clearly separate the summative evaluation administered according to the objectives, but without complacency
RD22: Many iterations of (co) writing guided by a constructive feedback can support knowledge building
RD23: Teacher feedback encourages cognitive conflicts by highlighting inconsistencies or differences in explanations intra-text, inter-texts and with external resources
RD24: At the beginning of the investigation tolerate colloquial student language, but enforce formalization during the institutionalization
RD25: Feedback in the text of others is handled in accordance with the principle of territoriality
RD26: Learners are confronted to numerous resources of very varied quality
RD27: Educational authority embedded in the structure of design frames but reaffirms the freedom of students and frees the teacher for conceptual control and relationship management.