

OLN Innovative Learning and Teaching Committee Meeting Minutes

October 17th, 2006 | 10:00am - 3:00pm

Members present: Carolyn Gard, Kim Goudy, Wayne Hall (Chair), Laura Little, David McConnell, Leslie Ortquist-Ahrens, Ann Palazzo, David Wright

Staff present: Kate Carey, Sheryl Hansen, Heather O'Neil, Cable Green

Regrets: Rene Aitken, Kathleen Buttermore, Raymond Craig, Larry Dragosavac, Judith Maxson, Dennis Taylor, Rebecca Ertel, Nancy Thibeault

1) New Member Welcome and Introductions

2) Tour of the OLN New Website

Agreed that the ILT pages are easily to navigate and contain rich resources.

Improvements and additions

- i) A suggested change to the ET test bed was to fill it with examples or state "no effective practices" differently.
- ii) OLN will add RSS to the website, including ILT areas Resource of the Week/Day & Shedding Light.
- iv) ELA: Distance Learning-related topics will be added to ELA, dates also

3) Atomic Learning Discussion - Led by Cable Green

- a) Atomic Learning has short "how to" videos about eLearning. OLN negotiated an aggregate price for Ohio to support faculty and faculty developers stay up to date on how to use technology in classes.
- b) BGSU has used AL for many years and has found it extremely helpful in reducing training and support costs.
- c) Cost? Depends on FTE - low of seventy-five cents to one dollar and twenty-five cents per FTE. Retroactive discounting is available if you are already an Atomic Learning user.
- f) If interested, contact Cable Green. cgreen@oln.org

4) Other items

- a) The three OLN project areas are exploring ways to increase integrated projects and perspectives; also to increase website integration
- a) New DRAFT Vision: OLN seeks to be recognized nationally for its leadership in facilitating collaborative efforts to improve and expand innovative applications of technologies that enhance learning.
- c) New DRAFT Mission: OLN works in collaboration with higher education, schools, policy makers, business and industry, government, and local communities to expand educational opportunities for Ohioans.

5) Small Group Discussions:

We broke in to 3 discussion groups to delve deeper into these ILT activities. We did not discuss Our Quality Matters and will take it up at the next meeting.

A) Regional Centers - discussion about metrics and data to collect (Leslie, Laura, David M, Kim)

The group discussed metrics for each of the 4 main goals of RCs:

1. Increase awareness

We saw this goal as related to communication and education about LCs and emerging pedagogies and technologies.: look at/document include # of related presentations, web sites, publicity, etc.—intended to communicate and educate. We are interested not only in “counting” such things but in trying to gauge their impact. Is there any standardized survey (or a few questions at least) that all RCs might be using when they hold events (Along the lines of what people learned that was new, etc.)?

2. Build upon Ohio's rich history . . .

We thought of this goal in two ways: 1) evidence that past successes or past learning communities continued to live on or have ripple-effect impacts or outgrowths (concept maps?) and 2) the development of new LCs (and any degree to which they linked with past ones or learning that emerged from past LCs). We saw this one as connected with progress and sustainability, growth and branching out.

3. Create metrics, tools, and support

This is the heart of the outcomes related to teaching and learning. We all agreed the assessment needed to be qualitative as well as quantitative and that incorporating participant reflection was key. We didn't discuss specific ways to measure, but we did mention surveys, projects, and reflections. A first step should involve identifying what would be done with the data collected and who are the audiences (help us focus).

4. Support the development . . .

Here we saw a place where the above had an “audience” or a “venue.” Assessment could involve not only what's in it but also how often (and how?) it gets used.

B) State Faculty Survey (Carolyn and Sheryl)

Members reviewed 20 or so surveys dealing with faculty/instructor technology use. A discussion of many items and the selection of numerous categories and specific items to include in DRAFT.1 occurred.

The survey will consist of 3 parts a) general survey for all faculty about use of technology, b) survey specifically for those who teach courses in OhioLearns! catalog, and c) 3-4 campus case studies - policies, incentives, assessments, design, facilitation, challenges/enablers, status/development of quality DL at each institution.

C) Significant Learning/SoTL/Course outcomes (Wayne, David W, Ann)

Main idea: a “digital resource commons” area (which would include products that could be migrated into OhioLINK's Digital Resource Commons that is due to launch in about a

year. This "commons" would be built collaboratively, along the lines of a wiki, but that has more specific template-driven features and goals than a wiki. Features include:

- Build upon OLN initiatives that have already proven their success: faculty learning communities, the e-Learning Athenaeum, open-source software development, the concept of regional centers of activity and focus.
- Thematically, key areas of focus would be assessment, SoTL, best practices in course design, and pedagogy.
- The various assets would be identified by author and expanded / revised by others through a truly collaborative editing, expanding open public process.
- Major guideline would be simplicity: the products / assets would need to be easily understood, readily used. "Immediate application" is a good guiding concept.
- Contributions might include links to similar kinds of digital repositories (such as Merlot, and there's a similar repository in England) The "items" in this repository would go beyond those in scope and depth.
- One key element: what's the scholarship behind these items? - What does the key research look like? What does the underlying theory look like? In other words, these items should go beyond "this really nifty thing that I tried in one of my classes and it worked in really cool ways." Build collaboratively: start with a "really nifty thing," others help build the item/entry. If it doesn't get built fairly soon, it gets kicked out.
- I have an idea for the kind of entry/item that I'm describing here and could put it out for review, if that would help. We discussed this example (assessment based on Dee Fink's taxonomy) at the ILT meeting, and I've refined it a bit more since then.

6) Second Life tour and discussion - led by Cable Green

This synthetic world is all the buzz lately. Each OLN Regional Center is offering one small grant to educators interested in exploring SL and it's potential for education and learning. Cable showed the committee several locations, including the New Media Foundation's site, OLN's island, OU's sandbox. Some ILT members have already created their SL avatars and explored the virtual world. ILT members had mixed responses to SL and it's clear we'll be revisiting this and related topics in the future.

7) Follow Up Actions:

□ ***Faculty Survey: Sheryl and Wayne***

Wayne recognizes that this is a top priority. We need to survey the faculty this year and find specific needs so that the ILT (and OLN) initiatives are strategically focused

□ ***Streamline and change Learning Communities Homepage: Heather and Sheryl***

This restructuring will provide others will a "light" version of all the LC's goals and abstracts that come out of the Regional Centers.

□ *Discussion Groups: Correspond About Their Topics before our next meeting*
Regional Center, Faculty Survey, SoTL, and Quality Matters should continue the conversation about OLN's involvement with each of these areas along with how to proceed in the future.

Next ILT Committee Meeting: January 18th , 2007 at 10:00 am.