

Spring 2011 Face-to-face LTDC Meeting

February 10 - Planning meeting The Planning Group members are: LTDC Exec Committee (Gene Leisz, Andy Speth, Mary Mielke, Mary Alice Muraski, Alan Aycock), Pat Fellows, and Cheryl Diermyer (absent)

- May need a hotel for Tuesday evening for some campuses - will ask Concourse if extend to Tuesday night
- Should have a registration processes

2/17/2011 - **How to evaluate instructional technologies**

UW campuses, individually and collectively, engage in pilot projects of innovative and promising instructional technologies. For the most part, these pilots are successful, even if we do not have a clearly articulated definition of “successful,” but there are some that we intuitively know are more or less successful than others. And even the less successful pilots result in lessons learned and other positive outcomes, so we do not want to automatically discount these.

One of the objectives of this exercise is to determine criteria by which we can evaluate the success of a pilot. Our approach is to examine existing technologies and determine criteria by which each can be evaluated. From there we will compile a master list. Our second objective is to determine criteria by which we can evaluate whether a pilot program should be undertaken, i.e., whether it is likely to be successful.

Process

Pat F* introduces the activity, explains the objectives, describes the process, etc.

Groups are formed consisting of about six people each. Each group is given a specific technology, e.g., clickers, wikis, etc. It is likely that these technologies will be familiar and established.

Each group considers the criteria by which their technology can be evaluated.

- What questions should be asked that would help us define the degree of success for the initial pilot stage of this technology? What factors can be used as evidence of success?
- What answers indicate success? Or what answers suggest that the technology is not a good fit or is not yet ready for prime time?

The groups come together and share their findings.

- Are there certain common criteria we find once all groups report?

Pat F leads a discussion of the large group regarding our second objective.

- What questions should be asked before a pilot is undertaken? What information would provide insight as to whether the pilot is likely to be successful or not?

Groups are reformed with shuffled membership and each group is assigned a new, specific technology. It is likely that

these technologies will be emerging, untested, and unproven.

- What questions should be asked that would help us define the degree of success for the initial pilot stage of this technology? What factors can be used as evidence of success?
- What answers indicate success? Or what answers suggest that the technology is not a good fit or is not yet ready for prime time?

The groups come together and share their findings.

Notes:

- Someone has to record the outcomes from each of the groups and the collective discussion.
- I list Pat F as the leader of the activity, but that responsibility can be assumed by someone else or shared with others in our planning group.
- It is understood that it is the responsibility of the LTDC to try new technologies and not all will be successful. Frankly, if we never fail we are probably being too conservative and aren't pushing hard enough.
- I do not list any technologies that we might examine.
- Pat will be contacting Ohio St and ask for relevant information from them.

From Alan "Latest and greatest," "bleeding edge," "technology for technology's sake" are phrases which suggest the equivocations of a field where techno-hype is commonplace, and the predominance of markets which are notoriously volatile.

How, then, should we decide to pilot a particular learning technology? How can we know whether the pilot is successful? May our evaluation of a successful pilot, in its turn, inform our decisions about other emerging technologies? Our purpose here is to develop – not a single definitive answer to these questions – but an examination of better ways to ask them, and factors which might be brought into play given identifiable user needs.

We begin by randomly sorting the room into 6 groups. Each group will be assigned a specific technology already in use on many campuses, and asked how to evaluate it: (a) if it is now in a pilot stage, how can we decide whether the pilot should be continued; (b) if it is already adopted, how can we determine whether it has it been worth its cost? The purpose here is not actually to conduct an evaluation, but to sketch the way to approach one. [Note: the range of assigned technologies will include both highly successful and widely adopted learning technologies such as PowerPoint, clickers, or D2L, while some will be those whose success is somewhat less certain, such as iTunes U, ePortfolio, and Second Life.]

Following a brief plenary discussion, the room will be resorted once more into 6 groups. Now the task is different: (a) given the factors that have already been identified during the first part of the session, is it possible to develop a series of questions that would allow a campus to decide whether to pilot an emerging technology; (b) given the wide range of campuses in the UW-System, how would those questions differ from one campus to another? In short, is there a method of skepticism that campuses can use to evaluate its approach to such products as Facebook, Flickr, Twitter, Kindle or other eReaders, augmented reality?

*Evidence of Success & Impact (exact title TBD) - 120-150 minutes

- - A breakout group exercise to ponder on the criteria of success, assessment strategy, strategies to mainstream a technology beyond early adopters. A few technologies (3,4,5?) will be chosen for discussion. The goal is to establish some best practices or strategies of measurement and adoption that all can use.
NEED INPUT and VOLUNTEERS to plan this session.

Pat: select one or two technologies they were established, tested, and assessed (how it is done not actual data) and maybe one really new technology. Was the technology successful or not? Why or why not? What makes it successful? What makes it effective?

- There will be 24 - 30; 5 groups; meet then discuss, report and reshuffle the groups. One committee member in each group.
- First round (established): D2L, clickers (PRS), PPT,
- Second round (emerging): Social Media, mobile devices, Second Life
- Use ones that did not catch on - iTunesU, wikis, blogs
- Other technologies: Interactive White Boards, document cameras, ITV, Lecture/Screen capture, several restrictive technologies by one group
- could gather information on how to decide on technologies to pilot, how to conduct the pilot, evaluate 2 -5 years after.
- **Pat will develop more fully and conduct session. She will also contact Ohio State re. their process.**
- Introduce topic, break apart, discuss 30 minutes, share back, decision making process development; shuffle groups, discuss emerging, share back,
- What are the questions we should ask ourselves in deciding on whether or not we should pilot future technologies.
- **Andy, Alan and Pat will work more on questions, planning session, etc.**

Potential Areas/Questions to Investigate

Go to http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/technology_and_learning/toward_a_product_evaluation_framework

--

***Emerging Technology presentations - 60 -90 min**

- - Augmented Reality
 - Campus Mobile Technology
 - Gaming
 - Learning Analytics
 - Other?

-Lorna has contacted Tanya & Cheryl

January 20, 2011 meeting

The following agenda was developed by the F2F Meeting group at their first meeting on Jan 20, 2011. The Planning Group members are: LTDC Exec Committee (Gene Leisz, Andy Speth, Mary Mielke, Mary Alice Muraski - absent, Alan Aycock), Pat Fellows, and Cheryl Diermyer (absent)

Any LTDC-reps and campus colleagues are welcome and encouraged to assist in the planning with your ideas, or volunteering to facilitate to present.

The plan is tentative and subject to change at this point (Jan 20, 2011)

Date: Wednesday, April 13

Time: 10am to 5:30pm

Location: Madison, WI - either the Concourse Hotel or Lowell Center(TBD)

This meeting will be held in conjunction with the UWS President's Summit on Excellence in Teaching and Learning, April 14-15. We are asking all LTDC-reps and colleagues to attend the President's Summit as part of our F2F meeting and a professional development opportunity.

Tentative Topics of F2F Meeting

- Business Meeting - including election of new officers for 2011-2012 - ~ 60 min
- Annual action items for 2011-2012 - from Strategic Plan ~30 min
- Campus Updates - 90 min
 - we have not done this for a while because of our regular blog entries, The planning committee thinks it is worthwhile to revive this activity for this meeting. Campus reps will be given 5-10 minutes to either do a short update to highlight campus actions, changes in organization or personnel, or bring up an issue that needs feedback from the group
- Evidence of Success & Impact (exact title TBD) - 120-150 minutes
 - A breakout group exercise to ponder on the criteria of success, assessment strategy, strategies to mainstream a technology beyond early adopters. A few technologies (3,4,5?) will be chosen for discussion. The goal is to establish some best practices or strategies of measurement and adoption that all can use.
NEED INPUT and VOLUNTEERS to plan this session.
- Emerging Technology presentations - 60 -90 min
 - Augmented Reality
 - Campus Mobile Technology
 - Other?