

## Interim Reporting Template

<b>Project Name</b>	Sharing the LOAD University of Cambridge
<b>Report compiled by</b>	Dawn Leeder
<b>With contributions from</b>	Heather Wharrad, Richard Windle, Raquel Morales
<b>Reporting period</b>	First interim report 1 May – 20 October 2006
<b>Section One: Summary</b>	
<p>The Sharing the LOAD project commenced in May 2006 and has progressed well and according to plan over the past five months. The project management team has convened at regular intervals; Sharing the LOAD is a standing agenda item for the RLO-CETL management group monthly meetings; a project website has been launched; four hands-on learning design workshops have been organised to take place in November and December and bookings are going well; a large scale review of existing learning objects has taken place and a taxonomy of learning object pedagogical attributes has been constructed, mapped to the IMS learning design framework; the project has been disseminated at ALT-C 2006 and through the HE Academy, Subject Centres and Heads of e-Learning forum; communications with the programme manager, evaluation and support teams have been effective and regular and there has been contact and collaboration with several other D4L projects.</p> <p>Deliverables and outputs are documented in Section Two</p>	
<b>Section Two: Activities and Progress</b>	

Report on activities in support of project objectives for the reporting period.

The project commenced on May 1 2006.

### **Project management**

A website has been set-up (<http://www.ucel.ac.uk/load/>) and this forms the central source of dissemination and the repository for all project outputs and documentation. The site is linked to from RLO-CETL (<http://www.rlo-cetl.ac.uk>) where project workshops and events are also publicised.

There have been regular project management meetings, 5 in total so far, taking place monthly (with the exception of August), in Nottingham, Cambridge and London. Notes and actions from these meetings are available from the "Project Documents" section of the project website.

### **Review of existing content and construction of learning design taxonomy**

Significant progress has been made with the learning design taxonomy. 101 learning objects from the CETL, UCeL and SONET collections have been analysed and a classification of their pedagogical attributes has been derived, based on the IMS Learning Design Framework and the JISC Pedagogic Planner. 12 key attributes have been identified that describe and quantify the learning objects. These attributes are mapped to the environment, roles and activities in the IMS LD framework. These are described in a report "Results of learning object pedagogical classification" which is in draft form and is the basis for a paper (or perhaps two). It will be published on the website once some additional verification has been carried out.

### **Learning Design Workshops**

Four workshops will be held in November/December in London, Cambridge, Nottingham and Oxford. The dates and venues have now been finalised and the materials for the workshops (resource packs, pedagogical design sheets, poster-size storyboard, peer-group review form and RLO characteristic scoring criteria) and in draft form and will shortly be going off to print. Again, these will be available on the project website. The booking forms for the workshops are live and at the time of writing 30 participants have already booked.

### **Practitioner Survey**

An initial practitioner questionnaire is under construction and will use (with permission) some of the questions asked in Liz Masterman's study and build on some of the recommendations she made. Participants will be invited to complete it during the workshops.

The overall approach as outlined in the project plan remains unchanged and the workpackages are being executed on time as according to the plan. There were some minor typographical errors in some of the workpackage dates in Appendix B of the project plan; these have been corrected in v1.2 (attached). There have been no changes to the project team, aims, objectives, deliverables, milestones or the Project Management Group.

## **Section Three: Outputs, Outcomes and Deliverables**

At the time of this report most of the outputs are currently in draft format and the final versions will shortly be uploaded to the project website.

Currently available online from <http://www.ucel.ac.uk/load/documents.html> are:

- Original proposal
- Workpackages
- Start-up meeting presentation
- Table of LO attributes mapped to IMS Learning Design Framework
- Report on taxonomy progress as of 8/08/06
- RLO attribute scoring criteria
- ALT-C Symposium: Design for Learning: a new paradigm? Abstract and presentation
- Minutes of Project Management Group meetings

An example of a spider diagram of LO attributes is at <http://www.ucel.ac.uk/load/taxonomies.html>

The draft programme for the workshops, workshop flyer, workshop poster and booking forms are online at <http://www.ucel.ac.uk/load/workshops.html>

The draft workshop resource pack will be finalised shortly and contains:

- Practitioner questionnaire
- Design guidelines
- Pedagogical design sheet
- Storyboard poster
- Peer-group review form
- RLO attribute scoring criteria
- Workshop evaluation form

#### **Section Four: Dissemination**

There has been good and regular communication with other D4L projects (Mod4L Models of Practice; LD4P/D4LD; Phoebe Pedagogic Planner; IOE Pedagogic Planner) and key stakeholders (RLO-CETL, CARET, SONET). Workshops have been set up through Mira Vogel at the Centre for Excellence in Learning Technology, Goldsmith's and Liz Masterman at Oxford University Computing Services. (Both Mira and Liz were responsible for the Evaluation of Learning Design Tools reports that in part informed the Sharing the LOAD bid). The workshops have been promoted through the HE Academy, Heads of e-Learning and the following 17 Subject Centres:

- Art, Design and Media
- Bioscience
- Built Environment (CEBE)
- Education (ESCALATE)
- Engineering
- English
- Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences (GEES)
- Health Sciences and Practice
- History, Classics and Archaeology
- Information and Computer Sciences
- Materials (UK Centre for Materials Education)
- Maths, Stats & OR Network (MSOR)
- Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Medicine (MEDEV)
- Physical Sciences
- Psychology
- Sociology, Anthropology and Politics (C-SAP)
- Social Policy and Social Work (SWAP)

The project was disseminated at ALT-C 2006 at the Design for Learning Symposium. The materials are online at <http://www.ucel.ac.uk/load/documents.html>

The workshops will be a major dissemination route for the next phase and the team plan to publish and present their results at an international conference next year.

A chronological list of meetings, presentations and dissemination can be found in Appendix 2.

### **Section Five: Evaluation**

#### **RLO-CETL Evaluation Toolkit**

The RLO-CETL Evaluation Toolkit will be used to evaluate the pedagogical effectiveness of the learning objects. The toolkit comprises 8 tools:

1. RLO evaluation form
2. Routine data analysis
3. Focused interview
4. Field notes
5. Student questionnaire
6. Student focus groups
7. Tutors' forms (Context of learning form and tutor's evaluation of learning effectiveness)
8. Technology and deployment audit

There is a minimum set required by the CETL to allow comparison across institutions. The minimum evaluation set consists of Field notes, Student questionnaire, Tutors' forms, Technology and deployment audit.

#### **Evaluation of pedagogical attributes of Learning Objects**

101 learning objects have been analysed and classified as described in Section 2 above. These results will be published in due course.

#### **Evaluation of workshops**

This will be carried out using a modification of the UCeL and CETL workshop evaluation form (see Appendix 3)

### **Section Six: Issues and Challenges**

## Design for Learning Programme

Collaborative projects involving more than one institution always present additional challenges, especially in terms of communication, organisation and time management. Fortunately, the team has experience of these issues and has dealt with bottlenecks effectively. Regular face to face meetings supplemented by telephone, email and video-conferencing have ensured effective communication.

Report on issues or problems that are impacting on the development and implementation of the project. Detail what impact any issues may have on the achievement of project targets, and set out how you plan to tackle these issues.

In terms of unexpected project achievements, the classification of the pedagogical attributes of learning objects as outlined under the review of existing content and construction of learning design taxonomy in Section Two has proved so far to be a major achievement. It could not have been predicted that the IMS LD Framework would be too broad and therefore inappropriate to classify learning objects at the “micro-context” level and that a separate taxonomy that mapped to it would require construction. But that has been the case.

There are no specific training needs at present.

### **Section Seven: Support**

The team had an initial project meeting with the programme manager in Bristol in early May, attended the start-up meeting in Birmingham later that month and there has been regular email contact throughout the reporting period. A team representative has attended the pedagogy experts group meetings.

There has been regular contact with Glenaffric the evaluation team and occasional contact with the CETIS support team throughout the reporting period.

## Appendix 1

Chronological list of meetings, presentations and dissemination 1 May – 20 October 2006

9 May	Initial project meeting, Bristol
11 May	1 <sup>st</sup> project management meeting, Nottingham
23-24 May	JISC D4L start-up meeting, Birmingham
21 June	2 <sup>nd</sup> project management meeting, Cambridge
27 June	Pedagogy experts group meeting, Bristol
26 July	3 <sup>rd</sup> project management meeting, London
5-7 September	ALT C, Edinburgh D4L, symposium presentation, workshops publicised
11 September	4 <sup>th</sup> project management meeting, Nottingham
15 September	Workshop flyers mailed out to venues
16 October	5 <sup>th</sup> project management meeting, Cambridge
16-17 October	RLO-CETL Developers' Meeting, Cambridge – workshops publicised
18 October	Workshops publicised to Design-Learn JISCMAIL list
19 October	Workshops publicised to HE Academy, HELF and subject centre lists

## Appendix 2

### RLO-CETL workshop evaluation form

[Title of workshop]

[Date] [Venue]

We hope that you found the workshop of interest and that it gave you an opportunity to explore issues of importance to your work. To help us evaluate the event and plan for future workshops we should be grateful if you would spend a few minutes completing this questionnaire.

For each question ring the most appropriate number, where 1 = "poor" and 5 = "excellent". Any additional comments would be welcome.

1. Were the registration instructions clear and timely? 1 2 3 4 5

-----

2. Was the workshop relevant to your needs? 1 2 3 4 5

-----

3. Were the programme notes provided sufficient? 1 2 3 4 5

-----

4. How would you rate:  
a) The balance of presentation and practical work? 1 2 3 4 5

-----

b) The standard of refreshments and lunch? 1 2 3 4 5

-----

c) The convenience of the location? 1 2 3 4 5

-----

5. Would you like to suggest any topics for future workshops?

-----

Any other comments

-----

*Optional details*

Name:

e-mail address:

*Thank you for your help.*

Institution:

Please hand completed form to the organisers or send to  
RLO-CETL workshops, University of Cambridge, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, 16 Mill Lane, Cambridge, CB2 1SB