BLENDED LEARNING AND COURSE DESIGN

Liz Chamberlain
April 2016

Liz.Chamberlain@open.ac.uk
Aims

• Introduction: Creative Commons, OU Open Education Resources: MOOCs and BOCs

• Session 1: Blended learning

• Session 2: Knowledge exchange: learner/educator/learner

• Session 3: Learning design
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Facilitating learning in practice

BOCs
MOOCs

- EU2014 study in 67 HEI responses from 22 European countries (EU and wider Europe)

Jansen, Schuwer, Teixeira, & Hakan Aydin (2015:121)

Figure 1. Geographical distribution of institutions responded.
The European view

Primary objectives for engaging with MOOCs

*Figure 7. Primary objectives to offer a MOOC.*
FREE ONLINE COURSE

Blended Learning Essentials: Getting Started

A free course for the Vocational Education and Training sector to promote effective practice and pedagogy in blended learning.

Join now – starts 4 Jul
Who were the nominated participants? What was their experience of the MOOC?

The majority of nominated participants were teacher educators (58%) with much experience of teaching and teacher training - most are currently employed within DIETs. Most (96%) had not participated in a MOOC before, and almost all who completed the end of course survey reported greater levels of confidence in their IT skills (93%) and in participating in online learning (95%) after completing the course. Most of the nominated participants used and adapted the TESS-India OER whilst participating in the MOOC, and reported in the end of course survey that they plan to continue to use them in their professional practice after completing the course – a key objective of the MOOC.
BOCS: BADGED ONLINE COURSES

3. Digital badging

OpenLearn Badged Open Courses (BOCs):
1. Give informal learners the recognition they’ve requested.
2. Give prospective students the skills to be prepared for undergraduate study.
3. Give our current students a means of developing and displaying skills relevant to career progression = HEAR and Student Record

✓ Cheaper to produce than our MOOCs
✓ No tutoring overhead
✓ Badging infrastructure interoperable with open standards

Image sourced from: Institute for Learning Innovation and Development & University of Southampton:
https://slate.adobe.com/cp/aUPoX/
Classroom and online education – integration of traditional face-to-face and online activities, based on pedagogical decisions.

Transform and improve the learning process:

- What is that you can do online that you can’t do F2F, and vice versa?
- Why do you want to teach what you teach?
- How can you best teach what you teach?
- What do you want students to do independently?
- What do you want students to do with others, or to be facilitated by a tutor?
- Which activities work best, and how do you know?
The blended, or online learning involves synchronous or asynchronous communication tools.

Develop a synchronous and asynchronous strategy.
Synchronous time

Synchronous/Asynchronous

- German: sychron/asynchrony
- French: synchrone/asynchrone
- Russian: синхронный/асинхронный
- Hungarian: egyidejű/aszinkron
- Romanian: sincronic/asincron
- Portuguese: síncrono/assíncrono
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real time: synchronous</th>
<th>Anytime: asynchronous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Twitter discussions</td>
<td>• Twitter discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Google hangouts</td>
<td>• Google hangouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Webinars</td>
<td>• Videos/podcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Webconferencing</td>
<td>• Email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forums</td>
<td>• Forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Online chat</td>
<td>• Discussion boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PowerPoints (Explain Everything)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Asynchronous discourse is inherently self-reflective and therefore more conducive to deep learning.

## Exhibit 1. Conceptual Framework for Online Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Experience Dimension</th>
<th>Synchronicity</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Alternative</th>
<th>Face-to-Face Enhancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expository</td>
<td>Synchronous</td>
<td>Live, one-way webcast of online lecture course with limited learner control (e.g., students proceed through materials in set sequence)</td>
<td>Viewing webcasts to supplement in-class learning activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>Math course taught through online video lectures that students can access on their own schedule</td>
<td>Online lectures on advanced topics made available as a resource for students in a conventional math class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Synchronous</td>
<td>Learning how to troubleshoot a new type of computer system by consulting experts through live chat</td>
<td>Chatting with experts as the culminating activity for a curriculum unit on network administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>Social studies course taught entirely through Web quests that explore issues in U.S. history</td>
<td>Web quest options offered as an enrichment activity for students completing their regular social studies assignments early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive</td>
<td>Synchronous</td>
<td>Health-care course taught entirely through an online, collaborative patient management simulation that multiple students interact with at the same time</td>
<td>Supplementing a lecture-based course through a session spent with a collaborative online simulation used by small groups of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asynchronous</td>
<td>Professional development for science teachers through &quot;threaded&quot; discussions and message boards on topics identified by participants</td>
<td>Supplemental, threaded discussions for pre-service teachers participating in a face-to-face course on science methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exhibit reads:** Online learning applications can be characterized in terms of (a) the kind of learning experience they provide, (b) whether computer-mediated instruction is primarily synchronous or asynchronous and (c) whether they are intended as an alternative or a supplement to face-to-face instruction.
Graham (2006), who describes the convergence of face-to-face settings, which are characterised by synchronous and human interaction, and Information and communication technology (ICT) based settings, which are asynchronous, and text-based and where humans operate independently.

Mason and Rennie (2006:12) extend this definition to including ‘other combinations of technologies, locations or pedagogical approaches’

Garrison & Vaughan (2008:5) define blended learning as ‘the thoughtful fusion of face-to-face and online learning experiences’ emphasising the need for reflection on traditional approaches and for redesigning learning and teaching in this new terrain.

Littlejohn and Pegler (2006) also recommend a different approach that they term ‘blended e-learning’. This is a useful approach because it changes the focus in learning design by shifting the emphasis from simply considering the face-to-face and online environments to that of considering the design issues of (1) introducing e-learning and (2) the process of blending [the online and face-to-face environments].
Oliver and Trigwell (2005)
- The combination of media and tools employed in an e-learning environment.
- The combination of a number of pedagogic approaches, irrespective of the learning technology used.
- The integrated combination of traditional learning with web-based online approaches.

Clark (2003)
the ‘simple ‘pick-and-mix’ definition of the concept is insufficient.’
SESSION TWO: KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE
‘Informal communities of practice and formal communities of learning with an online resource base of web resources and case studies are the basis of much effective institutional professional development.’

Stacey & Gerbic (2008:965)

Image source:
https://edtechresearch.wordpress.com/category/h810-week-3/
A significant challenge facing the adoption of any digital innovation at the undergraduate level is designing pedagogy that provides adequate support for student engagement.

Montgomery, Hayward, Dunn, Carbonaro & Amrhein (2015:658)
**Educators’ Knowledge**

**Low-impact blend**

1. Teacher has no experience in designing and developing for blended learning
2. Teacher has no prior experience in teaching the traditional course
3. Teacher has some knowledge in integrating technology
4. Teacher has no confidence in integrating technology
5. No institutional support is provided

**Medium-impact blend**

1. Teacher has designed and developed a blended learning course
2. Teacher has taught the traditional course
3. Teacher has good knowledge in integrating technology
4. Teacher has some confidence in integrating technology
5. Institutional support is provided

**High-impact blend**

1. Teacher has several years of experience in designing and developing for blended learning
2. Teacher has made several iteration of teaching the traditional course
3. Teacher has strong knowledge in integrating technology
4. Teacher has high confidence in integrating technology
5. High institutional support is provided

*Figure 1. Factors that influence the selection of blended learning design approaches*
Figure 2. Applying the three different approaches to a traditional face-to-face course
OER engagement can trigger meaningful learning opportunities for educators facilitating the creation of expertise and knowledge across contexts.

**Integrative Pedagogy Framework**

**Six Key Knowledge Types**

- **KT1** Conceptual/theoretical knowledge (general) – about OER process
- **KT2** Conceptual/theoretical knowledge (contextually situated) – subject, workplace, resources
- **KT3** Practical/experiential knowledge to develop experiential and practical knowledge and skills that will enable them to actually engage with OER process.
- **KT4** Self-regulation & socio-regulation knowledge. Need support to understand the value of OER for their own practice for students’ learning and development.
- **KT5** Socio-cultural knowledge (community-based) – interaction with other educators
- **KT6** Socio-cultural knowledge (workplace based) – support offered within institutions

Littlejohn & Hood (2015)
Useful reading:


SUCCESS FACTORS

• Institution
• Teacher
• Students
• Pedagogic considerations

Stacey & Gerbic (2008)
Session three: learning design
Learning Design is process based: practitioners make informed design decisions with a pedagogical focus and communicate these to their colleagues and learners.

Conole (2012)

Teaching types
- Article reading
- Lead readers
- Discussion
- Audio
- Video
- Discussion points
- Reflection
- Case studies
- Compare/contrast
- Concept map – relationship between information gathered
- Mind map – structure thinking with key words
- Peer evaluation
- Role-play
- Debates
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of activity</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimilative</td>
<td>Attending to information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding and handling information</td>
<td>Searching for and processing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Discussing module related content with at least one other person (student or tutor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive</td>
<td>Actively constructing an artefact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential</td>
<td>Applying learning in a real-world setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive /adaptive</td>
<td>Applying learning in a simulated setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>All forms of assessment (summative, formative and self assessment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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