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Connecting Pedagogy and Technology

- Consume
- Connect
- Create

Gear diagram showing the interconnectedness of the processes.
L&T Support Roles

AEL
- Curriculum Consultant
- Blended Learning Advisor
- Educational Designer
- (135 programs, 10,900 students)

Health
- Curriculum Consultant
- Assessment Consultant
- Blended Learning Advisor (2)
- Educational Designer
- (96 programs, 9650 students)

Sciences
- Curriculum Consultant
- Blended Learning Advisor
- Educational Designer
- (83 programs, 6000 students)

Business
- Curriculum Consultant
- Blended Learning Advisor (4)
- Educational Designer
- (67 programs, 8700 students)
Context

• Large Faculty Group
  – 8 Schools (Education, Law, Humanities, Art, Film, Music, Criminology, Languages)
  – 390 full-time academic staff, 400 sessional staff
  – 135 Degree Programs
  – ≈2000 courses per year
Support Structures

• Group- embedded roles
  – A Curriculum Consultant, a Blended Learning Advisor and an Educational Designer

• Central Support team (Educational Resources Development, Griffith Online)
  – Accessed on a project basis
Levels of Change

New IT platforms and processes have been adopted and implemented and, as discussed in the literature, offering the potential of three levels of change (Price & Kirkwood, 2011) by:

1. supporting existing teaching practices;
2. enhancing teaching through additional learning opportunities; and
3. transforming the landscape of learning and teaching through the design and delivery of learning experiences that were previously not possible.
Partnerships in Action

Level 1 of Change:
Supporting existing teaching practices
Using data to inform change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean value for Overall Satisfaction Item</th>
<th>Sem 1 2010 (number)</th>
<th>%of total courses surveyed (n = 152)</th>
<th>Sem 1 2011 (number)</th>
<th>%of total courses surveyed (n = 143)</th>
<th>Sem 1 2012 (number)</th>
<th>%of total courses surveyed (n = 156)</th>
<th>Sem 1 2013 (number)</th>
<th>%of total courses surveyed (n = 132)</th>
<th>Sem 1 2014 (number)</th>
<th>%of total courses surveyed (n = 128)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean &lt;= 3.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean &gt;3.00 &amp; &lt;3.50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean &gt;=3.50 &amp; &lt;=4.00</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean &gt;4.00 &amp; &lt;=5.00</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Plan Target 90% courses &gt;=3.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- 3 courses stayed in the <= 3 category
- 1 course dropped from >3.00 to <=3.50
- 1 course improved from <=3.00 to >3.00
- 1 course improved from <=3.50 to >3.00
- 2 courses dropped in the <= 3.00 category
- 1 course improved from <=3.00 to >3.30
- 1 course improved from <=3.50 to >3.50
- 42 courses stayed in the >4.00 & <=5.00 category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean value for Overall satisfaction Item</th>
<th>Sem 1 2010 (course code)</th>
<th>(course code)</th>
<th>Sem 1 2011 (course code)</th>
<th>(course code)</th>
<th>Sem 1 2012 (course code)</th>
<th>(course code)</th>
<th>Sem 1 2013 (course code)</th>
<th>(course code)</th>
<th>Sem 1 2014 (course code)</th>
<th>(course code, campus, mode)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean &lt;= 3.00</td>
<td>1712QCM (SB)</td>
<td>1539QCM</td>
<td>3161QCM</td>
<td>1514QCM</td>
<td>2151QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2151QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2151QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2061QCM (GC)</td>
<td>1712QCM</td>
<td>8928QCM SB (IP)</td>
<td>2291QCM</td>
<td>2324QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2312QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2312QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2063QCM (GC)</td>
<td>2061QCM</td>
<td>2710QCM</td>
<td>2391QCM</td>
<td>2390QCM_Y1</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2390QCM_Y1</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2390QCM_Y1</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2164QCM</td>
<td>2063QCM</td>
<td>2710QCM</td>
<td>2715QCM</td>
<td>3390QCM_Y1</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>3390QCM_Y1</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>3390QCM_Y1</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2169QCM (OL)</td>
<td>2242QCM</td>
<td>2456QCM</td>
<td>3731QCM SB</td>
<td>5985QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>5985QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>5985QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2318QCM</td>
<td>2456QCM</td>
<td>2781QCM</td>
<td>7871QCM SB</td>
<td>5985QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>7871QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>7871QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2324QCM</td>
<td>2781QCM</td>
<td>3061QCM</td>
<td>8298QCM_05 SB</td>
<td>5985QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>8298QCM_05 SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>8298QCM_05 SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2511QCM (SB)</td>
<td>3711QCM</td>
<td>7501QCM</td>
<td>2017QCM</td>
<td>2017QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2017QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2017QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3628QCM</td>
<td>3711QCM</td>
<td>7501QCM</td>
<td>7501QCM</td>
<td>2017QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2017QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2017QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean &gt;3.00 &amp; &lt;3.50</td>
<td>1017QCM</td>
<td>1512QCM</td>
<td>1022QCM SB (IP)</td>
<td>2020QCM SB</td>
<td>2065QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2065QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2065QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1611QCM</td>
<td>2109QCM</td>
<td>1514QCM SB (IP)</td>
<td>2513QCM SB</td>
<td>2513QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2513QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2513QCM</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1721QCM</td>
<td>2511QCM (SB)</td>
<td>2061QCM GC (IP)</td>
<td>2514QCM SB</td>
<td>2514QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2514QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>2514QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2348QCM</td>
<td>2711QCM</td>
<td>2514QCM SB</td>
<td>5000QCM SB</td>
<td>5000QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>5000QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>5000QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2571QCM</td>
<td>3161QCM</td>
<td>3281QCM SB</td>
<td>5970QCM SB</td>
<td>5970QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>5970QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
<td>5970QCM SB</td>
<td>SB (IP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2712QCM</td>
<td>3161QCM</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3711QCM</td>
<td>3711QCM</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>6014QCM SB</td>
<td>IP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- 3 courses stayed in the <= 3 category
- 1 course dropped from >3.00 to <=3.50
- 1 course improved from <=3.00 to >3.00
- 1 course improved from <=3.50 to >3.00
- 2 courses dropped in the <= 3.00 category
- 1 course improved from <=3.00 to >3.30
- 1 course improved from <=3.50 to >3.50
- 42 courses stayed in the >4.00 & <=5.00 category
My Marks Project

University Policy decision being implemented through Group Change Management process

Courses using MyMarks
Crafted Workshop series

- Workshop menu started with 7 and has grown to 19 different workshops
- 6 – 10 workshop topics are run each semester session (core and new)

Moving from 1\textsuperscript{st} to 2\textsuperscript{nd} level of change
- New topics are selected by the Academics, through a voting system, before the series is designed
Partnerships in Action

Level 2 of Change:
Enhancing Teaching Through Additional Learning Opportunities
Implementing Turnitin

• 2014 – Highlighted in an online submissions workshop but not endorsed

• 2015 - Joint-venture workshop approach
  – Feedback good practice focussed and how Turnitin could enable these processes
Implementing Turnitin

• Mitigating the University’s open-pilot approach

• Integrated LMS product – the repeated lesson of never being the first!
  – Problematic to current processes (marking and moderation, course copy...)
(23% same time last year)

Given rise to new processes
-data informed targeted communications in Week 1 and 3
Program-wide Course Site Design

- Integrative
- Iterative
- Expertise “round-table”
- Design “boot camp”
- Design leading skill development
Show and Share Workshops

• School Driven
• CC/BLA facilitated
• Connecting/contextualising between discipline, university drivers and technology drivers
Partnerships in Action

Level 3 of Change:
Transforming the Landscape of Teaching and Learning
“Designing Online Courses” Module

- Getting Started
- Curriculum Design
- Interaction Design
- Assessment Design
- Site Design
- Next Steps
Data

- 109 enrolments, 78 active users
- 25 working towards certificate
Three Emerging Themes From Evaluation

- Connecting to the overall design
- Practical Examples
- Evidence-led approach
“Easy to understand.”

“Overall, I think the modules give a good starting point for online course design regardless of whether the user is starting course design from scratch, translating an existing course to an online environment, or preparing learning activities for an online course.”

“Practical activities that clearly linked with existing responsibilities..”

“The practical examples - this made it easier to interpret how different strategies could be applied to your own courses.”

“In general, it is good to see that each of the modules is supported by empirical research, which also allows the user to go off and do additional reading on a certain area if desired. “

“Integration of theory with practice was great.”

“This training course is quite unique in that it scaffolds academics to consider pedagogy first and technology second while maintaining the focus of the participants on student learning.”
Program design, renewal and review process

- Creation of Program sites within the LMS
  - Repository and reference point for staff and students

Staff
- Consistent Program Information
- Quality curriculum and design processes
- Pedagogical developments
- Program-wide learning activity design

Students
- Consistent Program Information
- Connecting Courses to Program
- Orientation
- Interactive Academic Skill Development
Process brings program to centre of design consideration rather than courses
Benefits and Challenges

- Created at a time the Group was coming together
- Active engagement is key by all involved
- Creates an agile and responsive system for change
- Danger of over-reliance on these roles and partnerships by central services
Questions? Thoughts