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Context

• About Navitas
  – Higher Education
  – Vocational and Educational Training
  – English Language Teaching

• About LTTs
  – Learning Technology Services
  – Learning and Teaching Innovation
  – IT Business System and Services
  – CADRE
Context

- Provision of professional development by Learning, Teaching and Technology Services (LTT).
  - Foundations of Teaching and Learning Online: Essential Concepts;
  - Foundations of Teaching and Learning Online: Assessment;
  - Foundations of Teaching and Learning Online: Student Engagement and Motivation;
Context

• Provision of professional development by Learning, Teaching and Technology Services (LTT).
  – Teaching and Learning Innovation Seminar Series;
  – Tech Talks Seminar Series
  – Bespoke Professional Development for Curriculum Development Projects
  – Support for Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
Background

- Drivers for seeking a framework for categorizing PD offerings:
  - Make sense of this range of offerings;
  - Identify overlaps and gaps in servicing;
  - Support coherency along with innovation in future development of PD initiatives;
  - Review PD practices;
  - Presage and promote pedagogy in PD.
PD Frameworks

• The literature review:
  – Results that categorized PD in terms of the different PD approaches e.g. workshop, seminar;
  – Categorizing PD in terms of the Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK).

• The PCK model has been superseded by the Technological, Pedagogical, Content Knowledge (TPCK) Model.
PD Frameworks

- Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK)
- Technological Knowledge (TK)
- Technological Content Knowledge (TCK)
- Pedagogical Knowledge (PK)
- Content Knowledge (CK)
- Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK)
- Contexts

navitas
PD Frameworks

• Given the drivers outlined earlier, the TPACK model made sense to us as a potential framework for categorizing our PD offerings.

• A review of the TPACK literature identified a number of documents that framed PD in terms of the TPACK model, including a review of 36 studies (Voogt, Fisser, Pareja Roblin, Tondeur, & van Braak, 2013) addressing strategies to develop teachers’ TPACK skills.
Categorizing PD

• We started to categorize our PD with reference to the TPACK framework.
• As we went through the process we realized that the framework both “worked” and “did not work”.
• For example, we could easily categorize FoLTO courses because they were based on a pedagogical approach that integrated each TPACK component.
Categorizing PD

• PD provision such as Tech Talks proved impossible to frame because the various talks were all very different emphasizing e.g. technology, technology and pedagogy, technology pedagogy and content.

• The same was true for e.g. the Innovation seminar series with the various talks having different foci.
Categorizing PD

• At this point we went back to our drivers for seeking a framework for categorizing PD offerings:
  – Make sense of this range of offerings;
  – Identify overlaps and gaps in servicing;
  – Support coherency along with innovation in future development of PD initiatives;
  – Review PD practices
  – Presage and promote pedagogy in PD
Categorizing PD

• We then reconsidered the potential utility of having a PD framework:
  – A theoretical structure consisting of a set of assumptions, principles and rules that would guide LTT in the provision of PD.
  – Not a means for categorizing PD according to its component parts.
Best Practice

• Considering the TPACK model we next asked ourselves what sort of PD we would be offering e.g. technology focussed, pedagogy focussed.

• We revisited the literature to confirm our understanding of what constitutes best practice in provision of PD for teachers.
Best Practice PD

• Broadly speaking we are seeing a shift away from formal courses that lead to the “accumulation of superficial knowledge” (de la Harpe & Mason, 2014, p.222).

• Wang et al, include active learning along with a connection to classroom work amongst the principles for effective PD (Wang, Hsu, Reeves, & Coster, 2014).
Best Practice PD

• Salmon and Wright stress the need to focus on “the learning design needs for specific units or programs of study, thus producing a more authentic and relevant experience for those taking part” (2014, p.4).

• Situated in the work environment (Jefferson & Pollock, 2014), based on active learning techniques and engaged in continuously over a significant period of time (de la Harpe & Mason, 2014; Medlock, 2013).
Best Practice

• Best practice thinking from the PD literature aligns to some degree with a rule that is utilized in business environments to understand how employees develop their knowledge and skills.
Best Practice

• The rule – known as the 70:20:10 rule – suggests that formal learning accounts for only 10% of workplace learning.

• Interaction with peers accounts for 20% of workplace learning.

• The remaining 70% of learning occurs through engaging with challenging projects / tasks.
Best Practice PD

• Whilst there seems to be little in the way of empirical evidence that the theory holds true (Jefferson & Pollock, 2014; Kajewski & Madsen, 2012), the value of thinking in these terms lies in the recognition “that employees are learning all the time—by observing, by making mistakes, through interactions with others and sometimes through formal course work” (Jefferson & Pollock, 2014).
Best Practice PD

• If we bring together the TPACK framework and the ideas around best practice PD then it could be argued that PD should be instantiated in the workplace to develop teachers’ Technological, Pedagogical and Content Knowledge.
Projects

• Currently have two PD projects make use of a social learning platform – **Fuse** – as the online space for the delivery of PD.
Projects

• Fuse supports the delivery of structured / formal PD experiences e.g. video content, short answer questions, multiple choice questions.

• User progress can be tracked and reported using backend reporting functionality.

• Good for reporting on required PD in the context of e.g. government contracts.
5.1 Overview of AMEP DL

5.2 The DL client

5.4 Resources

5.5 Assessment

End of module self-checklist
Q: Which Key Performance Indicator relates to the Settlement course?
Projects

• Formal PD is not the main focus of the Fuse platform.
• Fuse was developed in terms of the 70:20:10 principle outlined earlier in this paper with the core idea being that informal learning that occurs as part of the work flow can be shared and built upon in the Fuse environment.
Projects

• Fuse also facilitates informal social and collaborative learning.
• Learners can upload content – videos, audio, documents, images etc. – as well as share links to content on the Internet.
• Users can also create screen casts from within the application which can be shared by other users.
Conclusions

• We can:
  – Conceptualize and represent our PD offerings;
  – Focus more clearly on developing PD in terms of best practice principles; and
  – Provide the Fuse environment as a place where teachers can engage in formal and informal PD.
Conclusions

• Evaluating the impact of PD has been consistently problematic.

• A paucity of studies showing that formal PD changes classroom practices.

• Does a 70: 20: 10 approach open up new ways for thinking about impact measurements?
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