DAY 1 BREAK-OUT

CHEO Instructional Designers

OER DISCUSSION/BRAINSTORM

This session is intended to continue the conversation about OER resources and requirements as outlined in the CHEO Statement of Work: *All CHEO digital files will use open formats and/or ubiquitous formats (SOW p. 23). CHEO eliminates the need for each institution to create all of its own online and hybrid science courses since OER resources will be leveraged to the extent possible, and new learning materials will be licensed through Creative Commons (SOW p. 39). Approximately 75% of program materials will be developed as open educational resources, and the remaining 25% will be licensed or purchased (Project Abstract p. 3).*

Handouts:

- CHEO Inventory of Products
- CHEO Monitoring List of Modified Courses

Discussion Points:

- We were recently asked to estimate OER percentages per course – how were these numbers reached? Would it be worth standardizing a process for future reporting?
- Should we create a process to identify and separate copyrighted material and OER material for each course?
- Is everyone comfortable with Creative Commons licensing? If not, Boyoung Chae offers a great two-week online course in finding, using, and creating Creative Commons licensed materials

Boyoung Chae:

"June" Training Announcement: How To Use OER

OPEN partner WA State Board for Community and Technical colleges again invites you to April How to use Open Educational Resources training.

The purpose of this course is to provide information and experience in using open educational resources (OER) in your teaching practice. We will discuss the concept of OER and open licenses and provide plenty of practice in locating and sharing open educational resources.

This is a 2-week online, asynchronous course through Washington State Board for Community & Tech. College. Register at:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1qyNTWxLMRdjxAB-6181wpSzs4XAcUh6AtEFcI1nTqBs/viewform

DAY 1 BREAK-OUT

CHEO Instructional Designers

- Other items to discuss: Following are notes from 5/15/14 meeting
  - Attendees: Chastity Graves, Geri Koncilja, Brenda Parea, Dawn Puente, Rebecca Reese, Kai Savi, Nancy Scofield, Cheryl Stanley, Julie Wenz

- Not all consortium schools have a hybrid definition, but for the schools that do have defined parameters, the guidelines are 70% face-to-face and 30% online.

- Brenda discussed a rubric that she had created to assess OER percentage. She will send a copy of that rubric.

- Cheryl discussed the differences between competencies and objectives. She mentioned a good explanation of the differences may be found in D2L under 'Instructor Resources'.

- Dawn mentioned that Boyoung Chae has a good resource in her Google.docs page to identify OER through Creative Commons vs. copyrighted material. We will contact Boyoung to find link and distribute.

- Brenda pointed out the importance of setting-up institutional accounts for YouTube, SlideShare, etc. That way when faculty members move or leave, the content would remain accessible.

- Brenda discussed the importance of creating an Intellectual Property List to index all material created with grant funds (incl., Career Coach resources created) --> Will check with Maria, and ask Brenda about a sample document.

- Dawn suggested CHEO institutions that have an ID publish their own courses to OER (Merlot) and feed links back to one ID (Kai?) to index in Weebly.

- Discussed CCBY and DOL statement placements in OER course materials. CCBY should be on lower left of every slide and DOL statement on last page.

- As a group, IDs will create a dictionary of metatags. A string of tags that will be consistent for all CHEO OER courses. Individual courses will receive additional tags from ID uploading content to Merlot.

DAY 2 BREAK-OUT

CHEO Instructional Designers

REPOSITORY DISCUSSION/BRAINSTORM

This session is intended to start the conversation about content resources and requirements as outlined in the CHEO Statement of Work: *For CHEO content that will be packaged as aggregate level resources, partners will adhere to either IMS Content Packages or IMS Common Cartridge. CHEO will also provide local XSLTs (used to convert XML data into web pages or PDF documents). CHEO will provide metadata information for describing the digital resources in a way that can be shared and understood by other digital collections, using the LRMI standard. CHEO will contract to provide a comprehensive digital resource conversion to bring all allied health course materials into the formats mentioned above (SOW p. 23). The partners are committed to developing the highest quality research-informed laboratory experiences for students in online science courses and publishing them to OER to facilitate replication (SOW p. 41)*

Current repository solutions from TAACCCT Rounds 1 and 3:

- Round 1: https://www.cccs.edu/partnering-for-success/trade-adjustment-assistance/taa-coetc/taa-coetc-projects/
- Round 3: https://www.cccs.edu/partnering-for-success/trade-adjustment-assistance/taa-champ/taa-champ-projects/

Process (per Carma Leichty – TAACCCT Round ID Contractor):

- Package Lecture Materials from SoftChalk into a zip file.
- Create a web page in Merlot for each unit. Each unit incl. a Unit Description, Reading and Assignments, and Lecture Materials
- Create a web page in Merlot per course as a Course Intro (include course description, course objectives, textbook and any additional information needed for that course)
- Create a web site in Weebly for each Consortium institution. The website included links to each of the Units/Intro.
- Record all Merlot and Weebly links in an Excel spreadsheet for all unit pages and course sites (was a Round 1 grant requirement.)
- The final step is to 'contribute' each unit web page and each course website that's in Merlot. Adding keywords, description, primary audience, author, and metatags.

NANSLO Repository:

- http://www.wiche.edu/nanslo

DAY 2 BREAK-OUT

CHEO Instructional Designers

Discussion Points:

- What are our repository options? What would work best for our consortium?
  - Replicate Weebly/Merlot solution used in Rounds 1 and 3
  - Use the WICHE Wiki
- In addition to the basic course repository, Rounds 1 and 3 have created websites through CCCS to house meeting minutes/archive & documentation/resources. This may be out of our scope as IDs, but is it worth considering how we might archive all grant related materials?
- Other items to discuss: Following are notes from 5/16/14 meeting
  - Attendees: Chastity Graves, Geri Koncilja, Brenda Parea, Dawn Puente, Rebecca Reese, Kai Savi, Nancy Scofield, Cheryl Stanley, Julie Wenz

- It was agreed by IDs and Leads that the preferred repository solution is to replicate the Weebly/Merlot format used in Rounds 1 and 3 of TAACCCT.

- Kai will ensure that Weebly and Merlot accounts are set-up as CHEO Consortium accounts and share passwords with consortium IDs.

- The dictionary of metatags would best be created in Google.docs so all IDs can access and offer input.

- Google+ for CHEO IDs group and the Ning Instructional Design pages were discussed. It was agreed that the CHEO Google+ group would be a good workspace resource for repository building. The Ning could spotlight the work being done in the Google+ group.

- Another tab should be added to the Weebly page for meeting minutes/document archives/resources.

DAY 2 BREAK-OUT

CHEO Instructional Designers

CURRICULUM EVALUATION DISCUSSION/BRAINSTORM

This session is intended to start the conversation about content resources and requirements as outlined in the CHEO Statement of Work: *The evaluation methodologies will account for and track program improvements and enhancements and how they impact student outcomes and program implementation. This data and information will then be incorporated into the next reporting cycle.*

Discussion Points:

- Grant requirements around curriculum evaluation are vague; however other rounds of TAACCCT grants seem to be implementing standardized curriculum evaluation procedures. Would it be beneficial for CHEO IDs to find a standardized process, or work with consortium institution procedures?
    - Currently RRCC does not have curriculum evaluation procedures, however there are some guidelines established by CCCS based on Quality Matters evaluation rubrics.
- What procedures are you using, planning to use, or might be interested in using on CHEO developed courses?
- Other items to discuss: Following are notes from 5/16/14 meeting
    - Attendees: Chastity Graves, Geri Koncilja, Brenda Parea, Dawn Puente, Rebecca Reese, Kai Savi, Nancy Scofield, Cheryl Stanley, Julie Wenz

- Add http://open4us.org/ to Google+ group page.

- We will work together, as a group, to identify an evaluation tool and rubric. Rebecca and Cheryl will upload materials they use at their institutions. We can pick and choose a tool and rubric/process that will best suit our needs. Will work on this through Google+ group.

- The question was raised: Are there ongoing evaluation procedures planned for after the grant ends? LCCC does course evaluations every other year. Does Rutgers have a process for ongoing update and evaluation of their OER courses? Check with Maria, about plans for CHEO OER courses.

DAY 2 BREAK-OUT

CHEO Instructional Designers

Discussion Points:

- When evaluating courses for repository, should the entire course be evaluated or the OER portion? If the non-OER portions will be stripped from the content upload, perhaps evaluating OER resources alone would be the best idea. Check with Maria.

- Once evaluation protocols are determined, it was suggested that IDs hold an education session with CHEO leads on evaluation processes and procedures.

- Timeline for evaluation and repository:

  o As soon as our "bible" (Course Monitoring Tool) is solidified, set a drop-dead date to upload courses to repository and work backwards for timeline.

  o Would it be possible to have the bible set by 9/30/14 (end of year 2)? If so, as a group, can we set a final date for repository creation to be complete? Then determine dates to complete evaluation protocol and evaluation of course benchmarks.

    o Will create a document in CHEOID Google+ group to work toward formalizing a timeline.