|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Term End Reflections (#16) |
| Date | 20-April-2013 |
| Course/Week | Week 11, OMDE601 |
|  |

**1. Review your group's (r)evolutionary grid. What are your thoughts about the grid as a learning tool and the process used to create the grid?**

I found the grid as a very helpful tool to organize my thoughts about what we were learning throughout the term.

For the first grid, my process was very reactive. I was going back over my reading notes to generate my portions of the grid. Starting with Wave 2, I started to be more proactive – testing to fill out just my portions of the grid while reading. For Wave 3 & Emerging Trends – this was established pattern. I was creating the grid as part of taking my reading notes.

It was very helpful to be more proactive so I could cite sources when contributing to parts of the grid where I was not the primary author.

**2. Go back to your original definition of DE. What aspects of the course have influenced your understanding of DE? Based on what you have learned in the course, revise your original definition accordingly -- and explain why you have changed your definition in the way you have.**

The evolution of my personal definition of distance education has been primarily influenced by the course readings. My participation in this course has been the secondary influence on my personal definition.

My first definition mentions technology is passing and only mentioned a single teacher as well as simple communication pathway between teacher-student. While becoming acquainted with Waves 2 & 3, the teacher role was expanded from a single teacher to an educational development team. Technology was called out as a component by itself as was the learning organization. Wave 3 and Emerging trends made me include student-student communication pathways in my definition.

My current definition can be found at”

<http://joannedeitsch.pbworks.com/w/page/64578510/Joanne%27s%20Personal%20Definition%20of%20Distance%20Education>

**3. Consider the overall course objectives. Were all or most of these objectives achieved? If so, in what ways and to what degree?**

I feel all course objectives were met between the reading assignments and the grid activity. I feel the specific skills were obtained through the skill builder activities and the conferences.

**4. Take some time to reflect on your study group experience: What did you think about the experience of working together to create a collaborative document? What worked? What did not? What could your group have improved in order to realize a more smooth process? What do you see as benefits (or drawbacks) of online collaboration? How do you think the activity could be improved?**

Overall, I felt the experience working on a team to create a collaborative document was primarily a very positive experience. I felt I was fortunate to have two other colleagues who were as committed as I to completing the program as team mates. That really helped us to make our deadlines. There were 2 bumps in the road: 1) we got off to a rocky start and 2) losing a teammate when he withdrew from the program.

One thing that did not work so well was the frustration I think we all felt because we only had words to express ourselves during our chats. There was a lot of misunderstanding and our meetings were much longer than if we had met “voice-to-voice”. One thing that could have made it smoother was for us to agree early on about rotating responsibilities. Lisa got stuck doing the majority of the posting the threads – I got stuck with the majority of posting assignments. It would have been better if there was an agreed upon rotation because being responsible for the same roles over and over again gets old very quickly.

Benefits of online collaboration is sharing the workload but a drawback is that the quality of work may not be of the same quality throughout the team.

One thing that would be helpful for improving this activity would be having a youtube video to explain proper chat and/or study group activity etiquette. A word document was provided but having to read one more thing is exhausting. The conference threads are very overwhelming at first in addition to all the required reading and trying to do my job and find time to eat sleep. Every time I got a youtube video – it really helped convey information much quickly than reading it.

Working with teams is a life skills – there are times you must lead and time you must follow.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Reading Reflections (#15) |
| Date | 13-April-2013 |
| Course/Week | Week 10, OMDE601 |
|  |

**Anderson** (2010) begins our exploration by reviewing established educational theories of constructivism and complexity theory. He then undertakes the more difficult task of introducing relatively new theories that could be used in applying emerging technologies to education.

We start with the **Pedagogy of Nearness** talking about Megias’ work. The Pegagogy of Nearness talks about the fact that online learning/interaction is as valuable as real learning/interaction. Also it is a critical skill for learners and educators to be able to effectively work in both online and offline contexts as well as being able to shift rapidly between the two. Not surprisingly this resonated with me – after all, I am participating in an online grad program.

Anderson then talks about Heutagogy learner is the agent in his or her own learning – teacher as facilitator – learner has to know how to find objects on the web. We will talk critics in a few minutes

Anderson finishes with connectivism where the learning environment is an information network and each learner is a node. The thrust of connectivism is to learn how to create pathways to knowledge when they are needed. Finally, knowledge/learning can reside outside learner as well as a need to embrace informal learning.

There is one problem that I had with connectivism. I agree that learning can exist in a human community. However, a series to teaching objects in a database do not constitute learning. A database, a device, a tool does not have the ability to learn – it cannot strategize – it cannot apply learning – it can just store learning objects that humans can learn from but machines do not have that same rich capacity to learn.

Critics of connectivism and Heautagogy that I agree with

“Kop and Hill (2008)… the requirements placed on the learner to be capable of and motivated to engage in very self-directed learning” (Anderson, 2010, pp. 34-35)

“Verhagen (2006) argues that connectivism is more a theory of curriculum (specifying what the goal of education should be and the way students should learn in that curriculum) than a theory of learning”(Anderson, 2010, p. 35)

Hase & Kenyon (2000) and their work on Heutogogy or what I like to call Andragogical Constructivism.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Heutagogy** | **Other Theories** |
| teachers think more about process than content | Task or problem centered orientation to learning (Bullen, 1995) |
| enabling learners to make sense of their world rather than make sense of the world of the teacher | Meaning making, according to constructivists, is the goal of learning processes; it requires articulation and reflection on what we know. (Jonassen, 1995) |
| forcing teacher to move into the world of the learner | Mutual planning, diagnosis of needs by learners and facilitator (Bullen, 1995) |
| enabling teachers to look beyond their own discipline and favourite theories | Use of inquiry projects, independent study and experimental techniques (Bullen, 1995) |

“The idea that, given the right environment, people can learn and be self-directed in the way learning is applied is not new and has been an important humanistic theme” (Hase & Kenyon, 2000, Heutagogy, para. 4). I was waiting for the environment to be described in vain.

“assessment becomes more of a learning experience rather than a means to measure attainment ” (Hase & Kenyon, 2000, Heutagogy, capable people and capable organisations, para. 5). This won’t play in regulated learning environments. I work in Pharma and we are all about proving competency through assessments. I can see this also not being applied in other regulated industries such finance and healthcare.

Overall, the authors seem naive in their understanding of their fellow human beings – talking enabling proactivity, that managers have to be capable so they can model that for their employees and that people work for money. I coined the phrase “duh-da” moments because I actually felt myself getting stupider reading this paper. I felt Anderson did a more professional delivery about this theory than the actual authors of the theory.

**Schwier – Connectivsim with George Siemens (2011)**

George talks about Stephen’s approach being more algorithmic while his is more psychological and sociological in his approach.

The educational process is seen through how connections are formed. Knowledge growth and concepts are developed in relationship to one another. Connectivism emphasizes the importance of the actual connections being made. Knowledge is in the connections themselves. He ends by talking about that more empirical research is needed
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Wave 3 Reflections (#14) |
| Date | 7-April-2013 |
| Course/Week | Weeks 8 & 9, OMDE601 |
|  |

1. What do you see as the most influential development of this third wave and why?
The emergence of the world wide web and web 2.0 tools had a profound effect on DE. It shifted the educational paradigm once again. According to **Anderson & Dron (2011)** this new paradigm has brought about a new learning theory called connectivism which describes how learners explore educational objects using the networks made possible by the world wide web. **Swan (2010)** also talks of how the web 2.0 tools allow media creation to be done very easily but at the same time, this creates information overload. **Peters (2010)** discusses digitized learning and similar web exploration as Andreson and Dron. Peters also talks about that there are now new and novel educational opportunities that defy previous educational understanding. It’s a brave new world one again.

2. Were there any "a-ha!" moments during this wave? Tell us more about them and what specifically made them "a-ha!" moments.

**Anderson (2011)** and his Interaction Equivalency Theorem was definitely a **confirmation moment** which I feel are just as important as a-ha moments. I was not surprised about student – teacher being least effective interaction. I meet with a student of mine a year after I had trained her. She did not recall many of the exercises that we did together in class. One on one I was able to reiterate we had discussed but that experience did impact me. I recently took 6Ds training which talks about the fact that learning transfer takes place after the learning event – something I had already experienced with my student but now I have strategies for helping to making the learning transfer happen (http://www.the6ds.com/our-company)

Secondly, **Garrison & et. Al. (2000)** and the Community of Inquiry framework – having seen it not only described but also used during the Wave 3 readings was an “a-ha” I have a new tool tool kit moment.

3. Go back to your original definition and consider again how it has changed (and if it has). What specific readings, interactions, and/or discussions influenced the change?

My personal definition hasn’t changed due to this wave. It did change quite a bit for wave 2 but I feel that nothing in wave 3 is forcing me to make a change. In the last round, I put technology as the latest component of the definition. I see no reason to alter the definition based on what I’ve learned in Wave 3.

4. Think of a real-world situation, perhaps your current work environment, where you could apply what you’ve learned in this module. Describe this situation in your journal.

This past Friday, I completed the alpha build of an eCourse I have been developing at work. The subject matter is dry – we discuss 2 templates that have over 50+ sections. I struggled with my business partners who wanted to dump at 90+ slide PowerPoint into out LMS and call it an eCourse. I was able to persuade them to let me develop 12 captivate demos to walk the learner through the template. Each demo is generally 1-3 minutes in length and then is followed by 1-3 True/False or Multiple Choice assessment.

As I was building the eCourse is our course development tool, I realized I was applying a very crude constructivist model by having the learner view information and then test their understanding. It’s not that I specifically set out to apply constructivism. However, I feel I have a better understanding and vocabulary to bring to bear when discussing my instructional design choices with my business partners
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Weekly Reading Reflections (#13) |
| Date | 7-April-2013 |
| Course/Week | Weeks 8 & 9, OMDE601 |
|  |

**Anderson (2011)** gives a very objective précis of the history of DE. He talks about Community of Inquiry (more on that later) as well as his Interaction Equivalency Theorem. Three kinds of interaction student-content, student-teacher, student-student. Like Moore’s transactional distance where 3 elements have an internal tension – like a triangle made of rubber bands – if you stretch one plane of that – how does it affect the others two planes?

I was not surprised about student – teacher being least effective. I meet with a student of mine a year after I had trained her. She did not recall many of the exercises that we did together in class. One on one I was able to reiterate we had discussed but that experience did impact me. I recently took 6Ds training which talks about the fact that learning transfer takes place after the learning event – something I had already experienced with my student but now I have strategies for creating a climate for the learning transfer happen (http://www.the6ds.com/our-company)

**Swan (2010)** sees online learning as the next evolution in distance education. Rather than three waves, she sees two eras. Distance education which to defines industrial distance education while online learning is post-Fordist distance education. According to Swan, teachers using online learning must help their students to make their thinking visible and assist with the student’s mental remediation or reconstruction of their understanding. Teachers must provide knowledge centered learning environments. They must also evaluate their students work as in the Industrial Era. They must develop and assess more assignments than their traditional classroom counterparts to help their distance students feel engaged. I really like the summations that she used to transition from one topic to the next in a very logical order. We often forgot the very simple and most basic rule in education – repetition helps reinforce learning.

While both Garrison and Swan refer to online learning to discuss learning experiences enabled via the computer, **Peters (2010)** refers to this type of learning as digitized learning. Peters does not appear to draw a hard line between distance education and digitized learning as Garrison does between distance education and online learning. However, Peters does acknowledge that distance education pedagogies will have to change extensively due to this new learning environment.

**Garrison (2009)** sees distance education as separate and distinct from online learning. When we read the term distance education in the context of his work, he is generally discussing what we would interpret to be wave one, self-study courses only. He sees Moore’s transactional distance theory as a possible way to bring about convergence between distance education and online learning. I did have three bias alerts on this article - 3 bias alerts

1. Garrison favors his own theory of Community of Inquiry
2. I could take some of his arguments and turn them 180 degrees to show how traditional education is embracing DE rather than DE having to embrace online learning. I felt he had a touch of tunnel-vision there
3. He feels the future of DE is dependent on developing and communicating a coherent theory. I do not believe that traditional education in their over 2000 years of practice has a coherent theory. DE has less than 200 years of practice. I feel that DE is still figuring itself out. The pace of technology plus audience demand is changing so much and so quickly I feel that ALL educational institutions are scrambling to keep up.

**Vaughn (2010)** covers how blended learning started as campus based online learning where online learning experiences were used in conjunction with face to face lectures. One thing I found interesting was how faculty were really willing to work three times as much to improve their student’s outcomes. Then Vaughn talks about COI briefly as this is the basis for a lot of the design that he discusses for distance education online learning. He covers design considerations as well as describing what happens before, during, between and at next synchronous event. I can see myself using the information in this chapter as a diving board for designing an online learning program.

Last but not least, **Anderson & Dron (2011)** use the Community of Inquiry framework to describe the pedagogy of DE. They define the 3 waves based on pedagogy rather than on technology.

• Behaviourist- cognitive – very teacher directed

• social constructivist – teacher is more of a guide or facilitator

• connectivist – teacher is really just another traveler on this educational journey we are all taking

There is an acknowledgement that pedagogy evolved with the technologies that enabled them. Also there is an acknowledgement that these waves of pedagogy are still valid regardless of technology.

Anderson & Dron (2011) discuss connectivism as the learner interacting not just individually or in a group setting with education but rather on a larger network lever of many, many educational objects. My concerns as an educator about connectivism is that is seems to be very chaotic. I liken it to andragogy where you can take this theory and apply to such an extreme that this is no educational benefit for the learner, the learning organization or the teacher.

My initial thought is that connectivism needs to be applied sparingly in course development – may be allow the students to define their own project – do scaffolding (I know I mixing my theories here) to give students a jumping off point but also allow for other topics to be defined by the student or group of students.

Another way to potentially apply connectivism while adding structure would be through curation – where students could be encouraged to add to knowledge structures already defined by the teacher or by previous students. “Consider the most common example of curation: the museum curator. This person does not create content in the traditional sense. He or she listens to what is going on, and finds topics that resonate with museum guests. He or she scours the globe for artifacts related to that topic, and organizes the artifacts in such a way that guests are taken on a learning journey as they experience the exhibit. (Kelly, 2012, para. 5).”
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Week 7 Reflections (12) |
| Date | 24-March-2013 |
| Course/Week | Week 7, OMDE601 |
|  |

**Review your group's (r)evolutionary grid. What aspects of Wave 2 did you find to be the most interesting? Why? What was the least interesting? Why was this the case?**

Some of the things I found most interesting were from Miller (2010) about other types of courses used in Wave 2 - telecourses and multi-point DE courses. So much of the reading in Wave 2 is about Open Universities but there were other forms of DE used in this wave and it can be easy to overlook that.

**What were your "a-ha!" moments during this wave? What incited these moments and how did they influence your understanding of DE?**

An a-ha moment for me was reading Haughy (2010) and Miller (2010). Haughy because of introducing me to the concept of the course team used at OU UK. And Miller for breaking down the different technologies used in Wave 2.

**After what you have read, learned, or experienced in studying this second wave, how might you revise your original definition of DE? What specific readings/experiences have influenced your understanding of DE?**

I have revised my personal definition to incorporate technology as a fourth component of Distance Education based on my readings of Miller (2010) and Peters (2010).

Essay 2 really highlighted to me how different countries with different contexts still benefit from open universities. Delivery methods are different but the education provided still enable countries to serve their underserved populations.

**Consider the seminar with our visiting scholar Alan and the expert video from Tony Bates. What left a lasting impression on you? Tell us about your impression and how it affected your views about DE.**

Tony Bates comment on the visiting president from a traditional university. It was a funny story. It got me thinking about the reality of DE from an Open University perspective – the comment about No students! He mentioned the senate in passing which inspired one of my questions to Alan.

Alan’s question about Why an OU got me thinking about the differences in between countries that would either encourage or discourage founding an OU.

**Go back to the course objectives listed in the Syllabus. Do you feel the objectives are being fulfilled and if so, how and to what degree? Are there objectives that are not being met? If so, which ones?**

I am impressed with how much of the course objectives we have already accomplished. We will continue to learn more about the characteristics & methodologies of DE, influences that affect it, discover more key authors, teaching and learning models and well as technology. But we have explored many of these subject for Waves 1 and 2. I look forward to Wave 3 and beyond!
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Skill Builders Self-Assessment (#11) |
| Date | 17-March-2013 |
| Course/Week | Weeks 5 &6, OMDE601 |
|  |

I wanted to take a moment and just reflect on things I’ll do better next time that came out of Skill Builders 1-6.

Mind maps & ePortfolio – definitely taught me to look at all the options before making a choice of software and/or platform to use. I would use freeplane again for simple and visual mind maps but would use mindomo for more complex projects. Same type of comments for pbworks – I am definitely going to change my platform during the break.

SG2 – definitely taught me how to use the threads in WebTycho better. Next time, I’d probably put threads like “Getting to know you…” “Assignment 1 approach” “Our first meeting”

I will do this rather than building a crude project plan that took some time on my part to build and was difficult for everyone to understand. I can see the need to suggest meeting roles like scribe, manner minder, summation minder, tie-breaker to give everyone a role to play as well as keep meetings effective and purposeful.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Andragogy (#10) |
| Date | 17-March-2013 |
| Course/Week | Weeks 5 &6, OMDE601 |
|  |

Bullen (1995) makes some very compelling points about the reality of using andragogy in a distance education environment. Bullen (1995) refers to Farnes’ research which does correctly apply andragogical principles by having the student pick out their own learning program with the assistance of a tutor. However, it places a burden on the adult student’s limited time in doing excessive research in preparation for the course as well as making this approach of creating a highly individualized program a very cost prohibitive proposition for the learning organization (Bullen, 1995).

A pragmatic and thoughtful approach such as suggested by Taylor & Kaey in Bullen’s (1995) work of keeping a structured course that includes multiple reading options for the student still applies andragogical principles while still making this a value proposition for all parties involved.

Joanne’s Commentary

I have seen andragogy in action in my own practice. It does take some creativity on the part of the instructor as well as a mindset to savor small victories. There was a face-to-face course I used to teach about a computer application. Toward the end of my tenure with this course, I would let student questions determine the ordering of the course instruction. But I had to be very familiar with the content to jump around and still cover the main points.

My second example is an online course I am currently designing. Unfortunately, it is primarily a “page turner” – that is the student clicks next … next to page through text heavy content pages to thankfully get their course completion. There was an opportunity to put in a roll over page – that is a page where the learner can roll the mouse over part of the screen to get more information to pop-up. For at least one page the learner has a modicum of freedom to choose the order of how they interact with this page.

In both courses, however, my student’s ability to make lots of choices were very few. For example, in both courses my students MUST complete them to get their computer accounts that they must have to do their jobs. Talk about an unmotivated student population! I have taken Bullen’s (1995) approach of “as far as possible, students should be offered a choice” hoping it will make courses a little more bearable for my learners.
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Shale Dichotomy (#9) |
| Date | 17-March-2013 |
| Course/Week | Weeks 5 &6, OMDE601 |
|  |

I didn’t realize that I could get mad reading someone’s research. Shale definitely upset me – his tone was at times condescending, his support of videoconferencing because it is more like traditional classroom interaction and finally, what I felt was his dig at Peters’ work in the first sentence of this conclusion – he didn’t even have the professional courtesy to cite Peters’ work!

This is a question I posted to the class:

Dear Classmates,

In Shale’s (2010) conclusion, he talks from a philosophical standpoint that learning occurs when people interact in a social context. He later makes the statement, “It was mentioned earlier that there has been no formalized rubric to guide the design of distance education courses...” (Shale, 2010, p. 103).

**Joanne’s Commentary**

I call this post the Shale Dichotomy with a question mark because from my perspective it appears that Shale is asking DE practitioners to provide a concrete protocol for educational development on one hand while on the other he is saying that traditional classrooms have worked just fine because of a philosophy that has been embraced that social interaction is good. Why? Because it is!

Regardless of setting (traditional or DE), education is not a widget that can be built following some blue print. For me, education is as much of a journey, an exploration as it is a process. I can develop each page of an online course following a rubric but the creativity I try to bring to the contents of each page is not something that can be easily documented.

I don’t know if I am reading too much into this. I look forward to my classmates perspective on this topic.

Kind Regards, Joanne
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number |  Reflections on Visiting Scholar Alan Tait (#8) |
| Date | 17-March-2013 |
| Course/Week | Weeks 5 &6, OMDE601 |
|  |

I was very impressed with our visiting scholar, Alan Tait. I really liked that he posted a youtube video of us to be able to see him virtually. I always like putting a face with a name!

My question to him was about Senates and Coping Strategies. I found the OU Senate model of academics holding OU management accountable was very interesting. Especially since in my day job, our business model is the reverse. Our business funds the training arm and then holds the training arm accountable for the work that we do.

It nice to see that Alan and I share a coping strategy of humor. This was especially important when OU UK had their funding pulled by the government.

I also enjoyed his question about Why an OU? It was an interesting discussion and I can see his point that our community colleges in the US might fill that role that OU UK does in the UK.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Early DE Reflections (#7) |
| Date | 3-March-2013 |
| Course/Week | Week 4, OMDE601 |
|  |

A forerunner of DE is Apostle Paul’s epistles to his congregation as an example of the written word mediating a message as opposed to the spoken word (Peters, 2004; Holmberg, 2006).

The industrial revolution in the Mid-19th Century caused the people’s environment significantly. Peters (2010) discusses how DE is the most industrialized form of education as it employs the same practices of industrial enterprises and changed people to the point that they desired education mediated by written words rather than spoken words. It effectively creates a unique form of education that is different from traditional face to face education (Peters, 2010).
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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | WAVE 1 Reflections (#6) |
| Date | 3-March-2013 |
| Course/Week | Week 4, OMDE601 |
|  |

**Has your original definition of DE evolved further? If so, in what ways?**

Yes, it has. I am taking the approach of building my personal understanding of DE based on the weekly readings. Taking what I know to be true from that to start and further evolve my DE definition over time.

I know that Design, Development, Implement, & Evaluate from ADDIE were missing from the week 1 definition so that needed to be added at some point.

I have to say Haughey’s reading gave great insight into the Design and Develop Ds in ADDIE for me. I look forward to understanding more about this throughout the program as I currently live and breathe Design every day.

This definitely a work in progress that will continue to evolve.

**What did you learn about the first wave of DE that was most surprising to you? And why?**

The most surprising aspect was that correspondence courses were developed for humanitarian purposes. Entrepreneurs developed these courses so profit motive was the primary consideration. I am still trying wrap my mind around this one.

**What do you think was the most important work of early DE scholars?**

I would have to say Dr. Peter’s original work. I apologize for not citing this. It was important because he was the first way to say “Hey, guys, maybe there is some value to be found in these correspondence courses that have been going on since mid-19th century. What can this past experience contribute to our current need to provide DE.” He is the one to start the conversational balling rolling about this.

Dr. Peter’s was also willing to take a 360 degree approach into putting some hard thought into describing what DE is and what are the moving parts to make DE work. His work got other people thinking about this and evaluating the usefulness of DE.

**How do you think studying the early development of DE might affect you as a student of DE and/or as a DE practitioner?**

You can’t get to *where you want to go* without first exploring and acknowledging *where you have been*. I feel that this foundational knowledge will help me as a student of DE in ways that I can’t even describe at the moment. As a practitioner, again, I can’t verbalize exactly how will affect me. I’m just acknowledging that it will.

1. What is your experience of learning collaboratively as part of a small group with a specific task?

I was really impressed with the servant leadership of my team. They were willing to make suggestions and learn new things. Lisa educated the team about the WebTycho capabilities. Patricia and Jason got our collaborative workspace up and moving. Lisa and my contributions were getting the team talking about the project and moving things forward.

Was it smooth sailing? Definitely not for any member of the team! I feel this is par for the course with any team project I’ve ever worked on though. A project plan never survives the first encounter with the team!

Could I have done a better job? Definitely! Did we make significant progress on the Wave 1 project? Definitely!

One comment on the SG interface. It’more web 1.0 than WebTycho. But it’s a great learning tool because we are learning about what DE feels like experientially, not just intellectually. That is, we get to feel the pain! Those insights moving forward will be invaluable.

**6. Did creating a grid have any impact on the way in which you understand the history of DE? If so, in what way?**

I felt creating the grid with my team did impact my understanding of the history of DE. When I create an eCourse I need to chunk down the knowledge into bite size chunks for my learners. This grid does the same thing for our team. It gives us a collaborative framework for discussion.

The grid really helps you critically think about what you’re learning. By sharing and discussing with others, it enhances the learning for everyone.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | 3 Thoughts and Actions (#5) |
| Date | 23-February-2013 |
| Course/Week | OMDE601, Week 3 |
| Thought #1 I haven’t read much yet! However, when I was preparing my first assignment, I had to go over and over the readings again. This journal should help but I’m going to check out Refworks to see if this can help me keep on top of all that I’m reading.**Thought #2** This is week 3 and I feel like I had A LOT to write to catch this journal up. Now that I have this journal started, I want to stay on top of this rather than playing catch up. I will start to make a draft of my journal entry at the end of my reading notes. After I video record my weekly reflections, I will use both my reading notes summary and video to draft my final journal entry(ies).**Thought #3** I have always felt that video is a powerful communication tool:* Watching Dr. Peter’s videos helped deepen my understanding of his theory more than just reading the materials
* This is a medium that I desire to be more proficient at using in order to develop learning moments for my media publication company, Wildfell Press
* I have always found self-talk as a good learning tool for my own edification

I am so intrigued by this topic that it could form the basis of my research project.**ACTION PLAN****#1 – Check out ref works to see if this can help me keep this material organized****#2 – I will start to make a draft of my journal entry at the end of my reading notes. I will use both my reading notes summary and video to draft my final journal entry(ies).****#3 – Continue reflective video recordings**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Week 3 reflections (#4) |
| Date | 23-February-2013 |
| Course/Week | OMDE601, Week 3 |
|  |

I was tardy in reading Bernath. I’m really glad that I did as it filled in the blanks on Holmberg’s and Moore’s theories for me. I really liked how Moore presented his theories in different graphic formats (Bernath, 2007).**OTTO PETERS VISIT**It was great to have Dr. Peters visit our class. I appreciated the insights he was able to share with our class.I was disappointed in one of my question to Otto regarding traditional, DE and blended as being best suited to which ages of students. It was too general of a question. **MDE ORIENTATION**This is a great resource and I know I’ll be back for a refresher. I added 2 posts.**ePORTFOLIO**Started my ePortfolio on pbworks. It is easy to use and set up. Posted best practices around backing up information and how to address limited storage on these sites.**REFLECTIVE LEARNING JOURNAL**Created my reflective learning journal in a Word document. Transcribed Week 1 & 2 videos. Created Week 3 video.**DEFINITION OF DE ESSAY A1**I felt I described Peter’s (Peters, 2004) four unique characteristics of DE correctly. I was disappointed in my rationale discussion. Next time, I will respond to the writing coach during the week to request further feedback.**MIND MAP OF DE**I created this using freeplane. I felt I was able to accurately capture my current understanding of DE although I feel what I have for the learning organization is inadequate. I anticipate I will change this as my understanding of DE continues to grow.REFERENCEBernath, B., & Vidal, M. (2007). The theories and the theorists: Why theory is important for research. Distance et saviors, 5(3), 427-458. Available from: <http://www.box.com/s/fsgilnj1zxsnlbjqzi0b>Peters, O. (2004). Learning and teaching in distance education: Analysis and interpretations from an international perspective. London & New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Reading Reflections and how could I apply what I learned to Assignment 1? (#3) |
| Date | 23-February-2013 |
| Course/Week | OMDE601, Week 2 |
|  |

Watching the videos deepened my understanding of Dr. Peter’s theory of DE as the most industrialized form of education (Peters, 2011). It is more than just a time period, it is also the industrial processes/infrastructure that enables this type of learning as well as shaping the type of teachers and learners who would even want to engage in DE (Peters, 2011)!Otto discusses some of his concerns with DE isolating students (Peters, 2011). Reflecting on my own traditional face-to-face training experiences of adult students, there is a large and rich amount of feedback that I get from my students. The very best classes I’ve ever taught ended up where I was no longer the expert teacher but rather another knowledgeable colleague engaged in a spirited dialogue. My concern about DE is how to engage in that type of interaction with my students when I am cut off from their live feedback in body language and with spoken questions.Another drawback of online courses is the confirmation of a learner’s level of competency. You would not want a surgeon who is about to operate on you to have only a theoretical understanding of surgery from a page turner online course. Face-to-face and DE are both needed – we need to use our best judgment on what learning situations need one versus the other. My vision is to have technology evolve to such a state that we can enable rich face-to-face dialog virtually.REFERENCEPeters, O. (2011, December, 2). Interview with Otto Peters: Industrialization theory and distance education, Part 1 [Video]. Retrieved from http://vimeo.com/33107755 Peters, O. (2011, December, 2). Interview with Otto Peters: Industrialization theory and distance education, Part 2 [Video]. Retrieved from http://vimeo.com/33523216 Peters, O. (2011, December, 2). Interview with Otto Peters: Industrialization theory and distance education, Part 3 [Video]. Retrieved from http://vimeo.com/33525745 Peters, O. (2011, December, 2). Interview with Otto Peters: Industrialization theory and distance education, Part 4 [Video]. Retrieved from http://vimeo.com/33109477 Blaschke, L. (2011, December, 2). *Interview with Otto Peters: Industrialization theory and distance education, Part 1 video transcript, December 2, 2011* [Video interview transcript]*.* Retrieved from http://www.box.com/s/76m3lv2baa3n63vm0bjn Blaschke, L. (2011, December, 2). *Interview with Otto Peters: Industrialization theory and distance education, Part 2 video transcript, December 2, 2011* [Video interview transcript]*.* Retrieved from http://www.box.com/s/q3f6nuh98mtdydti8b92 Blaschke, L. (2011, December, 2). *Interview with Otto Peters: Industrialization theory and distance education, Part 3 video transcript, December 2, 2011* [Video interview transcript]. Retrieved from http://www.box.com/s/8jzx6qm65lgj8kt0aep7 Blaschke, L. (2011, December, 2). *Interview with Otto Peters: Industrialization theory and distance education, Part 4 video transcript, December 2, 2011* [Video interview transcript]. Retrieved from http://www.box.com/s/cnl0nmio1je707iaekmx

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | What is my personal definition of Distance Education? (#2) |
| Date | 23-February-2013 |
| Course/Week | OMDE601, Week 1 |
|  |

Based on my week 1 readings, I took what I found to be true about DE in forming my own personal definition of DE:“Distance education, first and foremost, requires teachers to plan learning experiences for students with the foreknowledge that, generally, teacher and student(s) will be in separate physical locations. In addition, technology is used to provide two-way communication pathways between the teacher, student and learning organization to enable students to reach their educational goals.”I was dissatisfied with it, however, because I did not feel I addressed the questions: How will we assess learner’s knowledge? What will be the hallmarks that the learner has achieved the desired level of competency? These are the kinds of questions that professionally I and my colleagues deal with every day. It is early days in the course so I anticipate this will change over time.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | Reading Reflections and how could I apply what I learned to Assignment 1? (#1) |
| Date | 23-February-2013 |
| Course/Week | OMDE601, Week 1 |
|  |

**REFLECTIONS ON HOLMBERG**Keegan (1990 and 1998), identifies five characteristics and differences between distance education and traditional teaching and learning (Garrison, 2010):I disagree with one of Keegan’s DE characteristics: The use of technical media (print, audio, video or computer) to share course content (Garrison, 2010)In a traditional classroom a teacher could: share a printed manual, could share audio/video feed via the instructor’s computer, use computers for hands on exercises. I have done this myself in a face-to-face instruction so I do not feel this is unique to DE.My first time encountering the team Open Education so I look this up on wikkipedia just to give myself a basic understanding of this term.**REFLECTIONS ON MOORE**I was excited when I read Moore’s definition of Distance Education. As a former IT professional, I found his definition to be elegant. I particularly liked the reflective questions at the end. I am entering a sample here of one question that helped me to solidify my understanding of the different DE institutions:Q: Name another type of institution and list advantages of each (Moore, 2012):A: Massively Open On-line Courses was my additional institution type.Advantages of Single Mode Institutions:Since DE is sole activity for these institutions, these institutions should be more expert in the delivery of DE. Advantages of Dual Mode Institutions: Traditional higher learning institution will have a wealth of resources (content and educators) already in place to leverage when adding DE to their structures.Advantages of Individual Mode: Due to the small scale, implementation should be rapid. If the individual teacher has prestigious standing in their field, it will enhance enrollment.Advantages of Virtual Universities and Consortia: Since multiple institutions are involved they can leverage their resources to more easily make an entrance into DE. If the member learning institutions have prestigious standing in their field, it will enhance enrollment.Advantages of MOOCs: Learners are already motivated to participate in learning. Another advantage would be that cost is not a barrier to participation.**REFLECTIONS ON GARRISON**Another wikkipedia hit to gain some insight on constructivism.Again, this text has built in reflective questions so I’m sharing another sample here.Q: Has DE reached an evolutionary dead end (Garrison, 2010)?A: Human beings are constantly evolving and changing. In a single person’s lifetime, goals/beliefs/lifestyles are constantly shifting and changing as people learn from their experiences and deal with the changing world in which they live. Now multiply that complexity of just that one person’s life by the billions of fellow human beings on our planet. The change that is being created by all of us beggars our own ability to comprehend the complexity and direction of this change.I do not believe that DE has reached an evolutionary dead end. As long as people continue to reform their world around them, their need to learn and how learning is provided by more learned human beings will all need to continue to change to meet the realities of the new world we are collectively creating.**REFLECTIONS ON PETERS**I enjoyed Peter’s perspective that DE is not a new thing – this started with correspondence courses in the mid-19th century (Peters, 2004). Let’s take what we’ve learned over the last 100+ years and see what is true outside the boundaries of what technology will implement DE (Peters, 2004).REFERENCEHolmberg, B. (2006). *The evolution, principles, and practices of distance education*. [Adobe Digital Edition]. Retrieved from http://www.mde.uni-oldenburg.de/40895.htmlMoore, M.G., & Kearsley, G. (2012). Basic concepts. In *Distance education: A systems view of online learning* (3rd ed., pp. 1-22). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth CengageLearning.Garrison, D.R. & Cleveland-Innes, M.F. (2010). Foundations of distance education. In M.F. Cleveland-Innes & D.R. Garrison, An introduction to distance education: Understanding teaching and learning in a new era (pp. 13-25). New York and London: Routledge.Peters, O. (2004). *Distance education in transition: New trends and challenges: Vol. 5* (4th ed.) [Adobe Digital Edition]. Retrieved from the Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg website: http://www.box.com/shared/5x3tpynqqf  |
|  |
| Entry Title/Number | What should be in my learning journal? (#0) |
| Date | 23-February-2013 |
| Course/Week | n/a |
|  |

## This is not really a journal entry but rather a reminder to myself of what I should include here:

**Christine’s Original Post**

* Report on what you have learned within each course module and in the course overall
* Examine, analyze, and critically reflect upon the new knowledge acquired through this course, for example, by relating the knowledge gained to personal experience or applying that knowledge to current situations (e.g., within the work environment)
* Make connections between the course topics and how the course topics relate to what you have learned and how you have learned (i.e., your individual learning process)
* Explore your evolving ideas about and understanding of distance education, and relate these to the course content
* Describe if/how you have achieved module objectives and overall course objective

**John Marsden (youtu.be/IWk80rjgFNA)**

* Reflective journals are a way of developing a skills base
* How to keep a journal
	+ Step 1 – record experience accurately
		- What’s happened? Where? When? Who is involved? What emotions has it brought up for me? How did I behave?
	+ Step 2 – What have I learned as a result of this experience?
		- What do I know now that I didn’t before? ? What would I do differently? What would I do well? What did I do badly? What was the result of my behavior? Does anything constitute a repeat pattern of behavior?
	+ Step 3 – Action plan
		- As a result of what I learned, what would I do differently next time? What goals do I need to set myself? How do I know when I’ve achieved those goals?

Kolb’s Learning Cycle: 4 categories of learners: Experience/Reflection/Theory/Planning

Per Kolb the most successful learners use all 4 strategies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Entry Title/Number | TITLE (#n+1) |
| Date | dd-Month-2013 |
| Course/Week | Week [?], OMDE601 |
|  |

[ENTER REFLECTION HERE]