

# Meeting Minutes April 12, 2006

**Subject:** Working Group "Pedagogy"

**To:** All working group members,  
project management

**Author:** Daniela Isch at rete ag

**E-Mail / Tel:** [daniela.isch@atrete.ch](mailto:daniela.isch@atrete.ch) / 044-266 55 13

**Date:** April 12, 2006      **Time:** 11:00 - 14:00      **Place:** Lucerne

<b>Participants:</b>	Andréa Belliger	AB	Unilu
	David Krieger	DK	Unilu
	Andrea Helbach	AH	ZFH
	Thomas Korner	TK	ETHZ
	Heinz Küng	HK	PHZ
	Pieter van Dijken	PV	UNIL
	Michael Rolli	MR	UniBE
	Rolf Brugger	RB	edutech
	Daniela Isch	DI	at rete ag

#	Subject	I <sup>1</sup> T D	Who	Date
<b>1. Introduction</b>				
1.1	Rolf Brugger gives a brief introduction to the project. In particular, he places emphasis on the fact that not only tools or tool categories should be discussed, but also interfaces, the integration of tools, etc. The group is also asked to look at how national and local tools interact.	I	RB	
1.2	Some time was spent on clarifying the tasks of the working group and the expected results. In particular, the distinction between the two groups Pedagogy and Users was not clear enough.  Users should try to focus on the hands-on use of tools, while Pedagogy's view should be more forward-turned: what possible (and realistic!) scenarios are thinkable – "what do I need, and how do I do it?" E.g., define how collaborative self-directed learning can be supported by tools.  Project management is aware that a certain overlapping of the two groups will be inevitable. Also, the group should feel free to bring in aspects which are not strictly in their assignment if they consider them important. Such input will certainly be heard by the	I	all	

<sup>1</sup> I = information, T = to do, D = decision

#	Subject	I T D	Who	Date
	project management, especially if the same suggestion comes from several groups.			
1.3	The group decides to restrict the discussion to services provided nationally (although it may be difficult for group members to decide for their organizations whether a service should be national or local). It may well be that this decision will be purely based on costs in the end.	I		
1.4	Since WebCT Vista has great market power, OSS is a valid alternative and also a good way of preventing vendor lock-in. On the other hand, one could ask whether OSS is really the best solution. DK thinks of an integrated system based on Blackboard as another possible scenario, e.g. A national service would mean having greater power of demand. SWITCH could provide a software development service, i.e. assistance with integration.  AH finds it absolutely necessary that OSS is discussed as well (see also 2.1).	I	DK  AH	
1.5	The business plan set up by SVC allows one mio CHF per year for a long-term service provided by SWITCH	I	RB	
<b>2. Current situation at working group members' organizations</b>				
2.1	<b>ZFH:</b> presently attempting to unify the heterogeneous environment: 7 schools will be combined to 3. People have adopted strong positions, so a single platform is not aspired but there will be at least 2 platforms.  Currently in use are Moodle (most widely used); Ilias (PHZH), OLAT; and additional small proprietary developments. Some schools don't see a need for e-learning at all.  10 schools have abandoned Vista in the meantime, which means that ZFH will most probably not be willing to return to WebCT. Therefore, a discussion exclusively about Vista or Blackboard would be too limited. OSS needs to be discussed.  It is important to discuss not only tools but also services, e.g. coordination between organizations or support (especially useful for smaller organizations).	I	AH	
2.2	<b>UNIL:</b> In use are myUNIL (document repository); broad use of Moodle; and additional home-made small tools. All tools are used complementary to existing courses.  UNIL is probably more open to suggestions than other universities because no definite LMS has been chosen yet.	I	PV	
2.3	<b>PHZ:</b> Blackboard has been used from the beginning. The notebook concept required a platform; Blackboard is the main platform, but there are periodical evaluations of alternatives.  Additional tools used by individual teachers, but these are marginal phenomena.	I	HK	
2.4	<b>Unilu:</b> There are binding guidelines from an e-learning strategy. Blackboard is the platform used by all. A consortium has been aimed at from the beginning. Examples of additional tools that are	I	AB	

#	Subject	I T D	Who	Date
	used: Breeze, Switch, Quickplace.			
2.5	<b>ETHZ:</b> LMS: WebCT, Ilias, OLAT, BSCW; 7 small applications for file sharing, PM-Wiki. TK has only a limited view of what is going on in other departments.	I	TK	
2.6	<b>UniBE:</b> Centrally WebCT is provided by ICT Services (Informatikdienste). Decentrally, every institute has been seeing to itself so far. An evaluation of an OSS LMS beginning this year showed that it will not be possible to agree on a common LMS; therefore, three LMS will be provided locally.	I	MR	
<b>3. Next Steps</b>				
3.1	The group decided to use their own Blackboard wiki instead of the SWITCH wiki for reasons of user-friendliness. The link has been placed on the SWITCH wiki: <a href="http://www.vcampus.ch">www.vcampus.ch</a> . The other working groups have read-access.	D		
3.2	A list has been posted on the wiki with the following columns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ID</li> <li>• pedagogical scenario</li> <li>• function or service</li> <li>• priority</li> <li>• why national?</li> <li>• remarks</li> </ul> 1) All group members are asked to fill in their requirements regarding a national service and also comment on other people's entries. The ID may be used for reference purposes. 2) It is possible to add sub-pages (especially useful if one wants to comment extensively, give examples etc.) 3) Re remarks: Use the column „remarks“ and add your initials; please do not delete other people's remarks. 4) There may be more than one row per pedagogical scenario. 5) The column „function“ may also be used for entries regarding realistic implementation.	T	all	30.04.06
3.3	AH points out that the group should not restrict the discussion to technological aspects, but also include service requirements such as support, training, coordination etc.	I	AH	
3.4	Once the list has been filled in, AB/DK will start a discussion on whether or not another meeting beginning May is necessary and if so, in what.	T	AB/DK	05.05.06
3.5	<b>Next meeting dates:</b> <b>1) May 8, 10:00-12:00</b> , either virtual or in Lucerne. Goal of meeting: discussion and ranking of requirements. <b>2) May 22, 10:00-12:00</b>	D		

<b>To Do</b>
--------------

Nr.	from	Subject	Who	Date	Status
1	3.2	Fill in the list provided on the wiki.	all	30.04.06	new
2	3.5	Clarify whether the meeting on May 8 is necessary and if so, in what form.	AB/DK	05.05.06	new