

YORG - NOT: Training description and assessment

Training description:

Learning how to track changes and limit damage on collaborative websites, tagging and reusing images

Trainer institution or organisation:

Yinternet.org and NOT

Connection with VET:

This training provided practical activities in various sessions, suitable both for VET trainers and trainees (NOT partner polish association of engineers)

Title:

The course was designed with a practical approach on collaborative tools and results for VET trainers and trainees, based on:

“Learning how to track changes and limit damage on collaborative websites” & “tagging and reusing images in a wikinomics way”.

This course is part of a generic training scenario and pedagogical material on developing collaborative skills in online environments. The set consists of choosing and implementing learning units that promote personal and group skills : editing and collaborating online, engaging in public conversation, social tagging, sustainable community governance, and propose a methodology to evaluate their deployment and organise their (peer) assessment in a ECVET or VET context.

Keywords of this unit: Wikinomics; Collaboration; Learning how to learn; Skills; images; licences; Creative Commons

Length: (Number of hours and temporal distribution)

The training was divided in four (4) sessions of a duration of 2 two hours each. Sessions were held about a week apart from one another.

Institution: (Indicate in which institution is implemented)

Yorg provide training material and trainers while NOT organised participants and groups both for the online training sessions

Profile of participants:

22 - 28, including IT students, language professors and security trainees

Describe the training in relation with other (Describe if the training is designed as a complete course or subject or part of huge training)

The two sessions tested are part of a more global set of activities, the Wikinomics training module. The Wikinomics training module main idea consists of choosing and implementing learning units that promote personal and group skills. It seeks to initiate participants in wiki culture aspects (such as gardening a wiki), and to propose guidelines of working and collaboration, while developing their understanding for the underlying issues.

The full training scenario is composed of 7 face to face sessions, and exercises in between sessions. Each session is expected to last 2 hours.

- session 1 :
 - provide an introduction to wikis and collaboration
 - facilitate a first editing session on a collaborative environment (wiki)
 - discover the core functionalities
 - motivate people rethink their role in a structure or process
- session 2
 - further discover wiki editing tools
 - discuss issues of legal responsibility as author
 - discuss copyright issues of the collective work
 - reflect on issues related to digital identity
- session 3
 - discover a second type of role (beyond authoring role) on a wiki project: the archivist. It will outline the importance of a different way of categorizing information and its associated benefits.
- session 4
 - discover and discuss how rules are set up on a wiki alike project and how social moderation is handled. This is further developed with concrete actions on various roles.
- session 5
 - give an overview of all contribution roles on a wiki and to study in more details the facilitation of the community and how to measure participants activity.
- session 6
 - provide a checklist of does and don't when setting up a wiki and to review potential cave pits when setting up a wiki alike website

- session 7
 - discuss how collaborative behaviors observed in wiki or wiki-alike contexts may be implemented in entrepreneurial situation.

The training “tagging and reusing images” was a mix of session 2 (copyright issues) and session 3 (tagging, categorizing, licensing).

The training “Learning how to track changes and limit damage on collaborative websites” was mostly based on session 4 (but did not cover the entire session).

Learning objectives or expected learning outcomes: (Explain in detail what is expected that participants know, know how or develop at the end of the course. Highlight those learning outcomes related with collaborative competences)

Training “tagging and reusing images”

- The purpose of this course was
 - firstly to raise awareness and understanding with regards to intellectual property rights, image licensing and its practical consequences for the copyright holder as well as for the final user,
 - secondly to explore a different way of categorizing information and its associated benefits.
- Specific learning outcomes are :
 - Is able to categorise a resource, information following personal knowledge
 - Is able to categorise a resource, information following a set of rules in collaborative, group environment
 - Is able to use social bookmarking tools (Diigo or similar)
 - Is able to use collaborative licensing tools (creative commons or similar)
 - is able to find freely licensed content on the internet
 - Is able to understand and apply appropriate image license in sharing environments

Training “Learning how to track changes and limit damage on collaborative websites”

- The purpose of the session was:
 - to discover and discuss how social moderation is handled on a collaborative wiki-based website,
 - to maximize open participation and minimize risks for the site.
- Specific learning outcomes are :
 - is able to understand the importance of having different social profiles within a team
 - is able to consider several options to protect a community and its work
 - is able to argue the idea and the benefits of an open system

Training on social bookmarking

- port url and tag resources in a social bookmarking tool

Teaching methodology:(Indicate: If training is based on theoretical exhibition, practical work or both, If work developed by students is done in group or individually, If teacher acts as an expert or as a content provider and participants are autonomous, If lessons are online, face-to-face or both)

Training is based both on theoretical exhibition and practical work.

Work done by students may be in group (several students in front of one computer) but preferably individually (one computer by participant).

Teacher is acting more as an expert than as a content-guidelines provider and is further referred as “expert” due to the presence of a local teacher with the students.

Teaching was tested online only , this is [a typical example](#) of the collaborative training scenario taking place during the session

Activities and resources: (Describe what type of learning activities are proposed and which resources are used)

- The training was a mix of formal presentation (using presentations as support), demonstration (display of the expert screen in front of the students and demo made online with real context) and group work (2-3 students in front of a computer to do assignments proposed by the expert).
- Links to the presentations:

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B0RoAfNmXJq6ako1ODdKS2hwWUk&authuser=0>

<https://drive.google.com/open?id=0B0RoAfNmXJq6bm1Na3BfU3duLU0&authuser=0>

Moodle or other LMS usage: (Yes/No, which type of platform/s, which elements of virtual campus are used: wiki, forums, ...)

The technologies/software/devices used were : Skype and a camera.

Skype was set up with only two accounts. On one account, the expert. On the other account, a local teacher and all students. A camera was filming part of the classroom and the image was displayed to the expert.

The training was provided in English. A local teacher was physically present with the (Polish) students and translated in Polish the discourse of the expert. When Polish students talked, he translated their message from Polish to English or repeated loudly their comment so that the expert could hear the feedback.

Computers were available in the room (one computer for 2-3 students) for the workshop and the demonstration.

Learning assessment: (Indicate type of assessment: summative or formative and which type of evaluation tools are involved: reflective journal, eportfolios, test, project design)

Competences assessed and indicators used: (Describe which competences are assessed and based on which indicators)

Certification: (Describe which kind of report is given to the students at the end of the course or during its development to accreditate what kind of knowledge or competences are achieved: badges or other certification system. Explain the certification process)

Satisfaction of participants: (Indicate if you implemented some questionnaire at the end of the course to determine students' satisfaction. Indicate the main results obtained)

Course rate: (Indicate how well the professor rate the overall quality of course development and its value, students motivation and positive aspects)

Identify the main difficulties of the training development:

There were several difficulties.

First, the Wikinomics training is meant to be a global set, not a collection of individual units. It has been designed with a progression in mind and with personal homework in between sessions.

However, testing the 7 sessions on the same students was difficult to achieve. Only 2 sessions were organized, each session on a different group of students. As a consequence, we identified elements that seemed to be as "independant" as possible to constitute test sessions. Practically speaking, one session (tagging reusing images) was quite independant and manageable even though some more background would have been helpful to the better understanding and motivation of the students. The other session (social management on a wiki-based system) badly suffered from missing context and the background that should have been provided in the first sessions.

Second, there was somewhat a mismatch between the topic of the sessions and the actual group following the training. The group following the "licensing and categorizing images" was constituted of students in Internal Security, who had limited obvious interest in that training topic (more context would have facilitated the identification of

the benefits). The group following the “social management and security on a wiki based website) was constituted of teachers and even if more context was offered for this second session, the missing prior sessions probably made it complicated for them to see how they could apply the outcome to their daily activities.

Third, and probably more importantly, the technical set-up was not the best choice. Teaching was tested online only. Recommendation is to do it face-to-face only as the guidance during the practical work is made difficult by an online set up. For example, discussions and spontaneous thought sharing is made difficult in a set-up where the teacher can not hear or see the students. A session planned as interactive can only turn to be simply a lecture. For example, a hands-on practical activity on a computer can not be very effective if a teacher can not see what the student is doing, nor actually even get aware whether the student succeeds or fail to do the assignment as the student has little mean to provide a feedback. The option of asynchronous homework makes this feasible. Online synchronous control, feedback and support to 10-30 students with a single microphone, no screen sharing and hardly any common language (Students were Polish speaking) just make it too much of a challenge.

Identify the main positive aspects of the training development: