

**Instructional Development Officers' Winter Meeting**  
**February 21 & 22, 2003**  
**The University of Western Ontario**  
**Spencer Conference Centre, London, Ontario**  
**Minutes of Meeting**

**IDO Structure and Governance**

*Ros Woodhouse (Queen's)*

- < context and approach taken was to establish a caucus which would help build a network of communication amongst the IDO group
  - < the caucus would have a small leadership structure
  - < using a caucus as the founding principle/model, a community of practice (defined as a group with shared purposes/goals who work together through shared activities to address new and emerging problems) would emerge
  
- < a number of issues for further discussion were identified (refer to *IDO Working Group Report: Summary* in the *Task Force on IDO Caucus, Structure and Governance* document that was distributed at the meeting) including:
  - < questions around inclusivity of membership
  - < voting
  - < name of group
    - < Susan Wilcox suggested that the historical and cultural roots of the terms used (e.g. instructional development) need to be considered when selecting a name for the group
    - < educational development focuses on *purpose* rather than on targets, which are constantly changing, thus Educational Developers Caucus (Ed-Cee) was proposed
    - < also need to consider the national voice, which has resulted in steps being taken to translate the document into French
    - < the challenge is that the translation isn't always a one-to-one thing
    - < after discussion with French speaking participants of the group, the following translation was suggested: Le reseau des formateurs en pedagogie de l'enseignement superieur (RFPES) was suggested, but all agreed that further consultation is necessary to ensure that inclusivity is achieved
  
- < process and timing for leadership and election
  - < an approval in principle of the idea of a caucus and a discussion of constitutional amendments was proposed before moving forward with the discussion-carried
    - < constitutional changes must be nailed down 1 month before Annual General Meeting (AGM) of STLHE

- < tasks to be completed include establishing an inaugural meeting in June to consult with membership on direction and approach of caucus; establish members; run first election; select site and plan for a February 2004 meeting
- < consultation and decisions to be made include determining the nomination and election process and establishing an interim leadership
- < proposal that caucus become a permanent part of STLHE but maintain its own leaders (e.g. chair, VP Communications etc.)
  - < 20 signatures are needed to move a change in the constitution
  - < participants were asked to vote on whether or not they supported establishing the caucus, establishing leadership for the caucus and having the chair of caucus become an officer of the STLHE Steering Committee (carried)
- < Gary Poole indicated that at the steering committee meeting, the IDO caucus will play an important part in the general strategic planning of STLHE
  - < he also noted that the caucus answers the call to sort out the relationship between Ed-Cee and STLHE
- < caucus must be formed first before leaders can be elected
  - < E. Paget proposed that Ros Woodhouse be interim leader; in light of due process, Ros declined until further discussion could take place
- < Gary Poole indicated that currently the IDO group is classified as a special interest group, and that there is a precedent to invite members of special interest groups to the (AGM) of STLHE
  - < as a result, someone from the group needs to attend the AGM in the absence of caucus ratification
- < in terms of process, a change in constitution will take place at the AGM in June, 2003, followed by an election for the caucus leadership
- < **action:** final wording of the document by end of the IDO meeting, with 20 signatures of support
- < role of task force will be to shepherd the motion for caucus through to the AGM stage
  - < one member of the task force will attend the STLHE Steering Committee
  - < an interim leader should be appointed in June until an election takes place
  - < Dale Roy suggested that the interim leader be one of the members of the task force

- < there was a suggestion the on-line registration form for the STLHE conference include the following question (with a response box): Do you want to belong to the IDO special interest group?
- < there were questions about resource and budget implications
  - < there is a line in the proposal that allows for the provision of budget/money, but the task force felt it most appropriate for the leadership of caucus to decide on specifics
  - < there was a suggestion that STLHE and Ed-Cee could share a secretariat
- < there was a consensus among IDO meeting participants that the task force should continue doing what it is doing and bring the proposal forward to the AGM in June

### **Professional Developers: But Are We a Profession?**

*Jeannette McDonald (Wilfrid Laurier) and Trevor Holmes (Guelph)*

- < discussion focused on 5 key areas:
  - < authority and recognition
  - < range of practice
  - < standards of practice
  - < qualifications
  - < membership
- < participants broke into smaller groups to discuss one of the five areas and then a representative from each group reported back to the larger group
- < a summary of the discussion that ensued will be sent in a draft form

### **Instructional Design**

*James McNinch (Regina)*

- < instructional design is at the heart of technology, continuing and distance education and teaching
- < instructional designers 'design the learning', have expertise in learning theory and instruction and have the skills to work with other experts
- < the challenge to instructional design is to find an appropriate model
  - < choice between **collaborative model**, in which a team is necessary to build a course or a **service model**, in which a professor has the expertise of knowledge and assumes the status of the head, even if (s)he has a lack of understanding of learning theory or pedagogy

- < participants broke into small groups to address the question: **What organizational structure might best reach our goal of enhancing instructional development/design?** A sample of the comments appear below.
- < in many cases, the existing structure at the instructional design level is a service model, while at the same time there is a recognition that collaboration is the way to go
- < it is difficult to move from a service model to a collaborative model
- < collaboration is challenged by differences amongst different units (e.g. IDO, Continuing Studies, Distance Studies, technology services), all of who have different budgets, different powers, and different hierarchies
- < strategies for collaboration may include organizing all units into a common physical space, outlining clear expectations of each unit, creating joint positions and advisory councils
- < service models would not work in the long term

### **Learning Teams**

*Lynn McAlpine (McGill)*

- < centre at McGill has cross-appointed academics, faculty developers and instructional designers
- < in the last ten years, there has been a course design approach, which is now being replaced by a discipline-based approach (50% in Faculty, 50% university-wide); also attempting to collaborate across the university and encourage a culture of teaching and learning in faculties
- < challenges of a changing environment
  - < new hires
  - < new technologies and keeping up with them
  - < burgeoning information and how to turn it into meaningful knowledge
  - < reinvesting in teaching development
  - < structural changes
  - < multidisciplinary teaching and research
- < established learning teams, which involve the talent and input of many people instead of the one faculty member
- < the identification of shared goals leads to the inclusion of several people on a team, including:

- < a professor who is a pedagogical expert
- < a professor who is a subject matter expert
- < a student from the subject of interest who is an expert in learning
- < a project technical consultant who is an expert in technology and materials development
- < a librarian who is an expert in the subject, as well as an expert in information systems
  
- < the vision of a learning team is enacted through a number of steps, including:
  - < establishing criteria for what projects qualify for learning teams
  - < writing a funding proposal to release professors to participate in the teams (release time depends on the nature of the project and the responsibility of faculty member)
  - < determining reward system for students (e.g. letter of recognition, special reception with Dean etc.)
  
- < learning teams lead to faculty development at individual and group level; they provide the conceptual tools and language about instruction that gets people talking, and as a result changes the culture of learning

### **Academic Integrity Project**

*Julia Christensen Hughes (Guelph)*

- < session began with an outline of the problems around academic integrity at Guelph (e.g. students appealing charges of academic misconduct and winning the appeals), which resulted in Guelph's participation in this project
  
- < key themes resulted from the survey results at Guelph and IDO participants broke into groups to brainstorm for recommendations
  
- < participation in the survey at Guelph fostered the development of resources e.g. faculty handbook, CDROM for faculty and students; IDO group was asked to bring any of their own resources to STLHE to share
  
- < feedback from other participants in the national initiative was solicited e.g. St. Mary's reported 25% faculty representation and 1100 student participants; noted that it was time consuming project, that required top-down campus support to help ensure its success
  
- < reviewed factors associated with academic misconduct/integrity, including: student understanding of 'serious' cheating, risk/reward analysis, perceptions of peers' cheating behaviour, effectiveness/support of policies, exposure to/understanding of policies, year level

**Presentation by "facultydevelopment.ca" team**

- < call for participation by IDO members in identifying people to participate in the current project (module 2) on large group teaching and a discussion surrounding the ways that people can participate
  
- < there are 4 underlying principles forming the basis of construction of the module:
  - < reflective practitioner
  - < learning principles and good practices
  - < experiential learning
  - < universal instructional design (ADDIE model)
  
- < there are two types of contributions that can be made
  - < artifacts
  - < personal knowledge and subject expertise
  
- < the Facultydevelopment.ca: Call for Contributions document was distributed as a draft document
  - < the team invited ideas and thoughts on the draft
  - < the team noted that there is an infinite timeline for contributions
  - < the deadline for completion of module 2 on large class teaching is January 2004

### **Miscellaneous Information Sharing**

- < David Hawes-University of Calgary
  - < gave a demonstration of the Learning Commons' educational database, the Campus Alberta Repository of Educational Objects (CAREO)
  - < invited IDO participants to consider how to better share information and suggested that CAREO may be one database that could be utilized by the caucus
  
- < Aline Germain Rutherford-University of Ottawa
  - < exploring issues around new mid-career faculty, who have different needs from new faculty in general; mid-career faculty have lots of experience, but are new to the institution
  - < Aline has developed a questionnaire that she wants to forward to IDO participants, who would then contact 1 or 2 new mid-career faculty members at their institution who are having problems integrating and ask them to complete the survey