

Report on Winter School 2007

Citation for published version (APA):

Kravcik, M., & Glahn, C. (2007). *Report on Winter School 2007: Internal Deliverable 9.3*. Heerlen.

Document status and date:

Published: 26/02/2007

Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Please check the document version of this publication:

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

<https://www.ou.nl/taverne-agreement>

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

pure-support@ou.nl

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

Downloaded from <https://research.ou.nl/> on date: 17 Jan. 2020

**Internal Deliverable 9.3
Report on Winter School 2007**

Author: Milos Kravcik, Christian Glahn TENCompetence
Date: 26 February 2007 Training

The first TENCompetence Winter School took place on January 22-26, 2007 in Innsbruck (<http://www.tencompetence.org/node/116>). Its objective was to provide a means for an intense training and collaboration on the core topics related to the TENCompetence project, building the European Network for lifelong competence development. The event was intended especially for PhD students investigating the issues related to lifelong competence development and technology enhanced learning. The programme included lectures and hands-on sessions from leading experts in the field. Our ambition was to stimulate emergence of communities of practice and learning networks as well as to support joint research opportunities. To support it we have established a special item on our Moodle server (<http://www.partners.tencompetence.org/course/view.php?id=49>) for the Winter School participants. A photo report from this event is available as well (<http://www.flickr.com/photos/tags/tencws2007/>). The Winter School sessions were dealing with the following topics:

- Technology Enhanced Learning
- Knowledge Management
- Education Process Modeling
- Learning Design
- Competence Development
- Personal Learning Environments
- Simulation & Game Based Learning
- Semantic Web
- Social Software
- Open Source & Open Standards
- Software Engineering with UML
- Web Services

17 lecturers (with one exception exclusively from the TENCompetence core partner institutions) lead the sessions:

- Albert Angehrn, INSEAD, France
- Boyan Bontchev, Sofia University, Bulgaria
- Eric Bosten, LogicaCMG, the Netherlands
- Alexandar Dimov, Sofia University, Bulgaria
- Dai Griffiths, University of Bolton, United Kingdom
- Ralf Klamma, RWTH Aachen, Germany
- Rob Koper, Open University, the Netherlands
- Milos Kravcik, Open University, the Netherlands
- Ruud Lemmers, LogicaCMG, the Netherlands
- Carlos Mendez, Altran SDB, Spain
- Yongwu Miao, Open University, the Netherlands
- Daniel Olmedilla, L3S, Germany
- Andrey Ruskov, Sofia University, Bulgaria
- Petko Ruskov, Sofia University, Bulgaria
- Wolf Siberski, University of Hannover, Germany
- Marcus Specht, Open University, the Netherlands
- Scott Wilson, University of Bolton, United Kingdom

30 attendees from 11 European countries participated at the event, additionally there were also 5 TENCompetence developers working separately at the same place. The Winter School was organized by:

- Milos Kravcik, Open University, the Netherlands
- Christian Glahn, Open University, the Netherlands
- Marcus Specht, Open University, the Netherlands
- Mieke Haemers, Open University, the Netherlands
- Sabine Maassen, Open University, the Netherlands

The event took place nearby Innsbruck, an internationally renowned winter sport centre in the western Austria. The participants were staying in the Tiroler Bildungsinstitut - Grillhof. The application fee was EUR 500 (including accommodation and meals, excluding traveling expenses). 8 students have received a grant and their institutions became TENCompetence associate partners.

The final programme included lectures, hands-on sessions, group work, a social event (on Monday evening, including live Tyrolean music), as well as sport activities and a guided tour:

Monday	
09:00-10:30	Winter School Official Opening TENCompetence & Technology Enhanced Learning – Milos Kravcik
10:30-11:00	Coffee Break
11:00-12:30	Education Process Modeling - Petko Ruskov

12:30-13:30	Lunch	
13:30-14:30	Group Work	
14:30-16:00	Learning Design: Achievements, Opportunities & Constraints – Dai Griffiths	
16:00-16:30	Coffee Break	
16:30-18:00	Education Process Modeling with Open Source Tools - Andrey Ruskov	
Tuesday		
09:00-10:30	Open Source and Open Standards – Rob Koper	
10:30-11:00	Coffee Break	
11:00-12:30	Simulation and Game Based Learning – Albert Angehrn	
12:30-13:30	Lunch	
13:30-15:00	Designing Educational Games – Albert Angehrn	
15:00-16:00	Group Work	
16:00-16:30	Coffee Break	
16:30-18:00	Competence Development Perspectives – Marcus Specht	Service Oriented Architecture - Eric Bosten
Wednesday		
09:00-12:30	Sport Activities / Guided Tour	
12:30-13:30	Lunch	
13:30-14:30	Group Work	
14:30-16:00	Introduction to Semantic Web – Daniel Olmedilla, Wolf Siberski	
16:00-16:30	Coffee Break	
16:30-18:00	Introduction to Semantic Web – Daniel Olmedilla, Wolf Siberski	Learning Design Level B, C: Concepts and Tools – Yongwu Miao
Thursday		
09:00-10:30	Social Software and Perspectives for Learning – Ralf Klamma	
10:30-11:00	Coffee Break	
11:00-12:30	Social Software, Web 2.0 – Ralf Klamma	Using UML and the Unified Process – Ruud Lemmers
12:30-13:30	Lunch	
13:30-14:30	Group Work	
14:30-16:00	Web Services for e-Learning Environments – Boyan Bontchev	
16:00-16:30	Coffee Break	
16:30-18:00	Constructing Personal Learning Environments using Web 2.0 – Scott Wilson	
Friday		
09:00-10:30	Web Services for e-Learning Environments – Alexandar Dimov	Open Source Tools for Knowledge Management – Carlos Mendez
10:30-11:00	Coffee Break	
11:00-12:30	Students' Presentations Official Closing	
12:30-13:30	Lunch	

TENCompetence Winter School Evaluation

28 participants (including some lecturers) have filled the prepared evaluation forms and provided valuable comments and suggestions regarding this event.

Part 1: General Issues

1. Which **aspects of this event** were **most beneficial** for you?

Most of the respondents (17) identified networking with researchers and social aspects as most beneficial for them. Hands-on activities were also mentioned often (10). Generally, people liked the opportunity of focused learning, sharing knowledge with their peers, understanding new ideas, and constructing new knowledge and skills. All types of sessions were appreciated by the attendees, although their preferences vary. The wide range of subjects and perspectives was received well. Participants liked also informal activities, social events, and coffee breaks. Some people named also most beneficial sessions for them: Game based learning (3), Web 2.0 (3), Social Software (2), Semantic Web (2), UML (2), SOA, Process modelling, and Competence development.

2. Which **aspects of this event** were **least beneficial** for you?

Some participants (7) did not like too technically oriented presentations, focusing on computer science (e.g. Web Services, Software Engineering, UML). For several people (6) workshops and group work were not interesting enough. One person has suggested to “proof-read” the presentations, as some of them were too special and some too general, which was observed also by other attendees. For some individuals least beneficial were theoretical lectures, too user-oriented presentations without underlying technical principles, presentations with presumed knowledge (e.g. LD), “presentations where slide follows slide, but I don’t follow” and sessions not related to their interests.

3. What aspects were missing in this event according to your opinion?

Some participants (3) would need better organization of group work, especially concerning guidance, clear instructions, time, and objectives. A couple of people would prefer more students’ participation, presentations, and discussions during sessions. Weekend excursions and social events were missing as well according to a few of them. There was a suggestion that before the Winter School students’ profiles should be published and their previous knowledge checked. Then there should be some recommendations for them (e.g. via questionnaire) for choosing between work groups and parallel sessions. For that purpose it would be also helpful if the presentations are available in advance. Other missing aspects mentioned by the participants included best practice, benchmarking and metrics

about life long learning and competence development, mobile and context aware learning, a workshop, as well as a gala dinner.

4. Please add any additional comments which will help us in planning the next Winter School.

Some people (3) commented about the group work – it should be bottom-up, with clear goals, instructions, tasks, problems to be solved. As participants have different backgrounds and interests, it may be a good opportunity to establish contacts with similar people. A very important point is to support continuation of the started activity. Some participants have emphasized the importance of the practical part, with active participation of the audience, because “interactive sessions rule”. More time for social events and outdoor activities was also requested (3).

There was a suggestion concerning more preparation of students in advance (download and read materials), another pointed out that the schedule was overloaded and there was also a proposal to avoid parallel sessions. One lecturer suggested integration of different courses into one subject (e.g. modelling exercises about game-based learning). Another person remarked that the role of TENCompetence infrastructure needs to be defined.

One student would like more explanation of technical principles, considering a developer/domain expert approach. Also another one thinks that one Software Engineering session will be useful for some PhD students. A lecturer proposed a special session on “How to write a PhD”.

Other comments include a request for more information about location and resources (e.g. wireless access) as well as preparation of a Learning Design version of the Winter School activities.

Part 2: Organizational Issues

5. What do you think about the overall schedule (length of sessions, start/end times, breaks)?

Most of the people were satisfied with the overall schedule and appreciate that the programme was not overloaded. For some of them (4) the parallel sessions caused a problem as they would like to attend both. Others (3) pointed out that some sessions were too long to fit in a 90 min slot and its consequence was fast processing in these sessions. A couple of persons would prefer two 45 min sessions instead of a 90 min one.

Several attendees (3) criticized delays and changes in the agenda. More time for group work, discussions and active participation of students was requested as

well. Other remarks mentioned that learning and working 8 hours per day is too much, that afternoon sessions can start already at 2pm, and appreciated that free time in the evening is good for establishing contacts.

6. What do you think about the types of sessions?

Many participants (8) liked the wide range of the session subjects and types provided, as well as the balance between technical and theoretical / pedagogical sessions. Hands-on sessions were well received by the attendees (5 for it, 1 against), discussions and students' presentations as well, although even more participation of students was asked for and an opinion appeared (2) that there were too many traditional lectures.

Some individuals mean that there were big differences between individual lectures and lecturers, some sessions were irrelevant, the level of detail varied (e.g. SOA vs. Web Services), the user interface topics were missing, and that the developer / domain expert approach would be interesting. One has suggested running some technology and pedagogy sessions in parallel.

7. Do you have any comments regarding the overall organization?

The participants evaluated highly positively the organization of the event – 15 of them used the terms like *very good* and *excellent*. Sightseeing and social events were well received. On the other hand there were also opinions that we should be more strict, lecturers should stay the whole week and give private consultations, the event was too long and 4 intensive days would be enough (ending in the evening), and dinner was too early.

8. How could we improve the organization?

Participants have suggested several improvements: abstracts / slides should be available in advance, especially for parallel sessions, group work should be better organized and with clear objectives, a glossary of terms should be prepared for people new in some fields, and the presented slides should be "helpful", i.e. without too much text.

Additional proposals include a gala dinner, social evening events, one day for sport / social activities, more time for sport, as well as weekend excursions. People want to avoid programme changes, ask for a better internet connection, and for taking care about non-smokers (during breaks and social events).

Part 3: Course Specific Issues

The participants have evaluated the sessions they have attended. The scores give the following meaning to their evaluation:

- 1= Very positive
- 2= Positive
- 3= Average
- 4= Negative
- 5= Very negative

The following table gives an overview of the ranking, showing for each session the number of evaluators and the average assessment. The average evaluations range between very positive and average.

Title	Lecturer	Evals	Avg
Simulation and Game Based Learning	Albert Angehrn	24	1.38
Learning Design: Achievements, Opportunities & Constraints	Dai Griffiths	22	1.64
Constructing Personal Learning Environments using Web 2.0	Scott Wilson	24	1.67
Unified Process: Effectively Combining UML Diagrams	Ruud Lemmers	13	1.69
Introduction to Semantic Web	Daniel Olmedilla, Wolf Siberski	22	1.73
Web Services for e-Learning Environments	Alexandar Dimov	8	1.75
Social Software and Perspectives for Learning	Ralf Klamma	21	1.81
TENCompetence & Technology Enhanced Learning	Milos Kravcik	25	1.88
Open Source and Open Standards	Rob Koper	26	2.00
Competence Development Perspectives	Marcus Specht	11	2.00
Open Source Tools for Knowledge Management	Carlos Mendez	20	2.30
Education Process Modeling with Open Source Tools	Andrey Ruskov	21	2.43
Service Oriented Architecture	Eric Bosten	12	2.50
Education Process Modeling	Petko Ruskov	23	2.52
Web Services for e-Learning Environments	Boyan Bontchev	23	2.91

Part 4: Geographical Spread and Impact of Adoption

26 participants rated also other indicators, using the following scale:

High 1 – 2 – 3 – 4 – 5 Low

The uptake of lifelong learning in their country was in general evaluated as average (3.04), the use of technology in the delivery of lifelong learning in their country even lower (3.27). The support which TENCompetence will eventually offer to help develop competence in lifelong learning was rated higher than average (2.04).

13. What support do you hope to get from TENCompetence to organize your lifelong learning process, once the infrastructure is available for general access?

People need user support in the form of manuals, guidelines, tutorials, consultations, and training (6). They also want to share best practice examples in communities (4) and consider enough content as a critical part, especially for finding relevant study materials easily (4). Reliable technical infrastructure is important as well (3).

Some persons hope to get help in finding their weak points and fixing them, as well as in improving existing knowledge (2), others want to create their own contributions easily (2). There were also opinions that a personal competence profile may be useful for job searching and for finding study peers, as well as that the infrastructure will provide a workspace for exchange of resources and collaboration.

Several participants expect cooperation in future projects and with other professionals (3). Some of them would like to investigate pedagogical and learning design models.

Part 5: Participation

14. Are you **willing to participate** in the TENCompetence project?

All the respondents want to participate in the project! One of them can do it just as a person, because the department does not have resources for this purpose.

6 people answered that they want to participate in the research (models, scenarios, assessment – e.g. in the form of a joint paper), other 6 intend to contribute in the development and customization, 4 are interested in evaluation and tests, and finally a few of them would like to help with dissemination (visiting and organizing events) and training (tutorials).

One lecturer offered scientific advice and reviewing activities, while 2 students want to be part of the PhD Researcher Network and of a Community of Practice. Several people want to be informed about activities and achievements of the project. One PhD student has a scholarship and would like to visit another research group for several months.

The main areas of interest are competence models, learning activities, modeling pedagogical workflows, process modeling, IMS LD, IMS QTI, e-learning platform, authoring tools, personalized adaptive learning, and adaptive testing.