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Technology, particularly laptop computers in the classroom, has had a significant impact on lecturing. It is now common for instructors to present lecture material as PowerPoint slides within a more or less pre-choreographed presentation. While this has several advantages over the traditional chalk and board lecturing style, there are several disadvantages, too. One frequently cited disadvantage is that PowerPoint presentations are too fast to allow the mind to really absorb material. Some instructors present 60 or more slides in as many minutes. Another issue is the lack of flexibility inherent in PowerPoint presentations. PowerPoint content cannot be customized to satisfy the questions that may arise from the slides presented.

A recent innovation in laptop computers, the advent of the tablet-PC, heralds the promise of a significant advance in lecturing technology. A tablet-PC is a laptop whose screen doubles as a writing board, with an electronic pen taking the place of chalks or markers. Attached to an LCD projector in the classroom, the screen is projected much like a traditional laptop presentation. In essence, the tablet-PC acts as a virtual blackboard, with the lecturer writing on the tablet screen and with the writing saved as electronic strokes on the computer. The hybrid lectures given with the tablet-PC have several advantages over both traditional chalk-board style and conventional laptop style.

The tablet-PC can be used as a conventional laptop or as a replacement for the traditional chalkboard. It also allows a hybrid approach, combining the strengths of both methods. For example, lecturers who commonly use the chalkboard or overhead projector may drag multimedia files such as pictures, graphs, and movies onto the presentation screen and annotate them, which would not be possible using traditional lecturing methods. PowerPoint-based lecturers can use the electronic pen to write directly over their slides, thereby customizing their presentations on the fly. The tablet-PC lectures can be saved on the computer, allowing instructors to make their notes available to students for review, helping students to concentrate on the lecture rather than worrying about taking notes from the blackboard or overhead projector screen.

Tablet-PCs are not exorbitantly expensive, and student reviews have been quite enthusiastic.


**LIDC strategic planning**

In November 2004, the Learning and Instructional Development Centre (LIDC) assumed responsibility for Surrey’s eLearning Innovation Centre (eLINC). Then in April 2005, the Centre for Writing Intensive Learning (CWIL) was transferred from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences to the LIDC. The LIDC is now engaged in writing a three-year strategic plan to guide future activities. The process of preparing this plan includes soliciting feedback from LIDC staff and the SFU community. LIDC director, Dr. David Kaufman, has already consulted with many individuals and university groups with mandates associated with teaching and learning, including deans and associate deans, SFUFA, the Senate Committee on University Teaching and Learning (SCUTL), the Instructional Development Group (IDG), and the Learning Technologies Coordinating Committee (LTCC). Three focus groups also have been held, consisting of people who have used LIDC services over the years: one for classroom and technical services, another for media production, and a third for teaching support. In this session, a public forum will be held to discuss the current draft of the strategic plan.

**LIDC’s core mission (from the draft report) is to assist in the creation of an enriched academic environment at Simon Fraser University by:**

- providing a strong, coordinated, and sustainable infrastructure to support the development and delivery of exemplary instruction, whether classroom-based, fully online, or in a blended model;
- using the same infrastructure to support research in technology-enhanced teaching and learning and to foster linkages between research and practice;
- delivering services and support, reaching new off-campus students, creating a strong sense of community for students and instructors;
- delivering professional development programs and events to faculty and staff

**Video: Simply accessible**

Video has come a long way from the days of black-and-white tubes. As it evolves, it has become easier to create and deliver to the masses.

For anyone wanting to get a message out, showcase an event, or create exemplary learning material, video is an excellent method of communicating with your audience. While delivering video presentations used to be difficult and complicated, requiring VHS tapes or DVDs and an audience collected in one place, these barriers are being eliminated, thanks to the internet. Webcasting allows video to be delivered to hundreds or thousands of people, synchronously or asynchronously.

LIDC has produced webcasts seen live in the United Arab Emirates, Australia, Taiwan, and many more countries around the globe. In keeping with SFU’s heritage, we have even welcomed viewers in Scotland.

Live webcasting can be coupled with internet chat programs, enabling virtual audiences to participate in discussions from anywhere in the world. Webcasting can also be used to archive video, making the subject matter accessible to anyone at any time, so that even if they’re in a different time zone, they can watch the material when it’s convenient for them.

Webcasting can also protect the content that’s being viewed, should you wish to change or remove it. Because the content can be viewed at any time, there really is no need for the viewer to save it; moreover, saving the content is not easily managed.

The future applications of this technology at SFU are vast. Webcasting a presentation or a lecture will soon be as simple as booking an overhead projector. Educators can have their videos turned into learning objects or supplementary materials for anything they choose. This new delivery method makes creating reusable, marketable media a simple process.

Soon it will be possible to create online courses and license them to educational institutions, then monitor the number of students viewing your material and the institutions from which the students hail, all while retaining control of your teaching materials. Video on the web can capture conventional lecture-style delivery, and migrate it to the mass delivery model of the internet.
Synchronous audio-conferencing is moving beyond the teleconference and into the halls—real and virtual—of educational institutions. The ability to use audio conferencing through the web is making audio conferencing a significant educational medium (Laudrillard, 2002). It is online (so participants can view a common screen), synchronous (occurs in real-time) audio conferencing (participants can speak to and hear each other).

When considering using synchronous audio-conferencing, consider what it can do that a text-based, asynchronous environment cannot do. How can you use the strengths of each mode of delivery to create an effective learning environment? How can different modes of delivery support different learning styles?

SFU currently licenses a product called Elluminate Live (eLive). It has been used to stream face-to-face lectures to those who cannot attend in person, and to “bring in” virtual guest lecturers. Students have also used it to deliver PowerPoint presentations to the class and/or the instructor from a distance. It has served as a collaborative environment for smaller tutorials, an online demonstration area using application sharing, and a “virtual office” for drop-in office hours at a distance.

The web-based, synchronous approach is effective for gathering and delivering immediate peer feedback. It is also valuable as a tool for motivation, decision making, quick, intense communication, and focusing and directing real-time conversation via visuals.

See how synchronous audio communications can support good teaching practices
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How can web-based synchronous learning support asynchronous distance learning or face-to-face classrooms?

The addition of a shared whiteboard screen or application adds visual confirmation and direction to audio communications. The combination of audio and the shared screen supports different learning styles; gives students greater control over the direction of the discussion; and allows both instructor and student to give and receive instant feedback.

You can use synchronous environments to gauge student understanding and encourage students to interact with the material, with you (the instructor), or with each other.

What level is your course?

Inspired by a posting on Darren Cannell’s blog [http://careo.elearning.ubc.ca/weblogs/vschools/archives/2004_12.html#009745] that outlines different levels of online learning, I have applied the idea to web-based synchronous audio-conferencing. The approaches change according to level of mastery of the tool and the specific learning objectives for each course.
**LEVEL ONE** is the equivalent of delivering a one-to-many online lecture. It may be recorded, and reach students at a distance, but without any collaboration or active learning built in. Delivering a lecture requires the least amount of technological know-how. Level one also includes a demonstration of the software.

**LEVEL TWO** mirrors the face-to-face tutorial. Students have multiple opportunities to voice questions and engage each other in discussion. This approach gives some of the responsibility for the session to the students—their questions and arguments will affect the direction of the session. Level two is not much more technologically advanced than Level One, though participants need a microphone, and must understand the online etiquette and steps to speaking in the online environment.

**LEVEL THREE** is the most complex, and carries valuable learning opportunities. It encourages collaborative and active learning. Small-group discussion in breakout rooms gives participants more opportunity to interact with each other and engage in collaborative exercises. Tools such as webtour, application sharing, the whiteboard, and instant polls are used to engage students actively and repeatedly.

**Engaging participants**

Collaborative tools and techniques can make online audio-conferencing an interactive experience for participants and moderators.

When we are online, we lack visual cues. Hence, it is difficult to assess non-verbal communication. Emoticons can make explicit what we implicitly understand through body language. Asking people to choose between the happy or confused icons is a means of quickly gauging comprehension or acknowledgment.

I stop frequently – at the end of every second slide – to ask explicitly if there are questions or if any clarification is needed.

Polling functions serve to track participants’ opinions or preferences. This eliminates the need to pass the microphone to each person, and quickly tracks the opinions or preferences of participants. Polling results are, by default, anonymous, and so only the moderator will see the results.
Including the polling choices in a PowerPoint slide both reminds you to ask for feedback and gives the students their options in writing, so that they can reflect on their choice. Moderators can choose to see a summary of the results in real-time.

Participants may respond better to structured questions. Ask them to illustrate a theory with an example from their lives or from the media. Be specific when asking questions. You will not be able to read visual cues, and students cannot return later for the clarification possible in an asynchronous environment like a discussion group.

You don’t have to rely entirely on emoticons, which can be limiting, or on sharing the microphone, which can be time-consuming. Create a blank page at any time in your presentation, and ask students to brainstorm the pros and cons of a question or ask them to highlight key terms from a short glossary to indicate terms they wish to discuss more.

Breakout rooms are frequently used to encourage discussion among smaller groups of people. Virtual breakout rooms provide many of the same benefits as face-to-face breakout rooms and require similar planning. Give students a time limit for discussion and a clear topic or question, and
Good teaching practices are outlined in the article **IMPLEMENTING THE SEVEN PRINCIPLES: Technology as Lever**, by Arthur W. Chickering and Stephen C. Ehrmann, ([www.tltgroup.org/programs/seven.html](http://www.tltgroup.org/programs/seven.html)).

These seven principles of good teaching, as shown in the table on the following page, highlight the need for interaction between the student, the material, and the instructor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good teaching principles</th>
<th>eLive tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Student-faculty contact</td>
<td>Voice contact between faculty and learners. Polling feature tracks student understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collaboration among students</td>
<td>Breakout rooms for small group collaboration. Private messages for side conversations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Active learning</td>
<td>Use application sharing to collaborate on a file.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Rich/rapid feedback</td>
<td>No delay between student questions and instructor feedback using synchronous communication. Polling allows student feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Time on task</td>
<td>Application sharing: no need to send files back and forth. Changes immediately applied and viewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Communicate high expectations</td>
<td>New communication technologies expose students to new ways of approaching learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Diverse talents and ways of learning</td>
<td>Audio contact; recording sessions allow review; application sharing encourages hands-on learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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