

## PRAISE project – Iceland

**Day 1 – Saturday 18<sup>th</sup> September 2004-09-18**

### **1<sup>st</sup> SESSION**

**A** Introduction by Mike Karlsson

### **B** Welcome from Cesare

Halfway through the project \*\*  
Define the elements in order to know how to work on the content to allow us to  
prepare the final document for publication  
In Bethel plan to combine the two project eg also CABLE  
Presentations from new individuals are invited (esp Bethel colleague)

### **C**

Liz Fern – English trained SWkr – representing Iceland and Social Work  
Fulvio Forno – Poly Torino, on technical side.  
Vaneira – student in Social Sciences in Barcelona  
Begona – Professor in SSci in Barcelona -  
Weikel? Bethel – Cable and Praise only since July – Teacher and trainer  
Laura Farinetti – Poly Torino – professor  
Alastair Young – Tech  
Sean Mehan  
Maurizio – Social Worker Torino  
Cesara – il direttori?  
Guiseppe  
Stephano – Torino – Teacher in Social Sciences from INFOP France  
Hannah – Office Manager in Iceland  
Diana – Psychologist in Akureyri  
Mike – Akureyri – philosophy – Social Sciences

**D** Consortium Agreement, Payments, Interim Report – Guiseppe

2 copies to be sent to **Commune di Torino**  
**SFEP**  
**Via Cellini n.14**  
**10127 TORINO – ITALIA** - via Express mail

Also urgently required 'CA praise AnnesC.doc'

[gdiblas@elite.polito.it](mailto:gdiblas@elite.polito.it)

PRE- FINANCING - 40% of budget

Highland Council were paid on 2<sup>nd</sup> September, 2004 - €18,896

We have to produce the technical and financial info re the project using Internal Records for the EU> Modules provided by the EU for the technical info. Detailed structure already presented in Barcelona. Focus on the expenditure on the project. In Bethel we need to produce these figures so we need to submit detail of the

expenditure up till Nov 30<sup>th</sup> in hard copy for the meeting. Or it could be sent by email to the email address above - [gdibiasi@elite.polito.it](mailto:gdibiasi@elite.polito.it)

The modules for the technical info in

Summary of activities undertaken during the reporting period  
An overall description of the project activities, products and results

Executive summary of the interim report

Guiseppe suggests referring back to the summary of types of legitimate expenditure as given to us in the initial paperwork – the relevant file will be sent to us giving all the necessary information.

Funds can be moved from one type of expenditure to another up to 20% as long as this info is verified with EU.

Cesare has been invited to a meeting in Brussels and the issue of expenditure and what is permitted will be discussed then – 5/6<sup>th</sup> October. We should discuss these issues at this meeting to be taken to the meeting in Brussels.

There is an open issue of allowing costs of Civil Servants to be involved

Funds can only be paid to a Civil Servant if the work is outside their normal

File is available online at <http://www.comune.torino.it/sfep/praise>

More money is advanced when we have used 70% of the first 40% = €13227.20

Alan raised point about everything being done with the given time frame. This was also raised by Bethel in relation to setting up the virtuous circles. This point was answered by Maurizio but it can be discussed further in Brussels.

## **Second Session**

Presentation by Fulvio

### **CABLE/PRAISE**

Consultation meeting with the EU Commission re the [é-learning](#) project. The legal form of the project may be easy to manage for the Learning establishments but not so easy for the Local Authorities. So the message to the Commission must be that 'if you want this kind of association between Universities and Public Institutions then you must consider the implications for the Public Institutions and perhaps change the regulations to allow them to contribute and take part more easily'.

Maurizio says that he feels these difficulties have to be brought to the Commission so that they can be presented accurately – in other words the partners must discuss this and the material facts must be provided.

The interim report for the CABLE project was submitted to the Commission in July 2004. Fulvio asked for a response 10 days ago and got an immediate reply that it would be difficult for them to say when this info would be available, certainly not before this October (but apparently this is normal).

On the subject of expenditure to be presented to the EU Commission – we need to spend and show that we have spent, even if this goes overbudget, because any invoices that are not accepted, or are late etc, would be not counted so even if all the money is accounted for, we may still be short.

Maurizio

The website should have been up and running for today but is not quite ready.

Cesare

Stephano is to present the basic elements of today's work. This means setting up project groups working on the creation of VC's. We have to set up 3 subgroups. If we want to be successful we need the systemic involvement of the institutions – in order to create the VC we need as much integration between the technological expertise and the social work participation.

Stephano

Linking together the pedagogical need to find a common language and communicate this understanding by means of the technological methods we have available. To choose some cases rather than others for documentation. It's a matter of moving from the narratives to 'good practice'. Then we have to shift from the analysis of good practice to identifying the pedagogical needs (using focus groups) –

To hypothesise in order to understand should be our motto

Praxis --- theory -----praxis ----theory -----praxis 'und so weiter

The job is to rationalise the key words – reducing and refining the research work.

NOW

- 1 Creating a list – to reflect on the most important key words
- 2 Choose the priorities
- 3 Using a person in each group to present and to speak when we all come back together

Why did we choose these key words?

Producing a definition of the key words.

Exchange our understanding of these key words

Each group will look at different key words

Synthesis of the definitions

Arriving at new understandings of the key words and highlighting differences between ourselves social/practical?

The creation of educational models that are based on our practical needs and situations

Identify a particular model of e-learning that we wish to foster

Produce a content that will be used to sell the technological model

## Small Group work

Discussion of term 'minors' – other group agreed that this term had some connotations, particularly oppressive ones, people who are not something – or are becoming rather than have become – issue of status and image – other words related included adolescents, unborn, children etc. One of the age related diffs between minors and non-minors was the eligibility to welfare benefits – minors linked to disability. One of the terms on list under 'minors' was media competence – communication technology – in British context this could be related to the 'bad press' that Social Workers have.

The term 'disease'. Talked about health and ill health. Became apparent that there were two different subjects – health and 'disagio'. This meant 'things that prevent development of' like drug-use etc.

Combating – most important aspects were that professionals talk about prevention but from an individual's perception they may talk about 'combat' which is a more active term.

Disambiguation – an 'American' word I think?

Discussion of the above – Sean – links through the concepts and not the dictionary definitions.

The second group

By studying the definition of the term we realised that the interrelation of the terms helped with the understanding of the definition and the relationships  
Started on the definition of the term prevention  
Added two new key terms – diagnosis and risk  
Prevention suggests the idea of risk and diagnosis.

Argument between Sean and Stephano about defining a definition of international language for social work. This we agreed this was a shared social work conceptualisation or understanding of concepts. Sean agreed that the negotiation of concept was pertinent to the modern trends in different countries eg the concept of 'disagio'. Informing conceptual change.

This is also a process that will persuade students that they are not just learning 'fixed' concepts – the concepts are alive and changing.

Sean on relationships between concepts – the relationships between words give each word meaning (the example of mammal – warm blooded, breathing, milk giving etc).

We still have to draw a map; of the terms used and the relationships of the semantic ontology.

So far we have only five cases to work on. The EU were told we needed ten cases.

Stephano – proposition that using the pedagogical studies we have discussed and the technological methods available we could produce an new model of distance learning. Maurizio – formative models to be produced tomorrow and the technology discussed.



**Course designer, course manager and tutor:-**

Takes care of the effective eLearning course design, implementation and evaluation

Course planning, learner's profile analysis  
Activity planning, monitoring and evaluation

**Tutor:** - educational support, human user interface

Key role in eLearning  
Provide prompt educational feedback  
Motivate learners

**Encourage contact between students and teachers**

Depends on teaching methods  
Most widely used

How do we do this? Case Studies

Educational modules include questions and problems to solve  
Face to face learning moments  
Interaction tools provided by the platform (chat and discussion)  
Questionnaire to be completed and sent to tutor before f-f mtgs  
Learn students names

**Develop reciprocity and cooperation among students**

On line interaction is very different from f-f

How?

Face to face learning  
Shared experience by students  
Interaction tools provided by platform  
Shared 'netiquette rules' eg reply in 1 day etc  
Tutors as moderator and facilitator  
New challenging questions added every so often

**Encourage active learning – how?**

In 80's 90's on-line courses were designed as large monolithic modules

Rich in terms of info and content  
Poor in actively engaging students  
Emphasis on content  
More recently on-line courses more focussed on tasks

Ask students to take a decision collaboratively  
Find info, discuss info, use info, construct scenarios, verify scenarios

HOW?

Case Studies  
Challenging probs to carry out alone or in group  
Interaction tools provided by the platform  
Accessible repository of in-depth related material  
List of useful links – ontology and semantics!!

## **Give prompt feedback**

How?            Simplest level – email but difficult to manage the info flow  
Very important! -- keep track of info flow  
Synchronous tools (eg chat)  
Real time interaction, higher involvement, many-to-many  
Asynchronous tools (eg forums) – Higher flexibility

Interaction tools provided by Bodington, platform fora etc

Use of forums instead of é-mail

## **How can I ensure time on task?**

Ensure that students spend time on learning tasks, rather than sorting out techno probs

So: Help facilities available: helpdesk, user guides, faq's  
Accessible by phone, email, face to face, on line.

HOW?            User's guide, FAQ ....about most common tech probs  
Timely tech support available by phone, email, on line.

Face to face supporte

## **How can I motivate students?**

Case studies are Real World, significant examples/probs  
Challenging probs posed by the tutors, requiring different skills  
Appealing graphics  
Face to face meeting to emphasise the ad advantage of eLearning

## **Managing diversity?**

Customisable educational modules  
Learning style questionnaire proposed to students  
Additional learning material repository available to students  
Possibility for student to add and share materials and links etc

## **EXAMPLE:**

Preliminary questionnaire (ground for interaction) eg names, expectations, backgrounds, learning style, learning goals, information about schedule and time constraints, raise expectations

Face to face meeting to get to know each other, expectations etc, communicate high expectations, emhasise the advantages of eLearning, avoid feeling of being abandoned, group feeling, present and discuss interaction tools.

Periodic face to face meetings maintaining pace, sharing experiences, reviewing old material, introduce new material.

Periodic synchronous moderated chats with tutor and students on line  
Pose new challenging problems, start discussion, foster synchronous non-moderated chats among students.

Technical help always available by phone

Provide self-evaluation tools, periodic questionnaire, online self-evaluation, feedback, final evaluation.

Monitoring the process:

- About student' participation in various modes eg face to face, on line
- About students' performance
- Students direct feedback eg why are they not interacting
- Identify actions to take

## **SECOND SESSION**

Maurizio

Didactical modules

Closely related to VC's. The mentor/facilitator helps the group to recognise formative needs during the analysis of the case studies  
The outcomes should be linked to practical experimentation  
The courses developed in English may be used in the future by new partners  
Language problems are not the only barriers which can be cultural, or inappropriate to different local conditions  
Partners in PRAISE need to think beyond the project itself  
E Learning ----- practical applications  
The mentor/facilitator is not necessarily a traditional teacher but has responsibility for the educational aspects of the group  
This is not an external examiner but a guide and interpreter trying to identify the needs of the VC starting at the beginning of the life of the VC  
The mentor is involved at two levels, as part of facilitating the VC but also as part of the VC at the next level eg the PRAISE group of partners  
Mentor is mediator between the group and the pedagogical institution – may have to moderate the requests of the VC  
The mentor may then help the VC to develop the themes which themselves will develop into courses  
Two important aspects – motivation of the VC – providing info for those outside the VC  
In assessing the course we are not only concerned with the product of the VC/student but also in quantifying this material  
Primary task is to organise the material rather than just adding to the pile and we are trying to create a system to do this  
We cannot create social workers from eLearning alone but cannot be too vague either  
Diagnosis from WHO for example. – a small course on line – it's not a universally shared module but we should be aware of its existence – sharing the documents between Italian and English speaking people – the only interaction between the course and the VC's was in the feedback which was something put together by a different project within the EU.  
It was used with students in Turin – the result of the experience was that it was particularly successful with student conversant in both languages –

Returning to the main issue of producing small scale modules.

Gathering info from social workers that can be presented in a form that is useful for other social workers – so selection of material from VC's and organising this in a way



that is valuable for others. This may mean involving the students themselves. Some of the social workers who were presenting the course were also making use of the material for their own development. The double role of social workers who are teachers and students at the same time – (Alan – this is like the role of facilitator – maybe a Practice Teacher who is learning alongside the trainee).

We are working in a changing environment so we need to respond to the actual situation we find on the ground and learn from the experience in a continual way.

It is important to experiment with the modules produced – they need to be tested – small scale is better than trying to produce large scale models.

### **Who prepares the module?**

We then discussed the preparation of the module from VC to co-ordinator to planning of learning objectives to preparing the course and then to creating the eLearning package – so we need a team comprised of social worker/facilitator, planner, technical expert.

### **AFTERNOON – 3<sup>rd</sup> Session**

A few slides to synthesise the work that has been done so far.

Maurizio

The nature of the Virtuous Circle. The term 'Case Studies' in this context has a particular meaning ie not a Case Study that merely describes the situation of a particular case. A 'narrative' case study has a particular format. Here there is a TITLE, NARRATION, ACTOR (the Social Worker or person doing the narration) ACTIONS, REACTIONS, SCENE, CONTEXT, TIME, SPACE and SCOPE, KEYWORDS.

The layout for Case Studies is in document form that can be found on the website and each part of the study is included in the narration but has space for development of each element of the narration.

The studies are discussed by a group of peers facilitated by a tutor/facilitator/co-ordinator. The focus can be an unsolved problem, a solution or and important concept/fact.

Each narration represents an interpretation or reflection of the writer in a natural language which is then commented upon by the peers in the group. It is not so much a short story as a piece of the narrator's biography.

Not a professional report so much as a personal reflection of an event set in a professional context.

### **FOCUS GROUP, COOPERATIVE METHOD, AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL NARRATIVE AND APPLICATION OF MULTIPLE INTELLIGENCE**

This autobiographical narration relies on the experience and understanding of the professional using this to project to probable or possible outcomes for future situations and a reflection towards the future.

The structure of the group is recursive or circular – the discussion is ‘open ended’ and does not aim for a conclusion - it is a second level structure insofar as it focuses not on the original situation but on the reflections of the participants about the concepts and projected formative modules

The system is not aiming to be revolutionary but to complement social work methods and theoretical perspectives. Many people know how to use the computer for individual concerns – here we are trying to use it to develop shared experiences and concerns.

So we are trying to balance the needs and demands of social workers with the openings and opportunities given by the technology available.

Each partner, depending on local situation, language and culture, will approach the model in a different way.

The model is not fixed in stone but is open to being modified according to the group’s view.

The aim is to test the model and modify it according to the various experience of the partners. The discussion needs to be on the theoretical and practical levels in order to inform the process of modification!

### **Fulvio – from Keywords to Ontology**

Why are we bothering to define concepts?

Summary/Goal

Recall the context of the CABLE/PRAISE projects  
Goal of the semantic feature  
Structure of the shared ontology  
Working on the ontology

Virtual Circles linked to eLearning and Praxis

- -  
Theory ???Case Studies

The Learning Platform – Bodington – Navigating Case Studies

Fulvio showed some slides of the screens that will be available on the Virtual Learning site. In this way a Case Study can be linked through the buttons on the screen to other similar cases.

Linking the semantics of the eLearning (Theory) and the Case Study (Praxis) through ontology.

Ontology – The hierarchical structuring of knowledge about things by subcategorising them according to their essential (or at least relevant and/or cognitive) qualities.

Example – a chair. The dictionary gives six definitions. The dictionary solves the problem by not bothering about the set of letters that makes up the word ‘chair’ but by describing a set of concepts. An image would make this easier but a computer cannot see this. The concept of chair is a class – can the other objects such as

stool, bench, seat etc be classified – yes, something I can sit on. Is there one word for this? No. Invent a new word – ‘sittable’ to fit this concept. The word is just a convention on which we all agree – we need to agree – but the definition or single term must not be too general – it must be precise

The Wizard’s Trick

A glossary of terms – look at the important concepts – the most relevant key words.

Ingredients

Concepts

- Shorthand name (internal use)

- Synthetic title (to display in menus)

- Definitions (real unambiguous shared definition)

Relationships among concepts

- is\_a

- Other

Annotations

- For Case Studies

- For Learning modules

Concepts

We need to develop the Shorthand names, Synthetic titles and definitions for the concepts we wish to move

Internationalisation

- English, German, Spanish, Catalan, Icelandic, French, Romanian, Italian

Relationships

So classroom is\_a room .....chair is\_a for sitting made\_of material

Wood is\_a material Table is\_a made\_of wood

Beware – do not worry about relationships for now – just talk about relationships

Important to List relevant concepts, provide definitions, check and validate and agree

Annotations

- The author of a Case Study specifies the concepts relevant to the case

- The author of a didactical module (Bodington ‘Room’) specifies the concepts relevant to the module

Ontology navigator – and interpretive logic – it can provide degrees of relevance taken from a glossary of terms or concepts

Do we agree – and can we proceed from a practical point of view?

## 4<sup>th</sup> Session

### Fulvio

Ontology working group

- One rep per partner
- Proposes concepts, definitions and relationships
- All partners contribute to validation and translation

### Case Studies

- Enough cases to be representative of the domain
- For now, free-form keywords
- Along time, formalised keywords
- At the end of the project, navigation interface for annotation

### Technical Development

- E-Learning plan
- Case study development
- Interface development etc etc

### Didactical modules

- Define formative needs and learning methodology
- Assign relevant keywords
- At the end, navigation interface

### Ontology development

Pyramid

Web  
A Formal Validation (A = Analysis/Synthesis)  
Working grp  
Pedag. Partners  
Virtuous Circles  
Social Workers

### Sean – PRAISE development

Bodington – VLE

Description of the new website - the CABLE Campus  
Highland has a floor in the Cable building

### Maurizio

Bethel Meeting

Maurizio gave a hand-out of the time scale for completion of each partner's responsibility eg narrations, reports etc by given dates.

The first part is about the definition of the VC  
The second part is about the setting up of the VC  
INFOP and Barcelona have to prepare reports for EU Commission

Five Case Studies and a report on the activities of the VC's (At the time of the meeting in Bethel)

Akureyri is responsible for co-ordinating these first five Case Studies have been produced by each partner

Highland Council is responsible for the Dissemination Plan and for preparing a report on the Public Meeting in Akureyri

### **Sean**

Recapped on the achievements and decisions from the Akureyri meeting

### **Bethel**

Asking about the timetable for Bethel and looking for suggestions for the agenda.

2 main issues for CABLE – Advance on the ontology

Experimentation – into the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of the project on 1<sup>st</sup> October so in October/November the courses should be starting.

PRAISE - Completion of the index for the volume that will be published

Finding also the overall organisation of the book to be published

Organisers of the two projects will have to come up with an agenda for the meeting – by the end of the month this should be presented to the partners

Bethel will need to concentrate on the organisation of the meeting and arranging for and disseminating info about the practical aspects for the partners attending.