

**Title:**                    **Technology for the un-technical: lessons from a successful educational project involving technology**

**Presenters:**           **Celia Popovic, Anne Hill and Ruth Lawton**  
Independent consultant and Birmingham City University

### **Abstract:**

### **Session Learning Outcomes**

By the end of this session, delegates will be able to:

- Specify ways project teams can improve engagement in project activities by university lecturers
- Identify key barriers to the use of various forms of technology
- Improve their choice of media to meet intended purposes

### **Session Outline**

In the past few years the NTF scheme has funded 8 or 9 projects each year to the tune of £200,000 match funded by host institutions.

Between July 2007 and December 2009, a group of non-technical academics engaged in a NTFS funded project Creating Future Proof Graduates, with the aim of creating resources to improve students' employability skills. According to Beetham (1997) the "imaginative use of ICT can engage more learners in the excitement of learning" so the team wished to create resources using as wide a range of media as possible. The project was centred in and led by the University's Educational Development Unit but included two faculty-based National Teaching Fellows. This workshop explores the challenges faced by non-technical 'experts' to produce fit for purpose resources and to engage teachers from across the university and the wider HE sector, while meeting resource and temporal constraints. In this session we will illustrate our challenges by demonstrating some of the resources produced by the project. Participants will identify the key barriers in the use of various forms of technology which will lead to their improved choice of technology to meet a given need (Segal, 2003).

We focus on the conference themes of the effective use of technology to enhance teaching and strategies to engage staff in their use; and using technology to engage students in their learning development.

### **Session Activities and Approximate Timings**

0 to 5 mins.: Description of the project – what we aimed to do and why

5 to 20 mins.: Group work – participants:

- a) identify a range of possible approaches using technology – from paper and pen, to state of the art camera – one method allocated to each group
- b) discuss the implications of each of these in terms of impact, resources, costs, expertise

20 to 25 mins.: Share group work in plenary

25 to 40 mins.: Brief demonstration of how we approached the issues, using 2 or 3 of the resources, together with a brief reflection on the problems encountered.

## **References**

Baume C, Martin P and Yorke M, 2002, *Managing Educational Development Projects*, London, Kogan Page

Beetham H (1997) *Supporting Further and Higher Education: Towards a critical e-learning research and practice*, JISC e-Learning Programme

Segal R 2003, 'Working on Educational Development Projects' in Kahn P and Baume D, *A Guide to Staff and Educational Development*, London, Kogan Page