

Minutes for Working Group 3.3 (Research into educational applications of information technologies) Annual General Meeting which opened online on 7th June 2015 and concluded in Vilnius, Lithuania from 14:30 2nd July 2015.

- 1. Apologies** (only for those who could neither attend the Vilnius meeting nor join in online).
 Apologies received from: Birgit Eickelmann (but Kerstin Drossel will attend in place); Janet Price; Una Cunningham; Franziska Spring; Peter Albion; Valentina Dagienė; Ulrich Kortenkamp; Donna Gronn; Wolfgang Mueller; Christina Preston; Sarah Younie; Jonathan P. San Diego; Barry Quinn; Christine Redman; Robert Aiken
 Online only: Robert Munro; Keryn Pratt; Paul Nleya; David Gibson; Therese Keane; Clark Quinn; Rosa Bottino; Andrew Fluck.

Please see Appendix for list of attendees at face to face meeting.

2. Election of chair

Following the Bylaws: International Federation for Information Processing (IFIP) (2014) Section 4.2.7^[1] nominations for the position of chair were called. No others were received by the deadline of 17th June 2015.

The nomination of Nicholas Reynolds is provided in the Appendix. No other nominations were received by the deadline. Nick was declared elected.

Mary Webb expressed thanks to Nick Reynolds and Andrew Fluck for their support during her term of office.

Nick Reynolds proposed a vote of thanks to Mary for her strong leadership, which was approved.

Andrew Fluck and Cathy Lewin were appointed as co vice chairs.

3. Minutes of 2013 AGM in Potsdam, Germany (and matters arising)

Motion to accept previous minutes:

Proposed by Bob Munro

Seconded by Nick Reynolds

No matters arising.

No objections.

4. Membership proposals (using these definitions*)

Category & Nominees	Name	Institution	e-mail address
Corresponding member	Dr Michael Henderson	Monash University	michael.henderson@monash.edu.au
Proposed Geoff Romeo			
Seconded Nick Reynolds			

Category & Nominees	Name	Institution	e-mail address
Full member Proposed: Cathy Lewin Seconded: Mary Webb	Dr Sue Cranmer	Lancaster University	s.cranmer@lancaster.ac.uk
Full member Proposed: Cathy Lewin Seconded: Mary Webb	Dr Keith Turvey	Brighton University	Kt6@brighton.ac.uk
Full member Proposed: Nick Reynolds Seconded: Sindre Rosvik	Johan van Niekerk (TC3 representative for South Africa)	Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University	Irene.Okere2@nmmu.ac.za
Full member Proposed: Mary Webb Seconded: Cathy Lewin	Eric Sanchez	French Institute of Education, ENS de Lyon	eric.sanchez@ens-lyon.fr
Intending member (TBC) Proposed: Ana Amelia Carvalho Seconded: Cathy Lewin	Sónia Cruz	Catholic University of Portugal	soniacruz@braga.ucp.pt
Intending member (TBC) Proposed: Niki Davis Seconded: Nick Reynolds	Julie Mackey	University of Canterbury e-Learning Lab	Julie.mackey@canterbury.ac.nz

Category & Nominees	Name	Institution	e-mail address
Corresponding Member Proposed: Mary Webb Seconded: Andrew Fluck	Sue Sentance	King's College London	sue.sentance@kcl.ac.uk http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/departments/education/people/academic/Sentance,-Dr-Sue.aspx
Corresponding Member Proposed: Mary Webb Seconded: Nick Reynolds	Jo-yu Lee (Amber/Amanda)	King's College London	jo-yu.lee@kcl.ac.uk
Corresponding Member Proposed: Gioko Maina Seconded: Nick Reynolds	Wachira Nicholas	Aga Khan University, Tanzania	Nicholas.Wachira@aku.edu http://www.aku.edu/ied-ea/Faculty/Pages/Nicholas_Wachira.aspx

*

Category

Corresponding member	<i>Open to anyone: can attend meetings and observe; can join e-mail list.</i>	<i>No voting rights</i>
Intending member	<i>Proposed and seconded by a Member who knows them. Voted into the group at a WG3.3 meeting.</i>	<i>No voting rights</i>
Member	<i>Intending Member who has participated in at least two IFIP events and been approved by their country representative and TC3.</i>	<i>Full voting rights</i>

All present were in favour of accepting these new members.

5. Reports on recent and current WG 3-3 activities

IFIP TC3 Working Conference *A New Culture of Learning: Computing and Next Generations* from 1st to 3rd July, 2015 in the Parliament (Seimas) of the Republic of Lithuania and hosted by the Vilnius University. <http://www.iticse2015.mii.vu.lt>

Overall comments on this joint conference with 3.1 have been very complimentary and much useful work has been done at the conference as well as generating good ideas for ongoing work within the working groups and TC3 overall. The programme included individual and joint papers from many members of 3.3 and 4 panels by members of 3.3 on: EduSummit, the role of CS/Informatics in the Curriculum, Innovation through digital technologies, Information Security, and Digital Equity. It is good to see so many examples of ongoing collaborative work of 3.3.

The Task force “Towards understanding of the role of CS/Informatics in the Curriculum”, which is across all working groups includes a number of members of 3.3 and has developed a draft position paper and will be reporting to the TC3 meeting.

EduSummit 2013 was supported by IFIP TC3 and attended by many members of 3.3. A special issue of *Education and Information Technologies* originating from EduSummit 2013 will be published shortly. Several of the articles for this are already available in the Online First Articles section of the journal. A number of members of 3.3 are authors on these articles and several members of 3.3 chaired the thematic working groups.

Another two articles by WG 3.3 members were published in Volume 20, Issue 2, June 2015.

2014 – Potsdam conference in conjunction with 3.1 and 3.2 "Key Competencies in Informatics and ICT" was held 1 – 4 July 2014. Mary Webb noted that this went extremely well with several resulting reports. This conference was very successful and well-attended by 3.3. Hot topics suggested at Potsdam (some of which have now been taken forward):

Creativity

Powerful Knowledge

Curriculum and Standards

Computational thinking

Mobile learning

Professional Development

Assessment as, for and of 21st Century Learning

Observatories for researching impact of It in education

Big data/Analytics

Digital citizenship

New Systems for Learning (that includes, New Systems for Schooling, MOOCS, Mobile Learning)

Digital Pedagogy – Possibly should be Pedagogy rather than Digital Pedagogy

Leadership

6. Communications

- a. website: <http://www.ifipwg3-3.org/> : Averaging 120 hits per month (up from 45 last year) – mostly from Brazil (27%), USA (18%), Australia (8%) and India (6%).
- b. Ning: 2 more members joined the Ning this year (now 25 WG 3.3 members).
- c. Online discussions: We have 110 members in the membership database. Prior to the 2015 AGM, the database was reconciled against the e-mail list; 11 members were re-invited to join the list, of which 7 responded and are now getting messages. Ulrich Kortenkamp kindly looked into the possibility of transferring the list to mailman, but informed us the current Yahoo list is working sufficiently well to obviate the need for a transfer.
- d) Journal: *Education and Information Technologies* is now indexed by 18 different services, which are helping the impact factor rise.

7. Future activities of WG 3.3

EduSummit: will be held September 14-15 Bangkok, Thailand 2015. Please see <http://www.curtin.edu.au/edusummit> for more details or contact Tammie Burke [Tammie.Burke@curtin.edu.au].

2016 Proposed meeting 'Stakeholders and Information Technology in Education' in Portugal in conjunction with ITEM 2016. Currently WGs 3.1, 3.3, 3.4 and 3.7 are

interested in participating – which is excellent. At the moment the range of suggested dates are 6th-8th July. Don Passey is working with the local organisers on the proposal and budget documents. In order to discuss and take things forward, Don Passey, Sindre Rosvik, Eric Sanchez and Cathy Lewin met at 7.00pm on Wednesday 1st July 2015, in Vilnius. Cathy Lewin has agreed to co-chair with Don Passey, Eric will be on the IPC as a representative of WG3.1. Representative of WG3.4 to be confirmed.

8. News from IFIP Technical Committee 3 for Education

Major current issues under discussion in TC3 include:

- Plans for WCCE 2017 Dublin, July 2017
- Linking TC3 plans with the UNESCO agenda
- Links with other networks including EduSummit
- TC3 response to curriculum initiatives focused on CS/Informatics
- IFIP Strategy
- Organisation and ways of working in TC3
- Digital presence and activities Web page and/or the Ning platform

N.B. Mary Webb is now on the TC3 Executive Committee.

9. Research Clubs proposal

Context

Membership of the group is by personal invitation, establishing a degree of trust and common purpose.

Assets

The group has a private e-mail list, a web site and a Ning site.

Aims

“To provide a forum to identify issues and priorities for research and to map research policies arising from the differing cultures in IFIP Member countries.”

Implication

With the context of shared trust, we can use our assets to further our aims. The Research Clubs proposal suggests we can improve this as follows:

- a) To generate discussion and provide mentoring leadership for newer members and early career researchers, we can provide a brief announcement of our publications on the e-mail list. The formal citation with a sentence or two about the global significance of the findings therein should be sufficient.
- b) As we generate larger research projects, we can ask members of the Working Group (through the e-mail list) if they wish to become allied partners. This might be in one of two ways:
 - i. Current research projects could be extended or duplicated in other countries by extending an invitation to WG3.3 members to become project associates.
 - ii. Proposed projects seeking grant aid could invite other WG3.3 members to increase scope by joining as co-applicants without sharing funds.
- c) Working Group 3.3 is an excellent place to plan collaborative projects on a global scale. This could involve simultaneous grant applications in several countries.

Response online was mostly supportive to this proposal, although some members expressed concern that the clubs may break up the community of 3.3.

Discussion points at the meeting were:

- Isn't this activity supported already through posting on the email list? (Christine Bescherer) Nick Reynolds noted it would be more structured (perhaps through more effective use of the Ning site).
- It would provide endorsement for activities (without funding complications) – eg proposals could state that an established international network will support the work. (Niki Davies)
- How different is this from special interest groups? (Sue Cranmer) Nick Reynolds noted that it is not intended to be a series of separate groups. It is more fluid – the research clubs would be formed as and when necessary.
- A good starting point is continuing the work of the task force looking at the role of CS/informatics in the curriculum.

ACTION: Mary Webb to ensure there is a research club linked to the task force.

10. Date and location of next AGM

4th-6th or 6th-8th July 2016, University of Minho, Guimarães, Portugal

11. AOB

11a. EduSummit attendance and WG 3.3 membership.

Niki Davis has asked for this question to be discussed:

As EDUsummIT is strongly aligned with IFIP WG 3.3, I wonder if members who attend it would be able to count it towards the WG 3.3 conferences attended for full membership?

More generally, we would like to expand our understanding of the relationship between Edusummit and TC3.

There was good discussion online, with general support for EduSummit attendance contributing to WG3.3 membership, although it's acknowledged IFIP rules may inhibit this.

Should there be criteria for alignment with other conferences to raise awareness of IFIP? (Johan van Niekerk) Mary Webb and Nick Reynolds noted that it would be difficult to know where to draw the line. Mary said that EduSummit is special to 3.3 but it is not a one-off so recognition of attendance would need to be defined carefully.

Nick Reynolds proposed to take this suggestion forward to the TC3 meeting. Approximately 10 people present supported this. No-one objected. Nick will bring attention to the issues of cost, distance, time and accessibility for conference attendance.

Niki Davis noted thanks to the meeting for taking this forward.

11b. Bringing people into IFIP (Doctoral students, eminent scholars, expert practitioners).

This item is a call for suggestions on how we may strategically enlarge Working Group 3.3. Please put forward ideas for recruiting and nominating new members in the following categories (and please nominate other categories as well):

- i. Doctoral students [many of us propose our PhD students for membership – can we extend this idea?]
- ii. Eminent scholars [are there academics we are aware of that might be encouraged to participate?]
- iii. Expert practitioners [do you know inspirational teachers who are transforming their schools with computer technology? Some schools no longer issue student reports – using an LCMS makes reporting continuous, with parental access from home. Is this an example of future thinking?]

Other suggestions for extending membership:

- Involve national students in TC3 working conferences through offering pre-conference workshop/summer school. Could support students in how to prepare poster/presentation for main conference and provide some methodology input. (Christine Bescherer)
- Could involve research students in joint research/publications through WG3.3 perhaps in small groups of 2-3 countries. (Valentina Dagiene)
- Target education faculties more broadly as there is now wide interest in technology. (Johan van Niekerk)

A comment from Donna Gronn indicated financial support to attend meetings is rare: therefore asked if online participation could qualify as one of the ‘participated’ events?

This was not discussed at the meeting but facilitating online participation at events was:

- Sessions could be recorded. More use of social media to share messages would be beneficial. (Sue Cranmer)
- Could be synchronous (eg Google hangout) and asynchronous provision. Make better use of the Ning site. (Nick Reynolds)
- Attending members could support early career researchers/research students by facilitating online presentations at the conference and subsequently providing them with feedback (ie a mentoring role). (Niki Davis)
- Online attendance could help teachers and practitioners to benefit from the conference. (Toshinori Saito)

ACTION: Cathy Lewin to take these ideas forward to IPC of TC3 Working Conference 2016 in Portugal

Appendices

1. List of attendees at AGM 2nd July 2015, Vilnius, Lithuania

Caroline Jouneau-Sion, French Institute of Education, ENS de Lyon, (France); Eric Sanchez, French Institute of Education, ENS de Lyon, (France); Sindre Rosvik, sinro@online.com; Christine Bescherer; Peter Micheuz; Gerald Futchew?, Vienna university of technology; Ana Amelia Carvalho (PT); Seeta Jaikaran-Doe; Bent B. Andresen; Mart Laanpere, Tallinn University; Peter Doe, University of Tasmania; Sue Cranmer, Lancaster University; Keith Turvey, Brighton University ; Silvio Giaffredo, University of Trento; Olena Chaikovska, lana@knukim.edu.ua, Ukraine; Niki Davis, Niki.Davis@canterbury.ac.uk; Yoshiaki Matsuzawa, matsuzawa@inf.shizuoka.ac.jp; Hajime ohiva; Valentina Dagiene; Robert Gajewski, Warsaw University of Technology, Poland, rg@il.pw.edu.pl; Johannes

Magenheim, University of Paderborn, Germany; Toshinori Saito, Japan Professional School of Education; Yaacov katz, president, Michlala - Jerusalem Academic College, yaacov.katz@biu.ac.il; Monique Grandbastien, Monique.Grandbastien@loria.fr, French TC3 rep; Johan van Niekerk, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University; Volkan Kukul, Gazi university, turkey, kukulvolken@gmail.com; Maciej M. Syslo, UMK Torun, Poland, syslo@mat.umk.pl; Mary Webb,; Nick Reynolds; Cathy Lewin

2. Election of chair

From: Nicholas Reynolds <nreyn@unimelb.edu.au>

Dear Mary

I would like to indicate my willingness to stand for the position of Chair of WG3.3. I would like to continue your excellent work in supporting the activities of 3.3 and in being instrumental in the group’s successes. Your work in the area of building a research and theoretical position on the development and implementation of curriculum with an ICT/Informatics focus is something that I am looking forward to continuing. This is a key area of interest globally and one that would benefit from a research driven international perspective. I would very much like to lead discussion and activity in the establishment of Andrew Fluck’s idea of ‘Research Clubs’ that can support research into specific areas of interest that would in turn support TC3’s agenda. I understand that along with Andrew, Cathy Lewin has expressed interest in working with me as a Vice Chair of 3.3. This seems to me to be a very good approach and ensuring a continuity of leadership for the group.

I express my interest in taking such a leadership position mindful that due process should be followed. In doing so I also ask that any other members of 3.3 who are interested in taking a leadership role please feel free to indicate their interest. I am aware that many members will probably not be able to attend the actual conference in Vilnius, where we will have our AGM. I hope that this expression of interest will open discussion about the leadership of 3.3 and that others with interest will step forward.

I thank you, Mary, for the important work that you have done as Chair.

Nick

[Many accolades followed this message, greatly in support of Nick as Chair].

9. Research Clubs proposal

Good idea- keen to join...	Christina Preston
I fully support this Research Clubs Proposal, and welcome being involved.	Sarah Younie
An excellent idea. Really collaborative projects could be pursued. Fully support it	Robert Munro
Seems like a good idea and well worth trying. Perhaps groups can work out their own mechanisms and share what is learned from that so that over time effective approaches are developed.	Peter Albion

I also support the idea of research club proposals	Kleopatra Nikolopoulou
Sorry, probably I have missed something but I do not really understand the difference in terms of mission between research clubs and WG 3.3. moreover, it is not clear to me the proposed mechanism to establish and run a club...	Rosa Bottino
The Research Clubs idea builds on the aims of WG3.3 which were incorporated into the proposal as a foundation. There is no intention of fragmenting WG3.3: the whole working group is invited to join the activity. As use the WG3.3 e-mail list to SHARE our research, and invite others to join existing or future projects, some members may naturally join project-based activities. But we have a fantastic opportunity within WG3.3 to build wide-scale international collaboration. Early career researchers may find this a good way to work with more experienced academics.	Andrew Fluck
I fully support the idea of the clubs – the name is just a name at the moment. I see them as an opportunity for researchers to share ideas and build research around specific areas of interest; all of these areas fit within 3.3 and in no way would fragment it, rather they offer a way to possibly strengthen to the group.	Nick Reynolds
I like the idea of increasing members' interactions through opportunistically formed "research clubs." To make sure these clubs (interest groups) will enhance instead of fragmenting WG3.3, we need to keep these clubs open and accessible to all members, and set up online spaces to share ongoing efforts and advances.	Jianwei Zhang
I agree that it is a good idea for the WG to generate groups to pursue joint ventures, and to use an open approach with online collaboration. I would like to add something in the proposal which stimulates discussion at a theoretical and methodological level as well as work on research agendas and policy mapping.	Steve Kennewell

11a. EduSummit attendance and WG 3.3 membership.

I'm involved with EDUsummIT and will be attending so I'd like for it to be counted for activity with this group.	Peter Albion
I would think that attending Edusummitt2015 should count towards conference attended for becoming a full member of IFIP WG3.3, Having been a founder member of the Edusummits and attended all	Margaret Cox

of them (2009, 2011 and 2013) the involvement of IFIP members and the relevance to our work is very important and valued.	
I think that attendance at EDUSummIT 2015 (or indeed other EDUSummITs) should count as attendance at an IFIP conference.	Peter Twining
I totally support the motion that EDU summit attendance count towards WG3.3 attendance.	Bob Munro
And another positive vote from me. This should count	Ulli Kortenkamp
I think that this should be checked with IFIP TC3.	Rosa Bottino
IFIP already agreed to sponsor the Edusummits which is why Mary Webb has been on the Edusummit programme committee since 2011 representing WG 3.3, when TC3 gave its permission for the collaboration.	Margaret Cox
I also agree. 3.3 participation in the EduSummIT has always been very valuable.	Joke Voogt
...The relationship between EDUSummIT and 3.3 is already strong with an agreement that 3.3 members will automatically receive an invitation to EDUSummIT. I think that 3.3 is in a position to make a recommendation to TC3 about our preferred status but that TC3 will be bound by IFIP rules (whatever they might be) and TC3's understanding of what is best for TC3. The last thing we want to see is a weakening of our working conferences and TC3's role. I have no problem in acknowledging attendance if it does not have a negative impact on this group....	Nick Reynolds
...I agree that it is important to clarify and nurture the relationship between IFIP TC3 and EDUSummIT. This is a discussion that needs to be had with TC3 and it will be helpful if 3.3 can come up with a recommendation. Margaret is right that we have had previous discussions with TC3 – particularly in relation to EDUSummIT 2013 which TC3 sponsored (although not with any funding). At that time the TC3 executive agreed that TC3 would support EDUSummIT and that collaboration between TC3 and EDUSummIT is productive and important. It was also quite clear that EDUSummIT is not an IFIP event and that may determine whether or not it counts for membership of TC3.....	Mary Webb