

MOOC Metacognitive Analysis – Learning Contract

Study name: MOOC Metacognitive Analysis

Guided independent study

Mentor/instructor: Nicola Marae Allain

September Term

3-credit graduate study

Program: MA.LET

A. PURPOSE

In this research based course, the student will critically examine the experience of participating in the following connectivist Metaliteracy Massive Online Course offered by Empire State College and the University at Albany:

In collaboration with Empire State College and the University at Albany, this is a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) that examines metaliteracy as a comprehensive approach to information literacy in the social media age. Metaliteracy provides a metacognitive perspective that empowers learners to produce and share information in participatory social media environments. It also introduces an overarching framework for related literacy types, such as visual literacy, digital literacy and media literacy, in connection to an expanded metaliteracy structure. As a metaliteracy MOOC, this learning experience will be collaboratively produced and delivered by scholars from around the world with expertise in emerging literacies. These terms will be discussed within a metaliteracy viewpoint that unifies complementary approaches to literacy with a self-empowering metacognitive perspective. Learners will engage in an open online environment using some of the online resources that have inspired metaliteracy, including blogs, video conferencing, twitter, online discussions and collaborative online communities. According to the formal definition of metaliteracy, this framework is “a unified construct that supports the acquisition, production and sharing of knowledge in collaborative online communities” (Mackey and Jacobson, 2011, p. 62). This MOOC will present metaliteracy as an evolving concept while exploring the participatory dimension of producing and sharing information in today’s social media, open and networked environments. Participants will critically evaluate the theories presented, while exploring the practice of emerging technologies and metaliteracy in relation to 21st century learning. Discussions will involve a critical analysis of trends in social media and social networking, Open Educational Resources (OERs), as well as open and online learning, such as the MOOC format itself. The Metaliteracy MOOC will include presentations by experts in the field and will be open to students at the University at Albany, Empire State College and the world, as an open learning experience.

The MOOC is available using the following link: <http://metaliteracy.cdlprojects.com/>

B. LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Learning Outcomes:

In addition to enrolling in the MOOC and completing assigned educational activities, you will conduct a metacognitive analysis of the MOOC, with the following focus: (1) evaluation of the efficacy of the learning environment (2) analysis of approaches to assessment, both actual and potential (3) a metacognitive analysis of the student’s learning in the MOOC. You will also complete a related research project and literature review of your choice.

To achieve these outcomes, you will:

- (1) Read required articles listed below.**
- (2) Read the following Course Pages:**
 - About This Course: <http://metaliteracy.cdlprojects.com/about.htm>
 - What is Metaliteracy: <http://metaliteracy.cdlprojects.com/what.htm>
 - Course Outline: <http://metaliteracy.cdlprojects.com/outline.htm>
 - How it Works: <http://metaliteracy.cdlprojects.com/how.htm>
- (3) Read all course topic information, including linked scholarly articles.**
- (4) Read the Metaliteracy MOOC Newsletter.**
- (5) Read a selection of contributions provided by MOOC participants.**
- (6) Participate in the MOOC live talks.**
- (7) Create a blog for the purpose of this study.** Link the blog to the MOOC. Share weekly reflections and analysis in the blog.
- (8) Create a Twitter account** (if you don't already have one). Provide a minimum of 5 weekly tweets on topics related to the MOOC. Follow MOOC directions for Tweeting using the #metaliteracy hash tag.
- (9) Link other Social Media Accounts of your choice to the MOOC**, and share resources using those accounts.
- (10) Create an annotated literature review** of 20-30 scholarly articles, shared resources, and authoritative references tied your metacognitive analysis, evaluation of effectiveness, approaches to assessment, and research project. Share in the blog and with MOOC participants.
- (11) Develop an evaluation plan and evaluate the efficacy of the MOOC.**
- (12) Analyze approaches to assessment.** Propose an assessment strategy. Decide if you are assessing learning, assessing outcomes, assessing for potential college credit, or all of the above.
- (13) Write weekly metacognitive analyses of your learning and MOOC experience** (posted to your blog, in a reflective essay format).
- (14) Propose a related research project of your choice.** This could tie in to any aspect of your previous work in the study, such as the efficacy, assessment, or metacognitive analysis. Or, you could choose to focus on MOOCs in general, or some aspect of metaliteracy.

Required Readings:

(1) Metaliteracy

Mackey, T. P., and T. E. Jacobson. (2011). Reframing information literacy as a metaliteracy. *College & Research Libraries*, 72(1), 62-78. Retrieved from <http://crl.acrl.org/content/72/1/62.full.pdf+html>

Mackey, T. P. (2011). Transparency as a catalyst for interaction and participation in open learning environments. *First Monday*, 16(10). Retrieved from <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3333/3070>

Thomas, S. et al. (2007). Transliteracy: Crossing divides. *First Monday*, 12(12). Retrieved from <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2060/1908>

(2) Connectivism

Siemens, G. (2004). "Connectivism: A Learning Theory for the Digital Age." Retrieved from <http://www.elearnspace.org/Articles/connectivism.htm>

(3) Metacognition

Kuhn, D. (2000). Metacognitive development. *Current directions in psychological science*, 9(5), 178-181. Retrieved from: <http://www.mx1.educationforthinking.org/sites/default/files/page-image/1-02MetacognitiveDevelopment.pdf>

Schraw, G., & Moshman (1995). Metacognitive theories. *Educational Psychology Review*, 7, 351-371. See Dropbox for article.

Collins, A., Brown, J. S., & Holum, A. (1991). Cognitive apprenticeship: Making thinking visible. *American Educator*, 15, Winter, 6-11, 38-46. Retrieved from: http://elc.fhda.edu/create/resources/collins_brown_holum_1991.pdf

Scardamalia, M.(2002) Collective cognitive responsibility for the advancement of knowledge. In B. Smith (Ed.) *Liberal education in a knowledge society*. Chicago: Open Court. Retrieved from: <http://iikit.org/fulltext/inpressCollectiveCog.pdf>

Serra, M. J., & Metcalfe, J. (2008). Effective implementation of metacognition. In A. Graesser, D. Hacker, & J. Dunlosky (Eds.), *Handbook of Metacognition and Education* Vol. [2]. Retrieved from <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/psychology/metcalfe/PDFs/serra%20metcalfe%20chapter.pdf>

Other readings and online resources will be assigned by MOOC presenters.

MOOC Outline:

Topic 1: Metaliteracy from Theory to Practice Plenary
September 2-15; Live session MOOC Talk 4 September

Topic 2: The Metacognitive Dimension of Metaliteracy
September 16-29; Live session MOOC Talk 18 September (with Char Booth, Tom Mackey and Trudi Jacobson).

Topic 3: A Global Perspective on Metaliteracy
September 30-October 13; Live session MOOC Talk 9 October (with Alton Grizzle and Paul Prinsloo).

Topic 4: Connecting Visual Literacy to Metaliteracy
October 14-27; Live session MOOC Talk TBA (with R. Brian Stone).

Topic 5: Media and News Literacy
October 28-November 3; Live session MOOC Talk 30 October (with John Delano and Rex Smith).

Topic 6: Digital Storytelling and Metaliteracy

November 4-17; Live session MOOC Talk 6 November (with Bryan Alexander and Nicola Allain).

Topic 7: Transliteracy and Technobiophilia

November 18-December 1; Live session MOOC Talk 20 November (with Michele Forte and Sue Thomas).

Topic 8: STEMx and Metaliteracy

December 2-18; Live session MOOC Talk 4 December (with Betty Hurley-Dasgupta and HP Academy Fellows).

Course Technology and Related Activities:

From the MOOC About Page: In the spirit of metaliteracy, a variety of technologies will be employed by all participants to share information and to collaborate during the course. The **MOOC Talks** will be conducted on **Blackboard Collaborate**. Each student will create her or his own blog, which will be harvested by an RSS program, gRSShopper, and appear in the [Metaliteracy MOOC Newsletter](#). The newsletter will be sent to all registered participants. Flickr, YouTube, and Instagram are examples of applications that might be embedded in blog posts, and participants will be encouraged to explore a variety of other web-based applications. Those working on a team project will have flexibility in determining which technologies will advance their work.

Ethical Considerations

This course uses a variety of media tools and applications. Accessing a digital or social media site (or application) presents you with an ethical choice regarding how you choose to use, and share digital assets available to copy, download, and disseminate. Assets include data provided, photographs and other images, documents and written content, and any media or digital artifact created and uploaded by the user. You are expected to respect copyright, attribute original authors, and share information responsibly. In addition, you must use ethical approaches to the repurposing, creation and sharing of content, and follow all rules of academic integrity: <http://www.esc.edu/academic-integrity/>.

When using digital media tools and applications, be aware of the ethical, privacy, and security practices of service providers. Be prepared to investigate whether the company providing a digital tool or service is ethical in the handling of user data and information, asking questions such as: “will the provider collect the student data and track user activity? Will this be with or without user consent? Will they sell this data to 3rd party businesses? How will they protect and store the information and assets? Does all content created by the user remain the intellectual property of the user, or is a company claiming all rights to all materials created with their tools? Is the provider downloading hidden applications to a user’s computer to harvest information or use for advertising? Does the application leave security gaps that might provide an entry point to an intruder?” This information is generally found in the terms of service and privacy policies. I know they can be quite long, but you really should make a habit of reading those.

C. METHODS AND CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION

Weekly Metacognitive Reflections (Blog)	20%
Social Media Sharing	10%
MOOC Participation	10%
Literature Review	15%
Evaluation of Efficacy	15%
Assessment Analysis	15%
Research Project	15%

Each of the learning activities requires the application of graduate level research, metacognitive reflection, writing, analysis, and evaluation. Specifically, the student is expected to apply the knowledge acquired to demonstrate a graduate level metacognitive analysis of the Metaliteracy MOOC while conducting an evaluation of the efficacy of the learning modality, analysis of approaches to assessment, and apply this to the research project of his or her choice. In evaluating these, the instructor looks for evidence - in reflective blog posts, social media sharing, MOOC participation, assessment activity, evaluation framework, and final project work - that the student is applying the course theories, ideas and knowledge acquisition to the learning activities. The student must apply a progressive gathering of readings, research, reflection, and MOOC resources to support the metacognitive framework of this study. The successful research project will fit the scope of this study, and incorporate theory, research, applications and analysis at the graduate level.

Metacognitive Reflections Evaluation Rubric

Criteria	Superior (22.5-25 points)	Sufficient (19-22 points)	Minimal (18 points)	Unacceptable (0-17 points)
Depth of Reflection (25% of Total Points) ___/25	Response demonstrates an in-depth reflection on, and personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are insightful and well supported. Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable.	Response demonstrates a general reflection on, and personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are supported. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable.	Response demonstrates a minimal reflection on, and personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are unsupported or supported with flawed arguments. Examples, when applicable, are not provided or are irrelevant to the assignment.	Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented in the course materials to date. Viewpoints and interpretations are missing, inappropriate, and/or unsupported. Examples, when applicable, are not provided.
Criteria	Superior (22.5-25)	Sufficient (19-22)	Minimal (18 points)	Unacceptable (0-

	points)	points)		17 points)
Required Components (25% of Total Points) ____/25	Response includes all components and meets or exceeds all requirements indicated in the instructions. Each question or part of the assignment is addressed thoroughly. All attachments and/or additional documents are included, as required.	Response includes all components and meets all requirements indicated in the instructions. Each question or part of the assignment is addressed. All attachments and/or additional documents are included, as required.	Response is missing some components and/or does not fully meet the requirements indicated in the instructions. Some questions or parts of the assignment are not addressed. Some attachments and additional documents, if required, are missing or unsuitable for the purpose of the assignment.	Response excludes essential components and/or does not address the requirements indicated in the instructions. Many parts of the assignment are addressed minimally, inadequately, and/or not at all.
Criteria	Superior (22.5-25 points)	Sufficient (19-22 points)	Minimal (18 points)	Unacceptable (0-17 points)
Structure (25% of Total Points) ____/25	Writing is clear, concise, and well organized with excellent sentence and paragraph construction. Thoughts are expressed in a coherent and logical manner. There are no more than three spelling, grammar, or syntax errors per page of writing.	Writing is mostly clear, concise, and well organized with good sentence and paragraph construction. Thoughts are expressed in a coherent and logical manner. There are no more than five spelling, grammar, or syntax errors per page of writing.	Writing is unclear and/or disorganized. Thoughts are not expressed in a logical manner. There are more than five spelling, grammar, or syntax errors per page of writing.	Writing is unclear and disorganized. Thoughts ramble and make little sense. There are numerous spelling, grammar, or syntax errors throughout the response.
Criteria	Superior (22.5-25 points)	Sufficient (19-22 points)	Minimal (18 points)	Unacceptable (0-17 points)
Evidence and Practice (25% of Total Points) ____/25	Response shows strong evidence of synthesis of ideas presented and insights gained throughout the entire course. The implications of these insights for the respondent's overall analysis, evaluation and research are thoroughly detailed, as applicable.	Response shows evidence of synthesis of ideas presented and insights gained throughout the entire course. The implications of these insights for the respondent's overall analysis, evaluation and research are presented, as applicable.	Response shows little evidence of synthesis of ideas presented and insights gained throughout the entire course. Few implications of these insights for the respondent's overall analysis, evaluation and research are presented, as applicable.	Response shows no evidence of synthesis of ideas presented and insights gained throughout the entire course. No implications for the respondent's overall analysis, evaluation and research are presented, as applicable.

Metacognitive Reflective Evaluation Rubric originally by Dr. June Talvitie-Siple, modified by Nicola Marae Allain, PhD. Used with Permission.

Grading Policy:

I allow revisions. You may revise your work as many times as you wish until the final week of classes. If you're willing to revise – I'm willing to review and re-evaluate. The highest grade will be the one that stands. I'm also happy to review drafts of your work and provide feedback for improvement. Drafts must come in fairly early for me to review and provide substantive feedback.

Course Grading Scale:

A+ 97

A 94

A- 90

B+ 87

B 84

B- 80

C+ 77

C 74

NC 73 and below

Communications and Formative Feedback

I will respond promptly to communications – usually within 24h or less. If you haven't heard from me within 48 hours, please prompt me again to ensure that I got the message. If I am away for any reason, I'll be sure to let you know. You may set appointments with me to meet in a virtual world, by video communication, or by phone on an as needed basis. I will be happy to review and advise on your work at any stage.

I think you'll find me to be flexible, friendly and supportive of your endeavors. You'll also find that I will encourage you to excel. I have rigorous expectations. I want you to succeed. If you turn in work that needs refinement, I will return it to you with the opportunity to revise before I grade it.

As a general rule, I will evaluate and provide feedback on work submitted with 7 days of submission, usually sooner. I tend to be quite prompt in reviewing and advising on proposals. I am a stickler for guidelines, and evaluate objectively following the criteria laid out in the assessment section of the course.

You will receive ongoing feedback from me in the manner that seems most appropriate for the activity (i.e., in virtual worlds consultations, in response to written documents, as part of project thread, and so on). I also aggregate the feedback and post it for you in your Dropbox folder assessment file area as per the course schedule and formative assessment plan.



MOOC Metacognitive Analysis – Learning Contract by Nicola Marae Allain, PhD is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/).