

Transcript

- 1. Benchmarking your capacity for technology enhanced learning: Helping you take the reins Associate Professor Michael Sankey Director, Learning Environments and Media University of Southern Queensland Member ACODE Executive Presented at the University of South Africa, Thursday 18 September 2014
- [2.](https://www.flickr.com/photos/internetarchivebookimages/14782530034/) Taking the reins v To assume charge or control.
- [3.](http://www.acode.edu.au) Introduction v To understand where we need to go with technology enhanced learning (TEL) we also need to understand where we currently stand. v One approach that has helped many institutions do just this is the regular use of benchmarking. v More particularly using the Australasian Council on Online, Distance and E-Learning (ACODE) Benchmarks. v This tool allows institutions to: v Self-assess their capacity in TEL v Share this with other like-minded institutions v Incorporate this into their ongoing QA/QI processes www.acode.edu.au
- [4.](http://www.acode.edu.au) ACODE v www.acode.edu.au
- [5.](http://www.acode.edu.au) What is ACODE v ACODE's mission is to enhance policy and practice in open, distance and e-learning in Australasian higher education by: v disseminating and sharing knowledge and expertise; v supporting professional development and providing networking opportunities; v investigating, developing and evaluating new approaches; v advising and influencing key bodies in higher education; and v promoting best practice..
- [6.](http://www.acode.edu.au) The original ACODE Benchmarks v First developed in 2004 v Revised in 2007 v Well used by many institutions since
- [7.](http://www.acode.edu.au) Original benchmarks 1. Institution policy and governance for technology supported learning and teaching 2. Planning for, and quality improvement of the integration of technologies for learning and teaching 3. Information technology infrastructure to support learning and teaching 4. Pedagogical application of information and communication technology 5. Professional/staff development for the effective use of technologies for learning and teaching 6. Staff support for the use of technologies for learning and teaching 7. Student training for the effective use of technologies for learning 8. Student support for the use of technologies for learning
- [8.](http://www.acode.edu.au) USQs use of benchmarking v 2007 trialled the revised version v 2009 with Deakin University and CQU v 2011 with RUN Universities +
- [9.](http://www.acode.edu.au) USQ CSU UNE CQU SIEU Malaysia Massey NZ Benchmark 1 x x x x Benchmark 2 x x x x Benchmark 3 x x Benchmark 4 x x x x Benchmark 5 x x x x Benchmark 6 x x x Benchmark 7 x x x Benchmark 8 x x x x
- [10.](http://www.acode.edu.au) ACODE decision to update v In mid-2013 it was determined that the benchmarks needed reviewing www.acode.edu.au
- [11.](http://www.acode.edu.au) Timeline of events
- [12.](http://www.acode.edu.au) v Reframed them away from e-Learning to TEL. v The boundaries around e-Learning have become quite blurred (if they weren't before). v Previously mostly used the main DE institutions. v F2F institutions, entering late into the use of the LMS, have now seen the business drivers behind providing many of their offerings more flexibly. v Many of the hallmarks of the first major wave of online learning have shifted, e.g. the advent of MOOCs, open source software's, open educational resources, App-based online interaction, the rise in cloud-based hosting of major institutional system. v We have complex mash-ups of internally/externally hosted environments, to meet the demand.

- [13.](#) In the greater scheme of things
- [14.](#) Other tools to line up your ducks v E-Learning Maturity Model (eMM) v NZ eLearning Guidelines v Quality Matters (QM) v Standards for Online Education v Quality Management of Online Learning Environments (OLE) v European ‘Excellence’ Benchmarking tool (based on the original ACODE benchmarks) v The Pick and Mix Model v CADAD Benchmarks v VET E-standards v Others?
- [15.](#) Other tools to line up your ducks v The Pick and Mix Model v E-Learning Maturity Model (eMM) v CADAD Benchmarks v Others?
- [16.](#) Pick and Mix v Consists of 18 criteria. Each criterion is scored on a scale of 1–5 with 1 = nil or base-level activity & 5 = maximum activity – extendable to 6 = “excellence”, “transcendence”, or “second wave” situations. The Pick & Mix table (simplified)

Factor	1	3	5
Instrument 01	Adoption phase	only Early majority taking it up	All taken it up except some laggards
Interviews, surveys, documentation in IT reports, etc.			
Instrument 02	VLE stage	No VLE	VLEs reducing in number to around two
“One VLE”	Observation, purchase orders		
Instrument 03	Tools use	No use of tools beyond email, Web and the VLE minimum set	Widespread use of at least one specific tool, e.g. assignment handling, CAA HEI-wide use of several tools
Interviews, cross-checking with JISC and CETIS, etc.			
- [17.](#) eMM process categories
- [18.](#) CADAD Benchmarks v More for ADU’s but elements and methodology consistent with the ADODE BMs v Great extension activity
- [19.](#) New Benchmarks v Shifted the focus away from ‘eLearning’ to ‘Technology Enhanced Learning’ (TEL) v New Self-Assessment template v New guidelines for the use of these instruments www.acode.edu.au
- [20.](#) The 8 Benchmarks for TEL
 1. Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning;
 2. Planning for institution-wide quality improvement of technology enhanced learning;
 3. Information technology systems, services and support for technology enhanced learning;
 4. The application of technology enhanced learning services;
 5. Staff professional development for the effective use of technology enhanced learning;
 6. Staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning;
 7. Student training for the effective use of technology enhanced learning;
 8. Student support for the use of technology enhanced learning.
- [21.](#) Some fundamental changes v The introduction of a much stronger alignment with L&T standards and assuming there is in existence a way to measure the quality of an individual course/unit/subject. v A greater emphasis on emerging technologies and innovation, particularly in planning and budgeting. v A new measure around open education practices and the sustainable use of resources, v A measure on how institutions are assuring a level of quality in their externally hosted services.
- [22.](#) Extension v We also developed a methodology to:
 1. Provide institutions with a platform to self-access their standing against some/all of the 8 benchmarks, and to stimulate meaningful conversations, at a local level, around how they are using technology to support their L&T.
 2. Provide institutions with an opportunity to share & learn from each other, based on their individual institutions responses (via an inter-institutional event).
- [23.](#) This resulted in
- [24.](#) Institution BM 1 BM 2 BM 3 BM 4 BM 5 BM 6 BM 7 BM 8

Institution	BM 1	BM 2	BM 3	BM 4	BM 5	BM 6	BM 7	BM 8
Asia Pacific International College	X	X						
Auckland University	X							
Auckland University of Technology	X	X						
Australian Catholic University	X	X	X					
Christchurch Polytechnic	X	X						
Curtin University	X	X						
Federation University	X	X	X	X				
Flinders University	X	X						

Lincoln University X X Macquarie University X X Open University, UK X X X X
 Queensland University of Technology X X University of Canberra X X University of
 Otago X X X X X University of New England X X X X University of Southern
 Queensland X X X X University of South Africa X X X University of the South
 Pacific X X University of Technology Sydney X X University of Western Australia X
 X University of Western Sydney X X X University of Wollongong X X X X Victoria
 University (Melbourne) X X Victoria University Wellington X X X X X X X X Total
 11 8 8 10 12 9 5 6

- [25.](#) But to get to this point... v We first had to do a self assessment v Pull people together from different sections v Agree on where we stood v Provide a rationale and evidence as to why
- [26.](#) Benchmark 1 Institution - wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning v Performance indicator 1. Institution strategic and operational plans support and promote the use of technology enhanced learning. 2. Specific plans relating to the use of technology enhanced learning are aligned with the institution's strategic directions and operational plans. 3. Planning for the ongoing use of technology enhanced learning is aligned with the institution's budget process. 4. Institution policies, procedures and guidelines provide a framework for how technology enhanced learning should be used at both a course and program level. 5. Policies, procedures and guidelines on the use of technology enhanced learning are well communicated and integrated into processes and systems. 6. The institution has established mechanisms for the governance of technology enhanced learning that include representation from key stakeholders. 7. Authority and responsibility for the operational management of the technologies used to enhance learning and teaching are clearly articulated. 8. The institution uses a clearly articulated policy framework and governance structure then deciding on the adoption of new technologies.
- [27.](#) Consolidation
- [28.](#) Submit this to the event
- [29.](#) Then we have the conversation
- [30.](#) The beauty of the beast v The beauty of benchmarking is not around which tool or set of standards you are using, it's more about the dialogue that emerges and the sharing of practice that is the real winner for all concerned. v It opens the door for further collaboration. v It serves as a mechanism to facilitate discussion at senior leadership level.
- [31.](#) Some basic stats 35 30 25 20 15 10 5 0 The benchmarks prompted me to consider strategic changes that we could reasonably implement in the near future I was able to make the right kind of judgements in relation to my institutions capacity in TEL I found what the other institutions had to share particularly informative I learned a number of strategies from other institutions that I would like to see implemented at my institution Strongly disagree Disagree Neither agree, or disagree Agree Strongly agree N = 33
- [32.](#) A couple of comments v "Great opportunity to meet and share where everyone is at. The benchmarking exercise is a great self reflective practice that is reinforced through the feedback and deliberation from other institutions" v "I really enjoyed this Benchmarking Summit, I have learned a lot from the inter-institutional activity and will definitely be sharing and pushing for these benchmarks to be accepted at our institution. Thank you for facilitating this and look forward to the institution following up with the benchmarks in the future."

- [33.](#) What does this mean for DE v Dealing with this specific demographic requires institutions to ensure their processes and systems are regularly reviewed, to remain agile and act responsibly toward this unique client base, that is somewhat different to metropolitan institutions. v E.G. There are a number of common issues faced by institutions with a strong DE focus. v Students who rarely, or never, come on campus require more holistic support mechanisms and follow-up v Student training (online) and induction is more important v Staff need to be trained to deal with distance students (specifically) v Staff support needs a broader focus
- [34.](#) Conclusion v Many of the issues we face can be remediated by simply taking the time to self-assess against the performance indicators. v We then extend that by sharing our current practice with those in similar circumstances. v This build relationships and stronger ties (not competing), providing our institutions with the wherewithal to meet the unique challenges of building a strong digital future. v The ACODE Benchmarks provide a catalyst to help make this happen v We are not alone www.acode.edu.au