



Final Report TLTP3/89 EFFECTS

Contents

Section 1 Project Information and Goals	2
1.1 Project description and goals	2
Section 2 Deliverables and Outcomes	3
2.1 Deliverables	3
2.2 Products available beyond the life of the project	8
Section 3 Dissemination	10
Section 4 Evaluation	13
4.1 Quality of products and deliverables	13
4.2 Take-up and use of products and deliverables	13
4.3 Effectiveness and impact of take-up and use:	13
4.4 Main achievements	15
4.5 Lessons learned	16
4.6 External evaluation	16
Section 5 Continuation Strategy and Associated Activities	17
Section 6 Final Financial Report	18
Section 7 Declaration	19
Appendix 1: Programmes and Participants	20
Appendix 2: Project Dissemination Activities	30
Appendix 3: Project Reports and Papers	33

Section 1 Project Information and Goals

Project Director

Hazel Fullerton
Educational Development
Money Centre,
University of Plymouth,
Drake Circus,
Plymouth,
PL4 8AA

Tel: 01752 232331

Fax: 01752 232348

Email: H.Fullerton@plymouth.ac.uk

Project Manager

Paul Bailey
Learning Technology Support Service
Institute for Learning and Research Technology
University of Bristol
8-10 Berkeley Square
Bristol
BS8 1HH

Tel: +44 (0)117 928 7152

Fax: +44 (0)117 928 7112

Email: Paul.Bailey@bristol.ac.uk

1.1 Project description and goals

Much of the early effort to integrate C&IT into teaching had been motivated by competitive funding programmes. These provided a vital stimulus, but there was a need for more structured or targeted programmes of professional development to ensure effective integration of C&IT into higher curricula, and the development of relevant transferable skills on the part of learning and teaching professionals. While some elements of such programmes were already in place at individual universities – including the consortium members – it was felt that a coordinated national framework would add considerable value, both in terms of shared expertise on the part of programme developers, and in terms of wider recognition for the individuals taking part. Members of the EFFECTS consortium therefore undertook a three-year process of programme development and piloting at their own institutions. In the first phase, a national framework for programme development and award recognition was put in place, based on the combined experience of those five institutions. In the second phase, this framework was cascaded to other partner institutions through national workshops and institutional mentorship. In the third phase, the project co-ordinated the sharing of knowledge, experience and resources in embedding learning technologies across the HE sector, working through the partner institutions, key professional bodies, and the accreditation of a nationally recognised award. Throughout its lifetime the project has sought to work proactively with other initiatives towards the professional development of staff embedding C&IT into learning and teaching.

The project therefore set out with the **goals** to:

- Establish a generic framework which institutions could adapt to support the embedding of C&IT into the teaching of a wide range of disciplines
- Develop local support frameworks that would be sustainable after the end of the project, and support institutional change
- Support staff through these programmes to embed C&IT into at least 70 teaching courses
- Evaluate the effectiveness of each EFFECTS institutional model
- Develop a nationally accredited scheme of professional development for staff embedding C&IT
- Cascade the EFFECTS framework to at least 5 partner institutions
- Establish a Professional Development Network to disseminate the project outcomes

Section 2 Deliverables and Outcomes

2.1 Deliverables

2.1.1 Comparison of original goals with actual deliverables

Original project goals	Actual deliverables and outcomes	Variations from original and reasons for change
Establish a generic framework which institutions could adapt to support the embedding of C&IT into the teaching of a wide range of disciplines	EFFECTS Generic Learning Outcomes EFFECTS Guidelines for Institutions SEDA ELT Award	
Develop local support frameworks which were sustainable after the end of the project and support institutional change	Five institutional programmes with institutional support guaranteed beyond 2001 (see Evaluation Report section 4.1.5; 4.2.2; 4.2.3) Evidence of a wide range of related institutional developments (see Evaluation Report section 4.3.4)	Extension of initial concern with institutional change through involvement in the TLTP3 evaluation workshop on institutional change, and lead site management of a national audit of learning technology use in HEIs (separately funded by the JISC).
Support staff through these programmes to embed C&IT into at least 70 teaching courses	C&IT successfully embedded into 72 modules at the original five institutions across a wide range of disciplines and teaching practices (see Appendix 1: programmes and participants), and into a number of additional modules at partner institutions	Not every instance of embedding has led to the production of a case study due to a number of factors (see Annual Report Year 2)
Evaluate the effectiveness of each EFFECTS institutional model	Five institutional case studies External Evaluation Report by Jen Harvey and Martin Oliver Ongoing quarterly and annual reports with 'lessons learned' analysed on a yearly basis and used to inform future project plans and activities (see Annual Reports yrs 1 and 2) A number of relevant publications (see Appendix 3: Project reports and papers)	
Develop a nationally accredited scheme of professional development for staff embedding C&IT	Embedding Learning Technologies Award based on EFFECTS Learning Outcomes now fully recognised within new SEDA professional development	

	<p>accreditation framework</p> <p>EFFECTS input to ILT CPD consultation wrt appropriate embedding and use of learning technologies</p> <p>EFFECTS input to ALT consultation on professional accreditation scheme for learning technologists</p> <p>EFFECTS input to THETO consultation on benchmarking ICT skills for HE professionals.</p>	
<p>Cascade the EFEFCTS framework to at least five partner institutions</p>	<p>Four programmes based on the EFFECTS Learning Outcomes currently running at partner institutions (see 2.1.3 below and Evaluation Report section 4.4)</p> <p>12+ institutions currently developing or programmes in consultation with EFFECTS team members on the development/mapping of programmes</p> <p>120+ institutional contacts from 80 institutions have attended an EFFECTS national workshop or expressed interest in the work of the project</p>	<p>Extension of original 'cascade' concept to include a broader range of partners and wider concept of collaboration.</p>
<p>Establish a Professional Development Network to disseminate the project outcomes</p>	<p>Collaborative workshops and ongoing links with existing development networks including NetCulture, M1/M69 network, Manchester Universities, South Coast consortium.</p> <p>Integration of EFFECTS project work with activities of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEDA (professional development accreditation framework) • ALT (professional accreditation consultation) • JISC (JCALT scoping study on learning technology use in UK HE) <p>Meetings and ongoing contact with ILT, THETO</p> <p>Leadership of collaborative activities among TLTP3 generic projects, including the case studies database, sharing of evaluation data, and research workshop at Warwick (June 2001).</p>	<p><i>'although no formal network was created, an extensive and valuable informal network has been established'</i> (Evaluation Report section 5.5.1 – see also section 5.5.3)</p>

	Joint continuation bid with SoURCE Contribution to development of RESULTS learning technologies network	
--	--	--

2.1.2 Major Project Activities: Programme Development and Supporting Participants

A major part of the institutional commitment to the project has been the development of programmes and support for individual participants. One of the goals of the project was for each programme to achieve institutional recognition and validation, including ongoing support and funding. Institutional programmes have been continually evaluated and have undergone several iterations to meet the changing needs of individual participants and institutional agendas. In three institutions, two separate programmes have been developed (one with and one without accreditation). At Southampton and Brookes, institutionally accredited programmes proved unpopular with staff and were replaced by individually supportive programmes with less emphasis on academic outputs and more on practical skills and curriculum development.

Institution	Title and brief description of programme	Accredited	Participants
UMIST	<i>Teaching and Learning Technologies</i> WebCT course accompanied by workshops and targeted support, following the EFFECTS learning outcomes	Y	19
UNL	<i>Learning Technology Support Programme</i> CPD course offered to all staff under new Technology Tower initiative	N	15 participants doing projects (154 participants in total)
	<i>Applying Learning Technologies</i> One of four modules within the PGCert Learning and Teaching in HE	Y – 20 credits M level (PGCert = 60)	12 (plus APEL from LTS)
Oxford Brookes	<i>Embedding C&IT into learning, teaching and assessment</i> Optional module within PGDip Learning and Teaching in HE	Y – 20 credits M level (PGDip = 120)	6 (0 completed)
	<i>Media Workshop course</i> Professional development workshops in WebCT and Dreamweaver to help staff develop e-learning materials	N	14+
Plymouth	<i>Embedding Learning Technologies</i> Free-standing CPD module within the Integrated Masters Programme in Education	Y – 30 credits M level (PGDip = 120)	27
Southampton	<i>Certificate in Advanced Educational Studies</i> EFFECTS learning outcomes integrated into Module 1; one of three options in Module 2	Y – 12 credits M level per PGCert module	6
	<i>Active Learning and Teaching Online</i> EFFECTS learning outcomes offered as a series of professional development workshops and individual support	N	19

Appendix 1 lists a total of 119 participants from the five consortium institutions, who have embedded C&IT into a total of 72 teaching modules or other learning and teaching activities. So far, 47 case studies or similar have been produced, 31 available online at <http://www.clt.soton.ac.uk/effects/casestudies/>. More are in progress as participants continue to complete programmes, though some have been produced in formats not suitable for the web site such as articles for journal publication or paper-based portfolios. The number of completed portfolios which have been assessed and passed is currently just 10, although at least another 9 are approaching completion. A sample of portfolios can be viewed online as follows:

Neil Witt (Plymouth ELT module) <http://hydrography.ims.plym.ac.uk/effects/>

Lisa Bonetti (UNL LTS programme) <http://homepages.unl.ac.uk/~bonetti/effects/>

Stephen Bostock (UMIST LWT programme)

http://www.keele.ac.uk/depts/cs/Stephen_Bostock/docs/projectforUMIST.htm

Developing, accrediting and securing resources for programmes has in every case meant negotiating changes to institutional infrastructure and culture, especially catalysing new collaborations among disparate groups of support staff (see Evaluation Report 4.1.5). At four of the five original EFFECTS institutions, new learning technology units were established during the lifetime of the project with project staff having a direct impact on the process (see Evaluation Report Table 3).

2.1.3 Major Project Activities: Working with Partner Institutions

Since the original project bid the concept of 'cascading' the EFFECTS framework has been refined to include a range of different ways of working with partner and potential partner institutions, in recognition of the valuable work being done outside of the EFFECTS project and the need to learn from as well as disseminate to others. The main emphasis has been on national, regional and occasionally institutional workshops to reach a wide audience and address a range of different identified needs. Consultancy has also been offered to development teams within institutions as they work towards their own EFFECTS or ELT recognised programmes. The development of the SEDA ELT Award will form the basis of the transferability of EFFECTS. A number of institutions (14) have already expressed an interest in gaining recognition under this award and Coventry is planning to map elements of its PG Cert programme onto the ELT framework. The project continues to work with ALT on a national scheme for learning technology staff.

Specific partnerships which have been developed by consortium members include the following:

Institution	Title and brief description of programme	Accredited	Participants
Oxford	Optional diploma module	Y	0 (4 expressed interest but dropped out)
Leeds Metropolitan	Advanced Professional Diploma in Educational Development (Information and Communications Technology)	Y – 24 credits M level	44
Keele	Teaching and Learning with Technology	Y - 30 credits M-Level	11
Coventry	Pathway in PG Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education	Y	

The Oxford course was supported by Brookes, but interest was limited to awareness raising on the use of learning technologies and no interested in accreditation could be sustained.

Leeds Metropolitan have been running their programme successfully for over 2 years, based on very early and enthusiastic contact with the project, a consultancy visit and commentary on their developing course materials and documentation. They found the Plymouth ELT web site 'invaluable' in the development of their own programme.

UMIST have developed successful partnerships by allowing members of other institutional development teams to attend their programme. The accredited course at Keele arose from this approach. Participants from Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan, Salford and UNN are currently being 'developed' in this way by the project team.

The Plymouth project team has worked with the Scottish NetCulture project towards a coordinated approach to professional development in learning technologies, with an EFFECTS-type framework and shared resources across all 18 Scottish HEIs. The lead site has also made consultancy visits and established ongoing contacts with Bangor, Bristol, Coventry (see table above), Derby, De Montford, Glasgow, Loughborough, Reading, UCL and UEL.

UNL are currently working with East Anglia and East London who are interested in their ALT Programme.

Southampton have been working with a South Coast Consortium (including Bournemouth and the Southampton Institute) towards the development of a suite of programmes similar to ALTO. Warwick have also developed a partner programme through association with Southampton.

2.1.4 Major Project Activities: Raising Awareness

The project team have led 44 workshops or presentations relating to the project over the past two years, made up of 13 EFFECTS national or regional workshops, 26 workshops or presentations at national conferences and five presentations to institutional conferences (all in the final year of the project). A further 15 conference presentations have been made by EFFECTS programme participants which, while they may not have focused on the EFFECTS project specifically, have referred to or acknowledged the project as a source of support. All of these workshops and presentations are listed in Appendix 2. In total, at least 28 participants have presented at national conferences or workshops during the last two years of the project and 8 have been successful in publishing their project outcomes.

While the project has not recorded attendance figures at all of these events, the national workshops attracted between 12 and 33 participants and led to the building of a contacts database of over 120 names. Project workshops were highly interactive with a focus on enabling participants to take away and implement aspects of the EFFECTS framework in their own institutions, rather than simply raising awareness of the project's work. All workshops have been evaluated using customised evaluation forms and have received consistently positive feedback, with particular comment on the 'enthusiasm' and 'commitment' of the facilitators.

Appendix 3 provides details of 40 reports and papers produced by the project team, including papers by participants from the institutional programmes where these were relevant to the work of the project.

2.1.5 Major Project Activities: Building a Professional Development Network

The PDN was originally envisaged as supporting the sharing of practical experience among programme leaders/developers and among programme participants. The programme leaders' network has developed through meetings of the project working group, the EFFECTS mailing list, workshops and seminars, and through collaboration with other national networks such as NetCulture, ALT, the LT Officers' Forum and RESULTS. Collaboration with other generic TLTP3 projects has provided an important additional forum for developing a shared understanding of learning technology work and its embedding into institutional culture. This network will be continued through the Programme Recognition Committee for the SEDA ELT Award and (hopefully) through the network activities to be supported under EFFECTS/SoURCE transferability funding. No formal network for programme participants has been achieved, for reasons explored in the Annual Report for Year 2. However, the project has established working links with the GLTC, ILT and a number of LTSN Centres with a view to promoting EFFECTS outcomes and frameworks to a wider body of academic staff. It is hoped that the transferability phase will provide further opportunities to formalise this work.

2.2 Products available beyond the life of the project

The EFFECTS project has focused on developing staff within institutions, promoting organisational change, building networks of learning technology theorists and practitioners, and intervening in debates around learning technology use at a national level. The 'products' of these activities are not necessarily tangible but take the form of changes at the level of personal understanding, professional skills, organisational culture and infrastructure, and new collaborations. It is hoped that the changes documented in other areas of this report will last well beyond the lifetime of the project. However, the following products have proved useful in the course of project activities and will remain publicly available.

- EFFECTS Web site containing links to project papers, reports, institutional courses and (with transferability funding) a structured body of programme materials to support the Learning Outcomes: <http://sh.plym.ac.uk/eds/effects/>
- Reports and papers produced during the lifetime of the project (see Appendix 3) including: EFFECTS learning outcomes; EFFECTS guidelines for institutions; Annual Reports (years 1 and 2); Final Report; Evaluation Report.
- The SEDA Professional Development Accreditation Framework award in Embedding Learning Technologies (details available from the Chair of the ELT Programme Recognition Committee). The following documents are available on the EFFECTS web site:
 - Guidelines for recognition
 - Registration forms
 - Mapping document
 - Publicity flyer

- Database of case studies from EFFECTS Participants: <http://www.clt.soton.ac.uk/effects/casestudies/>. With continuation funding this resource will be fully described using IMS compatible metadata and will become available alongside other TLTP3 case studies via the SoURCE/RESL database.
- Staff Development Resources to support ELT programme developers and participants:
 - Plymouth Embedding Learning Technologies site: <http://sh.plym.ac.uk/eds/elt/>
 - Soton EFFECTS site: <http://clt.soton.ac.uk/effects/>
 - UNL Applying Learning Technologies site: <http://www.unl.ac.uk/tltc/effects/>
 - RESULTS DNER portal for learning technologists: <http://www.results.ac.uk/>

With continuation funding these resources will be fully collated and available via a single portal.

- Institutional audit tools and guidelines for institutional auditors, along with the final report and eight briefing papers from the JCALT funded Scoping Study of Learning Technology Staff in UK HE: <http://sh.plym.ac.uk/eds/effects/jcalt-project/>.
- Database of EFFECTS institutional contacts and two jiscmail lists for use by programme developers and programme participants.

Section 3 Dissemination

Please provide a brief account and critique of the dissemination strategy including successes and lessons learned.

Original dissemination strategy goals	Achieved through	Critique, successes and lessons learned
<p>Gather feedback on Generic Outcomes for accreditation scheme</p> <p>Identify cascade institutions</p>	<p>Presentations at national conferences</p> <p>Workshops and seminars</p> <p>Email lists</p> <p>Institutional presentations and consultancy visits</p>	<p>Large number of conference papers and workshops with focus on interaction and feedback.</p> <p>Interest sustained with regular changes of focus, looking at potential application of EFFECTS by staff in different roles e.g. Embedding Learning Technologies Strategically, and at regional workshops to promote inter-institutional collaboration and investigate regional differences.</p> <p>Expansion of original cascade plan to include much larger number of institutions, to accommodate demand from potential partners.</p> <p>Lessons learned: Allow institutions to define for themselves what they want from the framework. See institutions as 'partners', bringing their own expertise and insights to the project. Maintain a high national profile (see below).</p>
<p>Share experiences of embedding C&IT into 70 modules</p>	<p>Institutional seminars/presentations</p> <p>Case studies</p> <p>Participant presentations at conferences and published papers</p>	<p>Dissemination within institutions achieved by a higher percentage of participants than external publication: experiences often most relevant to a local audience. Most internal seminars/presentations have not been formally recorded or evaluated by the project.</p> <p>Experience often disseminated through change of role on the part of programme participants, e.g. becoming representatives, mentors or teaching fellows with particular responsibility for learning technologies. EFFECTS has contributed to creating a critical mass of staff with enthusiasm for and interest in LTs.</p> <p>Case studies have not proved as effective a means of sharing experience as anticipated, partly because participants difficulties in writing up case studies (e.g. lack of time, expertise, confidence and motivation) and partly because without a critical mass of case studies it has been difficult to develop metadata for describing them effectively and methodologies for enabling their effective use.</p> <p>A decision was taken to publish the case studies on the web and individually in journals as appropriate, rather than funding a separate paper publication. It was believed that the case studies would be far more useful to practitioners in a searchable format, and that authors wishing for scholarly recognition would prefer publication in a peer reviewed journal.</p> <p>Lessons learned: Encourage sharing of experience at very local level, e.g. talking to colleagues, lunchtime seminars, mentoring, as well as at national conferences and through publication. Local practice knowledge is often more immediately usable by others.</p>
<p>Promote the support framework</p>	<p>National workshops/seminars</p>	<p>Promotion has been a major success for the project, with a high national profile established by the second year (see Evaluation Report, introduction). This has resulted in the project team being invited to promote</p>

and accredited schemes	<p>Papers at national conferences</p> <p>Links with SEDA, ALT, NetCulture, RESULTS, other TLTP3 projects (ILT, GLTC to a lesser extent)</p>	<p>EFFECTS directly to staff at institutional conferences and events (Herts, UEL, UWE, Derby) and to advise other bodies working in this area (ALT, THETO, JISC).</p> <p>The project has successfully promoted the framework and the ELT Award through its own collaborative efforts and through the SEDA and ALT networks. However the LTSN, ILT and Generic Centre have not been of great assistance. This could be particularly due to the time taken for the new Institute and the new Subject Centres to become established.</p> <p>Lessons learned: Achieving and maintaining a high profile requires constant input and team members with national credibility (or the ability quickly to acquire it). Vary the message for the audience: it is disastrous to keep giving the same presentation or workshop. Aim for all participants/contacts to leave with a plan of action that involves immediately applying your framework in their own professional context. Then follow up. Explore all possible links and keep working at them: apparently 'cold' contacts can suddenly come good.</p>
Investigate transferability of EFFECTS models and the accreditation scheme	<p>National and regional workshops</p> <p>Inter-institutional consultancy</p> <p>Project reports, guidelines and published papers (including institutional case studies)</p> <p>External evaluation report</p>	<p>The project has from the start had little problem attracting interest from other institutions and the EFFECTS model has been fully transferred into at least four. Assessing the value added to each institution by adoption of EFFECTS model has been an ongoing concern, and the project team has written a number of reports on this issue including separate longitudinal studies for each institution. It has been difficult to undertake rigorous investigation, however, while sustaining the actual development effort, and the main evaluation of transferability is presented in the external Evaluators' Report (see section 4.4). This found '<i>direct evidence for the flexibility and broad applicability of the EFFECTS learning outcomes</i>'</p> <p>Lessons learned: The EFFECTS model and accreditation scheme proved extremely transferable because they were based on learning outcomes and values rather than any specific programme content or development process. Institutions could adapt the framework to suit their own culture, agenda and professional development needs.</p>
Ensure continuation of PDN and EFFECTS support frameworks	<p>Work with NetCulture, Results, the JCALT audit and other TLTP3 projects</p> <p>Institutional accreditation of programmes and securing of developer posts.</p>	<p>Maintaining a national support network has proved to involve sustained effort of the kind which external funders are often reluctant to support, as it may produce few tangible outcomes. EFFECTS has sought to involve existing network projects such as NetCulture and RESULTS, and to secure funding for deliverables such as the JCALT scoping study and TLTP3 case studies database which incidentally involved building or strengthening networks of learning technology developers.</p> <p>Within institutions, considerable work has been done to raise the profile of the EFFECTS project to ensure continued support for the related programmes and posts. The Evaluation Report concludes that '<i>EFFECTS has been able to achieve long term improvements in support structures</i>' at participating institutions. While more learning technology posts have undoubtedly been created, many remain on 'soft' funding, and expertise continues to be lost as individuals seek better paid or more secure positions.</p> <p>Lessons learned: The continuation project will address these issues by developing a loose federation of regional networks with shared frameworks to support learning technology practice, and collaborative development of programmes and materials. Working with SEDA, ALT, the ILT, the JISC and THETO, the aim will also be to enhance the status of learning technology work and therefore help to sustain the frameworks put in place by EFFECTS.</p>

Section 4 Evaluation

4.1 Quality of products and deliverables

Four of the five original institutions have validated programmes at Masters' level, all of which have been through rigorous internal quality assurance procedures at the relevant institutions (including in three cases inclusion in the recent QAA assessment exercise for education). A further three institutions have also validated M-level programmes with input and guidance from members of the project team. One PGDip programme was singled out for praise by the Education subject reviewers for its 'innovative learning technologies module' (source: Education Subject Review Report, University of North London)

In addition to the institutional quality assurance process, each institutional programme has been formatively evaluated at yearly intervals as part of the EFFECTS evaluation procedure, with programme developers learning from one another's experience and making often radical changes as a result (source: Annual Report years 1 and 2). Summative evaluation data has been gathered from 58 individual participants (source: Evaluation Report Table 4), from which the evaluators concluded that '*increased levels of skill and confidence have made academic staff more likely to investigate and refine their teaching practice, including embedding further C&IT applications, in the future*' (source: Evaluation Report 5.1.3). In general, participants on each programme have been very positive about their experiences.

If participant outcomes are treated as separate deliverables then the number of participants achieving national publication or presentation of their work is striking (8 and 28 respectively). Three UNL participants have also given presentations of their work at international conferences.

Programme web sites and online materials developed by the original institutional teams have been found 'extremely valuable' by partner institutions looking to establish programmes of their own. The Plymouth ELT web site was particularly likely to be used or referenced by other development teams (source: Annual Report Year 2). The Southampton web site includes Active*Guide, an online companion to *Integrating Technology in Learning and Teaching*, (Kogan Page, 2000), which was written by two members of the Southampton EFFECTS team. This second edition was revised to include an appendix on the EFFECTS learning outcomes.

The original goal to '*develop a nationally accredited scheme of professional development*' has recently been realised through the SEDA Professional Development Accreditation Framework Award in Embedding Learning Technologies. Six institutions will pilot the recognition process, three from inside the original consortium and three externals. Members of the EFFECTS project sit on the ELT recognition panel and have run workshops for institutional recognisers, while the project played a crucial role in the redevelopment of SEDA's Professional Development in HE award into an entire CPD accreditation framework (see <http://www.seda.demon.co.uk/pdaf.html>). The value of this accreditation framework has yet to be proven.

4.2 Take-up and use of products and deliverables

The EFFECTS learning outcomes and guidelines for institutions have been widely disseminated and proven capable of transfer to at least four other institutions, with at least twelve institutions in the process of adopting them fully. The quality of the EFFECTS framework is attested by comments to the project team and to the external evaluators, who concluded that '*partner institutions weren't just getting a set of validated outcomes, but rather an underpinning philosophy with an accompanying resource base which could be utilised to suit a variety of needs*' (source: Evaluation Report 4.4.3). Further evidence is provided by the number of institutions (15) seeking consultancy and collaboration with the project in its transferability phase (source: EFFECTS/SoURCE Joint Continuation Bid). Project team members are frequently invited to give presentations and workshops to a variety of audiences (see dissemination activities above).

Only one of the nine institutions with EFFECTS programmes (University of Oxford) has reported any difficulty in recruitment. Those which have run for more than one year have shown a year-on-year increase in uptake.

4.3 Effectiveness and impact of take-up and use:

4.3.1 on the subject nationally

As a generic project, we cannot claim to have an impact in any specific subject area. However, participants on EFFECTS programmes come from a very wide range of disciplines in the Arts, Humanities, Social and Physical Sciences, such as Education, Psychology, Sociology, Computer Science, Engineering, Architecture, Sports Science, Chemistry, Marine Science and Geology. Participants have published their

work in subject-specific journals (Nursing, Biology), received grants from their LTSN Subject Centre (Geography, Management) and even gone on to work for one of the subject centres (Geography), suggesting that EFFECTS has supported work at the cutting edge of discipline-specific pedagogy.

4.3.2 on institutions

There is evidence from several institutions of heightened awareness and prioritisation of technology-supported learning developments. This has taken the form of:

- o specific reference to EFFECTS programmes in learning and teaching strategies
- o involvement of EFFECTS team members in writing learning and teaching strategies
- o the leveraging of institutional resources (above project funding) to secure continuation of EFFECTS programmes
- o creation of new learning technology units and posts linked to members of the EFFECTS project team
- o institution-wide learning technology conferences and events
- o involvement of EFFECTS team members in planning and implementing major technology investments
- o promotion, formal recognition or change of role for EFFECTS programme developers and participants
- o scaling up of participants' projects to institution-wide initiatives

(sources: Institutional Case Studies, the Annual Report for Year 2, and the Evaluation Report section 4.3.4).

4.3.3 on departments

Almost all individual projects were chosen as a result of particular pressures or needs within the department: indeed, participants were *required* to demonstrate a local need for their embedding project (EFFECTS Learning Outcome 2) and to disseminate their findings to departmental colleagues (EFFECTS Learning Outcome 6). Anecdotally, many participants are now seen as their departmental 'experts' to whom colleagues turn for advice on incorporating technology in learning and teaching activities or for access to central services and support. The impact on individual departments can only be assessed by examining each case study, but the general fact of impact can be assumed from the process of completing the EFFECTS learning cycle. In a small number of cases Heads of Department have recognised this contribution by negotiating time in lieu for participants to attend EFFECTS programmes (sources: Annual Report for Year 2, Evaluation Report sections 4.1.7, 4.2.4, 4.2.9).

4.3.4 on teachers

Around 100 participants have already undertaken all or part of an EFFECTS programme at one of the original five institutions (see Appendix 1), with cohorts of up to 12 beginning to embark on programmes at partner institutions. Many of these participants are now beginning to write for publication and/or present their projects at conferences, as reported above, with consequent benefits for their role and status as educators. Some report formal changes in their role, and even changes of career, as a result of their EFFECTS participation (source: Evaluation Report section). Participants who have embedded learning technologies (79) can be assumed to have completed EFFECTS Learning Outcomes 1 to 4 (Review, Analyse, Plan/Design and Implement), while participants who have produced case studies or portfolios can be assumed to have completed outcomes 5 and 6 as well (Evaluate, Disseminate). This suggests that a wide range of process skills relating to the appropriate use of learning technologies have been cascaded to staff in participating institutions.

At the final evaluation forum in Dublin, programme tutors reviewed the progress of each participant using a 6-point system of development levels. The system was derived from the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (Fuller, 1969) and adapted for EFFECTS by Pat Maier, University of Southampton 2001. Appendix 1 shows that all participants were considered to have advanced at least one, and in many cases three or four, developmental stages during the course of their contact with EFFECTS (source: EFFECTS evaluation workshop, Dublin, June 2001).

Note that not all participants on EFFECTS programmes are 'teachers': a few are learning technology staff seeking academic and professional recognition for their work. Participants of all kinds have remarked on the

time involved in effective and rigorous curriculum development with new technologies and the fact that this commitment is rarely recognised or rewarded in real (i.e. career enhancement) terms. This was a major barrier to completion of the programmes by participants (source: Evaluation Report section 4.2.10) and a significant obstacle to achieving the project's aims at national level (source: Annual Reports for years 1 and 2).

4.3.5 on student learning

Project team members have rarely had direct contact with students. Participants on programmes were expected to analyse student learning needs and were supported to evaluate their students' learning experiences with new technologies. The second of these has proved to be a particularly difficult learning outcome for staff (see Evaluation Report section 4.2.9). However, participants who have had longer to develop their projects are now paying more attention to student feedback and evaluation issues, and student learning impact is addressed in a majority of case studies (source: Case Studies).

Because the EFFECTS Learning Outcomes, Professional Values and admissible evidence all emphasise student learning, participants can be assumed to acquire an enhanced concern for student learning outcomes in their curriculum development work. A large number of participants (33) can be seen to have moved from development levels 1 or 2 (What is it? Will it work for me? How does it work?) to development levels 3, 4 or 5 (How do I use it with my students? How can I improve what I am doing? What is the impact of this on student learning?) (source: EFFECTS final evaluation forum: see Appendix 1). The Evaluation Report found that, in a survey of participants, *'staff perceived that the introduction of C&IT was changing the nature of the learning experience for their students'*.

4.4 Main achievements

The main achievements of the project, according to the Evaluation Report, are as follows (all quotations are from section 5).

- A large number of staff across the consortium institutions were helped to embed learning technologies appropriately into their professional learning and teaching practice (*'there appeared to be a high achievement of the earlier outcomes relating to reviewing, selecting and planning strategies for integrating appropriate C&IT'*). There was evidence that *'if not for the EFFECTS programme, the majority of projects would not have gone ahead'*.
- A smaller minority within this group engaged at a deeper level with the scholarship of learning and teaching, *'apply[ing] theory to their academic practice'* and evaluating the impact of their interventions on students' ability to learn effectively with technologies.
- Expertise in embedding learning technologies - in the form of the EFFECTS learning outcomes and development framework - was cascaded to departments in the original consortium institutions and to a large number of other institutions across UK HE. As a direct result, *'some participants reported changes in their departmental roles': 'The general increase in relevant skills, experience and confidence, not to mention the creation of a recognised qualification now held by growing numbers of staff, have all helped to create a shift in institutional cultures'*.
- Nine programmes have been developed, and in seven cases institutionally accredited, to provide ongoing support to staff: *'Through establishing accredited institutional programmes, EFFECTS has provided academics with the opportunity and the incentive to effectively embed C&IT into their teaching and at the same time gain some form of recognition.'*
- Support structures have been put in place at all nine EFFECTS institutions to ensure that staff working with learning technologies receive appropriate help at different points in the development cycle. This has meant new collaborations being built across previously disparate providers: *'Having created such support structures, it should prove easier for staff to carry out related work in the future. Thus EFFECTS has been able to achieve long term improvements in support structures, as well as having demonstrated its short-term effectiveness.'*
- Sharing of good practice has been encouraged both internally and across institutions: *'having this process included as a learning outcome meant that staff could be supported and encouraged to write up their work and present papers at appropriate events. This resulted in examples of best practice being made available internally and externally. By supporting a range of projects from across an institution, EFFECTS has worked to ensure that this expertise is not limited by disciplinary boundaries.'*

- New collaborations have also been made possible among academic and support staff involved in the process of embedding, and new change agents have been developed: *'The nature of the EFFECTS programme meant that groups of institutional staff were collaborating to develop courses or work on projects. Through this process, networks of staff have been set up across institutions that have helped to create new online projects, and that have been trained in a range of ways in which they might use C&IT to support student learning. These people are now able to support others undertaking similar ventures.'*
- *'The profile of C&IT was raised in all participating institutions... As a direct result of EFFECTS, new staff were appointed and in some cases, this appears to have acted as a catalyst for structural changes such as the establishment of a new support centre... In addition, the profiles of the institutions were raised through involvement in EFFECTS'*
- The EFFECTS Learning Outcomes have proved a robust but flexible framework for understanding and supporting the process of embedding learning technologies: *'In addition to providing a structure for staff development and assessment, [the framework] enabled support to be allocated to each step in the embedding process in a far more systematic way than was previously possible. Moreover, such a structure can be viewed as a 'road map', helping practitioners to embed C&IT more effectively and appropriately, with sensitivity to issues such as student learning... The variety [of institutional programmes] provides direct evidence for the flexibility and broad applicability of the EFFECTS learning outcomes.'*
- The project framework has been enthusiastically adopted by other institutions, especially at the four partner institutions but with programmes under development at many others. *'Partner institutions perceived the support provided by the EFFECTS team, along with the associated resources as well as the national recognition of the programme, as an incentive for linking to the project. The strong national links made by the project team has also given the programme credibility.'*
- An ongoing accreditation and recognition framework has been established to support the development of further programmes with the same learning outcomes, values and development philosophy: *'The development of the ELT award through SEDA now gives academic staff national recognition for the effective use of C&IT to support Learning and teaching.'*
- Although most individuals involved in the project have moved on to other institutions or roles, all have remained in close touch with the project, creating a strong sense of a shared EFFECTS philosophy and set of values. The involvement of other stakeholders as partners in project development has extended this sense of the EFFECTS 'family' beyond the boundaries of participating institutions. *'One of the main benefits of being involved in the project was being part of network of people with a common interest in developing ways to encourage staff to effectively embed C&IT into their teaching... The project team also placed a strong emphasis on negotiation and collaboration with relevant external stakeholders in order to further redefine the framework and so, in part, involved them in its design'.*
- This inclusive approach to project development has placed EFFECTS at the centre of an informal network of developers/practitioners with a shared understanding of the issues involved in learning technology adoption and use. *'This openness and willingness to collaborate has helped not only in the overall development of the framework but also in establishing an associated network of interested practitioners who have subsequently been more likely to make use of any materials generated through the project... [the value placed on collaboration and community building] is not only evident within the cross-institutional activities but in the way in which the teams have actively tried to provide support to participants, encouraged them to share project outcomes and learn from other's experiences.'*

4.5 Lessons learned

4.6 External evaluation

A comprehensive external evaluation has been carried out by Dr Jen Harvey of the Dublin Institute of Technology, with assistance from Dr Martin Oliver of UCL. A copy of the report is attached. The final report was only received in the closing days of the project, but the interim report provided by Dr Harvey in February 2001 included recommendations for individual institutional programmes which were well received and where possible have been acted on. Project members saw ongoing involvement of Dr Harvey in the evaluation activities of the project as highly beneficial.

The contract of a second external evaluator, who was employed alongside Dr Harvey to assess the institutional and national impact of the project, was terminated after five months. A separate report has been submitted to the funders with the project team's perspective on this process and the lessons learned: it is not included here for reasons of confidentiality (see 'Notes on the experience of employing an external evaluator

for a TLTP3 project'). The project was fortunate in being able to retain Dr Harvey and employ Dr Oliver at short notice to undertake the remaining aspects of the external evaluation.

Section 5 Continuation Strategy and Associated Activities

The project has achieved most of the items set out in the original exit strategy within the lifetime of its core funding:

- Continuation of the EFFECTS support frameworks has largely been guaranteed by institutions' commitment and policy towards professional development of staff. This is evident from the establishment of new posts and units and from commitments made in institutional learning and teaching strategies.
- EFFECTS professional development programmes will continue to be delivered in each original and partner institution.
- SEDA are committed to support other institutions in developing ELT awards and ALT are committed to developing a nationally recognised scheme for learning technology staff.
- Staff completing the professional development programmes have been encouraged to act as change agents in their departments and institutions, and have undertaken new roles and responsibilities as a result.
- EFFECTS programmes have included professional development for support staff and senior management; the JCALT project enabled the project to undertake development work with learning technology specialist staff from 25 UK HEIs; and EFFECTS has worked closely with the TLTP TALENT (formerly MELT) project to develop shared tools and frameworks for understanding institutional change.

The project has not been able to secure funding to extend and disseminate the framework to FE partners but is negotiating with the JISC CALT and BeCTA. Additional funding from these sources would enable FE colleges to be included in the regional networks proposed for the transferability project.

The project has not been able to secure ongoing funding for a formal Professional Development Network but plans to pursue this goal with transferability funding.

The national framework will continue to be supported by the SEDA ELT Award and the PRC for this award. However additional support will be sought through the transferability proposal to link support into existing regional networks, from the LTSN, Generic Centre, NetCulture (Scotland) to adopt the support activities and resources from the project.

Resources and products from the project will be collated and offered, together with other TLTP3 outcomes, for hosting by the RESULTS Learning Technologies Portal via the SoURCE database.

Section 6 Final Financial Report

Section 7 Declaration

I certify on behalf of the lead institution that the attached progress report and the information contained therein is correct.

Project Name:

Project Number:

Head of Institution or Nominated Deputy

Name (print)

Signed

Date

Project Director

Name (print)

Signed

Date

Appendix 1: Programmes and Participants

Name	Description	Embed LT	Case Study	Portfolio	Start Level*	End Level*	Notes
UNL Participants							
Martin Oliver	Learning Technologies	✓	✓	✓	6	6	
Debbie Holley	International Purchasing	✓	✓	✓	1	6	
Lisa Bonetti	Staff Development	✓	✓	✓	3	5	
Susie Andretta	Technology Tower Evaluation		✓		3	5	
Gavin Sandercock	Applied Sports Science	✓	✓		1	5	
Shehina Fazal	History of Mass Communications ¹	✓	✓		2	2	
Tony Rich	Contract Law II	✓			1	1	
Kathy Ahluwalia	Cell Biology	✓			1	3	
Nick Brooks / Mark Alger	Engineering Polymers	✓			1	1	
Howard Feather	Introduction to Hypermedia	✓			2	2	
Norman Stang	Introduction to Economics	✓			1	4	
Tim Walpole	Introduction to Psychological Research Methods	✓	✓		3	5	
Caron Barter/ Helen Peters	Study Skills				1	1	
Elena Moschini	Desktop Publishing & Design/ Multimedia Production				5	6	

¹ This module will become the case study considering accessibility issues

Kathy Ahluwalia	Bioanalytical Techniques / Quantitative Analysis						
Poppy Pickard	Maths through IT				5	6	
Michael Mumford/ Patricia Ward	Data Modelling & Databases / Data Modelling & Database Systems / Rapid Application Development				2	3	
John Cook	Communicating Via Multimedia				5	6	
Robin Read	Crystallinity and Morphology				1	1	
Bill Revell	Biological & Applied Sciences						
Carina Browne	Health promotion	✓	✓	✓	2	5	The 5 here equates to LO5
Don Green	Retrosynthetic analysis				1	3	Deferred
Gary Pheiffer	Online MBA				3	4	I think most of Gary's stuff remains at a conceptual level
Iain Littlejohn	Science...						Deferred
Lucile Desblache	Resource bank for Translation Studies	✓	✓	✓	2	5	Again, has met LO5. Invited to give a keynote regarding this development at a conference in Poland.
Nadia Rahab	Translation						Withdraw
Pat Wood	Business Plan simulation for Hospitality Management	✓			3	3	Embedded an existing commercial product into a module. Was making progress towards a portfolio and case study.
Paul Matewele	Science...						Deferred.
Penny Dekker	Databases and Data modelling	✓			4	4	
Plymouth participants							
Penny Armstead	Pilot study: use of a virtual learning environment (Learning Landscapes) to support students in psychology	✓	✓		3	6	Completed LTHE 503 project – report published in Active Learning. Employed on course team from Sept 2000 to support other participants.

*Colin Christopher	Enhancing visualisation and problem solving skills by introducing undergraduate mathematicians to the use of MAPLE	✓	✓		2	5	Has completed evaluation. Currently writing up portfolio.
*Dave Croot	Delivering glacial geomorphology through the ELEN online learning environment	?			3	3	Delayed due to work for teaching fellowship – re-enrolled on Cohort 2.
Matthew David	Evaluating the use of the World Wide Web with Sociology undergraduates	✓	✓		1	3	Completed LTHE 503 project.
Andy Hannan	Use of computer conferencing to deliver educational research modules in the Integrated Masters Programme	✓			6	6	Technology embedded. Case study planned but portfolio unlikely (Reader in Education with no need of further qualification in this area)
Stuart Mealing	Access to digital images in fine art	✓			5	5	Technology embedded. No portfolio or case study likely (already publishes books, articles in this area so no need of further publications/qualifications).
Stanley Oldfield	Collaborative Web-based research and publishing with third year Computer Science students	✓	✓	✓	5	6	Portfolio submitted for formative assessment but requires further work. Papers delivered at SCL week and at SEDA conference (Spring 2000).
Tim Partridge	Creating computer-based problem-solving materials for second-year Engineers	✓	✓		4	6	Completed LTHE 503 project. Re-enrolled on Cohort 2 to write up evaluation and submit portfolio.
Styliane Philippou	Feasibility study: a digital image library for Architecture	✓	✓		2	5	Completed LTHE 503 project. Helping to support another member of dept on his LTHE 503 this year.
*Lawrie Phipps	Design and evaluation of an online tutorial to support fieldwork in environmental science	✓	✓		2	5	Portfolio almost complete. Paper submitted to ALT-C (2000).
Tony Reynolds	Evaluating CAL packages in biology	?			2	2	Participated in face-to-face workshops but has not taken the course further due to changes in job role.

Carol Sutton	Integrating distance and on-campus learners in an introductory research skills module for social policy using the world wide web	✓			3	5	Currently evaluating and writing up
*Rob Williams	Critical review of learning technologies and their application to student centred learning in rural land management	✓			1	5	Currently evaluating and writing up
*Neil Witt	Developing a collaborative online learning environment for the Institute of Marine Studies (APEL route)	✓	?	✓	6	6	Portfolio submitted for formative assessment.
Jill Annison	Supporting undergraduate probation officers online using computer and video conferencing.	✓			2	6	Working on LTHE 503 project. Unlikely to continue to full ELT portfolio.
*Dave Croot	Delivering glacial geomorphology through the ELEN online learning environment	?					Rolled over from Cohort 1 – postponement due to work for teaching fellowship. Has become campus manager for ELEN. ELEN project completed and being evaluated.
*Frank Dobbs	Online, distance delivery of Personal Learning Development course for health professionals across the SW	✓ (In progress)			3	4	Recently joined course. Developed a course in Blackboard.com – supporting pdp's for medics.
*Karen Gresty	Embedding and evaluation of a basic biology package (HeadStart) with first year student nurses.	✓	✓	✓ (In progress)	4	5	Presented HeadStart at ILT launch. Paper submitted to ILT conference.
Jenny Morris	Problem-based learning in social research design using a computer based tutorial environment (Mtutor)	✓	✓	✓	3	5	Portfolio submitted for formative assessment. Case study submitted to Nursing Education journal. Completed and submitted to IMP
Tim Partridge	Creating computer-based problem-solving materials for second-year Engineers	✓					Completed LTHE 503 project in Cohort 1. Currently evaluating and writing up portfolio.

*Chris Ricketts	Evaluating the use of QuestionMark Perception to author and run summative tests in Statistics, including issues for institution-wide implementation of CAA.	✓	✓	✓ (In progress)	3	6	Has organised two institutional workshops on QuestionMark, established a steering group and funded/supported seven pilot projects. Portfolio nearly completed.
*Mike Sanders	Design and evaluation of a tutorial to support fieldwork in second year geology (ToolBook)	✓	✓	✓ (In progress)	2	5	Evaluation completed. Paper submitted to ALT-C 2000 (jointly with Lawrie Phipps).
Mike Westley	Supporting project work in Architecture using structured activities in FirstClass	✓			1	4	Working on LTHE 503 project. Unlikely to continue to full ELT portfolio.
*Jonathan Challacombe	To investigate resources available to enable students participate in a Virtual Field Trip				1	3	Supervisor Neil Witt??
*Olive Hill	Integrating C&IT in to the PCGE and CertEd Courses				1	3	Has established a FirstClass discussion group for PGCE.
*Alan Hooper	Investigating development of on-line learning in IHS.				2	3	
*Vicky MacGuire	On-line support of Information Skills				3	4	
Ken Gale		✓			4	4	
*Andy Phippen	Further investigation and evaluation of using Perception	✓			2	4	Building on 503 project
*Tom Crichton		✓			2	2	Supervisor Neil Witt??
Oxford Brookes participants							
Roger Suthren/ Allister Smith	Web based learning in science	✓					

Sue Greenwood/ Rosemarie Phillimore	Computer mediated learning on the web	✓					
Georgina Glenny/ Sarah Maidlow	Asynchronous conferencing in online learning	✓					
Angela Roper	Research methods	✓					
David Elsmore/ Richard Huggins	Online materials template	✓					
Alan Jenkins	Electronic portfolios	✓					
Marilyn Farr	Supporting language learning with WebCT	✓					
Maria Parsons/ Sue Hall	Distance learning for dementia care students	✓					
Jeremy MacClancy	Online delivery for anthropology of art	✓					
John Prior	Learning issues in introductory business module	✓					
Chris Percy/ Elaine Healey	Dissertation support	✓					
Ian Mitchell	Hotel and restaurant management	✓					
Barbara Lovelady	Virtual skills laboratory	✓					
Doug Higgison	Online revision in engineering	✓					
UMIST participants							

Prof. Pete Hicks	Using CAD to teach first year electrical engineers	✓		Oct. 2000	6	6	
Bland Tomkinson	Designing and managing online support materials for courses in professional academic development	✓	Jun. 2000	Jun. 2000	6	6	
Bob Cottis	Didactical online assessment Corrosion and Protection	✓	Oct. 2000	Oct. 2000	3	6	
Paul Brunn	Reliably communicating with postgraduates students using a range of communication technologies	✓	Aug. 2000	Aug. 2000	2	3	
Marie Hayet	Developing and embedding a comprehensive CALL package for undergraduate French students	✓	Aug. 2000	Aug. 2000	4	5	
Clive Young	Designing online support material for the teaching and learning technologies course	✓	Oct. 2000	Oct. 2000	6	6	
Paddy MacDonnell	Designing online ECDL	✓	Oct. 2000	Oct. 2000	2	4	
Hélène Mathieu	Creating a Web page of Resources for students of French language	On-going	Sept. 2000	Sept. 2000	1	3	
Thomas Swailes	Using email or conferencing as a framework for students to communicate with the tutor (e.g. for the tutor to redirect them content-wise to web pages)	✓	Dec. 2000	Dec. 2000	1	2	
Ian Vickridge	Looking at ways in which to reduce face-to-face lecturing but increase effectiveness using WebCT or so.	Oct. 2000	Dec. 2000	Dec. 2000	1	2	
Gabor Megyesi	Improving communication with students using WebBoard	✓	Sept 2000	Sept 2000	1	2	
Mark Readman	?	?	?	?	1	2	

Rose Underwood	Rose wanted to be able to find out the best used tools for students but had no time for a project	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	3	
Stephen Bostock	Embedding Web-based Computer Assisted Assessment in 3 modules	✓	July 2000	August 2000	3	6	
James From					2	3	
Chris Hawksed					1	1	
Steven Ianson					2	6	
Vera Sokolovski					2	2	
Frank Thompson					1	2	
Southampton participants							
Ros Foskett	L1 unit 'Constructing Europe' (32 students) Use online discussion to develop key skills.	✓	✓		1	4	
Carolyn Blundell	L1 unit 'Health and Wellbeing' - use online resources and discussion to develop student skills and confidence in use of ICT				1	1	dropped out because of lack of time
Pat Larkin	L1 unit 'Life Stages' - further develop online discussion from 'Health and Wellbeing' unit.				1	4	dropped out because of lack of time - then transferred to ALTO programme
Julie Lakomy	L1 course 'Sports Science' (100 students) Use WebCT for evaluative and formative CAA tests and WebBoard for online small-group discussion	✓	✓		1	5	presented paper at ILT conference, York (June 2000)
Kerry Shephard	Produce a handbook for staff and students about the use of multimedia in student assessment.		✓	✓	3	6	published paper in BJET, March 2001. (see section 6 for details)
Steve Dorney	L2/3 unit 'Critical Theory'. Use online discussion in small groups.				1	1	dropped out because of lack of time

Neil Broadbent	Wanted to develop something to support 'Business French'.				1	1	left the University, October 1999
Richard Kay	Develop pilot materials for a distance learning unit for L4 'Management of Voluntary Organisations'		✓		1	1	dropped out because of lack of time
Bella Millett	Develop online resources to support a unit on 'Early Middle English Song Lyrics'	✓	✓		3	5	transferred to ALTO programme
Andrew Hart	Created WebCT unit on 'Dissertation Studies' for part-time and distance-learning education students.	✓	TBC		2	6	
Bella Millett	Develop online resources to support a unit on 'Early Middle English Song Lyrics'	✓	✓		3	5	looked at WebCT but decided that a stand-alone Website was more appropriate.
Chris Jackson	Used WebCT to develop CAA tests for	✓	TBC		1	5	
Henry Mpologoma	Assist academic staff in Faculty of Social Science develop WebCT courses	✓			6	6	not funded - set up two courses for others - left University in September 2000
Mark Varney	Developed two WebCT courses		TBC		2	4	
Mike Wald	Investigating the accessibility of the WebCT environment				5	5	not funded - just interested in seeing what WebCT could do
Oren Stone	Looked at use of WebCT to provide online training in information skills for students.				1	2	not funded - just interested in seeing what WebCT could do
Pat Larkin	Develop multimedia resources to train students to take blood pressure readings.		✓		1	5	Eventually delivered these in several formats as a small research project.
Paul Wyeth	Use WebCT to deliver formative assessment for unit 'Fundamentals of Modern Chemistry'		TBC		1	3	
Ric Paul	Working with Oren Stone on the same project.				1	2	not funded - just interested in seeing what WebCT could do

Ros Mitchell	WebCT resources to support an MA in English Language Teaching		TBC		1	2	
--------------	---	--	------------	--	---	---	--

Appendix 2: Project Dissemination Activities

Year 3

Conference/event	Title of workshop (w), paper (pa) or poster (po)	Presenter(s)/facilitator(s)
TLTP3 Projects Workshop, Goldsmiths College, September 2000	Lessons learned from EFFECTS (w)	Adam Warren (Soton)
Videoconference presentation to ScotCIT projects, various locations, October 2000	EFFECTS and ScotCIT (w)	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
EFFECTS Workshop for Wales, Bangor, December 2000	Introducing the EFFECTS framework (w)	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
UNL staff development conference, London, Jan 2001	Keynote on learning technologies (pa) and poster exhibitions/multimedia showcase (po)	Tom Boyle, Fiona French, David Andrew and Jan Smith (UNL)
Networked Learning Conference, UWE, Jan 2001	<i>Institutional Culture and Staff Development</i> (pa)	Paul Bailey (Bristol)
EFFECTS/SEDA Professional Development in Higher Education workshop, London, Feb 2001	Embedding Learning Technologies training workshop for institutions and recognisers (w)	Paul Bailey (Bristol),
M1/M69 workshop, University of Derby, April 2001	<i>EFFECTS and Embedding Learning Technologies</i> (w)	Helen Beetham (Bristol) and Marita Woods (Derby)
EFFECTS for Developers, University of Bristol, April 2001	Seminar for potential partner institutions (w)	Paul Bailey (Bristol), Adam Warren (Soton), David Andrew, Jan Smith (UNL)
LTSN Business & Management Conference, Kendal, May 2001	<i>Which room is the virtual seminar in, please?</i> (pa)	Debbie Holley (UNL participant)
EFFECTS/NetCulture seminar, University of Strathclyde, May 2001	Joint seminar for all Scottish HEIs (w)	Helen Beetham (Bristol), Paul Bailey (Bristol), Kathy Wiles (Tay), Allison Littlejohn (Strathclyde)
Networked Learning Conference, University of Hertfordshire, May 2001	<i>Empowering Staff, Empowering Students for Networked Learning Environments</i> , keynote presentation	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Bristol)
EdMedia 2001, Finland, May 2001	<i>Power struggles around integrated learning environments: a comparative case study</i> (pa)	Debbie Holley & Martin Oliver (UNL)
EdMedia 2001, Finland, May 2001	<i>Evaluating the impact of multimedia learning environments: visit to a virtual primary school</i> (pa)	Fiona French, Ian Cumpson and Ruth Wood (UNL participant)
ILT Conference, York, June 2001	<i>Using a learning portfolio to evaluate online learning</i> (pa)	Debbie Holley (UNL participant)
	<i>HeadStart in Biology</i> (pa)	Karen Gresty (Plymouth participant)
	<i>New Teaching Methods for New</i>	Paul Bailey (Bristol)

	<i>Technologies (pa)</i>	
	<i>Development and implementation of a web-based tutorial system (pa)</i>	Jenny Morris (Plymouth participant)
e-Learning Symposium, University of East London, June 2001	<i>EFFECTS and eLearning (w)</i>	Paul Bailey (Bristol) and Jan Smith (UNL)
TLTP3 Generic Projects' Research and Reflection Day, Warwick, June 2001	Overview and facilitation (w)	Helen Beetham (Bristol)
ICALT, Madison, August 2001	<i>Developing representations of practice for a community of knowledge practitioners (pa)</i>	Helen Beetham (Bristol)
ISL 2001, September 2001	<i>Evaluating EFFECTS – what did we learn and what have we changed? (pa)</i>	Martin Oliver (UCL), Helen Beetham (Bristol), Adam Warren (Soton) and Jen Harvey (DTI)
	<i>Modelling aspects of institutional development: culture, infrastructure, expertise (pa)</i>	Helen Beetham and Grainne Conole (Bristol)
ALT-C 2001, Edinburgh, September 2001	<i>Six small steps to nirvana: pathways for supporting the embedding of learning technologies (panel)</i>	Paul Bailey (Bristol), Helen Beetham (Bristol), Jen Harvey (DTI), Grainne Conole (Bristol), Adam Warren (Soton), Jan Smith (UEL)
	<i>The distributed university: rolling out computer aided assessment (pa)</i>	Chris Ricketts, Sid White & Geoff Bouch (Plymouth)
	<i>Using speech recognition to assist teaching and learning (pa)</i>	Mike Wald (Southampton)
	<i>Video Resources for the Academic Community; Meeting Demand and Requirements (pa)</i>	Kerry Shephard, Jim Strom, William Garrison, Gayle Calverley (Southampton)
	<i>Virtual Learning Environments: Access Denied (pa)</i>	Ruth Loebel, Shirley Evans, Lawrie Phipps, Jon Maber (Plymouth)
	<i>Computer-Based Assessment - Good for Students or Not? (pa)</i>	Chris Ricketts, Rob Williams and Sally Wilks (Plymouth)
	<i>No blue skies without firm foundations: developing theory for learning technology (pa)</i>	Helen Beetham (Bristol), Tom Boyle (UNL), Grainne Conole (Bristol), Bruce Ingraham (Teeside)
Practical Applications in Language Corpora conference, Lodz, Poland September 2001	<i>Building a web-based resource bank for translators</i>	Lucile Desblache (UNL participant)

Year 2

Conference/event	Title of workshop (w), paper (pa) or poster (po)	Presenter(s)/facilitator(s)
ETS Seminar, Warwick May 1999	<i>Effective Framework for Embedding C&IT through Targeted Support (w)</i>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
TALISMAN conference, June 1999	<i>Effective Framework for Embedding C&IT through Targeted Support (w)</i>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
ALT-C99 Conference, September 1999	<i>The DIY Digital Campus (pa)</i>	Ben Plumpton (UMIST participant)

	<i>Effective training for the embedding of learning technologies in the curriculum (pa)</i>	Bland Tomkinson (UMIST)
	<i>Break-out discussion: putting good practice into practice (w)</i>	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
	<i>Evolution of the LTS programme (pa)</i>	Lisa Bonetti (UNL)
	<i>EFFECTS of FOCUSing on Staff Development (pa)</i>	Julia Phelps (UNL)
	<i>EFFECTIVE frameworks for development (pa)</i>	Helen Beetham (Plymouth); Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
RUFIS 99 conference, September 1999	<i>FOCUS on EFFECTive Teaching Using Technology (pa)</i>	Julia Phelps (UNL), Martin Oliver (UNL), Lisa Bonetti (UNL)
Embedding Learning Technologies conference, October 1999	<i>A Phased Evaluation Strategy to Meet Evolving Staff Development Needs (po)</i>	Lisa Bonetti (UNL)
SEDA conference, November 1999	<i>EFFECTS (po); Embedding Learning Technologies (po)</i>	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
EFFECTS National Workshop, February 2000	<i>EFFECTS for Developers (w)</i>	Helen Beetham (Plymouth), Paul Bailey (Plymouth), Martin Oliver (UNL participant), Lawrie Phipps (Plymouth participant), Mike Sanders (Plymouth participant)
TALENT conference, March 2000	<i>The EFFECTS framework and institutional change (pa)</i>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
EFFECTS Regional Workshop, April 2000	<i>Embedding Learning Technologies (w)</i>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth), Helen Beetham (Plymouth), Mark de Groot (Leeds Met)
EFFECTS National Workshop, May 2000	<i>Embedding Learning Technologies strategically (w)</i>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth), Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
SEDA spring conference, April 2000	<i>Designing online learning activities to empower students (pa)</i>	Helen Beetham (Plymouth), Stanley Oldfield (Plymouth participant)
FDTL/TLTP conference, May 2000	<i>Who cares about case studies? (pa)</i>	Helen Beetham (Plymouth) (with Jim Basker, FOCUS)
	<i>National Case Studies Database: a model for long-term collaboration (pa)</i>	Helen Beetham (Plymouth) (with Peter Twining, SoURCE, Marita Wood, NCT and Frances Condron, ASTER)
ILT conference, June 2000	<i>Embedding Learning Technologies: a CPD framework (w)</i>	Helen Beetham (Plymouth), Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
	<i>A model for collaborative development of learning and teaching resources (pa)</i>	Helen Beetham (Plymouth) (with Peter Twining, SoURCE and Frances Condron, ASTER)
2 nd Connecting Learning & Critique Conference, Lancaster, July 2000	<i>Pedagogy and new power relationships (pa)</i>	Debbie Holley (UNL participant) and Martin Oliver (UNL)
ALT-C 2000, UMIST, Sept 2000	<i>Continuing professional development in embedding learning technologies (w)</i>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth), Jan Smith (UNL)
	<i>Thoughtful design widens access (pa)</i>	Jan Smith & Ian Cumpson (UNL)
	<i>As you like it (pa)</i>	Adam Warren (Soton)

Year One

Two national EFFECTS workshops in Manchester and London, attracting 33 participants in total.

Four conference papers delivered at the Association for Learning Technology conference (Jenkins, Bailey and Tomkinson, September 1998), the SEDA conference (Jenkins, December 1998), the SEDA/SRHE conference (Beetham, Phelps and Conole, March 1999) and Professional Development Online Conference (Beetham, May 1999).

Appendix 3: Project Reports and Papers

Year 3

Title of document	Date	Type/purpose of document	Author(s)
<i>Embedding Learning Technologies Award: Guidelines for institutions</i>	Nov 2000 May 2001 (revised)	Project document	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Bristol)
<i>Embedding Learning Technologies Award as a part of the SEDA Professional Development Accreditation Framework</i>	Nov 2000 Feb 2001 (v2.1) May 2001 (v2.2)	SEDA document	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
Learning technology staff in HE: issues for educational developers <i>Educational Developments</i> 1:4	Nov 2000	Journal Article	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
Pedagogy and new power relationships, <i>International Journal of Management Education</i> , Vol. 1	Nov 2000	Journal article	Debbie Holley & Martin Oliver (UNL)
Project Management, <i>NCT Newsletter</i>		Report	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
Project Update, <i>NCT Newsletter</i>		Report	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
The Future of VLEs at Warwick http://www.warwick.ac.uk/ETS/inte/ractions/vol5no1/Lewis.htm	February 2001	Web article	Graham Lewis (Warwick)
Development and Implementation of the MTutor On-line Tutorial System for Diploma Level Research Students, <i>Nurse Education Today</i>	March 2001	Journal article	Jenny Morris (participant Plymouth)
Submission of student assignments on compact discs: exploring the use of audio, images and video in assessment and learning in higher education, <i>British Journal of Educational Technology</i> , March 2001, vol. 32, no. 2: 161-170(10)	March 2001	Journal Article	Kerry Shephard (originally participant Soton)
Using web authoring to increase student engagement in learning technology, <i>IEEE Computer Society Learning Technology Task Force</i> , 3 (1)	May 2001	Journal article	JD Sadler & WJ Woollard (Southampton participants)
The specification and design of an interactive virtual environment for use in teacher training <i>ALT-J</i> , 9 (1)	April 2001	Journal article	Fiona French, Ian Cumpson and Ruth Wood (participants UNL)
What motivates academics to	August 2001	Accepted SRHE	Jan Smith (UNL)

adopt new technologies?		research proposal	
EFFECTS External Evaluation Report	Sept 2001	Report	Jen Harvey (DTI) and Martin Oliver (UCL)
EFFECTS Final Report	Sept 2001	Report	Helen Beetham (Bristol)
EFFECTS Case Studies Database	ongoing	Case Studies available on-line at http://www.clt.soton.ac.uk/effects/casestudies/	Kerry Shephard (Soton, contributions from EFFECTS participants at all institutions)
<i>A model of educational development for institutional change</i> , in Wisdom J and MacDonald R (eds) <i>Academic and Educational Development: Research, Evaluation and Changing Practice in Higher Education</i> , Kogan Page	forthcoming	Book Chapter	Helen Beetham (and Paul Bailey, Bristol)
EFFECTS briefing paper: a framework for professional development and institutional embedding of learning technologies	forthcoming	Report	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Bristol)

Year 2

Title of document	Date	Type/purpose of document	Author(s)
TLTP Concertation Event report, Enhancing Learning and Teaching/Dissemination, <i>NCT Newsletter</i>	July 1999	Report	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
Report on the EFFECTS National Workshops	July 1999	Internal report	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
The Development of a Generic Framework for Accrediting Professional Development in C&IT, <i>Innovations in Education and Training International</i>	July 1999	Journal article	Julia Phelps (UNL) Martin Oliver (UNL), Paul Bailey (Plymouth) and Alan Jenkins (Ox Brookes)
A National Accreditation Framework for Embedding Learning Technologies	July 1999	Consultation paper: sent to SEDA, ALT, THETO, UCoSDA, NCT, ILT	Paul Bailey and Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
Implementing and Evaluating a national programme of professional development in C&IT use, <i>IETI 37</i>		Journal article	Martin Oliver (UNL), Julia Phelps (UNL) and Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
EFFECTS Guidelines for Collaborating Institutions	August 1999	Dissemination document	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
EFFECTS Learning Outcomes (revised)	November 1999	Dissemination document	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
<i>Embedding Learning Technologies</i> , Kogan Page	January 2000	Book. Uses EFFECTS learning outcomes as learning activities, and as a separate appendix.	Pat Maier and Adam Warren (Soton)
EFFECTS Developers Workshop, Enhancing Learning and Teaching/Dissemination, <i>NCT Newsletter</i>	April 2000	Report	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
EFFECTS/BEATL Access Forum Enhancing Learning and Teaching/Dissemination, <i>NCT</i>	April 2000	Report	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)

<i>newsletter</i>			
Developing and evaluating courses to meet learning outcomes, <i>Interactions</i>	April 2000	Article, available online: www.warwick.ac.uk/ETS/interactions/vol4no1/	Martin Oliver (UNL)
An alternative perspective on CPD, <i>Educational Developments</i>	May 2000	Journal Article	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
<i>Teaching Forum No 48. Summer 2000 Brookes Virtual The Future: an IT special</i>	May 2000	Internal publication: collection of case studies/good practice	Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development at Oxford Brookes University
EFFECTS Evaluation Strategy	June 2000	Internal report	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
Audit tool: JCALT national audit of learning technologies staff	June 2000	Audit tool	Helen Beetham (Plymouth), with the audit working group
Notes for auditors: JCALT national audit of learning technologies staff	June 2000	Audit tool	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
Academic Development: A Framework for Embedding Learning Technology, <i>IJAD</i>	July 2000	Journal article	Martin Oliver and Jan Smith (UNL)

Accessibility case study	An interactive demonstration was given at ALT-C 2000 entitled " <i>Thoughtful design widens access</i> " that is used alongside other resources within the current ALT programme. Please see www.unl.ac.uk/ltri/pubs/j_smith/accessibility/index.htm
--------------------------	---

Year One

ALTering EFFECTS: Rewarding teaching using C&IT, <i>Active Learning 9</i>	December 1998	Journal article	Paul Bailey, Alan Jenkins, Martin Oliver, Pat Maier and Clive Young
EFFECTS Learning Outcomes	First version December 1998	Project document	Alan Jenkins, Martin Oliver, Rhona Sharpe, Pat Maier, Dave Wilkinson, Paul Bailey
EFFECTS Guidelines for institutions	July 1999	Project document	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
EFFECTS Annual Report (Yr One)	Sept 1999	Report	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)

