

**EFFECTS Annual Report  
Year 2  
July 2000**

**Project Number:** TLTP3/89

**Project Title:** EFFECTS (Effective Framework For Embedding C&IT using Targeted Support)

**Project URL:** <http://sh.plym.ac.uk/eds/effects/>

**Lead Institution:** University of Plymouth

**Name of Main Project Contact:** Paul Bailey

**Address:** Educational Development Services, 104 Money Centre, University of Plymouth, Drake Circus, Plymouth, PL4 8AA

**Telephone:** 01752 232346

**Fax:** 01752 232348

**Email:** P.Bailey-1@plymouth.ac.uk

## Contents

Section 1: Statement of Financial Spend in Relation to Progress .....	3
1.1 Financial Statement .....	3
1.2 Progress against objectives: Year 2.....	5
Section 2: Report on progress and lessons learnt 1999/2000.....	10
2.1 Activities, Outputs and Achievements.....	10
2.2 Institutional 'embedding' of learning technologies .....	22
2.3 Educational Effectiveness .....	28
2.4 Management and Partnership .....	30
2.5 Evaluation.....	32
2.6 Future Plans and Sustainability .....	33
2.7 Future Support .....	34
2.8 Round-up Sheet .....	35
Section 3: Project Plan for Year 3 .....	37
3.1 Activities for year three.....	37
3.2 Evaluation plan for year three.....	40

## Section 1: Statement of Financial Spend in Relation to Progress

### 1.1 Financial Statement

Actual expenditure for period 1 August 1999 – 31 July 2000

	Total budget for period	Total expenditure	Variance +/- from original budget	Reasons for variance and action intended
<b>Staff</b>	58,500.00	58,500.00		
<b>Travel &amp; subsistence</b>	5,638.00	4,330.64	+1,307.36	£1,372 underspend on Accessibility Funding £65 overspend, £1,307.36 to carry forward to Year 3
<b>Dissemination</b>	10,000.00	2,568.80	+7,431.20	Carry forward to Year 3: £3,626.20 for institutional projects £2,000 for publishing £1,805 National workshops and visits to other institutions
<b>Equipment</b>				
<b>Evaluation</b>	750.00		+750.00	Accessibility funding carry forward to Year 3
<b>Other costs (please detail)</b>	8,500.00	2,000.00	+6,500.00	Carry forward to Year 3: £1,000 Accessibility Funding Carry forward to Year 3 and reallocate: £5,000 National Recognition to External Evaluator £500 Steering Group to Travel and Subsistence
<b>Total</b>	83,388.00	67,399.44	+15,988.56	

Anticipated expenditure for period 1 August 2000 to 31 July 2001

	<b>Total budget for period</b>	<b>Anticipated expenditure</b>	<b>Variance +/- from original budget</b>	<b>Reasons for variance and action intended</b>
<b>Staff</b>	80,000.00	80,000.00		
<b>Travel &amp; subsistence</b>	4,307.36	4,307.36	+1,807.36	£1,307.36 underspend carried forward from Year 2 £500 reallocated and carried forward from Year 2
<b>Dissemination</b>	11,931.20	11,931.20	+7,431.20	Carried forward from Year 2
<b>Equipment</b>				
<b>Evaluation</b>	15,750.00	15,750.00	+5,750.00	£750 Accessibility Funding carried forward from Year 2 £5,000 National Recognition reallocated and carried forward from Year 2
<b>Other costs (please detail)</b>	9,000.00	9,000.00	+1,000.00	£1,000 Accessibility Funding carried forward from Year 2 £5,000 recognition for SEDA pilots £3,000 Steering Group costs
<b>Total</b>	120,988.56	120,988.56	15,988.56	

## 1.2 Progress against objectives: Year 2

Year 2 Objectives	Date to be Achieved	Output to Demonstrate Objective/Target/Outcome/ Milestone Achieved	Date Achieved	If Applicable, Reasons for Slippage in Date Achieved	If Applicable, Reasons for Change to Original Objectives
C&IT embedded into 30 modules	31/07/00	See Table in main report - 50 staff have embedded C&IT with the support of EFFECTS institutional programmes.	<b>On-going</b>	No slippage - but all participants are being encouraged to provide "evidence" in the form of a case study.	
30 Module evaluation case studies and participants portfolios completed	01/10/00	See table in main report - 33 summary case studies identified.	<b>On-going</b>	To be collated and put on web by Dec 00.	Case studies summaries will be made available on the web - they will not all be published in paper.
5 partner institutions identified	31/07/00	See list in main report.	<b>31/07/00</b>		A variety of institutions and collaborations are being negotiated.
Programmes validated in each institution	01/09/00	EFFECTS Modules validated at Plymouth, Brookes and UNL.			Appropriateness of validated programmes in certain institutions.
Outcomes for the nationally recognised scheme agreed	01/10/00	Meetings with SEDA - paper to be agreed at meeting in November '00	<b>On-going</b>		

Year 2 Project outcomes and milestones	Date to be Achieved	Output to Demonstrate Objective/Target/Outcome/ Milestone Achieved	Date Achieved	If Applicable, Reasons for Slippage in Date Achieved	If Applicable, Reasons for Change to Original Objectives
Specify External Eval function	01/09/99	Draft circ for comment	Dec 99	Agreed at Steering Group meeting	
PWG1 - UNL	15/09/99	See notes of PWG 15/09/99	Sept 99		
ALT-C 99	23/09/99	7 EFFECTS related presentations.	Sept 99		
Define case study format	29/10/99	Work with collaboration of project on a national database of case studies.  Case study template designed May 2000	May 00		Originally agreed not to specify a fixed template. Template developed as a result of need to show how participants were using the EFFECTS Framework.
Accessibility Workshop	10/11/99	Workshop held at UWE with BEATL.	Nov 99		
PWG2 - UNL	30/11/99	See minutes of PWG 30/11/99	Nov 99		
10 portfolios	30/11/99	None completed.			
Steering Group Meeting	01/12/99	See Minutes of Steering Group - 1 Dec 1999	Dec 99		
Agreement of External Eval function	02/12/99	Completed	Dec 99		
National recognition review meeting	06/12/99	Meetings with SEDA Meeting with Michael Frearson (THETO) Contact made with ILT - Victoria Eaton Meeting with SEDA - looking at CPD Scheme Jan 2000 ILT expressed interest in EFFECTS as a CPD module	On-going		

		March 2000 Meeting with SEDA on CPD scheme - April 2000 Meeting July with SEDA - agreed pilot to be approved in Nov 2000			
Partner inst workshop 1	17/12/99	Workshop for Partner Institutions held on 7 Feb 2000 in Bristol.	Feb 00		
Updated partner guidelines	31/01/00	Updated for ALT-C	On-going		The Guidelines for Partner Institutions are updated as the result of feedback from partners.
Publish case study format	01/02/00	Plymouth case study format circulated in May Work with NCT and collaborations with projects about national database.	May 00		See above
Circ guidelines to partners	28/02/00	Available on web <a href="http://sh.plym.ac.uk/eds/effects/partner.html">http://sh.plym.ac.uk/eds/effects/partner.html</a>	Feb 00		
PWG3	08/03/00	See notes of PWG 1 March 200 held at Brookes	Mar 00		
Workshop in Coventry	13/04/00	Workshop for partner institutions			
Papers for ALT-C & TLTP/FDTL	14/04/00	Done			
Organise post ALT workshop	14/04/00	Done			
Participant lists	28/04/00	Due for annual report 7 June			
Advertise/interview for External Evaluator	28/04/00	Appointed in May 2000	May 00	Working agreements currently being signed.	It was decided to appoint two external evaluators.
Decision on Year 3 conference	28/04/00	ALT-C Sept 2000 post	Dec 99		Agreed at SG that it would be

		conference workshop at UMIST			better to use existing national conferences for dissemination.
TLTP/FDTL Conference	31/05/00	Papers presented at ILT conference by project team and participants.	June 00		
Produce senior management paper	05/05/00				
Organise a Senior Managers workshop	31/05/00	Joint workshop on Embedding Learning Technologies Strategically with TALENT Project at the ILT in May.	May 00	.	Focused on staff in institutions who influence University strategy - looked at how EFFECTS could link in to L&T Strategies
PWG4 - Evaluation meeting	15/06/00	See final report	June 00		
Dissemination event	19/06/00	ILT Conference - Workshops and papers from EFFECTS	June 00		
Publish outcomes from accessibility workshop	01/07/00	Report written for NCT newsletter Case study focussed on accessibility by one participant.		Further outcomes need to be identified. Further actions for year 3 to include sharing of resources.	
Identify publication opportunities	28/07/00	???????????			
Produce at least one joint publication	28/07/00	SOURCE/EFFECTS?????			
Case study publication defined	28/07/00			Proposal to publish case studies on the web only and incorporate selected case studies in a book.	Not seen as effective dissemination. Encouraging participants to publish papers/case studies in national journals
C&IT Embedded into 30 modules - end of July 2000	31/07/00	See table of participants and 55 embedded modules.	On-going		
Partner institutions identified	31/07/00	Leeds Metropolitan University validated and running. Keele University - validated	On-going		Three are already running. At least six more are in the pipeline within institutions or collaborative groups.

		and starting in Jan 01 Oxford University - validated. Discussions with other groups eg South East, Manchester consortia, Coventry, Bristol, ALT workshops			
Appoint External Evaluator	01/09/00	Appointed - working agreements currently being signed.	July 00		
Validation of all programmes	01/09/00	Plymouth, Brookes and UNL	On-going		The idea of a validated staff development course is new to some institutions who have not previously had SEDA recognised courses.

## Section 2: Report on progress and lessons learnt 1999/2000

---

### 2.1 Activities, Outputs and Achievements

#### 2.1.1 Activities: institutional level

All five institutions continued to deliver and develop their EFFECTS courses. Further details of participants and programmes are given in 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 below.

At **UMIST** the focus of activity has been on developing two new features. First, the mode of delivery has been changed from an extended series of workshops to a 4-day intensive course during the summer vacation, with follow-up project work supported by face-to-face tutor contact and Web-based material. Second, more discussion and exercises have been introduced within the taught course. Negotiations continue to move the accreditation process forward.

The EFFECTS Project Officer at **Oxford Brookes** has supported five major projects funded through competitive bidding to an institutional fund of £50,000 for IT-assisted resource-based learning projects. The projects have brought about a range of changes across the institution. The Brookes Virtual initiative has organised a number of seminars and workshops at which the IT/RBL projects have presented their reports. This has come about as a direct result of the EFFECTS programme.

At **Plymouth** the first cohort of participants completed a programme of face-to-face workshops and has been helped (in nearly all cases) to successfully embed learning technologies. A second cohort has been supported using online resources and one-to-one sessions with tutors, which was identified from feedback in Year One as offering a more flexible approach for academic staff. The course is now accredited within the Integrated Masters Programme of the Postgraduate School of Education, and the project team has helped to accredit three further CPD modules sharing a similar philosophy to the EFFECTS programme. The Project Officer has been involved in drafting the institutional Learning and Teaching Strategy and in the Coordination Group for the institutional Student Centred learning Initiative, while the Project Manager has worked to secure the appointment of a new team of six Learning Support Advisers with a specific remit to support the use of learning technologies across the institution.

At **Southampton** University the writing of the learning and teaching strategy has been the main focus and strategic efforts have been concentrated here. As a result of the current uncertain climate no new participants have been recruited for the 'full EFFECTS' programme and work continues with the original team. A 'light' EFFECTS has been developed and incorporated into the institution's Certificate for Academic Practice (CAP) which will run for the first time in October 2000. A new strategy for EFFECTS is being devised, based on a CPD framework rather than solely an accreditation framework and incorporating participants who are working on a WebCT innovations.

During the past 12 months at **UNL**, the LTS programme has continued as a five-part series of face-to-face workshops supplemented with online materials, and has recruited 18 participants. A full evaluation of the LTS programme has been undertaken. New staff and faculty learning and teaching co-ordinators have been appointed, and the professional development programme has been completely rewritten as a to include 'Applying Learning Technologies' (ALT) (the EFFECTS module) as a 20 credit M-level module within a new PGCert/Dip/MA LTHE course. This programme was validated on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2000 with the development team in attendance, along with Paul Bailey as external advisor for the EFFECTS project and Gus Pennington from UCoSDA.

#### 2.1.2 Activities: project level

**Project management:** Four Project Working Group meetings and one Project Steering Group meeting have been held and minuted (source: minutes). Four quarterly reports have been submitted to the National Coordination Team. New members of the project team have been welcomed at the University of North London (Janice Smith and Tom Boyle) and at UMIST (Wendy David). The project web site has been maintained by the Project Manager, and the project contacts list and mailbase discussion lists have been maintained and developed by the Project Officer at Plymouth.

**Working with partner institutions:** In December the Project Manager visited Leeds Metropolitan University for a consultation meeting: the team is now delivering an EFFECTS course modelled on the Plymouth ELT course and has been involved with two EFFECTS workshops. This year also saw the validation of the Keele course by Stephen Bostock following his own completion of the UMIST EFFECTS course. Oxford has validated an EFFECTS-related module within its new Diploma of Learning and Teaching. The Project Manager and Plymouth Project Officer attended a consultation meeting in Bristol to discuss the possible

development of an EFFECTS course there and ran a workshop for the Learning Technology Task Force at the University of Coventry. The UMIST team has continued to work with other Manchester institutions, some of whom have expressed an interest in the EFFECTS programme. Valuable contacts have been made with developers at Derby, UEL, De Montford, Loughborough, UCL, Bangor, Glasgow and Reading, all of whom are working towards their own EFFECTS programmes, but changing institutional culture remains a slow and uncertain process.

**National accreditation:** Two meetings have been held with representatives from a number of SEDA Committees to discuss the development of a broad CPD framework within which EFFECTS (and a wide range of other specialist CPD awards) might be accredited. The Plymouth Project Officer attended a smaller Working Group meeting in May at which a formal proposal was drawn up. This will be put forward to representatives from all of the SEDA accreditation committees in early July. The Plymouth Project Officer also attended an international seminar on Competences for Online Teaching in May, and contributed to an early draft of a competence framework. The Project Manager has been in discussion with the ALT executive about the possibility of developing an award/accreditation scheme for learning technology professionals through a specific programme of ALT workshops. This would be based on the SEDA scheme but delivered by ALT as a separately validating institution/organisation, possibly based on resources held on the new Learning Technologies Gateway (see Collaborations and bids below).

**Collaborations and bids:** The Lead Site has collaborated with the TLTP3 SoURCE, ASTER, TALENT and FOCUS projects to produce a table of metadata to describe case studies and other educational objects relating to learning innovation in UK HE. A prototype database of case studies has been developed at the SoURCE web site at the Open University (<http://mathetics.open.ac.uk/source/> - follow links for the Re-usable Software Library) and papers based on this work have been presented at the TLTP/FDTL and ILT conferences. Attempts are being made to interest the GLTC and LTSN Centres in the outcomes of this collaboration.

The Lead Site was also successful in a joint bid with the ILRT at the University of Bristol for a six-month project to study the roles and activities of staff using learning technologies in UK HE. It is hoped that involvement in this study and its recommendations will allow the EFFECTS project to broaden its original remit of academic staff and look specifically at the roles of Learning Technology Officers. Activity of this kind was originally envisaged as part of the exit strategy, and to be able to achieve it at this stage is a significant step forward.

The JISC DNER Learning Technologies Portal proposal submitted by the ALT with the support of EFFECTS has also been successful. This will provide a long term platform for the resources element of the professional development network. The bid was supported by the EFFECTS project and the Plymouth Project Officer is a member of the Working Group. She will also be carrying out a user needs analysis for the gateway.

A bid to carry out an evaluation of the US Flashlight and Roundtable programme at four UK institutions was unsuccessful but led to useful contacts with ALT and the University of East London.

A meeting was held in January with Simon Heath of the University of Aberdeen, Coordinator of the new SHEFC-funded network for staff and educational development in C&IT. Outcomes included a range of options for involving EFFECTS in the development of this network, and long-term plans for a proposal to HEFCE to fund a similar network south of the border. Contacts have followed from other Scottish institutions (Heriot Watt, Edinburgh, Glasgow and Stirling), requesting EFFECTS input to the various regional networks that are involved in the project.

**Accessibility:** The Accessibility workshop took place on 10 November at UWE with a programme of speakers organised by the University of Plymouth (for EFFECTS) and UWE (for BEATL). This was an important event for raising awareness, though it was felt by some of the EFFECTS participants that there was insufficient focus on the positive ways in which learning technologies can improve access. A much more positive discussion took place in January when EFFECTS representatives met in Winchester to investigate appropriate follow-up activities. The EFFECTS Learning Outcomes have been revised in the light of this event. An EFFECTS participant at the University of North London is producing a case study which details the use of C&IT to enhance accessibility to a course of study.

**Evaluation:** At the PWG in March a new outline for project evaluation was agreed, taking forward the existing framework developed by UNL (see Section 3: Project Evaluation Overview). A two-day evaluation/review meeting on 14/15 June produced valuable additional data for the current annual report. Interviews were held for the post of external evaluator for the final year of the project, and it was decided to appoint two evaluators with complementary skills. Jen Harvey will support the project team in evaluating the embedding of C&IT at participant level and the effectiveness of the institutional programmes. Mike Dobson will provide a more strategic overview, looking at the impact of the project at institutional and national levels.

The Project Working Group will continue to maintain an overview of the evaluation framework and activities. The lead site at Plymouth was successful in bidding for a JCALT-funded research project (total value £34,500) to investigate the roles of staff involved in the use of learning technologies at UK HE. Comprehensive audit tools have been developed and piloted and are currently being implemented at 30 institutions nationally, including the EFFECTS institutions. It is hoped that findings from this study will help to inform project evaluation.

The Project Manager and Plymouth Project Officer participated in a workshop on evaluation led by the Tavistock Institute at the TLTP/FDTL conference in Coventry and were among several TLTP3 projects critical of the Tavistock input and role. The NCT has asked the Project Manager to make suggestions as to how Tavistock could better support the evaluation of TLTP3 projects and particularly how to coordinate the collection and analysis of data on institutional impact. The project has approached other generic TLTP3 projects to discuss sharing evaluation outcomes directly, and has had a positive response.

**Dissemination:** The project has amassed a database of over 100 named contacts at institutions across UK HE. The mailbase list tltt-effects-users (40+ members) is used to distribute information about forthcoming events and about general progress of the project aims and objectives. A wide range of dissemination activities including workshops, visits and conference papers (see 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 for outputs in this area) has produced considerable interest in the project and led to many requests for follow-up activities. Not all of these can be met with current project plans and staffing levels.

### **2.1.3 Percentage of project resources expended on each activity**

	<b>Total budget for period</b>	<b>Total expenditure</b>	<b>Percentage of total</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Project Management</b>	10,000.00	10,000.00	15%	Contribution to costs of the project manager.
<b>Staff</b>	48,500.00	48,500.00	72%	Contribution to salaries of five projects officers at five consortium institutions. Activities include supporting participants in evaluation and dissemination, project evaluation and dissemination activities, workshops etc.
<b>Travel &amp; subsistence</b>	5,638.00	4,330.64	6%	To project meetings, workshops, accessibility event and interviews for external evaluators
<b>Dissemination</b>	10,000.00	2,568.80	4%	Presentations and workshops at conference, two national workshops and working with partner institutions. ~£3.5k is still to be claimed by consortium members for dissemination activities. Underspend will be used to further disseminate case studies and models of embedding.
<b>Evaluation</b>	750.00			Towards evaluation of accessibility - notes other evaluation activities covered in staffing.
<b>Other costs</b>	8,500.00	2,000.00	3%	For external steering group members. Under-spend includes £5k which is being reallocated to pay for External Evaluators for year 3 and £1K from the accessibility funding which
<b>Total</b>	83,388.00	67,399.44		

### 2.1.4 Outputs: institutional programmes

A number of institutional teams have developed both a 'full' version of EFFECTS – with participants completing all seven learning outcomes and a case study and/or portfolio – and a 'light' version, with participants supported to achieve the outcomes at a lower level, or to achieve fewer of the outcomes. In both cases the focus is on effective embedding of learning technologies to enhance student learning.

Total participants includes participants who have joined programmes in both Years One and Two of the Project. This is because participants have taken longer to complete than originally anticipated (see EFFECTS Annual Report, Year One) and most have been supported in both years.

Institution	Title and brief description of programme	Accredited	Participants
UMIST	<i>Teaching and Learning Technologies</i>	N	14
UNL	<i>Applying Learning Technologies: one of four modules within the PGCert Learning and Teaching in HE</i>	Y – 20 credits M level (PGCert = 60)	18
Oxford Brookes	<i>Embedding C&amp;IT into learning, teaching and assessment: optional module within PGDip Learning and Teaching in HE</i>	Y – 20 credits M level (PGDip = 120)	6
Plymouth	<i>Embedding Learning Technologies: free-standing CPD module within the Integrated Masters Programme in Education</i>	Y – 30 credits M level (PGDip = 120)	18 (originally 21)
Southampton	<i>Certificate in Advanced Educational Studies: EFFECTS learning outcomes integrated into Module 1; one of three options in Module 2</i>	Y –12 credits M level per PGCert module	6 (originally 8)
Oxford	Optional diploma module	Y	0 (4 expressed interest but dropped out)
Leeds Metropolitan	<i>Advanced Professional Diploma in Educational Development (Information and Communications Technology)</i>	Y – 24 credits M level	12
Keele	<i>Teaching and Learning with Technology</i>	Y - 30 credits M-Level	0 (begins January 2001)

### 2.1.5 Outputs: case studies and portfolios

Portfolio - this column indicates the number of participants on EFFECTS programmes who have produced a portfolio of evidence for accreditation.

Case Study - this column indicates where a case study has been produced. This may be a short case study following the project template (2-3 sides), a conference presentation or published paper.

Embedded C&IT - this column indicates the number of participants who have successfully embedded C&IT with the support of the EFFECTS programmes.

Institution	Subject Areas	Portfolio	Case Study	Embedded C&IT
UMIST	Electrical Engineering, Total Technology, Corrosion, Staff Development, Computing, Maths, Civil Engineering	None	7	10
UNL	Learning Technologies, Business, Staff Development, Sports Science, Media, Biology, Engineering, Information	3	8	12

	Technology, Economics, Psychology, Key Skills, Maths, Geographical Sciences			
Oxford Brookes	Biological & Molecular Science, Hotel and Restaurant Management, Computers and Mathematical Sciences, Social Sciences, Law and Humanities, Library services	None	6	6 (40)
Plymouth	Psychology, Maths, Geography, Sociology, Education, Fine Arts, Computing, Engineering, Architecture, Environmental Science, Biology, Marine Studies, Human Sciences	3	8	18
Southampton	Human Sciences, Key Skills, Social Policy, English Literature	1	4	4
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>50</b>

See institutional reports for more details of case studies and portfolios.

### **2.1.6 Outputs: workshops and conference papers**

<b>Conference/event</b>	<b>Title of workshop (w), paper (pa) or poster (po)</b>	<b>Presenter(s)/facilitator(s)</b>
ETS Seminar, Warwick May 1999	<i>Effective Framework for Embedding C&amp;IT through Targeted Support (w)</i>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
TALISMAN conference, June 1999	<i>Effective Framework for Embedding C&amp;IT through Targeted Support (w)</i>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
ALT-C99 Conference, September 1999	<i>The DIY Digital Campus (pa)</i>	Ben Plumpton (UNL 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>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth); Helen Beetham (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>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth), Helen Beetham (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>	Paul Bailey (Plymouth), Helen Beetham (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 <sup>nd</sup> Connecting Learning & Critique Conference, Lancaster, July 2000	<i>Pedagogy and new power relationships (pa)</i>	Debbie Holley (UNL participant) and Martin Oliver (UNL)

Around 25 participants attended each of the national workshops this year and around 20 attended the regional workshop at Coventry, including representatives from Luton, Loughborough and Leeds. The workshop in May was held at the ILT and included input from the TALENT project. Interest in this workshop was so great that a waiting list had to be opened. Feedback from all of these workshops was extremely positive and a growing number of requests for institutional visits are received by the project. Unfortunately project staffing does not permit us to meet all of these requests.

Five EFFECTS related papers and two post-conference workshops have been accepted for ALT-C2000 in Manchester.

### 2.1.7 Outputs: documents, reports and publications

Title of document	Date	Type/purpose of document	Author(s)
TLTP Concertation Event report, <i>Enhancing Learning and Teaching/Dissemination</i> (NCT newsletter)	July 1999	Report	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
<i>Report on the EFFECTS National Workshops</i>	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)
<i>A National Accreditation Framework for Embedding Learning Technologies</i>	July 1999	Consultation paper: sent to SEDA, ALT, THETO, UCoSDA, NCT, ILT	Paul Bailey and Helen Beetham (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)
Implementing and Evaluating a national programme of professional development in C&IT		Journal article	Martin Oliver (UNL), Julia Phelps (UNL) and Helen

use, <i>IETI</i>			Beetham (Plymouth)
<i>EFFECTS Guidelines for Collaborating Institutions</i>	August 1999	Dissemination document	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
<i>EFFECTS Learning Outcomes (revised)</i>	November 1999	Dissemination document	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
EFFECTS Developers Workshop, <i>Enhancing Learning and Teaching/Dissemination</i> (NCT newsletter)	April 2000	Report	Helen Beetham and Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
EFFECTS/BEATL Access Forum <i>Enhancing Learning and Teaching/Dissemination</i> (NCT newsletter)	April 2000	Report	Paul Bailey (Plymouth)
Developing and evaluating courses to meet learning outcomes, <i>Interactions</i> ,	April 2000	Article, available online: <a href="http://www.warwick.ac.uk/ETS/interactions/vol4no1/">www.warwick.ac.uk/ETS/interactions/vol4no1/</a>	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
<i>EFFECTS Evaluation Strategy</i>	June 2000	Internal report	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
<i>Audit tool: JCALT national audit of learning technologies staff</i>	June 2000	Audit tool	Helen Beetham (Plymouth), with the audit Working Group and TALENT project
<i>Notes for auditors: JCALT national audit of learning technologies staff</i>	June 2000	Audit tool	Helen Beetham (Plymouth)
Academic Development: A Framework for Embedding Learning Technology, <i>IJAD (forthcoming)</i>	Forthcoming	Journal article	Martin Oliver and Janice Smith (UNL)

## 2.1.8 Key achievements: institutional

### UMIST

- We have redesigned and delivered the programme as a 4-day intensive course in the summer of 1999 (which proved a good period for the lecturers) from Thursday to Monday allowing the week-end to reflect on how this would impact on their work.
- More discussion and exercises have been introduced within the taught course.
- 7 case studies completed or in advanced draft (14 participants)
- We have instituted a progress chart to enable us to keep track of participants' projects. We have succeeded in establishing what participants are doing, who is not currently active and for what reason (see institutional report for details).
- We have programmed next year's intensive course for Summer 2000.
- A support site *Using the learning environment WebCT* has been developed for participants. This site is driven by the outcomes to make these more easily discussed. Each outcome will link to related resources, discussions and activities, and a detailed form where the participants can say how he achieved that outcome.
- Replacing the initial mapping of sessions on outcomes in 1998-1999, our sessions are now driven by the outcomes and will be more easily updateable as the outcomes are discussed from the results of the projects.

- We have designed an open resource site that provide general information and resources on EFFECTS and the EFFECTS course at UMIST at <http://www.umist.ac.uk/effects/> An open resource site will support the course content site. The idea is not so much to rewrite the material, although we do this as a matter of course in updating the content, rather it is to restructure it to:
  - be more manageable,
  - easier to relate to the portfolios,
  - easier to prepare and progress in the projects, and
  - easier to assess whether the outcomes have been achieved.
- The University of Manchester has been brought on board and may be followed by the University of Salford and Manchester Metropolitan University – through involving them as course participants.
- Learning and Web Technologies has been brought together with Staff Development in an institutional reorganisation

## **UNL**

- The opening of the technology tower gave rise to a bidding process that offered successful bidders incentives (time or equipment) to re-develop modules. As a result, UNL has met the year two participant milestone: six examples of staff embedding C&IT.
- The emergent Learning and Teaching Strategy explicitly acknowledges *'the development of an accredited programme to support the development of a sound understanding of using learning technologies in learning, teaching and assessment'*.
- The Strategic Plan Review (Section 4 – the Strategic Context) emphasises how *'UNL will need to continue to significantly enhance its ICT based course delivery capacity'*. This emphasis may lead to the desired institutional change, predominantly in the areas of appreciating the time and cost involved in C&IT developments.
- Learning Technologies were emphasised overall in both the Learning and Teaching Strategy and the Strategic Plan Review.
- Major investment in infrastructure for the Technology Tower means that institutional senior management are eager to support EFFECTS, as a means of ensuring the new technology is effectively used by staff.
- Four Learning and Teaching Coordinators (one for each faculty) have now been appointed and are centrally funded on a 0.5 fte basis.
- *Applying Learning Technologies* is now validated as a module within the PGCert Learning and Teaching in HE. Input will be from the Learning and Teaching Coordinators, subject specialists (mentors) as well as learning technology staff. The other validated modules of the PGCert also incorporate some use of learning technology.
- Institutional support for developing C&IT can be demonstrated by the employment of three multimedia developers that has significantly eased the technical burden on academic and LTS staff.
- Following the Accessibility workshop at UWE and the follow-up EFFECTS meeting in January 2000, UNL has ensured that all its project web pages were W3C compliant, although some linked pages require further development.
- The ALT syllabus reflects the project's commitment to widening participation. For EFFECTS participants, it has been arranged for input and guidance on accessibility issues to be available from the disabilities officer.

## **Oxford Brookes**

The appointment of Richard Frances as Learning Technologies Support Officer has enabled a new coordination of effort between Learning Resources and the Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development. The result of the EFFECTS project so far at Brookes has been a huge change in context and culture compared to the start of the project. Achievements which illustrate this include:

- Five centrally funded IT-RBL projects are largely complete and are in the process of disseminating their experiences university-wide.

- Conversion to electronic form of course notes (lecture notes, presentation slides etc.).
- Web pages to support module delivery.
- On-line discussion groups and electronic mailing lists.
- On-line reading lists.
- Open/distributed/distance learning initiatives: e.g. Lotus Notes at CMS, School of Business and School of Education, Lotus LearningSpace in HRM, and (prospective) use of synchronous computer conferencing at SOL
- Electronic communication of teaching systems.
- Simulations of physical models and data structures in operation or in development. Examples include: Virtual Workbench; Architecture of a computer; Case studies for nursing; Virtual experiments (e.g. psychology); Urban planning; Statistical models; Management training; On-line glossaries, datasets, information gateways (e.g. Geology)
- IT training in: Student web pages; Multimedia authoring; Basic computing skills
- Use/development of third party courseware: e.g. TLTP EDEC project.
- Use or planned development of on-line and CD-ROM archives e.g. image banks for geology, anthropology, and history of art.
- Computer Assisted Assessment using web-based toolkits (e.g. CASTLE and Question Mark Perception) and the Brookes Optical Mark Reader (OMIt); diagnostic/formative and some summative assessment. N.B. Initiatives in this area are supported by Brookes' participation in the TLTP Phase 3 CAA project.
- Limited use of Brookes' video-conferencing facility.
- Discipline-specific use of non-educational software, e.g. spreadsheets, CAD, DTP, statistics, electronic music production and many others.
- Many staff and students maintain personal web pages.
- Remedial learning material e.g. programming language tutors.
- Beta testing of learning materials in partnership with other universities. e.g. Hotel and Restaurant Management with Wisconsin-Stout and Nottingham Trent.
- Staff development support framework for pedagogic use of C&IT, e.g. EFFECTS

## **Plymouth**

- ELT module validated September 1999
- 21 participants have engaged with the programme in some form, whether or not they have formally enrolled on the validated module or plan to submit a portfolio for assessment.
- Seven participants have delivered papers or otherwise disseminated the outcomes of their work
- We hope to have 3 portfolios and 6 further case studies ready by the end of July
- The ELT module is explicitly mentioned in relation to three core objectives in the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy, along with the other recently validated CPD modules.
- Six new Learning Support Adviser (LSA) posts have been created at the University as part of the Learning and Teaching Strategy, with a specific remit to support staff embedding learning technologies. The Project Manager and Project Officer have been centrally involved in establishing the need for these posts, securing funding from the TQEF, recruiting staff and supporting the team in its early weeks.
- Student Centred Learning Initiative Liaison Group (of which Project Officer is a member) has now distributed £96k to 46 projects concerned with developing student centred learning at the institution. Of these 25 are C&IT related, and of these 5 successful bids came from ELT participants. Many are receiving ongoing support from the EFFECTS team.
- Ten Innovations Workshops (lunchtime sessions) were delivered in Semester 1 as part of the institutional staff development programme. Half-day workshops on QM Perception and FirstClass for Conference Managers were organised and delivered in Semester 2.

- Two ELT participants attended the Accessibility Workshop. They have since moved into new roles (in the LSA team and the Geography, Ecology and Environmental Science LTSN Subject Centre respectively) in which they are able to cascade awareness of the principles of Universal Accessibility to their new teams.
- The ELT module has been joined by three other validated CPD modules within the IMP. The Project Officer is now coordinator for all the IMP modules offered through the Educational Development team.
- The Learning and Teaching in Higher Education PGCert programme for new staff now has C&IT/Learning Technologies integrated into its delivery. The Project Officer has delivered two full-length sessions which were among the highest rated by course participants, web-based tutorials have been developed, and the Project Manager supports an online learning set.
- The Project Officer has also been made Module Leader of LTHE 503, which supports new lecturers in carrying out curriculum development projects. There are plans to rationalise some of the supporting materials for the CPD modules and for LTHE 503 for the start of the next academic year.
- The Project Manager has been closely involved in consultations over the development of the University's infrastructure, which have led to decisions to purchase institutional licences for QuestionMark Perception, videoconferencing facilities and Microsoft Outlook plus Exchange as a groupware system. The EFFECTS team contributes to ongoing staff development workshops and supports pilot projects to explore learning and teaching uses for all of these applications (8 in the case of Perception, 4 in the case of videoconferencing). Responsibility for these activities will now pass to the LSA team.

### **Southampton**

- We are currently working on the CAP programme for launch in October.
- We have included EFFECTS 'light' within this programme.
- We continue to support original EFFECTS participants
- One participant has handed in a portfolio (Kerry Shepherd), which has been assessed by an external marker.
- We have asked for case study reports from: Ros Foskett, Julie Lakomy, Richard Kay and Kerry Shepherd from the original EFFECTS group
- Julie Lakomy gave a paper at the recent ILT conference in Spring 2000.
- We have restored our website after our major server and backup crash after Christmas.
- We are working towards a non-accredited CPD framework for EFFECTS
- We are however, establishing mini projects e.g. Adam Warren is running a 3 month mixed mode – face to face sessions and open learning on using WebCT. He has recruited 15 participants. We are now discussing with those participants who would like to take their projects a little further and evidence the EFFECTS learning outcomes. This will not be award bearing, but we are asking willing participants to complete an EFFECTS case study using the project format, against the EFFECTS learning outcomes.
- Due to our current situation, we cannot enrol participants on an award bearing programme for EFFECTS. We were encouraged by Paul Bailey's report on discussions with ALT, SEDA and ILT re national accreditation for EFFECTS learning outcomes. Once we have that in place, we have a stronger basis for recruitment.
- Integrating Technology in Learning and Teaching: a practical guide for educators has been published by Kogan Page. This includes details of the EFFECTS learning outcomes and associated resources.
- We have also developed a web site to accompany the book – [www.clt.soton.ac.uk/activeguide](http://www.clt.soton.ac.uk/activeguide)
- We are working to bring together a regional CPD group including Portsmouth, Bournemouth and Southampton Institute

### **2.1.9 Key achievements: project level**

**Project management:** It has been a major achievement to keep the project on track this year through changes of staff and the institutional restructuring of the units in which project staff are located. These are, however, continuing uncertainties and challenges which may impact on the achievement of year three

objectives. In planning for year three we recognised that not all the available opportunities can be exploited, particularly as project officers may be looking for more permanent posts as project funding comes to an end.

**Working with partner institutions:** Validation of courses at Oxford, Keele and Leeds Met have marked important milestones in the sharing of our project framework across UK HE. We have also done valuable work at Coventry, Bristol and Derby, all of which are moving towards some form of EFFECTS accreditation, and developed good contacts at a wide range of other institutions. Feedback from our workshops – national and regional – has been consistently excellent, and we continue to receive requests for institutional visits and consultancy work. Unfortunately the constraints of time and staffing mean we can only offer workshops on a regional basis (see section 3).

**National accreditation:** We have made significant progress with SEDA at a time when the Association is itself facing uncertainty over its future role (due to the launch of the ILT). The EFFECTS framework has opened up new opportunities for CPD accreditation which we expect to be able to finalise in the coming year. We have gained a high profile for the project at SEDA and ALT conferences, and on various committees of SEDA, the JISC and the ALT.

**Collaborations and bids:** JCALT scoping study; National Database collaboration; Accessibility bid; Scottish C&IT network; regional collaborations (Manchester and South coast).

**Dissemination:** A wide range of dissemination activities including workshops, visits and conference papers (see 2.1.6 and 2.1.7 for outputs in this area) has ensured that EFFECTS is among the best known and most widely respected national projects working in this area. (Need a quote to justify this!). Southampton book.

### ***2.1.10 Changes to targets and objectives: institutional***

All institutions have had to revise downwards the original estimates of **completed portfolios** for this stage of the project. This was signposted in the Annual Report for Year One report, and we continue to experience problems in motivating staff to evaluate and evidence their work, with the related difficulty of the longer-than-expected completion times for the full cycle of EFFECTS learning outcomes (2.2.1 Effective Embedding: participants). We still aim to meet our original targets over the three years, though we have argued for the need to measure participants, portfolios, case studies and re-engineered modules/courses separately (see 2.1.5).

At UMIST and Plymouth the introduction and/or updating of **Web-based material** to support the programmes has been slower than predicted.

At UMIST the **accreditation process** has been delayed by two principal factors, both external to the project. First, UMIST has been considering its position on modular Postgraduate Certificates and this has led to issues of credit rating and the wider availability of modules. Second, the Qualifications Framework under consideration by the QAA has led to questions about the level of postgraduate courses and this impacts upon our present proposal. At UNL the accreditation process was also beset by institutionally-specific difficulties but these have now been overcome.

### ***2.1.11 Changes to targets and objectives: project level***

Our work with other TLTP3 projects who are producing **case studies** of embedding learning technologies has led us to conclude that they are most useful in the form of a searchable database, where the larger number of examples makes it more likely that readers will find something of relevance and interest. We have therefore decided to publish our case studies on the web only, ideally in a form which is cross-searchable with other national materials of a similar kind.

Rather than publishing a book of case studies, then, we have decided to focus on publishing some of the lessons learned from the EFFECTS project in the form of a **book of essays** from invited contributors. Some case studies will probably be included to exemplify the different approaches taken by different participants and by different institutional programmes. However, the focus will be on drawing out general conclusions for embedding learning technologies effectively into programmes of HE study and into institutional culture, infrastructure and everyday practice.

We hope that this book will develop conjointly with another activity we have planned for Year Three, namely a programme of **seminars** exploring the theories and practices of embedding learning technologies in HE. This will be launched at ALT-C2000 with a half-day workshop, though further workshops will be dependent on support from the ESRC. At the same time we will continue our highly successful strategy of **presenting papers, posters and workshops** at conferences organised by others, and encouraging our participants to do the same.

In response to requests from our contacts at institutions, we will be focusing our third-year dissemination strategy on **regional workshops**. We will be following the successful format piloted in Coventry whereby one institution hosts the event and provides a local audience of interested staff, while EFFECTS invites representatives from other HEIs in the same region or national area. This approach will enable us to exploit the opportunities presented by new regional staff development networks such as the M1/M69 link, the Scottish C&IT staff development network, the Southern regional network and informal networks in Wales and Northern Ireland. We hope we may also play a role in strengthening and supporting these networks.

We will continue to pursue our goal of five **partner institutions** with EFFECTS programmes by the end of the project, but we will work towards this chiefly by supporting regional networks with a broad dissemination effort (as above) rather than by 'cascading' our outcomes from each EFFECTS institution to one other.

We have appointed two **external evaluators** with different but complementary remits as outlined in 2.1.2: Evaluation. This will entail some additional work on the part of the project working group to liaise between and help synthesise the findings of the two evaluators. We will also be focusing some of our evaluation effort through the national audit.

See section 3 for a detailed Project Plan for Year 3.

## 2.2 Institutional 'embedding' of learning technologies

The following findings are compiled from discussions among project officers at our evaluation awaydays (June 2000) and from institutional end of year reports.

### 2.2.1 Effective embedding: participants

**Staff motivation** to complete EFFECTS programmes, particularly when it comes to writing up a case study or portfolio for assessment, continues to be an issue. We have found that publication and academic recognition are generally more attractive rewards than academic credit (for example a masters module). This is particularly true at UMIST where there is no culture of accreditation for professional development. At Oxford Brookes the opposite is true: *all* staff must complete a PGCE in LTHE within 2 years of being appointed, but there is correspondingly little incentive to complete an additional module. At Plymouth, UNL and Southampton, academic credit is more attractive to new lecturing staff, whose initial professional development can be built upon towards a Masters award in learning and teaching, but there is far less incentive for more experienced staff (see also CPD below).

**Staff time/workload** remains an issue at all participating institutions. There are very few instances of members of staff receiving time off from other responsibilities to complete an EFFECTS programme (though staff at UNL and Brookes do receive time off to complete the new lecturers' course, which incorporates an EFFECTS module). Exceptions are where staff can apply for internal development funding which they may use to 'buy out' their own time. Different participating institutions have tried different means of 'tying in' the award of funding/time off with the actual CPD requirements of EFFECTS. At Oxford Brookes, for example, money is available to be bid for – on the proviso that a case study is produced (though this does not currently have to meet any of the EFFECTS learning outcomes). All institutional teams have tried to ensure that the EFFECTS programme is included in the Learning and Teaching Strategy and other key documents in the hope that this will release funds and/or commitment from Heads of Department for staff time to engage in learning technology related CPD.

**Learning outcomes:** At four institutions (not Brookes) there is a structured programme followed by independent project work. This means that most participants work through EFFECTS learning outcomes 1-3 (review, analysis and planning) and go on to use this experience to actually implement the technology (outcome 4). In other words, these programmes seem to have been successful in getting participants to engage with relevant ideas, models, approaches and examples of best practice (source: institutional reports from UMIST, UNL, Plymouth and Southampton). Looking at the 'Embedded C&IT' column in section 2.1.5 we must conclude that this process has been successful in giving participants the confidence and competence to actually embed C&IT into their learning and teaching. There is far less evidence of participants successfully evaluating and writing up their work. We hypothesise that there is a lack of experience in educational evaluation, reflection on practice and writing for learning and teaching publications, along with a lack of motivation to carry these outcomes through once participants have achieved their own objectives (i.e. enhancing student learning through the use of technology).

**Evaluation:** As identified above, there is a clear need for more targeted support in this area. The project is addressing this with the help of one of the external evaluators, Jen Harvey, who will assess the materials we are using to support participants and help us to develop better models based on her own experience in writing the LTDI *Evaluation Cookbook*. Southampton is considering whether evaluation should be one of the first issues addressed in the structured programme rather than one of the last.

**Case studies:** Again, the evidence from the four structured programmes suggest that participants need individualised support to write up their work as case studies. The EFFECTS rationale means that each participant will have his or her own learning objectives in undertaking a CPD programme, and that each case study will be produced in the context of a masters programme with its own assessment criteria. As originally envisaged, then, case studies are taking a wide variety of formats and will not as readily be searched, synthesised or subject to standard meta-description as is possible for some other TLTP3 projects. On the other hand we now recognise that standard exemplars can be helpful for staff who are unfamiliar with writing in this area, and this year we have developed a case study template, based on a survey of other similar templates and built around the learning outcomes. In addition, project officers at Plymouth, UMIST and UNL are undertaking some of the writing work on behalf of participants. It should be noted that this is principally in order to ensure we achieve our project outcomes and is not strictly in line with the original project philosophy: to embed a culture of self-sufficient evaluation and dissemination practice in the institutions. It may be that our expectations were too far in advance of the prevailing learning and teaching culture(s).

**CPD:** If academic credit is of only limited interest to staff, there is increasing focus within the profession on CPD. The experience of all four structured programmes has led to a convergence on the action research/action learning approach, in which participants set their own learning objectives and take a reflective/evaluative approach to the process of development. The preference of participants is for targeted,

relevant support, as and when it is needed (though at Plymouth and UMIST there is *also* a demand for a structured curriculum, and this makes particular demands on staff delivering the programmes). It remains to be seen what forms of CPD evidence will be required by the ILT and whether this will have any impact on academic culture and the demand for courses such as EFFECTS. We will continue to find new ways for participants to evidence the EFFECTS values and outcomes – whether this is via structured courses, negotiated learning contracts, actions research, case studies, publications, or a hybrid of these – both to suit the changing needs of participants and (hopefully) as the culture of CPD develops.

**Communities of practice:** At our evaluation days the five programme teams agreed that there is an emerging community of academics with experience of and interest in learning technology innovation. This has been evidenced, for example, in the numbers presenting technology-inflected developments at the ILT-AC conference (June 2000) and in the national interest generated by EFFECTS workshops. The credibility of EFFECTS depends on whether the learning outcomes define (and are seen to define) accepted good practice in this community, and whether this community itself has status and recognition within the wider academic culture. This means that our work in supporting participants to develop their practice is intimately bound up with our work in building a community in which that practice is recognised and valued. We would see the development of the SEDA teacher scheme as an example of successful community-building around an agreed framework of values and outcomes.

**Evidence-based practice:** A linked issue is the need for EFFECTS to demonstrate that our participants are making pedagogically sound use of C&IT. This has two elements: the first is the participant's evidence that they are achieving the EFFECTS learning outcomes and that they are doing so at a level recognised by their institution as worthy of a masters award. The second is evidence that the learning outcomes themselves are indeed a measure of good practice, which can be proven only through peer review/community acceptance and critical research. Once again, the work of building a community and developing evidence-based practice on a communal scale cannot be separated from the task of supporting and motivating individual participants.

As outlined in the Year One Annual Report, other **participation issues** include: access to support staff; the support (or otherwise) of institutional and departmental management; the status of learning technologies in relation to other local priorities (e.g. QAA, RAE); a culture in which learning and teaching excellence has historically been valued; and the existence of real incentives to embed learning technologies effectively (i.e. incentives with relevance to academic career development and advancement).

Specific lessons learned by participants in the process of embedding learning technologies can be found in the case studies listed in section 2.1.5

## **2.2.2 Effective embedding: programmes**

**Timing of programmes:** As reported last year, the timing of professional development opportunities within the academic year remains an issue. All five institutions have tried to develop flexible learning opportunities for participants, but there are trade-offs both in terms of tutor time and in terms of the undoubted benefits of peer learning in a cohort. The more flexible approach makes it harder to ensure participants maintain progress towards the learning outcomes. The four structured programmes have retained elements of their original workshop format but focused these on vacation periods when staff have fewer immediate demands. Again, unless staff have time bought out to dedicate to group activities, this will remain an issue.

**Format of programmes:** At Oxford Brookes staff have expressed a preference for workshops dealing with specific issues, rather than a structured curriculum. At the other four institutions there is some structured programme (i.e. workshops are sequential and progressive), though the length of this programme has in most cases been shortened to a single intensive period which quickly gives way to individually-supported project work. This format gives participants enough background information, confidence and basic understanding to approach the task of embedding learning technologies. Once they have moved into individual development work, however, it is difficult to sustain progress towards the learning outcomes and particularly to ensure evaluation and writing up (as reported above).

**Content of programmes:** As academically-accredited courses, EFFECTS programmes must give some account of curriculum 'content'. This can be in tension with the need to provide flexible and relevant support for the development of professional practice. In four cases out of five we have found that the action learning cycle helps resolve this conflict. Participants are required to develop a wider range of skills and concepts than they need to deal with immediate objectives and problems. The intention is that a wider repertoire of responses should be available to the individual practitioner, but also to enhance the academic credibility and intellectual rigour of learning technology development.

**From feedback to educational research:** At our evaluation awaydays we saw practitioners progressing from seeking feedback to undertaking evaluation, and from action research (or practitioner-oriented

research) to academic educational research. Each stage demands new skills and concepts, a wider repertoire of techniques, and greater independence in choosing a research/development approach. Currently most EFFECTS programmes support practitioners with guidelines and toolkits to help them evaluate their practice. With more experienced practitioners – and arguably also at more research-led institutions – practitioners will require individual supervision to help them develop original approaches.

**New and experienced lecturers:** At Plymouth, Southampton and UNL, the EFFECTS teams have had significant input to the content of the course for new lecturing staff. This means that the use of learning technologies is seen as part of the basic toolkit of academic teachers rather than an arcane specialism. These elements of the new lecturers' programme are not seen as enabling participants to evidence the EFFECTS learning outcomes, however, which requires a particular focus on learning technology in the course of an action research or curriculum development project.

**Online support:** All four of the structured courses make use of a web site and have made some attempt to provide online communication opportunities (via FirstClass, Web CT, etc). As reported last year, use of the (optional) online learning opportunities has been poor. The Plymouth Project Officer attended a workshop in online tutoring to discover what could be learned from best practice in other institutions, but it seems to be generally true that: participants prefer face to face communication; optional (non-assessed, non-critical) online support will rarely be used by participants with many other demands on their time. This presents problems for extending the reach of programmes and for integrating programmes at the separate institutions.

**Structured tasks:** The difficulties in motivating staff mean that programmes have become more outcome-driven. There is a perceived need to provide structured tasks which will help participants to build portfolios and develop elements of their case studies, particularly where they lack the motivation or experience to write an academic paper. One solution has been online, web-based portfolio templates (UMIST and Plymouth), though all four programmes now offer more structured tasks. It is important that these structured activities and templates do not become ends in themselves – they must be seen as supporting the action learning cycle intrinsically, rather than as externally imposed assessment tasks.

**Location of course delivery teams:** Every one of the five EFFECTS programme teams has been restructured or relocated in this reporting year, or is currently in the process of restructuring. The new strategic importance of learning and teaching seems to be responsible for much of this reorganisation. New units, roles and job descriptions are emerging. Advantages include opportunities to work more closely with other individuals and teams involved in academic/learning/technology development, more input to decision making processes, and better resourcing for (some) restructured units. Disadvantages include disruption and uncertainty, dislocation from staff 'on the ground', and even resource cuts.

**Credit equivalence:** As more institutions develop EFFECTS-type programmes the issue of credit equivalence and level is frequently raised.

**Targeting/marketing of programmes:** Approaches to recruitment include: targeting new lecturers who have recently completed an accredited initial training programme (Plymouth, UNL); rationalising CPD modules by offering some generic workshops e.g. in models of student learning (Plymouth); targeting a specific department or faculty where learning technology is particularly favoured (Soton); targeting staff undertaking a specific type of innovation (UNL, Soton). Other approaches are to offer 'taster sessions' where staff have a chance to try new technologies or approaches for themselves (Brookes, UMIST), and 'showcase' events where staff can see what other people have achieved (Brookes, Plymouth). Programme features which are particularly attractive to staff are: just-in-time training (e.g. to solve specific learning and teaching problems or introduce specific new technologies); relevant examples of successful embedding (case studies, show cases); a positive institutional vision of what can be achieved; publication opportunities (source: institutional reports and survey of educational development mailbase lists).

**Staffing issues** It has proved difficult to recruit people with the expertise to deliver and support EFFECTS courses. Such people are generally in demand to support *all* staff embedding learning technologies (not just those undertaking CPD), and are rarely employed on teaching contracts or posts. This general problem has been exacerbated by project officer illness at UMIST and by major changes of project staff at UNL.

### **2.2.3 Effective embedding: institutions**

**Integrating with institutional initiatives:** All five institutions have been relatively successful in this respect (source: institutional progress reports). EFFECTS courses have been integrated with the Virtual Campus project at Brookes, the Technology Tower project at UNL and the Student Centred Learning Initiative at Plymouth. In all three cases there has been a large injection of institutional money for the embedding of learning technologies which the EFFECTS team has been in a position to influence, generally by ensuring that staff receiving one-off grants are helped to effectively plan, implement, evaluate and reflect on their

experience. There is a danger, on the other hand, that it becomes difficult to distinguish the outcomes of the EFFECTS programmes specifically from the outcomes of these initiatives in which EFFECTS staff are centrally involved. This will be an issue for the external evaluators to address.

**Local and central management:** The most effective use of C&IT by academics happens when the department has a supportive culture, i.e. where Heads of Department actively prioritise these developments and academics are not operating in an isolated environment. Clear signs of institutional commitment (e.g. funding, career progression or time off for development projects) rather than vague mission statements greatly increase the chances of success.

**Local dissemination:** It is important to communicate successes to other staff and to the university management, e.g. via a special publication, exhibition, 'technology term', 'student centred learning week' or similar. However, communications of this kind need to become iterative and feed back into institutional decision making, rather than being limited to one-off special events.

**Linking CPD to resources** Whether funding, equipment or time off for development, resources remain the most serious incentive to participants. There is the added advantage that funds are better spent if the staff who receive them are well supported in embedding learning technologies. However, competitive bidding processes can put off as many staff as they encourage, and it is debatable whether this approach helps to make learning technology development a mainstream activity.

**Support staff:** EFFECTS programmes do not define specific competences for academic staff, and one advantage is that they can be equally relevant for learning technology support staff looking to gain a better understanding of the learning process. A disadvantage, however, is that they do not define the limits of 'appropriate' activity for academic staff. Academics may want to develop their own multimedia materials – but they are more likely to want the support of professional multimedia developers to do so. An EFFECTS programme increases the demand for qualified, educationally-aware support staff much faster than institutions can supply them (through recruitment or development). This requires academic staff to become self-sufficient for many or all aspects of the development process. In the short term, poorer quality learning materials and activities are likely to be produced. In the longer term there is a danger that the role of learning technology professional will fail to develop as it becomes yet another 'string to the bow' of certain academic staff. Anecdotally, staff with these skills quickly become sources of support for others in their department, and the danger is that they can actually have their status downgraded rather than enhanced by this expertise (which is seen as technical rather than educational).

Plymouth has this year appointed 6 new learning support staff and UNL has appointed 2 (soon to be 3) multimedia developers. Southampton and UNL already have specific central service teams dedicated to learning technologies, and Plymouth is developing something of this kind. There is an interesting issue over whether centralised development teams with a 'service' culture are more effective, or whether responsibility for learning technology development should stay with academics and departments, perhaps drawing on a range of local and central support. Both models have implications for the development of academic and non-academic professional roles.

The **role of external projects** and external project staff is a contested one within institutions. While project money is bid for and awarded to carry out specific activities, the expected pay-off is that project staff will also take on institutional responsibilities. Particularly at the lead site, where 'project work' does not obviously have a pay-off for the institution, this has led to some conflicting demands and commitments. Project workers also perceive that they have more credibility externally than they do at their own institutions.

**Need for strategic direction:** The need for proactive, positive management and consistent messages about learning technology development is shown by both positive and negative examples (source: institutional reports).

**Change weariness:** Many academics are suffering from a plethora of 'learning and teaching initiatives', often implemented in a top-down manner and with a focus on quality assurance rather than personal or professional development. EFFECTS can seem like just another one of these.

**Institutional timing** is crucial. This is shown by the baseline and ongoing evaluation reports from the five consortium members – in each case there were existing C&IT developments which have helped EFFECTS to become embedded. It is also suggested by the experience of working with partner institutions. Some institutions represented at EFFECTS workshops have gone on to implement new staff development activities and even EFFECTS programmes, while others have (anecdotally) tried and failed to make progress. The national audit may uncover some of the institutional differences involved more systematically, and it is hoped that one of the external evaluators will also have time to pursue this issue.

### **2.2.4 Effective embedding: main barriers**

Summarising sections 2.2.1-3 above (where all of these are dealt with in greater detail), main barriers to effective embedding of learning technologies are:

#### **Staff:**

- Lack of credible professional incentives (e.g. career enhancement)
- Lack of credible academic incentives (e.g. RAE credit for learning technology publications)
- Lack of time and high workloads due to rising student numbers/administrative demands
- Lack of evaluation and dissemination expertise (and again, lack of any credible rewards for these)
- Lack of sufficient, relevant, high quality case studies to exemplify good practice in this area
- Lack of a well developed culture of CPD or an expectation of evidence-based practice in academic teaching and learning
- Very recent emergence of a community of common practice and understanding around the academic embedding of learning technologies
- Poor access to support staff (must be technically competent, educationally aware and available both centrally and locally as needed)
- Lack of support from institutional and departmental management
- Status of learning technologies in relation to other local priorities (e.g. QAA, RAE)
- Change weariness (and associated 'quality assurance' weariness)

#### **Institutions:**

- Weaknesses in technical infrastructure (usually lags well behind the ambitions of the most forward-thinking staff)
- Long lead-in times for technical developments and roll-outs (means that learning and teaching innovations are put 'on-hold' as the technology available is about to become obsolete)
- Failure to involve learning and teaching staff in development of technical infrastructure
- Failure to recruit *and develop* educationally-aware learning technology professionals to support academic staff effectively
- Ongoing uncertainty for learning technology professionals (location, resourcing and remit of relevant units; contracts, promotion opportunities and terms of employment for individuals)
- Lack of good communication structures (local and institutional) to enable dissemination of good practice and feedback from academic innovators and developers into institutional decision-making processes
- Poor integration of initiatives – a multitude of new agendas without much central direction or focus (leads to change weariness as above)
- Unsupportive local and central management – failure to prioritise or properly fund learning and teaching innovation is more common now than active hostility.
- Failure to link available resources with CPD, which would mean that funds were better spent (and provide incentives for staff to engage in CPD)
- Failure to recognise and integrate the work of externally funded projects
- Timing: institutional development requires progress on a large number of issues simultaneously (technical infrastructure, learning and teaching culture, reward systems, staff development, support staff, research and development...). Different factors will be limiting development at any one time. It is important for institutions to continue to push forward on all fronts.

### **2.2.5: Effective embedding: TQEF and other national drivers**

EFFECTS programme teams have been involved in developing their institutional learning and teaching strategies to different degrees (see 2.1.8 for details). All five institutions now have L&T strategies in place which make commitments to the development of learning technology use over the next three years, but it is

still difficult to assess what this will mean on the ground. One positive effect has been a freeing up of institutional initiatives which were 'on hold' while institutional management decided how to prioritise the demands on TQEF funding (e.g. at Plymouth the LSA team has finally been recruited).

New funding for learning and teaching development has meant new opportunities but also new demands on project staff. Time has been bought out from actually supporting the embedding of learning technologies to help devise institutional policies, strategies, action plans and targets – though naturally it is hoped that our involvement will have long-term benefits for learning technology integration. The new strategic importance of learning and teaching development has also compromised our degree of choice over which individuals and initiatives to actively support, and means that learning technology development work has become more closely aligned with quality assurance (e.g. TQA) and top-down initiatives. Management shows greater awareness of the issues than previously (perhaps because they have been spending more time listening to us!) but in practice the action plans we have helped to develop have largely translated into more demands on ourselves.

**We have made a number of attempts to contact the GLTC to discuss the relevance of our project outcomes to the emerging work of the LTSN network. This has taken the form of email communications with Cliff Allan and Richard Townend, papers sent to the GLTC and invitations to attend relevant papers/meetings at conferences. In doing this we have worked particularly closely with the SoURCE, ASTER, TALENT and FOCUS TLTP3 projects. Our specific aim has been to share the outcomes of our work on developing metadata vocabularies to describe case studies in learning and teaching innovations, while our general aim has been to articulate some structures whereby the outcomes of research and development projects such as EFFECTS could directly inform the activities of the new network. To date we have not met with any success. We have begun work with the LTSN Centres for Geography, Geology and Environmental Science and for Computing and Information Science to explore the possibility of subject-specific pathways to EFFECTS accreditation. We conclude that while we can see the relevance of our project outcomes to the remit of the LTSN Centres and the GLTC, the network may not be ready to make use of them until it has had more time to become established.**

## 2.3 Educational Effectiveness

### 2.3.1 *Understanding educational effectiveness*

Our understanding of educational effectiveness is to a large extent limited by the understanding of our participants. In general, if academic staff are 'happy enough' with the outcomes of a specific learning technology integration then they are unlikely to explore that situation in greater depth. This is not to say that academics do not care about student learning, but rather that current professional practice operates by 'rules of thumb' (perhaps backed up by course feedback questionnaires) rather than by rigorous educational evaluation of the kind that produces standard data for meta-analysis. Our approach has been to encourage a *more* rigorous and reflective approach (see 2.2.2: From feedback to educational research) as part of the professional and intellectual development of our participants. However, we do not promote any particular method of evaluating educational effectiveness over any other. As a result our case studies constitute various accounts, using a range of methods, of the educational impact of a wide range of innovations.

Over the last year we have become aware of a deficiency in the vocabulary (or typology?) with which learning technology integration is described both in the literature and by staff involved in curriculum development. We believe this limits our ability to account for educational impact. When it comes to the technologies used, at least two levels of description are available: the generic (such as 'computer conferencing', 'authoring tool', 'CAL') and the specific (such as 'FirstClass', 'Dreamweaver', 'Win-Econ II'). There are also analytical distinctions such as 'worldware' and 'courseware', 'tools' and 'resources', 'synchronous' and 'asynchronous' and so on. When it comes to describing the learning activities and interactions which these technologies mediate, the vocabulary is much less rich, and this is symptomatic of a general paucity of learning and teaching vocabulary. 'Lecture', 'seminar', 'practical', 'lab session' and 'crit' are terms which describe very broad features of learning and teaching scenarios. What actually takes place within those scenarios in terms of interactions among tutors, students and mediating artefacts, differs very widely from institution to institution, and even more so from subject area to subject area (ref: ASTER project), which makes it difficult to describe changes and interventions in a reliable way.

We see the '53 interesting things to do in (lectures/seminars/tutorials etc)' series, pioneered by Phil Race and Sally Brown, as a practitioner-focused attempt to enrich the descriptive vocabulary of learning and teaching. We would like to see two similar volumes dealing with 'interesting things to do in computer conferences' and 'interesting things to do with the world wide web', and we hope that some of the EFFECTS case studies might contribute to this work. We are concerned, though, that the vocabulary of educational research remains simultaneously very general (as far as terms of common agreement are concerned) and highly specialised within different theoretical and methodological perspectives. This is one reason why we are so concerned to develop common metadata for describing learning and teaching innovations, which can form the basis of a cross-searchable resource that would be sufficiently large to enable the development of richer typologies and descriptions.

In very general terms we would identify a move away from the use of learning technology products (TLTP materials, CAL, courseware) towards the use of generic tools to provide an integrated learning environment (what Erhmann would describe as a shift from courseware to worldware, and what Zuchermaglio would term a shift from a full to an empty technology). In large measure this is a pragmatic response to the availability of such generic tools as HEIs invest in groupware, virtual learning environments, web authoring tools, computer assisted assessment tools, conferencing facilities etc, and as these become better integrated with one another and with other information systems such as student records. However, all the evidence from the literature would suggest that this integrated approach should prove more educationally effective than previous attempts to bolt courseware solutions on to existing curricula.

### 2.3.2 *Examples of educational effectiveness*

See our list of case studies 2.1.5 and papers/reports 2.1.7.

### 2.3.3 *Educational effectiveness in different contexts of use*

Our action research/action learning approach is designed to help connect practice, development and research in the field of HE learning and teaching. Accordingly, our case studies are designed to reveal aspects of educational effectiveness in different contexts of use.

As outlined in 2.3.1, the EFFECTS project does not advocate a common approach to accounts of educational effectiveness. There is therefore no common format for case studies on which rigorous comparisons could be based. This problem is, however, endemic among learning technology initiatives and

is one reason why we have led an attempt among generic TLTP3 projects to develop common metadata for describing case studies in learning technology innovation. TLTP3 projects have not been funded to do this meta-analytical work (and nor do we have the expertise) but we are in the process of collecting data which, if effectively coordinated, would be invaluable to those who are in a position to undertake research in this area.

We hope that our work with the two LTSN Subject Centres in Year 3 will begin to draw out disciplinary differences in the contexts of learning technology integration and use. However, this is unlikely to throw up any conclusive results within the lifetime of the EFFECTS project.

### **2.3.4 Cost effectiveness**

This year we have pursued our commitment to explore cost effectiveness as an issue through informal contact with the Costs of Online Learning project, attending a cost effectiveness workshop at the TLTP/FDTL conference, and reading around the area. Along with other projects attending the TLTP/FDTL conference session, we have found the models put forward are either too simplistic or not applicable to the work we are doing. There are problems with any comparative approach (how to evaluate the outcomes of a hypothetical course of action, since experimental comparison is rarely justifiable in education, at least on a large enough scale to produce reliable results?). And while the costs of technology integration can often be approximated, the benefits are notoriously difficult to quantify. We see a need for TLTP3 to identify some key measures we can apply to our programmes and participants across institutions, and we will continue to work with other projects (e.g. SoURCE) to explore these common problems.

## 2.4 Management and Partnership

### 2.4.1 Main management issues

The University of North London (UNL) had **major changes in project staff** at the end of year one and start of year two, with four key project members of the project team moving to development roles in other institutions. The impact on the project has been lessened by the quality of the groundwork already done at UNL, and the appointment of a new project officer has maintained the momentum. However, other project staff have taken longer to replace with the knock-on effect of more national-level work for the lead site, as UNL had taken a major role in sharing these activities (especially with respect to evaluation). A member of staff from Plymouth, who was instrumental in the initial project development, has also moved to a new post. However, the original project members have proved useful for networking and dissemination of the project in other institutions and organisations.

Most project staff have experienced **conflicts of responsibilities and time pressures** throughout the year evidenced in institutional project reports and communication via email and project working group meetings. This has often made it difficult for all project members to attend every working group meeting and dissemination workshop activities. The main issues are related to the "partial" funding of posts, which strategically helps to embed these posts in the institution, but requires project officers to protect the time required for project level activities. The rest of the staffing for the project is being covered by the institutions involved and the pressures on these staff appear to have become worse as the project goes on and senior managers forget the commitments agreed at the start, as institutional agendas develop. This has been especially difficult for project staff at Plymouth having to manage commitments to local and project level activities, as a result of earlier-than-expected national interest in the project.

The **Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF)** has had a similar impact, partly by putting new demands on project staff to get involved with devising policies, strategies, action plans and targets. As recognised experts in the area of learning technologies (and learning and teaching development in general), project staff find their time in demand. Our flexibility of choosing to work with specific individuals and/or projects has become more difficult as a result of top down strategies and has resulted in greater expectation to work at a more strategic level within the institution.

Generally there has been more awareness and 'support' from management, but in practice this has often translated into new demands rather than (or as well as) new resources (source: institutional quarterly reports).

More specifically the development of new technology-based learning systems on an institution-wide basis has also impacted on the timescales for institutional level activities. It has been hard to get staff interested in small-scale projects when a new institutionally supported learning environment is just around the corner. It also makes good development sense and ensures greater embedding to capitalise on these new developments. However the timescales for such institutional projects rarely fit in with the short timescales of funded projects

A key factor in some institutions has been the restructuring of learning development units. Apart from the insecurity this means to staff posts, it has also led to changing local agendas which have impacted on the local project activities (source: institutional reports).

### 2.4.2 Lessons learned from partnership

Reflecting on our experience of working in a consortium (during project working group meeting in June 2000) and looking back at the lessons learned in year one, we have continued to gain similar benefits during the second year.

- The continued sharing of experiences and resources has benefited the development of our institutional programmes and the different timescales for activities such as validation or portfolio development has allowed members to offer support to each other.
- The EFFECTS framework continues to be the foundation of our developments and it has been useful in maintaining consistency in times when the rest of the HE sector seems to be changing rapidly. The opportunity to share national and institutional political issues between consortium members has been useful and has allowed individuals to put what is happening in their institution into perspective.
- Strong project management and leadership from the lead site has continued to be an essential element of what has made the project successful in the last year.

As mentioned above, it has often been difficult to arrange meeting at times and locations which representatives from each of the five institutions could attend, due to conflicting schedules, distance and occasionally to illness. Two strategies have been used to enable more project members to participate in each activity.

1. We have moved PWG meetings around the consortium institutions and tried to link them to other project activities where possible.
2. The Project Manager and Plymouth Project Officer have also undertaken site visits to maintain contact with institutional teams.
3. Continued use of the tltp-effects mailbase list.

**Participation in project level activities** has varied between consortium members and much of the responsibility for organisation has been with the lead site. This has been due to a number of factors including personal agendas of individuals, roles and positions of individuals and institutional demands on their time. In year 3 it is hoped that the responsibility for some of the intended activities will be shared across the consortium.

There has also been **variation in the implementation of the EFFECTS Framework** across each of the institutions. It was always intended that each institution should adapt their model to institutional needs and has been actively encouraged to do so from the start.

There is already emerging **an large unevenness in the number of participants** on institutional programmes. This will inevitably lead to differences in the number of participants embedding C&IT and completing programmes in each institution. Although the project is on target to archive the 70 participants embedding C&IT, it is unlikely that this will be evenly distributed across the five consortium members. Reasons for this include difficulties in gaining institutional validation of programmes in three institutions, a low take up of participants in one institution and strategically focussed activities in another.

It was also initially intended to identify five **partner institutions** and that each would be partnered by one of the consortium institutions regionally. However the current "pairings" are not all so conveniently matched. A number of different models have emerged. Some are as originally planned (Brookes pairing with Oxford). One is a result of a participant attending the UMIST programme from another institution and going back to develop a similar programme. Whilst some others are working with groups of institutions (e.g. in Manchester or across the South East). It is likely that the outcomes of these will be different in each case and the contribution from each consortium will vary greatly.

In year one it was identified that the project management needed to be responsive to change and allow for variations in the plan and identify changes to the project objectives and deliverables. In year two this has taken on extra dimensions as it is no longer possible to consider the project goals within an overall project context. At an early stage (in year one) institutions were asked to include future plans in their reports. As the project develops there will inevitably become some divergence across the institutions and it has been difficult at a project level to identify how best to manage this. Institutions feel a need to try to conform to the original plan and can become defensive when trying to explain why their institution does not want to travel the same route as the rest. It is essential to maintain open communication between consortium members and to ensure that all members of the project team are able to take advantage of opportunities as they arise and not feel constrained by the original project plans.

## **2.5 Evaluation**

See 2.1.2 Activities: project level (evaluation) for this year's evaluation activities.

### **2.5.1: Impact of evaluation on project decisions**

Our evaluation strategy has evolved such that each institution now files **quarterly reports of progress** against previous plans, along with new plans for the coming quarter. Our institutional plans remain informed by overall project objectives but have diverged sufficiently that the common reporting template was not proving helpful. In this way, all our project plans are informed by our assessment of current progress, based on ongoing measures of the outputs reported in section 2.1.

Our annual report for Year One outlined a number of key **changes to project plan** which we have pursued this year, including:

- Regional workshops and networking rather than one-to-one partnerships with cascade institutions
- Bidding for extra money to investigate the development of the learning technologist role in UK HE
- Working with TALENT, the ILT and the JISC to develop our work on strategic embedding of learning technologies
- Working more closely with SEDA to develop a national accreditation framework
- Moving away from structured programmes and portfolios of evidence towards more open-ended, action learning cycles with a range of participant outputs

All our national and regional **workshops** are evaluated with forms which are circulated at the end of each session. Participants are also followed up informally – many contact the lead site after the workshop to request further work or thank us for our contribution –and more formally via the mailbase list *tltp-effects-users*. This has led to a number of changes to our workshop planning. For example:

- We used feedback from our June 1999 workshop to plan an autumn workshop focused on the participant experience
- We used feedback from our autumn workshop to ensure the experience of partner institutions was included in our Coventry workshop
- We used feedback from our mailbase list to plan a workshop for institutional managers in May 2000.
- Positive feedback on the participative and responsive nature of our workshops led us to adopt an even more open-ended format, based around participant activities. For the ILT workshop we took along a large number of powerpoint slides and used these to build relevant presentations on the fly, based on the feedback from participant activities.
- Our break-out meeting at ALT-C99 showed the strength of support for a common case study format to coordinate the outcomes of TLTP3 projects. We have done considerable work this year to bring projects together around this common goal.

We have just embarked on a major **evaluation project** involving two external evaluators and the project working group. Our plan is that this should make recommendations to the project steering group meeting in January 2001, in time for us to re-focus our project activities in the last six months of funding.

### **2.5.2: Constraints on evaluation**

The main constraint on our evaluation plans has been the difficulty of recruiting external evaluators with suitable expertise. Evaluators with sufficient background knowledge of the project and its context have often already had some involvement with our work, or at the very least share many of the assumptions which we may want to examine critically. On the other hand, more objective evaluators may spend their entire secondment coming to grips with the issues, activities, cultural awareness and evaluation framework that we have been developing for the past two years. We have tried to address this dilemma by appointing two external evaluators, one who has been closely involved in embedding and evaluating learning technologies in UK HE (though not in the EFFECTS project) and one with a rather different background. It is already clear that this will be a challenging exercise, but we remain optimistic that the collaboration will provide some interesting outcomes!

## 2.6 Future Plans and Sustainability

### 2.6.1 Continuation plans

Our continuation plans are all dependent on collaboration with other projects, organisations and initiatives. It will not be possible to pursue any of these activities successfully at the end of project funding unless the groundwork has already been laid: therefore these activities are both long-term activities for year three (as outlined in Section 3.1) and prospective continuation plans for the subsequent period.

**Online resources** We aim to begin work to link our web-based resources with other resources to support staff embedding learning technologies: for example the Active Guide from Pat Maier/Adam Warren's Integrating Learning Technologies publication. One forum for doing this will be the new JISC-funded learning technologies gateway based at Warwick and UMIST. Clive Young (UMIST) and Helen Beetham (Plymouth) are members of the project working team and EFFECTS also has a seat on the Steering Committee.

**Case studies collaboration:** Despite indifference from the GLTC we are determined to pursue the work already done with SoURCE, ASTER, TALENT and FOCUS to provide common metadata descriptions of our project outcomes. Currently it seems likely that this will be coordinated by SoURCE at the OU but EFFECTS will take a leading role, particularly if it proves possible to combine this work with the feasibility study for the Learning Technologies Gateway (above). Meanwhile we will use our case studies template to ensure that outcomes from the EFFECTS project are amenable to common description, searching and analysis.

**Exploring Learning Technology theories** (models, philosophies and approaches): We are already committed to taking part in a workshop at ALT-C to explore the various theories and models in use by learning technology developers, researchers and lecturers. We are also committed to sharing ideas about course content and research/reading issues of interest to the programme developers, via our mailbase list. Helen Beetham is exploring the possibility of attracting ESRC funding for a seminar series on learning technologies.

**Publications:** a number of publications are already in the pipeline (see 3.3 Dissemination plan for Year 3). The most ambitious of these is a book on Embedding Learning Technologies, for which we hope to attract a commercial publisher (such as Kogan Page, Springer Verlag or SEDA). This will be composed of chapters by members of the EFFECTS consortium and other invited authors, along with a number of selected case studies to illustrate embedding at module, programme and institutional level. A meeting has been arranged for October to plan this publication and the seminar series in parallel.

**Develop PDN:** Currently the Professional Development Network exists as a number of discrete elements (i.e. mailbase lists, contacts lists, our proposed seminar series, EFFECTS workshops and events). Rather than try to consolidate all of these into a single network, coordinated by EFFECTS, we feel it would be more useful and sustainable to help consolidate other networks which are emerging around the UK. To this end we are planning workshops for the M1/M69 staff development link (at Derby), for the SHEFC-funded C&IT staff development network (at Glasgow or Edinburgh) and in Wales and Northern Ireland. Southampton is working to build a South Coast staff development network and UMIST will continue working with the full range of Manchester HEIs, along with Keele.

**Consolidate institutional frameworks:** Building on our work with TALENT and through the JISC scoping study we need to consolidate the lessons learned about embedding learning technologies strategically within institutions. This could take the form of reports to senior managers at our own institutions and of more general recommendations for dissemination within the sector (e.g. via TALENT and JISC ASSIST). There may also be opportunities for institutional consultancy, given the demand which already exists.

**Support partners:** As above, this will take the form of ongoing workshops with a focus on building regional networks and sharing good practice across institutions. We have also been asked to undertake consultancy visits from the lead site. While we do not consider that we are currently funded to do so, this is a possibility for the future.

**Cross-institutional collaboration among participants** is another area in which we had hoped to achieve more. We would like to explore systems for putting participants into contact with one another on the basis that there are often more points of similarity within subject areas than within institutions. Attempts to do this directly have come up against the problem that participants regard online discussion as a further demand on their time rather than an opportunity for peer learning. We may instead explore links with subject centres as a way of building disciplinary networks of learning technology developers.

**Further partners:** Even if the EFFECTS project achieves its goal of five partner institutions by the end of the project, there is no logical limit to the number of institutions which could develop EFFECTS programmes (providing the model is a sound one). We could also look at extending partnerships into the FE sector and

possibly even overseas. Our conference papers and workshops have aroused interest from universities in the US and Australia.

**Learning technology seminars:** We plan to arrange a seminar or series of seminars at a national level on learning technology theories, models, philosophies and approaches. This will enable us to extend our existing contacts, disseminate some of our outcomes in terms of actual programme materials, but perhaps more importantly raise the level of debate in the community of learning technology practitioners and foster links between this community and the often quite separate community of learning technology researchers and theorists. UNL and Plymouth are also organising local reading groups/seminars to encourage debate around similar issues, and UMIST have opened their EFFECTS course (including the discussion opportunities) to interested staff across the Manchester area.

### **2.6.2 Ongoing collaborations**

- We will continue to work with the **GLTC subject centres**, particularly Geography and Computing, to develop subject-specific awards or pathways, and to develop networks based around CPD.
- We will continue to take part in the **SEDA PDHE** committee, developing an overarching national accreditation framework for specialist CPD awards in HE.
- We will continue to give input to the **ILT** consultation process around both CPD and initial accreditation, providing suggestions as to appropriate outcomes for staff working with learning technologies.
- We will work with the **ALT** to explore the possibility of a single, national course in embedding learning technologies, based around the EFFECTS outcomes and an online resource library.
- We will work as consultants on the **JISC Learning Technology gateway**, both to develop the content base and to suggest ways that the resource could be used to enhance learning and teaching across subject areas.
- We will pursue our collaboration with other **generic TLTP3 projects** around the coordination of case study outputs, the development of metadata descriptions, and the sharing of evaluation outcomes.
- We will deliver regional workshops and help to promote emerging **staff development networks** in Scotland, M1/M69, the South Coast and Manchester. We will also look at the possibility of workshops in Wales and Northern Ireland.
- We will support the development of EFFECTS courses at potential partners, especially Derby, Coventry and UEL (and at Bristol, Reading and UCL where we have important contacts but which are at an earlier stage of institutional readiness).

### **2.6.3 Constraints**

We see enormous opportunities for continuation and collaboration with other projects. Unfortunately these project level activities are currently carried out almost entirely by the lead site. While we have more resources to commit to national level work than the other sites, there is still a limit to what can be achieved by two people. We will be working to draw in all the project teams to elements of our continuation strategy and project level activities for year three. We will also be continuing our strategy of bidding for additional funds and drawing in additional partners to pursue some of the new opportunities which arise.

## **2.7 Future Support**

Our contact at the NCT (Carol Baume) has been an important source of advice, information and support at crucial moments in our decision making. She has also helped us to prioritise our work for Year Three. Another member of the NCT (Marita Wood) has offered encouragement and support in our efforts at coordinating our outcomes with other TLTP3 projects. We are particularly grateful to them both.

We have participated in a number of TLTP events this year and are now benefiting from direct contact with a other TLTP3 projects whose remit is cognate with our own. We plan to share our annual reporting data for this year, which will cut out the frustrating process of waiting for a summary from the Tavistock institute and hopefully allow us to identify areas of common ground and synergy at a much earlier stage.

## 2.8 Round-up Sheet

Please fill in the following self-rating of your own project's achievements over the last year by circling the relevant number for each of the items below - where 1 is the lowest rating and 10 is the highest.

Please fill in the following self-rating of your own project's achievements over the last year by circling the relevant number for each of the items below - where 1 is the lowest rating and 10 is the highest.

### Overall success in achieving objectives

1      2      3      4      5      6      **7**      8      9      10

### Lessons learned regarding educational effectiveness

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      **8**      9      10

### Successfully embedding learning technologies, services and systems

1      2      3      4      5      **6**      7      8      9      10

### Effective partnership working

1      2      3      4      5      6      7      **8**      9      10

### Planning for future sustainability

1      2      3      4      5      6      **7**      8      9      10

**What lessons would you wish HEFCE/DHFETE to draw from TLTP3 for other current programmes and initiatives?**

Establish clear evaluation questions at start of each year so we can collect relevant data rather than struggling to answer retrospectively.

---

Consider likely effects of national agendas eg ILT, TQEF, L&T strategies and plan ahead for how these are likely to impact institutionally and across projects.

---

Look at longer term evaluation (ie 3-5 yrs) and plan longer term evaluation efforts based on a sensitive reading of current data trends.

---

Provide ongoing, flexible support for collaboration among projects, bearing in mind that opportunities for cooperation may arise spontaneously or unexpectedly.

---

Look at how project bids ('give us the money to do x') translate naturally into evaluation issues ('x will effectively embed learning technologies into UK HE') and coordinate these as a national research effort from the outset.

---

## Section 3 - Project Plan for Year 3

### 3.1 Activities for year three

Objectives - essential to completion of project	Output to Demonstrate Objective/Target/Outcome/ Milestone Achieved	Date to be Achieved
<p><b>Co-ordination of project activities:</b> <i>essential project management activities related to the project organised by the project manager but involving contributions from all consortium members.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PWG Group meetings</li> <li>• Quarterly reports</li> <li>• Steering Group Meeting</li> <li>• Final evaluation meeting</li> <li>• Final project report</li> </ul>	<p>(Sept, Jan, Apr) Jan 2001 June 2001 July 2001</p>
<p><b>Co-ordination of evaluation activities and collection of data:</b> <i>by project officers at individual and programme level, by the Project Manager/PWG at a project level in collaboration with the External Evaluators. This will lead to formative evaluation of the project with recommendations and a summative report produced for the Steering Group members</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Institutional reports including programme evaluations</li> <li>• Case studies (or similar) from individual participants (70)</li> <li>• Meetings with external evaluators and reports from institutional visits by evaluators</li> <li>• Interim reports from external evaluators</li> <li>• Final project report - including summaries and conclusions from evaluations</li> </ul>	<p>June 2001 July 2001 Aug-Dec 2000 Jan 2001 July 2001</p>
<p><b>Demonstrate that C&amp;IT embedded into 70 modules:</b> <i>by showing that the 70 participants have been supported via our programmes and have either embedded learning technologies (collecting valuable data such as publication or case study - written or via interview, evaluation report, etc.) or benefited professionally from the experience (evidence in form of a portfolio or output of external evaluation)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 30 edited case studies (or similar) from year two, published on the project web site.</li> <li>• 40 case studies (or similar) for year three, edited and publish on the project web site.</li> <li>• Summaries of focus groups with course participants</li> <li>• Completed portfolios from at least 10 participants</li> </ul>	<p>Dec 2000 July 2001 July 2001 July 2001</p>
<p><b>Investigating models of embedding learning technologies:</b> <i>by investigating how the EFFECTS Programmes have been integrated into each institution and look to produce some models of best practice.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initial reports from external evaluators which will include summaries of interviews with programme leaders</li> <li>• Analysis of data and production of models of best practice</li> <li>• Case studies of different models for publication</li> </ul>	<p>Sept 2000 Jan 2001 July 2001</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final evaluation report</li> </ul>	July 2001
<p><b>Encourage the development of EFFECTS programmes in other institutions:</b> <i>through our partners and further national workshops - specifically establish working agreements with partners and provide networking opportunities for partners; organise at least two regional/national workshops (Derby, Cardiff, Ulster, Glasgow) as well as representation at national conferences (ALT, SEDA, ILT)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALT post conference workshop - exploring a CPD scheme for learning technologists</li> <li>Working agreements with partners and/or recognised EFFECTS programmes (minimum of five)</li> <li>Organise and deliver at least two workshops nationally</li> </ul>	<p>Sept 2000</p> <p>Dec 2000</p> <p>Nov 2000 &amp; Apr 2000</p>
<p><b>Pilot a national recognition scheme.</b></p> <p><i>through a SEDA/PDinHE scheme to recognise EFFECTS programmes, supporting consortium and partners to gain recognition and using this to establish a workable CPD framework for embedding learning technologies (eg informing ILT consultation, looking for the correct balance of assessment, support and evidence, publications, etc.)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documentation for SEDA Pilot Scheme on Embedding Learning Technologies</li> <li>Recognition of pilot programmes (target 5)</li> <li>Dissemination activities at SEDA and ILT conferences</li> <li></li> </ul>	<p>Oct 2000</p> <p>Jan 2001 onwards</p> <p>Dec 2000</p> <p>June 2001</p>
<p><b>Sharing and collating of institutional resources for EFFECTS Programmes:</b></p> <p><i>by investigating the best method(s) of making these available to other HEI's and integrating them into emerging frameworks (eg LTSN and LT Portal)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Report of available resources and where to access published on web site</li> <li>Update and maintain EFFECTS web site</li> <li>Consultancy for Learning Technologies Portal project</li> </ul>	<p>Oct 2000</p> <p>Dec 2000</p> <p>Feb 2001</p>
Continue to integrate issues related to accessibility into the EFFECTS programmes, identify examples which demonstrate good practice.		
Dissemination activities will focus on the promotion of activities undertaken by the participants on EFEFCTS programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Publication focussed on evaluation of the outcomes, theories and philosophies and examples of the case studies.</li> <li>Articles (published or submitted) by individuals looking at their projects and from project working group members.</li> <li>Reports and publications from the external evaluation on the effectiveness of the EFFECTS programmes and the impact on the HE sector.</li> </ul>	
Continue to develop appropriate EFFECTS Frameworks within each	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programme review documents and/or programme validation</li> </ul>	

<p>institution, seeking institutional and national recognition for all participants.</p>	<p>documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extracts from institutional learning and teaching strategies and actions plans relating to the embedding of learning technologies</li> <li>• Participant lists and record of staff who have completed institutional programmes.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

In addition to the objectives listed above which form part of the initial project proposal, the EFFECTS Project has been working with other projects to establish further areas of work. These do not form deliverables of the original project but may form part of the continuation strategy and areas for future development.

The project is also working with other national projects and initiatives to investigate continuation plans and opportunities for:

- Sharing experiences of running programmes (educational philosophies and approaches), the resources we have developed and ways of disseminating and evaluating individual projects - to be disseminated through a one-day seminar and a publication (perhaps part of book or an output from seminar?)
- Developing a professional development network through the Learning Technologies Portal and case studies database with other TLTP projects SOURCE, TALENT);
- Sharing web based resources for embedding learning technologies via the Learning Technologies Portal
- Sharing and evaluating case studies material with other projects
- Evaluating of the staff and student learning experience (eg through a continuation bid in collaboration with other TLTP projects TALENT, ELEN, CAA),
- Reviewing professional development needs of staff involved in learning technologies (eg JCALT Career Development Study and THETO National Standards).

## 3.2 Evaluation plan for year three

### 3.2.1 Overview

This more detailed evaluation strategy has emerged from the evaluation framework established by the EFFECTS project team at UNL (see Oliver et al, 1999). It should be read in conjunction with the EFFECTS Evaluation Reports (Year 1 and Year 2), specifically the lessons at participant level, programme level, institutional level and national/project level.

### 3.2.2 Overall evaluation strategy

The evaluation will address 'intended use by intended users' (Patton, 1997), originally defined as:

participants in EFFECTS programmes

professional development staff involved in design and delivery of EFFECTS programmes

senior managers within EFFECTS institutions

national policy makers with remits relating to professional development in embedding learning technologies

project funders

The evaluation will address the original project **objectives** given as:

- embed C&IT into 70 teaching modules across the 5 consortium institutions
- develop local support frameworks within each institution
- evaluate the effectiveness of each EFFECTS model
- transfer the EFFECTS model(s) of integrating C&IT into five other institutions
- develop a nationally accredited scheme of professional development for staff embedding C&IT
- establish a Professional Development Network to disseminate the project outcomes

There may also be a need to take into account the original project **aims**, which can be summarised as:

- Promote a shift in Higher Education staff culture, reinforcing the professional aspects of the role of the university teacher and valuing those involved in C&IT supported teaching, through a nationally recognised qualification.
- Enhance the embedding of C&IT in a range of subject areas, spearheaded by the 70 modules targeted during the project.
- Ensure wide applicability of the project's findings to other HEIs.
- Build an informed group of staff who can act as agents for further integration and development, both within institutions and disciplines, supported by a professional development network based in the consortium institutions.

These aims provide the context for interpretation of the objectives as specific evaluation questions.

### 3.2.3 Participant level

Here we are evaluating the impact on student learning using a range of evaluation methodologies selected and implemented by participants.

#### **Key stakeholders**

- participants in EFFECTS programmes
- students of participants
- others identified as stakeholders in the participants' development proposal (e.g. colleagues, support staff)

#### **Aims/objectives to be addressed**

- Aims and student learning outcomes identified by each participant as part of their project proposal
- Overall objective to *embed C&IT into 70 teaching modules across the 5 consortium institutions*

- Original aim to *enhance the embedding of C&IT in a range of subject areas, spearheaded by the 70 modules targeted during the project*

### **Evaluation question: educational impact**

At the evaluation awaydays (June 2000) the Project Working Group discussed how to define the 'EFFECTS model' when it came to evaluating educational impact, i.e. the impact on student learning. As the Project team does not have (much) direct contact with students, and as the five consortium institutions work rather differently with staff, it is necessary to articulate this evaluation question very carefully. Two alternatives were presented:

- What is the total educational impact (on student learning) of the work of personnel who have been employed through the EFFECTS project to support the embedding of learning technologies?

This would include any work carried out by the EFFECTS Project Officers, directly or indirectly, to support the embedding of learning technologies, whether or not the staff embedding the learning technologies were participants on an EFFECTS programme or were exposed to the EFFECTS learning outcomes. Only one institution (Oxford Brookes) was in favour of this approach.

- What is the total educational impact (on student learning) of the embedding learning technology projects which have been carried out by participants on EFFECTS programmes?

This was the approach favoured by the remaining four institutions because it places the EFFECTS learning outcomes at the centre of our evaluation effort. It was felt that the EFFECTS philosophy is one of *developing* rather than simply *supporting* staff who become involved in using learning technologies with their students.

This raises the question of whether to count all staff who have participated in all or part of an EFFECTS programme, or only those staff who have completed and successfully submitted a case study or portfolio for assessment. Given the difficulties in motivating staff to complete the process, it was felt that the former approach would yield more valuable data.

### **Actions for each institution**

- Support participants e.g. provide resources on evaluation, offer models of good practice, provide materials such as pro formas to structure evaluation, contribute to evaluation and writing up where appropriate.
- Share best practice in supporting participants – e.g. online materials, case study pro formas, reference lists – with other members of the Project consortium.
- Liaise with External Evaluator to provide data and access to course participants as appropriate.

### **Actions for project evaluator(s)**

- Ensure ongoing opportunities for sharing best practice (PWG)
- Review and collate data from case studies on educational impact (JH)
- Review a sample of participant evaluations in depth and evaluate effectiveness of approaches taken (JH)
- Collate, analyse and report on findings wrt educational impact (JH)
- Make recommendations for improvement within the project (JH and PWG)
- Develop models/make recommendations for wider dissemination within UK HE (JH and PWG)

### **3.2.4 Programme level**

Here we are evaluating both the educational impact and the resource implications. QA procedures determine how programmes are evaluated, though we may want to share best practice (given that institutional procedures may not focus on learning outcomes in the way we want to). The most significant resource implications here are staff time.

### **Key stakeholders**

- participants in EFFECTS programmes
- professional development staff (deliverers of programmes)
- institutional managers and decision makers

***Aims/objectives to be addressed***

- Aims and rationale given in the programme validation documents (in the case of validated programmes)
- Professional development needs of participants
- Original objective to *develop local support frameworks within each institution*
- Original aim to *build an informed group of staff who can act as agents for further integration and development, both within institutions and disciplines*

***Evaluation question: educational impact***

- What is the total educational/ professional development impact of staff participation in the EFFECTS programmes?

In other words we are concerned not only that participants should have effectively embedded learning technologies on one occasion, but that they should have an awareness of the process of embedding which enables them to complete further iterations of the cycle with less (or a different degree of) support. We are also concerned that the EFFECTS programmes, and associated development staff and activities, should in general have raised staff awareness, skills, aptitudes and interest in the embedding of learning technologies.

A subsidiary question arises concerning support for staff in actually embedding learning technologies:

- How effectively have staff been supported at each EFFECTS institution?

Support need not necessarily come from staff employed by the EFFECTS project: indeed an index of success would be the leverage of other institutional resources to support staff in embedding learning technologies.

***Evaluation question: resource implications***

- What are the resource implications of each EFFECTS programme?

The most significant resource is likely to be staff time both in delivering and in participating on the programmes.

***Actions for each institution***

- Keep a record of programme development e.g. critical incident analysis, personal learning log, minutes and emails.
- Ensure programmes meet institutional QA requirements for participant feedback and evaluation.
- Carry out additional evaluation sessions/focus groups/questionnaires with participants as appropriate.
- Liaise with External Evaluator to design institutionally-specific evaluation questions and approaches
- Identify key issues and feed back to project level evaluation (e.g. at yearly evaluation awaydays).
- Keep record of resources devoted to the programme.
- Share best practice in programme evaluation (e.g. questionnaires, pro formas) with other members of the Project consortium.

***Actions for project evaluator(s)***

- Ensure ongoing opportunities for sharing best practice and for reporting on progress (PWG)
- Interview selected participants about their experience of programmes (JH)
- Collate, analyse and report on findings (JH)
- Make recommendations for improvement within the project (JH and PWG)
- Develop models/make recommendations for wider dissemination within UK HE (JH and PWG)

***3.2.5 Transferability***

This entire section may be regarded as optional, depending on the constraints of time.

***Key stakeholders***

- (potential) participants in EFFECTS programmes at other institutions

- professional development staff at other institutions
- institutional managers and decision makers at other institutions

### ***Aims/objectives to be addressed***

Original aim to:

- *transfer the EFFECTS model(s) of integrating C&IT into five other institutions*

### ***Evaluation question: transferability***

Originally it was envisaged that each consortium member would work with a single partner to support the development of an EFFECTS programme at that institution. This has not really been the case, hence these two questions are difficult in practice to treat separately:

- How transferable/useful has each EFFECTS model proved to be?
- How transferable/useful has the overall EFFECTS framework proved to be?

The second of these questions clearly also needs to be addressed at national/project level.

### ***Actions for each institution***

- Keep a record of all dissemination activities and contacts with partner institutions
- Identify key issues and feed back to project level evaluation (e.g. at yearly evaluation awaydays)
- Share best practice in working with partner institutions with other members of the Project consortium.

### ***Actions for project evaluator(s)***

- Ensure ongoing opportunities for sharing best practice and for reporting on progress (PWG)
- Interview selected professional developers and/or senior managers at partner institutions (?JH/MD)
- Collate, analyse and report on findings (?JH/MD)
- Make recommendations for improvement within the project (?JH/MD and PWG)
- Develop models/make recommendations for wider dissemination within UK HE (?JH/MD and PWG)

## ***3.2.6 Institutional level***

Here too we must evaluate both the educational and the resource impact of the project. Our baseline audits helped to identify where each institution started out from in terms of learning and teaching strategy and provision for embedding C&IT.

### ***Key stakeholders***

- senior managers
- professional development staff
- other staff and students identified as beneficiaries in the programme rationale

### ***Aims/objectives to be addressed***

- Original objective to *promote a shift in Higher Education staff culture, reinforcing the professional aspects of the role of the university teacher and valuing those involved in C&IT supported teaching..*
- Original objective to *enhance the embedding of C&IT in a range of subject areas, spearheaded by the modules targeted during the project*
- Original objective to *build an informed group of staff who can act as agents for further integration and development... within institutions*
- Relevant aims and targets from institutional L&T strategy

### ***Evaluation questions: educational impact***

- (How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities promoted a shift in culture at each institution?

- (How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities enhanced the embedding of C&IT in a range of subject areas across each institution?
- (How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities built an informed group of staff who can act as agents for further integration and development at each institution?
- Plus specific questions designed by the programme team at each institution

### **Actions for each institution**

- Revisit baseline audit for the project mid-term and finally at the end of the project.
- Return process reports as required
- Take part in JCALT scoping study

### **Project level actions**

- Share models for institutional evaluation (PWG)
- Coordinate JCALT scoping study and produce final deliverables (Lead site)
- Distribute pro forma for quarterly reporting and collate results (Lead site)
- Review and analyse data from quarterly reports (MD)
- Carry out structured interviews with senior managers and professional development staff at each institution (MD)
- Collate, analyse and report on findings (MD and PWG)
- Make recommendations for improvement within the project (MD and PWG)
- Make recommendations for wider dissemination within UK HE (MD and PWG)

## **3.2.7 Project/national level**

### **Key stakeholders**

- national policy makers
- project funders
- wider learning technology community
- wider HE community

### **Aims/objectives to be addressed**

- Original objective to *develop a nationally accredited scheme of professional development for staff embedding C&IT*
- Original objective to *establish a Professional Development Network to disseminate the project outcomes*
- Original objective to *promote a shift in Higher Education staff culture, reinforcing the professional aspects of the role of the university teacher and valuing those involved in C&IT supported teaching...*
- Original aim to *build an informed group of staff who can act as agents for further integration and development... supported by a professional development network based in the consortium institutions*
- Original aim to *ensure wide applicability of the project's findings to other HEIs*

### **Evaluation questions: educational impact**

- (How) has the Project contributed to the development of a nationally accredited scheme:
  - via SEDA?
  - via ALT?
  - via ILT?
  - via other collaborations?

- (How) has the Project contributed to the building of a network of professional C&IT developers in UK HE?
- (How) has the EFFECTs programme and associated activities promoted a shift in culture across UK HE?

***Actions for each institution***

- Record all dissemination activities and contact with other organisations and institutions
- Take part in evaluation activities
- Provide and facilitate the collection of data by the External Evaluator

***Project level actions***

- Organise annual evaluation events (Lead Site)
- Edit and provide annual report data to the NCTeam and Tavistock (Lead Site)
- Carry out structured interviews with national stakeholders and decision makers (MD)
- Carry out national email survey of learning technology community to establish awareness and perception of EFFECTS project (MD)
- Collate, analyse and report on findings (PWG and MD)

It is important that this level of evaluation does not replicate work done by the Tavistock Institute to evaluate the overall impact and effectiveness of the TLTP3 program, which will involve assessment of the contribution of individual programmes.

### 3.2.8 Summary evaluation objectives and questions

Objective/aim	Question	Evaluation approach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Embed C&amp;IT into 70 teaching modules across the 5 consortium institutions</li> </ul>	What is the total educational impact (on student learning) of the embedding learning technology projects which have been carried out by participants on EFFECTS programmes?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop local support frameworks within each institution</li> </ul>	How effectively have staff been supported at each EFFECTS institution?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evaluate the effectiveness of each EFFECTS model</li> </ul>	What is the total educational/professional development impact of staff participation in the EFFECTS programmes?  (How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities promoted a shift in culture at each institution?  (How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities enhanced the embedding of C&IT in a range of subject areas across each institution?  (How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities built an informed group of staff who can act as agents for further integration and development at each institution?  What are the resource implications of each EFFECTS programme?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transfer the EFFECTS model(s) of integrating C&amp;IT into five other institutions</li> </ul>	How transferable/useful has each EFFECTS model proved to be?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a nationally accredited scheme of professional development for staff embedding C&amp;IT</li> </ul>	(How) has the Project contributed to the development of a nationally accredited scheme: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>via SEDA?</li> <li>via ALT?</li> <li>via ILT?</li> <li>via other collaborations?</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish a Professional Development Network to disseminate the project outcomes</li> </ul>	(How) has the Project contributed to the building of a network of professional C&IT developers in UK HE?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote a shift in Higher Education staff culture, reinforcing the professional aspects of the role of the university teacher and valuing those involved in C&amp;IT supported teaching, through a nationally recognised qualification.</li> </ul>	(How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities promoted a shift in culture at each institution?  (How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities promoted a shift in culture in UK HE?	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhance the embedding of C&amp;IT in a range of subject areas, spearheaded by the 70 modules targeted during the project.</li> </ul>	<p>(How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities enhanced the embedding of C&amp;IT in a range of subject areas across each institution?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure wide applicability of the project's findings to other HEIs.</li> </ul>	<p>How transferable/useful has the overall EFFECTS framework proved to be?</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Build an informed group of staff who can act as agents for further integration and development, both within institutions and disciplines, supported by a professional development network based in the consortium institutions.</li> </ul>	<p>(How) has the EFFECTS programme and associated activities built an informed group of staff who can act as agents for further integration and development at each institution?</p>	