



ACODE Benchmarking Summit 2018

The following data/info and ideas have been provided by participants of the ACODE Benchmarking Summit 2018. It consists of Primary and Supporting Points.

Primary Points | Supplied by focused tables

Supporting Points | Supplied as supplementary by all tables

BM1: Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning

Primary points:

- Top down initiatives matched with Bottom up (operational) implementation CoPs, divisional plans, communication and educational designers.
- Clarity of the role of Associate Deans or Operational level people.
- Capability development- Middle level management to take leadership, accountability and agency authority.
- Support academics to share and communicate TEL initiatives, policies and governance.
- Accountability
 - Good data (analytics, dashboards)
 - Transparency
 - Agency- involve stakeholders (including students) in devising objectives, outcomes and measures to increase buy-in.
 - Strong vision and direction for TEL
- Reinforce strategy and goals.
 - "Bottom up" and "Top down" engagement, involvement, leadership (including students)
 - Strong stakeholder representation and participation
 - Budget alignment with strategy.
 - Right people at the "table" (resource pool at governance level)

- Need for rigor, robustness but maintaining agility.
- Technology vs innovation
- Early adopters not necessarily the process/ communicator drivers (Business case etc.)
- Communication
- Embedded in all strategies/operational plans across all levels (ad a commitment to).

Supporting points:

- Keep VC's and DVCA's away from TEL decisions
- Understand type: Set vision and value proposition. Stay out of tech. Units interpret vision to deliver.
- Innovation after catch up. Global market now → technological innovation is no use unless global.
- Alignment of strategy of goals e.g. how do we measure? E.g. 1x 'Active Learning' component in courses at GU. "prototypical course design principles.
- Governance Culture = COM8. "What committees etc. Do and why/what is the impact?"
- Specific TEL committee reporting to L+T committees (wide breadth) agency.
- Including student voice
- Cascading communication plan at USQ
- Operationalisation of strategy and plans is a content challenge.
- Learning model frameworks to evaluate unit delivery.

BM2: Planning for institution-wide quality improvement of technology enhanced learning

Primary points:

- Evaluation
- Post-implementation
- Collective action- showing value
- Business ownership
- Levels of adoption
 - Faculty
 - Enterprise
 - process for adoption
- Screening of tools and applications
- Publisher
- Unified Messaging e.g. 1 divisional message
- A framework for TEL to guide evaluation
- A way to manage innovation that doesn't scare people off
- TEL adoption- not just left at project level
- Apply 'agile' design principles for projects
 - Don't mention agile
 - Fail fast
 - Self org. teams
- Ask students more about their experience of TELT
- Program-level focus on evaluations and responses
- Consistency?
- Rewards for review? Rewards for engagement with TELT?
 - Communication/socialization of benefits of TELT to student experience/learning

Supporting points:

- Vocab "Evaluation"
 1. Evidence towards good decision making
 2. Has this project met its closure requirements?
- Students evaluate their experience (not necessarily the technology OR the learning).
- Develop QA frame way process for courses (some of us don't have one!)
- "Closing the loop"
 1. What is the evaluation feeding back into?
 - Institution processes must include TEL. Needs pedagogy → is it the right tool?
 - Central group → capture needs and disseminates which ideation- process system and review!
 - Student representation/engagement in planning process not just a tick box
 - Prospective student's alumni
 - Need a central group to conduct planning
 - Capacity to plan properly with correct info
 - Stakeholders
 - Process to advance use cases for consideration within the plan
 - Guaranteed funding sources beyond project status
 - Funding for just-in-time solutions
 - Tech innovation process
 - Addressing issues created by decisions made at high levels without consulting implementers- L+T group → driven by non-users.
 - Re-establish TEL projects prioritisation panel/meet (so we don't buy any more bots).
 1. Add TEL more specifically to our policies
 2. Develop a TEL health check tool to coordinators can self-assess
 3. Innovation: Any university that catches up to be using proven tools will be in front- no need for 'innovation'.

BM3: Information technology systems, services and support for technology enhanced learning

Primary points:

- Formal Relationships/Informal Relationships
 - BRM role (Business Relationship Manager)
 - Business Owners
 - Technical Owners
 - Coffee meetings
 - Embedded IT people in projects
- Clear responsibilities and good governance
- Role shadowing/residency
- Statistics to determine demographics and therefore anticipate support needs, improve service desk and tooling
- Help IT 'get over' their last "oopsie"
- Informal/agile connections
- Build trust, information sharing → better outcomes
- "Virtual CSU"
- You learn more from failure than from accidental/unconscious success

Supporting points:

- Communications between IT and L+T groups
- Understanding pin points
- Bring an IT person day!
- How can we be proactive in our roles and department?
- Building personal relationships: University of Melbourne transferred response for support back to infrastructure. Rocky at first but working now. Top down decision. Now meet fortnightly to maintain relationships.
- Co-Leadership of large transformational projects between education and IT
- Developing an understanding of where endorsement should be coming from

- Mix of informal meetings/coffee with counterpart → formal charge advisory boards, project control groups etc.
- Party and socialize with them
- Keep them engaged
- Explain the benefits of technology in L+T environment.
- Embedded- product owners
- Perspectives → non-functional
- Joint forces approach → ongoing support is based in funding model
- Beyond projects regardless of where “Bodies” sit
- Implement structures to encourage exploration
 - Process
 - Platforms
 - Non-functional
- Clearly articulated vision and TEL strategy
 - Multi-function teams
 - Co-location
 - SUC coordination forums
 - SUC managers meet (under business owner priorities)

BM4: The application of technology enhanced learning services

Primary points:

- Maintaining focus on pedagogy, technology, efficiency and compliance
- Evaluation (4.7 and 4.8 typically focused on technocratic rather than educational aspects (of governance))
- Problem: integrating guidelines with practice in support of learning vs rules for compliance – performance/conformance tension
- How do we disseminate standards/guidelines/conduct QA without turning it into a compliance exercise?
- Pedagogical framework and intent. Communicate to expectation e.g. rapid induction program online module, Grad cert, HEA
- Capacity building – to use new/existing pedagogies and technologies
- Overlay frameworks with other initiatives for application
 - Cross- divisional/discipline culture/methods e.g. digital learning hubs case studies
- Championing activities

Supporting points:

- Role of Quality Matters?
- Internal voluntary hard to engage academics in QA
- How to apply standards
- DVCA- active leadership in spaces tech pedagogy (lead by Dean in L+T)
- Good engagement and collaboration on focus L+T from stakeholder group
- Early adoption spread more widely but manage flexibly not just usual suspects or faculty spark)
- Teaching frameworks
 - Showed language
 - Across L+T community
- Challenge of enabling and how to carry out the intent → Lot of preparation time- support end resources and staff end.

- Sharing: communities of practice and special interest groups
- Clear need for embedded learning designers
- Best practice course design guidelines and self-assessment tool
- LMS min standards
- Grants give ED's comp. show and tell → Includes PP blended learning
 - Evaluation
 - Templates → course design
 - Local ED's and TEL support
 - Good links into programs → central
- Individual approach → tailored to academic
- EDs skills to manage change
- Networking/sharing practices forums
- Challenge sustained change
- Focus seems to be on the 'now' rather than the 'journey'
- Confidence and imagination led by academics across the board
- Team approach- can't be good at everything
- ACODE working group to explore AI as a special area of TEL also around employability recruitment.
- Need to move away from the model of economics of scale in TEL. Not the case anymore. Increase levels in expectation.
- Casualisation of workforce is a common issue. Challenge of preparation and planning when staff is an unknown
- Need to pay/incentivise casuals attending TEL professional development

BM5: Staff professional development for the effective use of technology enhanced learning

Primary points:

- Top level TEL plans integral (check assumptions)
- Resources and prof. LEARN@CENTRAL to be coordinated (and other units)
- Pathways need to be defined and supported (planning and reporting)
- Terminology and coms – Prof. learn vs prof. development training
- Capabilities across academic leadership roles need ID and Prof. learn ops
- Peer performance activities @ high level roles (aligned to standards frameworks e.g. HEA)
- Heighten profiles of TEL support providers (colleagues rather than support)
- Ways to demonstrate good practice
- Lose the assumption ‘anyone can teach’
 - Up the ‘value proposition’ of prof learning and those who provide IT!
- Professional development that is aligned with role requirements
- Staff capability model
- Develop roadmap and align professional development to be forward focused with external reference (HEA)
- Develop a unified strategic plan between faculties and centre for staff development needs
- Create a specific staff-facing module on TELT for new and existing staff
- Characterise the staff journey for orientation to promotion in relation to TELT
- Deliberate integration of TEL in accredited programs, e.g. HEA
- Use LMS change as an opportunity to introduce new language and approach deeper design level conversation
- Importance of collaborative effort between L+T and Technology expertise
- Professional development in partnership alongside with teaching (profile teaching experience) academics, to add value and credibility
 - Possible secondments of expertise
- Mechanisms to offer JIT, Professional development TEL for staff

- Professional development to do things 'at scale' seems to be a big need
- Assuring equitable professional development support by recording activity and identifying gaps
- Adaptive- first time user support tools with LMS
- Customized/ bespoke approach

Supporting points:

- IT fix staff prof development
 1. Teacher training! Teaching skills
 2. UQ teachers- now stall only
- Aim for more coordination between central and faculties – consistency and quality
- Professional development needs to be aligned with process for promotion (as a means of motivation) especially if it is not a formal evaluation such as Graduate Certificates.
- Want to promote a calendar of training courses
- Two levels bring organizational change vs bale professional development strategy closer together
- Help Sarah initiative
- ACODE share + tell
 1. Framework
 2. RD supporting
- Professional development by 'roving minstrel' builds trust, visibility

BM6: Staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning

Primary points:

- Enforce or implement 'dotted line' reporting for support staff into central teams*: better alignment of resources
 - * note this may not work at all universities
- Leveraging communities of practice to inform or influence
- Creating an induction program to learning technologists/support teams
 - We have induction programs for teachers, not support staff
- Comprehensive and defensible evaluation framework
- Awareness important
- SWG- online resources/physical
 - Academic focused case study
 - Roadshows
 - Events
 - Service catalogue (what, who, how, why)
 - Support profiles
- Framework
 - Coordination
 - Central hub/spoke
 - Who does what?
- Resources
 - \$\$\$
 - Personnel
 - Knowledge
- Evaluation/feedback of services (systems)

Supporting points:

- Define agreed roles and responsibilities for support staff across faculties and support units

- Create designer's forum (like Sydney) to share good practice, issue, network and updates
- Create SVC management group under PUC (T+L) to prioritise work
- Tighter reporting between TOC and control designers
- How do staff give feedback on usefulness of JIT resources?
- Recognise we're not always teaching 9am-5pm but also not teaching 24/7.
 - Focus your support
- Learning Technology at the elbow support (more of them)
- More educational designers in faculty
- Citizen enables support hub/platform
 - Staff talking to staff – peer to peer
- Ability to engage in an x-org coordination/collaboration conversation is a key capability
- In-context support if point and shoot
- UX- integration support and practice (streamline exp co-workshops)
- Scope, Scope and scope
 - Transition
 - Operational
- Top level budgets don't reflect people, just software

BM7: Student training for the effective use of technology enhanced learning

Primary points:

- Student journey (build autonomy...)
 - clarity
 - Scaffolding into units
 - JIT
- Governance- org. commitment to systems aligned to evidenced student needs
- Shift emphasis from 'training' to continuous support

Supporting points:

- Coordinated website for transition
- Preview site for 1st year courses
- Fragmented induction
 - Need cohesion
 - Exemplars
- Academic integrity
- Student and staff drop in sessions every afternoon
- Early exposure to tech delivery
- Self-guides are mostly sufficient
- General/core applications don't need training
- Help when/need it
- Specific applications may need guidance (tutor/academic level)
- Which teams are providing student 'training'?
 - How would we discover this?
- Need to create opportunities for students to self-assess competencies, not estimate
- Student trainers- tech angels!
- Right information- right time
- Self-assess resource for students e.g. library guide on TEL for ss.

- Context and timing are critical- if you offer help they don't know about it, you're not offering it!
 - Need to communicate

BM8: Student support for the use of technology enhanced learning

Primary points:

- Effective handover of support between service areas
 - So students don't get 'bumped' around
- Establish a focused time to collect student views on TEL and their learning experience
E.g. 'TEL us' week early year to be formative for action
- Build-out from pockets of good practice and connect services
 - Library
 - Study and learning centre
- Utilise students to provide relevant support
- Deliver self-paced onboarding systems/overlays for master learner tools

Supporting points:

- Students as partners
- Learning how to learn online → orientation → online volunteer → need two versions
 1. Mature aged
 2. Return students
 3. Island context
- Learning how to learn online --> prior to enrolment
- Drop in staff and students → key periods
- Embedded just-in-time
- Deal better diversity
- One stop-shop for student questions
- Coordination between core business units responsible for student services is essential in ensuring they are supported
- Mobile apps (unclear of usage) for alerts and notification using calendar
- Collecting data from experience surveys
- Students do an orientation (course page) -USP
- Student IT group – library – Melbourne

- Policy → access to course after weeks prior to course start
- Orientation course, wattle basics online
- Student IT info literacy training, not just 'band-aid' support (BM7)
- Trained support
- Escalation process
- Need to review support processes
- One primary advocate for students, 'owning' and chasing up quality student support
- Consider Bots or an AI tool
- Google search canvas LMS support is a game changer
- Evaluate student support services?

End.