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Introduction

• Assessment of e-learning capability is difficult
• Benchmarking - measurement and comparison
• Benchmarking in UK:
  – 2006 – 2008 HEA and JISC amongst 77 HEIs
  – 8 HEIs used the eMM Model (Marshall, University of Victoria, Wellington, New Zealand)
• In Australasia
  – 2004 Australia
  – 2008 19 ITPs in New Zealand used the eMM model
Benefits of Benchmarking

- State of e-learning and progress towards embedding e-learning
- Leads to understanding of own position on e-learning, set aspirations and goals for embedding e-learning
- Opportunity for active reflection on e-learning processes, provision and practices in institutions
- Informs strategic planning in the use of technology
- Comparison with rest of sector, but ...
- Improving own practice through self-review
The eMM Model

- The e-learning Maturity Model (eMM) is a benchmarking tool designed to ensure that educational organisation investments in e-learning design, development and deployment are meeting the needs of the learners, teachers and the organisation.
- In essence it is a self-review framework.
- 5 major process areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process category</th>
<th>Brief description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Processes that directly impact on pedagogical aspects of e-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Processes surrounding the creation and maintenance of e-learning resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Processes surrounding the oversight and management of e-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Processes surrounding the evaluation and quality control of e-learning through its entire lifecycle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Processes associated with institutional planning and management</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The eMM Model

• 35 processes, e.g. under the Evaluation category there are 3 processes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation: Processes surrounding the evaluation and quality control of e-learning through its entire lifecycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The eMM Model

• Each process can be assessed across five dimensions
The eMM Model

- During an assessment, the ‘assessor’ will rate performance in each process from ‘not adequate’ to ‘fully adequate’

- Once a process has been assessed, an overall rating is then made for each dimension of the process, with a colour being assigned
The eMM Model

The *Delivery* dimension for process E2 “Teaching staff are able to provide regular feedback on quality and effectiveness of their e-learning experience”, has two assessable practices:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td>Summative feedback collected regularly from teaching staff regarding the quality and effectiveness of their e-learning experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely</td>
<td>Formative feedback collected regularly from teaching staff regarding the quality and effectiveness of their e-learning experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partially</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The eMM Model

- Once each dimension within a process has been rated, the results for an institution may be displayed on a pictorial ‘carpet’ which allows visual comparison of capability within that process across a sector.
The eMM Model

Delivery

Optimisation
The E2 Process

- E2 “Teaching staff are able to provide regular feedback on quality and effectiveness of their e-learning experience”
  - Wintec rated relatively weakly
  - Feedback largely informal
  - Isolated surveys
  - No systematic analysis
Enhancing e-learning capability in the E2 process through professional development at Wintec

*Capability Development* team:

- Academic Developers
- e-learning Developer
- Learning Technologist
- ICT Trainer
Enhancing e-Learning capability in the E2 process through professional development at Wintec

- Formal staff evaluation plan (All)
- Induction programme, needs analysis & CDC (M,O)
- Suite of workshops to progressively build capability (D,P)
- Formalised user testing of new technologies (D,P)
- F2F and online fora via Moodle (D,P,M)
- Reflective portfolios (D,P,M)
Enhancing e-Learning capability in the E2 process through professional development at Wintec

- Continuous 1:1 e-learning support to staff (D,P,M)
- Annual staff survey – the 3 C’s (D,P,Dn)
- Flexible Delivery Champions (All)
- ‘Good practice’ checklists (Dn)
- Inclusion of e-learning questions in SETMAPs (D,P,Dn)
The next stage...

- Analyse annual needs analysis & CDC outputs
- Gather staff feedback on development opportunities and user testing
- Gauge staff perceptions of e-learning CoP
- Analyse results of annual staff survey
- Evaluate benefits of FD Champions
- Review use of ‘good practice' checklists
- Analyse trends in SETMAPs data
- Review formal staff evaluation plan
- Present at ALT-C 2010!
Summary

• Benchmarking is challenging, difficult, but beneficial
• Allows cross-sector comparison
• Opportunity to examine, review and reflect
• Can inform future investment of resources
• Highlighted Wintec's weaknesses, in particular the E2 process
• Highlighted Wintec's plans to address its weaknesses
Thank you for your attention!
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