



Leading in Technology Enhanced Learning and Teaching

**Benchmarks for Technology
Enhanced Learning**

The Australasian Council on Open, Distance and e-learning, hereafter referred to as ACODE

Acknowledgement

The ACODE Executive would like to thank the working group for their excellent work in reviewing and refreshing the now well established ACODE Benchmarks.

The work of refreshing the ACODE Benchmarks for Technology Enhanced Learning was undertaken by: Michael Sankey (University of Southern Queensland), Helen Carter (Macquarie University), Stephen Marshall (Victoria University of Wellington), Regina Obexer (Queensland University of Technology), Carol Russell (University of Western Sydney) and Romy Lawson (University of Wollongong)

Coordinated by: Michael Sankey

Correspondence

ACODE Secretariat

C/O Teaching and Learning Centre, University of Canberra, ACT 2601
Australia

Email: secretariat@acode.edu.au

Telephone: +61 (02) 6201 5176

Website: www.acode.edu.au

Version 3.1

© 2014 ACODE

You are free to share, copy, distribute and transmit the work under the following conditions:

- Attribution — You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.
- Non Commercial — You may not use the material for commercial purposes.
- Share Alike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original.



Table of Contents

Acknowledgement	1
Correspondence.....	1
Introduction	4
About the Benchmarks	4
Section 1 – How to use the Benchmarks	6
Structure of the Benchmarks.....	6
The Scoping Statement.....	6
The Good Practice Statement.....	7
The Performance Indicators	7
The Performance Measures.....	7
Providing a Rationale and Evidence	8
The initial recommendations for improvement section	8
Step-by-step guide	8
Steps in self-assessment	9
Glossary of terms	11
Section 2 – The Complete Set of Benchmarks.....	12
Benchmark 1	12
Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning	12
Scoping Statement.....	12
Good Practice Statement.....	12
Performance Indicators	12
Performance Measures	13
Initial recommendations for improvement	15
Benchmark 2	16
Planning for institution-wide quality improvement of technology enhanced learning.....	16
Scoping Statement.....	16
Good Practice Statement.....	16
Performance Indicators	16
Performance Measures	17
Initial recommendations for improvement	18
Benchmark 3	19
Information technology systems, services and support for technology enhanced learning	19
Scoping Statement.....	19
Good Practice Statement.....	19
Performance Indicators	19
Performance Measures	20
Initial recommendations for improvement	22
Benchmark 4	23
The application of technology enhanced learning services	23
Scoping Statement.....	23
Good Practice Statement.....	23
Performance Indicators	23
Performance Measures	24

Initial recommendations for improvement	27
Benchmark 5	28
Staff professional development for the effective use of technology enhanced learning.....	28
Scoping Statement.....	28
Good Practice Statement.....	28
Performance Indicators	28
Performance Measures	29
Initial recommendations for improvement	31
Benchmark 6	32
Staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning	32
Scoping Statement.....	32
Good Practice Statement.....	32
Performance Indicators	32
Performance Measures	33
Initial recommendations for improvement	36
Benchmark 7	37
Student training for the effective use of technology enhanced learning	37
Scoping Statement.....	37
Good Practice Statement.....	37
Performance Indicators	37
Performance Measures	38
Initial recommendations for improvement	40
Benchmark 8	41
Student support for the use of technology enhanced learning	41
Scoping Statement.....	41
Good Practice Statement.....	41
Performance Indicators	41
Performance Measures	42
Initial recommendations for improvement	45
Section 3 – Team consolidation of self-assessment (if required).....	46
What next?.....	53
Conclusion.....	54
References	54

Introduction

The ACode benchmarks have been developed to assist institutions in their practice of delivering a quality technology enhanced learning experience for their students and staff (recognising that some institutions refer to their practice with terms such as e-learning, online or flexible learning, blended, etc.). There are eight benchmarks, each of which can be used as a standalone indicator, or used collectively to provide a whole of institution perspective. However, where these benchmarks become even more powerful is when they are used in association with other institutions, as part of a collaborative benchmarking exercise. This is where one or more institutions are willing to share their practice and journey in technology enhanced learning with others, based on the outcomes of their own internal benchmarking activity.

The benchmarks were originally developed as part of an ACode funded project, initiated by Christine Goodacre and Angela Bridgland in 2007. They were developed collaboratively by representatives of a number of ACode member universities and at the time were independently reviewed by Professor Paul Bacsich, a UK consultant specialising in benchmarking and historical aspects of e-learning.

More recently (2014) the Benchmarks have undergone a major review to ensure they are now both current and forward looking. A team of six ACode representatives worked on this project and have developed the following suite of Benchmarks to assist any institution, not just ACode member institutions, in monitoring their capacity to provide the best possible technology enhanced learning experience for their students and staff.

About the Benchmarks

The purpose of benchmarking, and these benchmarks particularly, is to support continuous quality improvement in technology enhanced learning. The approach reflects an enterprise perspective, integrating the key issue of pedagogy, with institutional dimensions such as planning, staff and student development and infrastructure provision. The benchmarks have been developed for use at the enterprise level, or by the organisational areas responsible for the provision of leadership in technology enhanced learning and their associated services.

Each benchmark area is discrete; for example, staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning can be used alone or in combination with others benchmarks. The benchmarks can be used for self-assessment purposes (in one or several areas), or as part of a collaborative, comparative exercise, one that may include other institutions.

Because these benchmarks may be used individually there is some duplication across the benchmarking topics. However, in this iteration of the benchmarks the authors have tried to minimise this overlap, suggesting rather, that an institution may choose to select indicators from a range of related benchmarks rather than just choosing one or two whole benchmarks. Something more akin to the Pick & Mix (Bacsich 2009) methodology of benchmarking, where one selects the indicators they want to use from a much broader group of indicators. Importantly, if this methodology is adopted it becomes more difficult to compare your results with other institutions who may not necessarily have used this same methodology.

It is expected that any benchmarking exercise would take place over a period of years. For example, in any given year two to three Benchmarks may be addressed, were the areas selected reflect institutional priorities for quality improvement at that time. Alternatively, if an institution wanted to gain a full understanding of where they were placed at a given point in time, they could undertake a full review. Both approaches have been used successfully by institutions since the Benchmarks were first developed.

The Benchmarks cover the following eight topic areas:

1. Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning;
2. Planning for institution-wide quality improvement of technology enhanced learning;
3. Information technology systems, services and support for technology enhanced learning;
4. The application of technology enhanced learning services;
5. Staff professional development for the effective use of technology enhanced learning;
6. Staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning;
7. Student training for the effective use of technology enhanced learning;
8. Student support for the use of technology enhanced learning.

Each of the above benchmarks includes a Scoping Statement, a Good Practice Statement, a set of Performance Indicators (PIs) and an area to make initial recommendations on that may need improvement having emerged from undertaking the assessment.

Institutions may also customise the benchmarks by replacing or adding their own Local Performance Indicators (LPis). Each Performance Indicator then comprises Performance Measures. Each measure is rated on a 5-point scale (where level 5 indicates good practice). There are five statements that represent progress toward good practice (as represented by an indicator), with some represented as a matrix. Service areas, or units within the institution can complete a self-assessment of current practice using these indicators, noting that it is not necessary to aspire to best practice on all. Rather, it is one way to establishing a 'real' picture of where your institution may sit in relation to these, and by extension, within in the sector.

The rest of this document is designed to assist you in the use of these Benchmarks and comprises of:

- A step-by-step guide on how to use the Benchmarks (Section 1)
- A complete set of the Benchmarks and Performance Indicators (Section 2).
- A Team Consolidation template (Section 3). This template may be use at the various stages of the reporting process. It is also found on the [ACODE website](#) under Benchmarking as a Word document.

Section 1 – How to use the Benchmarks

The ACode benchmarks are designed to be used for continuous improvement and quality assurance purposes. Their focus is technology enhanced learning, an area that is now mission critical within higher education institutions for the quality delivery of courses and programs.

Use of the benchmarks can provide a basis for research for improving practice, resulting in a better understanding of operational systems and processes and contributing to accountability requirements. Use of the benchmarks can also provide a tool for learning and may be helpful in breaking down beliefs that “we are different”, instead “we are all in this together”.

Some of the benefits that have been found from prior use of the benchmarks include:

- Identification of strengths and weaknesses - for planning and priority setting;
- An improved understanding of strategic and operational requirements;
- A framework for quality assurance purposes;
- Recognition of areas of achievement;
- Generation of ideas and a reinvigoration of practice, for example, the development of strategies for improvement in areas of need;
- Collaboration is facilitated – develop better understanding across areas within the institution and with partners; and
- Communities of practice can develop which provide opportunities for staff professional development, project work, staff exchanges and secondments.

Structure of the Benchmarks

Each benchmark contains the following elements:

- Scoping Statement;
- Good Practice Statement;
- Performance Indicators (PIs);
- Performance Measures - on a 5-point scale (or LPIs);
- A place to provide a rationale and evidence to support your assessment; and
- An area to note an initial recommendation which may be useful for future improvement.

The Scoping Statement

This describes what is considered in the benchmark and sometimes what is out of scope. The following example from Benchmark 1 illustrates the purpose of the scoping statement, providing a detailed explanation of what is addressed in the benchmark and what is not. This reduces the potential for ambiguity and confusion when progressing through the performance indicators.

Example 1 – Scoping Statement from Benchmark 1: Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning

This applies to institution level planning, policy development and implementation in relation to the application of technology enhanced learning. It includes the delegation of authority and responsibility for developing and implementing policy, and strategic and operational plans.

The Good Practice Statement

This statement indicates what good practice would look like if it were being done well, noting that this level of practice is achievable. The following example is provided from Benchmark 1.

Example 2 – Good Practice Statement from Benchmark 1: Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning

The institution has established, well understood strategy, governance mechanisms and policies that guide the selection, deployment, evaluation and improvement of the technologies used to support learning and teaching.

The Performance Indicators

These identify the key performance areas that would indicate the realisation of the good practice statement. There is some duplication of performance indicators across the benchmarks but we have tried to limit this to where it is absolutely necessary. The following example provides the first two of the eight performance indicators used in Benchmark 1.

Example 3 –The first 2 of 8 Performance Indicators from Benchmark 1: Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning

1. *Institution strategic and operational plans support and promote the use of technology enhanced learning.*
2. *Specific plans relating to the use of technology enhanced learning are aligned with the institution’s strategic directions and operational plans.*

The Performance Measures

Performance Measures are statements contained within a matrix, representing levels of progress towards good practice (as represented by the performance indicator). A five point scale is used, and this is used for self-assessment and comparison purposes. Level 5 represents best practice.

The following example demonstrates the two types of measures that are provided in the benchmarks. This is where there is a requirement to demonstrate one, two, or more elements within a particular performance indicator. Where a single measure is provided a single score is selected, as per the first example below. Where two or more measures are provided, each should be scored then a summary scale should be completed as per the second example below. In this case there is also an ‘Overall Rating’ required. However this does not necessarily have to be an average of the two sub-measures necessarily.

Example 4 – The first two of eight Performance Indicators from Benchmark 1: Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning.

PI 1. *Institution strategic and operational plans support and promote the use of technology enhanced learning.*

1		No current strategic or operational plans
2		Strategic or operational plan but no recognition of technology enhanced learning
3		Strategic or operational plan includes some recognition of technology enhanced learning
4	X	Strategic and operational plans both have some recognition of technology enhanced learning
5		Strategic and operational plans both have clear recognition of technology enhanced learning

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

PI 2. Specific plans relating to the use of technology enhanced learning are aligned with the institution's strategic directions and operational plans.

	Specific plans exist		Plans are aligned	
1		No specific plans		Not aligned to institution strategic and operational plans
2		Immature plans	X	Limited alignment with either institution strategic or operational plans
3		Some specific plans		Moderate alignment with either institution strategic and operational plans
4	X	Numerous specific plans		Moderate alignment with both institution strategic and operational plans
5		Comprehensive suite of plans		Considerable alignment with both institution strategic and operational plans

Overall rating	1		2		3	X	4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	---	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Providing a Rationale and Evidence

Once a rating is given the rationale for that rating on the scale of 1-5 should be provided, along with evidence supporting that placement.

The rationale will usually be a series of dot points indicating key reasons that support the rating, this is then supported by your evidence.

Evidence might comprise of a URL leading to a planning document, report, guidelines, support website, etc., or a written statement containing excerpts, or explaining the whereabouts of the evidence, or artefact. This evidence will then be used defend, or support your rating, if required.

The initial recommendations for improvement section

When conducting a self-assessment activity it will often become clear that there are things that can be done to improve in a certain area. There is a space provided at the end of each benchmark where notes may be made for future reference. It is advisable to make these notes when you think of them, rather than leaving them for later. These points may be personal, or they may be useful in team discussions with team members later on.

Step-by-step guide

Benchmarking technology enhanced learning is not a trivial undertaking and would normally be considered as part of an enterprise commitment to using benchmarking for quality improvement purposes. It requires planning and resources if outcomes are to be fully realised and the commitment of staff involved is to be assured.

One, several or all benchmarks could be used in a benchmarking exercise. In recognition of this there is some limited duplication of performance indicators across the benchmarks. The benchmarks can also be used within an institution, for self-assessment purposes only, or they might be used with others to develop comparative data for the purpose of identifying improvement strategies based on the practice of colleagues. The focus of the benchmarking exercise might be the institutional level or that of an organisational unit, such as a faculty or teaching and learning unit.

In this benchmarking context, self-assessment is the critical comparison of existing performance of a selected area or topic against a set of predetermined expectations. Goodacre, Bridgland, & Blanchard, (2005), determined that when using a benchmarking framework, one of the key success factors in achieving comparability was that all collaborating institutions used the templates and self-assessment processes in full.

In the context of this ACode benchmarking activity, this is about:

- Gathering as much information as possible on the performance area (i.e. Performance Indicator) – and importantly using examples to provide evidence.
- Making a comparison between what was gathered (examples and evidence) against the expected Performance Measures.
- Weighing-up or making informed judgement about where the performance area stands in the continuum of progress towards achieving ‘good practice’ (as seen in the Performance Measures).

The self-assessment activity will ultimately facilitate an institution knowing itself just that little bit better, that is, against what has been proposed as ‘good practice’ by the Performance Measures in the Benchmarks. The desired outcome is for each institution to identify their strengths and weaknesses and ways they can facilitate the actions required to make enhancements in these areas where appropriate.

There are two steps in an institution assessing itself against the benchmarks (institutional self-assessment). It starts with individuals making an assessment (individual self-assessment) and then those individuals, as a team, making an assessment (team self-assessment). The following provides a set of guidelines that is ‘an approach’ to undertaking this activity.

Steps in self-assessment

Part 1: Individual self-assessments

Typically this activity will include staff representing different areas of the institution that have a stake in how a particular Benchmark is performed. It may include staff members from the Learning and Teaching (L&T) area, from ICT, faculty representatives, staff and/or student support, training, library, etc. Typically, there may be three, up to four people involved in this self-assessment, depending on the Benchmark. Each team member will perform a self-assessment as best they can.

Although this may involve staff from different areas taking responsibility for the different benchmarks, we do suggest that one person take overall responsibility for the whole activity. It’s important to the integrity of the final outcome that you get this level of cross-institutional engagement.

Importantly, the individual self-assessments are being made by those who can source the appropriate evidence, as they know and are familiar with how the institution is working to fulfil its mandate in the given area. In other words, they are seen as professionals in this space.

It is strongly recommended that an institution, or the benchmarking team, avoid the temptation of conducting a survey of their staff to see what ‘they’ think. This has been shown in the past to be problematic and can lead to a level of confusion in the team. This activity may well be used for other reasons but is not necessary for this activity. The evidence and the agreement reached between the team members should be sufficient to speak for itself, as they have a stake in these activities being conducted in the best possible way.

The following steps are suggested:

1. Bring the team members together, those who will be doing the self-assessment, and go through the ground rules with them. It's important they are familiar with the area covered by the benchmark.
2. At the outset, confirm the benchmarking area you will all be assessing.
3. As a team, review what would be considered 'good practice' for the chosen Benchmark and associated Performance Indicators. Discuss this so as to come to a common understanding.
4. We suggest considering the 'significant' criterion/criteria for that performance area (as identified in the Performance Measures area and ranking box).
5. The team should then go and gather their 'evidence' and make their individual assessments based on what they find (a comparison will be made between an existing situation and expected performance measures when you come back together).
 - a. We suggest considering the following forms of 'evidence':
 - i. quantifiable/direct measurable data (if available)
 - ii. documents e.g. policies, business protocol, procedural write-up
 - iii. practices, methods, programs
 - b. Provide excerpts and or links to these quantifiable data, documents, etc.
6. Once the team members have their evidence they should make a judgment of the indicator by providing a 'ranking' on the 5-point scale, using only the 5-points, not half points.
 - a. Try not to over emphasise the measures – the 5-point scale is a guide for summary purposes.
 - b. Try not to use the measures without reference to 'evidence'.
7. Write a brief 'justification' for the ranking. This doesn't have to be extensive but sufficient to remind you of the key points as to how you arrived at this ranking. This is important for when you come back together.

Part 2: Team self-assessment

Once you have completed the individual assessments the team assessing the benchmark will come back together to share their self-assessments and make a final assessment. The ultimate goal is to reach a level of agreement amongst the team and decide on ONE final score. This score will be used to represent your institutions position. Not everybody will agree but please avoid the temptation to give half marks (i.e. 3.5), as the tool is designed to work best with whole numbers.

8. Consult/discuss individual self-assessments with the benchmarking team.
 - a. Walk through the individual self-assessment - discuss the ranking and the 'whys' for that ranking, using the examples of evidence.
 - b. Have a dialogue/debate/discussion.
 - c. Make a group decision on the individual assessment.
 - d. Provide a 'final' group ranking – this is the ranking that will be submitted.

If the institution is using this self-assessment in preparation for a broader benchmarking activity with other institution, once the institution (via the team) has decided on its ranking for a particular benchmark it should collate its evidence ready to share. A space will be provided later in this document for the institution to provide its team assessment (ranking) for each Benchmark they have chosen to assess but it is not expected that the evidence be supplied at this time. The evidence will be shared later during the benchmarking activity (or summit) by the institutions nominated representative.

Glossary of terms

Benchmarking	<p>It is the process of measuring one’s performance, in a given area, against a specific set of established performance indicators.</p> <p>The extension of this is to benchmark, or compare, the results of this activity against others who have done the same thing.</p>
Cloud-based tools or services	This is essentially a metaphor for software, platforms and infrastructure that are found and used on the Internet.
Courses	May also be known as Units, Subjects, Papers, etc. Many Courses will make up a Program.
Evaluation	The process of making of a judgement about the value, or success of something, using a set of criteria or standards.
IT	Information Technology
Pedagogical	Pedagogy is the method and practice of teaching. Pedagogical refers to the teacher’s design, development and delivery of an academic subject.
Performance Indicators (PIs)	A type of measurement that may be used to evaluate the success of a particular activity in which the institution is involved.
Programs	Also known as Course, Degree, etc. Completion of a Program will usually result in a formal award of academic achievement.
Social media	Internet-based applications that allow the creation and exchange of user-generated content in virtual communities and networks.
Stakeholders	An entity (person, group or organisation) with a key interest in the outcomes of a given activity or project
Staff Development	Also known as Professional Development, where the staff of an institution is provided instruction and training.
Technology enhanced learning (TEL)	May also be referred to as technology enhanced learning and teaching. It is where technology is used to enable new types of learning practices and to enhance existing learning settings.
TEL Services	The ICT-based systems used by an institution that may be either internally or externally hosted.

Section 2 – The Complete Set of Benchmarks

Benchmark 1

Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning

Scoping Statement

This applies to institution level planning, policy development and implementation in relation to the application of technology enhanced learning. It includes the delegation of authority and responsibility for developing and implementing policy, and strategic and operational plans.

Good Practice Statement

The institution has established, well understood strategy, governance mechanisms and policies that guide the selection, deployment, evaluation and improvement of the technologies used to support learning and teaching.

Performance Indicators

1. Institution strategic and operational plans support and promote the use of technology enhanced learning.
2. Specific plans relating to the use of technology enhanced learning are aligned with the institution's strategic directions and operational plans.
3. Planning for the ongoing use of technology enhanced learning is aligned with the institution's budget process.
4. Institution policies, procedures and guidelines provide a framework for how technology enhanced learning should be used at both a course and program level.
5. Policies, procedures and guidelines on the use of technology enhanced learning are well communicated and integrated into processes and systems.
6. The institution has established mechanisms for the governance of technology enhanced learning that include representation from key stakeholders.
7. Authority and responsibility for the operational management of the technologies used to enhance learning and teaching are clearly articulated.
8. The institution uses a clearly articulated policy framework and governance structure when deciding on the adoption of new technologies.

Performance Measures

PI 1. *Institution strategic and operational plans support and promote the use of technology enhanced learning.*

1	No current strategic or operational plans
2	Strategic or operational plan but no recognition of technology enhanced learning
3	Strategic or operational plan includes some recognition of technology enhanced learning
4	Strategic and operational plans both have some recognition of technology enhanced learning
5	Strategic and operational plans both have clear recognition of technology enhanced learning

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

PI 2. *Specific plans relating to the use of technology enhanced learning are aligned with the institution's strategic directions and operational plans.*

	Specific plans exist	Plans are aligned
1	No specific plans	Not aligned to institution strategic and operational plans
2	Immature plans	Limited alignment with either institution strategic or operational plans
3	Some specific plans	Moderate alignment with either institution strategic and operational plans
4	Numerous specific plans	Moderate alignment with both institution strategic and operational plans
5	Comprehensive suite of plans	Considerable alignment with both institution strategic and operational plans

Overall rating	1	2	3	4	5
----------------	---	---	---	---	---

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

PI 3. *Planning for the ongoing use of technology enhanced learning is aligned with the institutions budget process.*

1	No alignment
2	Limited alignment
3	Moderate alignment
4	Considerable alignment
5	Complete alignment

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

PI 4. Institution policies, procedures and guidelines provide a framework for how technology enhanced learning should be used at both a course and program level.

	Course level		Program level	
1		No policies, procedures and guidelines applied at the course level		No policies, procedures and guidelines applied at the program level
2		Little alignment with policies, procedures and guidelines		Little alignment with policies, procedures and guidelines
3		Some alignment with policies, procedures and guidelines		Some alignment with policies, procedures and guidelines
4		Good alignment with policies, procedures and guidelines		Good alignment with policies, procedures and guidelines
5		Comprehensive alignment with policies, procedures and guidelines		Comprehensive alignment with policies, procedures and guidelines

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
-----------------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

PI 5. Policies, procedures and guidelines on the use of technology enhanced learning are well communicated and integrated into processes and systems.

	Communicated		Integrated	
1		Not communicated		Not integrated
2		Poorly communicated		Poorly integrated
3		Moderately communicated		Moderately integrated
4		Substantially communicated		Substantially integrated
5		Widely communicated		Fully integrated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
-----------------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

PI 6. The institution has established mechanisms for the governance of technology enhanced learning that include representation from key stakeholders.

	Governance		Stakeholder representation	
1		No governance		None
2		Planning for governance		Limited
3		Immature		Moderate
4		Established but maturing		Substantial
5		Well established and mature		Comprehensive

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
-----------------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

PI 7. Authority and responsibility for the operational management of the technologies used to enhance learning and teaching are clearly articulated.

	Authority and responsibility	Clearly articulated
1	Non-existent	Not articulated
2	Not well established or defined	Very limited articulation
3	Established but only partially defined	Moderately articulated
4	Well defined but maturing	Substantial articulation
5	Well established and mature	Comprehensively articulated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

PI 8. The institution uses a clearly articulated policy framework and governance structure when deciding on the adoption of new technologies.

	Policy framework for new technologies	Clearly articulated
1	Non-existent	Not articulated
2	Not well established or defined	Very limited articulation
3	Established but only partially defined	Moderately articulated
4	Well defined but maturing	Substantial articulation
5	Well established and mature	Comprehensively articulated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

Initial recommendations for improvement

Benchmark 2

Planning for institution-wide quality improvement of technology enhanced learning

Scoping Statement

Institution-wide processes are in place, including, planning, implementation, evaluation and feedback loops, to ensure the effective use of technology enhanced learning and its alignment with external requirements.

Good Practice Statement

Institutions support and encourage the sustainable, effective and efficient use of technology enhanced learning through strategic planning processes at all levels of the institution. The focus is continuous improvement through systematic and regular evaluation of implementation strategies and outcomes. Such evaluation will in turn inform future planning and align with the institutions strategic direction.

Performance Indicators

1. Institution-wide processes for quality assurance are in place and in use to integrate technology enhanced learning at both a program and course level.
2. Comprehensive evaluation processes are in place to support decisions relating to the implementing of technology enhanced learning services.
3. Planning for quality improvement of the institution's technology enhanced learning systems and procedures is resourced.
4. Evaluation cycles are in place to measure key performance indicators identified by and for all stakeholders, and are integrated in planning for continuous improvement purposes.
5. Outcomes are reported to all levels of the institution.

Performance Measures

P2 1. Institution-wide processes for quality assurance are in place and in use to integrate technology enhanced learning at both a program and course level.

	Processes in place	At both a Course and Program level
1	None	No integration
2	Limited	Across some course and or programs
3	Moderate	Across many courses and or programs
4	Extensive	Across most Courses and Programs
5	Comprehensive	Across all Courses and Programs

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P2 2. Comprehensive evaluation processes are in place to support decisions relating to the implementing of technology enhanced learning services.

1	None
2	Limited
3	Moderate
4	Substantial
5	Comprehensive

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P2 3. Planning for quality improvement of the institution's technology enhanced learning systems and procedures is resourced.

1	No resources
2	Inadequate resources
3	Moderate resources
4	Substantial resources
5	Comprehensive resources

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P2 4. Evaluation cycles are in place to measure key performance indicators (KPIs) identified by and for all stakeholders, and are integrated in planning for continuous improvement purposes.

	KPI's evaluation processes in place	Integrated into planning for improvement
1	No evaluation cycles	No integration
2	Limited evaluation cycles of some stakeholders	Limited integration
3	Evaluation cycles for some stakeholders	Moderate integration
4	Evaluation cycles for most stakeholders	Extensive integration
5	Evaluation cycles of all stakeholders	Comprehensive integration

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P2 5. Outcomes are reported to all levels of the institution.

1	No outcomes are reported
2	Some outcomes are reported to some levels
3	Outcomes are reported to the majority of levels
4	Outcomes are reported to all levels
5	Comprehensive outcomes are reported to all levels

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

Initial recommendations for improvement

Benchmark 3

Information technology systems, services and support for technology enhanced learning

Scoping Statement

Information technology (IT) services describe the range of systems and support required to maintain and update the institution's approach to technology enhanced learning. This can include the use of: learning management systems and their associated systems; library systems; cloud-based tools and services; mobile technologies. It also includes hardware (computers, telecommunications and ancillary equipment) and networks, both internal and external which are used for the purposes of technology enhanced learning, for both on and off-campus environments.

Out of scope. The pedagogical issues relating to the use of IT services is the domain of other benchmarks.

Good Practice Statement

Technical infrastructure, both physical and virtual, is aligned with institutional learning goals and the technologies are resourced, support staff are trained and the infrastructure is implemented, maintained, administered and supported efficiently and effectively.

Performance Indicators

1. Systems and processes are in place to generate learning and educational analytic data to support decision making.
2. There are clearly articulated processes, and responsibilities for the implementation and maintenance of the technology enhanced learning systems.
3. Responsibilities and processes for support and training of staff and students in the use of the technology enhanced learning systems are clearly defined.
4. Resources are allocated for the implementation and maintenance of IT services that support technology enhanced learning.
5. Experimentation with new and emerging technologies is encouraged and resourced by the institution and supported by procedure.
6. Professional development occurs for staff managing the services used to support technology enhanced learning (including new and emerging technologies).
7. The institution has robust procedures and processes in place to identify and manage risk associated with all the technology enhanced learning services.
8. Support levels and pathways for assistance for all learning technologies are clearly communicated to staff.

Performance Measures

P3.1. Systems and processes are in place to generate learning and educational analytic data to support decision making.

	Systems		Processes	
1		No systems and no data		No processes in place
2		Some systems and limited data		Ad hoc processes in place
3		Some systems and good data		Limited processes in place
4		Substantial systems and data		Defined processes in place
5		Comprehensive systems and data		Comprehensive processes in place

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P3.2. There are clearly articulated responsibilities, and processes for the implementation and maintenance of the technology enhanced learning systems.

	Processes		Responsibilities	
1		Not articulated		Not articulated
2		Poorly articulated		Poorly articulated
3		Generally articulated		Generally articulated
4		Substantially articulated		Substantially articulated
5		Comprehensively articulated		Comprehensively articulated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P3.3. Responsibilities and processes for support and training of staff and students in the use of the technology enhanced learning systems are clearly defined.

	Responsibilities		Processes	
1		Not defined		Not defined
2		Poorly defined		Poorly defined
3		Generally defined		Generally defined
4		Substantially defined		Substantially defined
5		Comprehensively defined		Comprehensively defined

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P3.4. Resources are allocated for the implementation and maintenance of IT services that support technology enhanced learning.

	Implementation	Maintenance
1	No resources allocated	No resources allocated
2	Inadequate resources allocated	Inadequate resources allocated
3	Moderate resources allocated	Moderate resources allocated
4	Substantial resources allocated	Substantial resources allocated
5	Comprehensive resources allocated	Comprehensive resources allocated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
-----------------------	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P3.5. Experimentation with new and emerging technologies is encouraged and resourced by the institution and supported by procedure.

	Encouraged	Resourced	Supported by procedure
1	Not encouraged	No resources	No procedure
2	Limited encouragement	Inadequate resources	Ad hoc procedures
3	Moderate encouragement	Moderate resources	Partially defined procedures
4	Substantial encouragement	Substantial resources	Defined procedures
5	Fully encouraged	Comprehensive resources	Comprehensive procedures

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
-----------------------	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P3.6. Professional development occurs for staff managing the services used to support technology enhanced learning (including new and emerging technologies).

	For core services	For new and emerging technologies
1	No PD occurs	No PD occurs
2	Ad hoc PD occurs, but only when requested	Ad hoc PD occurs, but only when requested
3	Semi regular PD occurs for some services	Semi regular (reactive) PD occurs
4	Regular PD occurs for most services	Regular PD occurs (after implementation)
5	Comprehensive PD occurs for all services	Comprehensive (pro-active) PD occurs

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
-----------------------	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P3.7. The institution has robust procedures and processes in place to identify and manage risk associated with all the technology enhanced learning services.

1	None
2	Limited
3	Moderate
4	Substantial
5	Comprehensive

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P3.8. Support levels and pathways for assistance for all learning technologies are clearly communicated to staff.

	Pathways for support	Communicated
1	Not identified	No communication
2	Ill-defined pathways	Ad hoc communication
3	Some pathways identified	Partially communicated
4	Pathways mostly identified	Mostly communicated
5	Comprehensively identified	Comprehensively communicated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
-----------------------	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

Initial recommendations for improvement

Benchmark 4

The application of technology enhanced learning services

Scoping Statement

This topic addresses the effective application of technology enhanced learning (TEL) services into courses and programs. It encompasses the underlying rationale and strategic intent, how it is embedded into teaching, how it is resourced, evaluated and advanced. The effective pedagogical application of these services is fundamental to the learning and teaching mission of the institution. Failure to apply TEL services in a pedagogically sound ways will reduce the value of the investment placed in these services and has the potential to impact on every student and staff member.

Out of scope. Technological, policy and administrative issues relating to the application of TEL services are the domain of other benchmarks.

Good Practice Statement

The application of TEL services is:

- grounded in the institution's Learning and Teaching strategy;
- informed by good pedagogical practice and research;
- supported adequately;
- deployed and promoted effectively;
- evaluated from a number of perspectives; and
- advanced appropriately.

The Performance Indicators are organised to reflect these aspects of pedagogical application.

Performance Indicators

1. The application of technology enhanced learning services are grounded in the context of the institution's learning and teaching strategy.
2. The pedagogical intent of the application of technology enhanced learning services within individual courses and programs is readily apparent to teaching and support staff
3. The pedagogical application of technology enhanced learning is based on sound educational research and guidelines (including compliance with legal requirements, accessibility, and learning designs) are readily available to all teaching and support staff
4. Collegial communities exist to promote and support the use of technology enhanced learning for communicating and promoting the innovative use and its pedagogical application in learning and teaching.
5. Resources are allocated for the ongoing development of technology enhanced learning pedagogies.
6. The pedagogical application of technology enhanced learning services is sustainable.
7. The pedagogical impact of technology enhanced learning services is regularly evaluated in detail at a course and program level.
8. Evidence of the impact of technology enhanced learning is integrated into continuous improvement planning for courses and programmes.
9. Good practice examples advance the pedagogically sound use of TEL services in courses and programs.

Performance Measures

P4.1. The application of technology enhanced learning services are grounded in the context of the institution's learning and teaching strategy.

1	Not grounded
2	Very limited grounding
3	Modest grounding
4	Substantially grounded
5	Comprehensively grounded

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P4.2. The pedagogical intent of the application of technology enhanced learning services within individual courses and programs is readily apparent to teaching and support staff.

	At a course level	At a program level
1	Not apparent	Not apparent
2	Apparent in only limited cases	Apparent in only limited cases
3	Apparent, but not consistently	Apparent, but not consistently
4	Mostly apparent	Mostly apparent
5	Fully apparent	Fully apparent

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P4.3. The pedagogical application of technology enhanced learning is based on sound educational research and guidelines (including compliance with legal requirements, accessibility, and learning designs) are readily available to all teaching and support staff.

	Application based on sound research	Guidelines readily available
1	Not applied	None available
2	Applied, but only in limited cases	Limited availability
3	Applied, but not consistently	Available, but does not cover all areas
4	Mostly applied	Mostly available
5	Comprehensively applied	Readily available to all

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P4.4. Collegial communities exist to promote and support the use of technology enhanced learning, for communicating its innovative use and pedagogical application in learning and teaching.

1	None in existence
2	Very few communities exist of this nature and are ad hoc at best
3	Some communities exist, but have limited exposure and reach
4	Communities exist and have a reasonable expose and reach
5	These communities are wide spread and have very good exposure and reach

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P4.5. Resources are allocated for the ongoing development of technology enhanced learning pedagogies.

1	No allocation
2	Very limited resources allocated
3	Partially funded
4	Well funded
5	Fully funded

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P4.6. The pedagogical application of technology enhanced learning services is sustainable.

1	This is not considered
2	Usually implemented as one-off's with little thought for sustainability
3	Sustainability is sometimes considered during implementation, with ad hoc follow through
4	Sustainability is usually considered during implementation, with some follow through
5	Implementation is well funded with the view to sustaining good practice longer term

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P4.7. The pedagogical impact of technology enhanced learning services is regularly evaluated in detail at a course and program level.

	At a course level		At a program level	
1		Not evaluated		Not evaluated
2		Limited evaluation occurs		Limited evaluation occurs
3		Evaluated but not in great detail		Evaluated but not in great detail
4		Evaluated in reasonable detail		Evaluated in reasonable detail
5		Fully evaluated		Fully evaluated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P4.8. Evidence of the impact of technology enhanced learning is integrated into continuous improvement planning for courses and programs.

	At a course level		At a program level	
1		Not apparent		Not apparent
2		Apparent only in limited cases		Apparent only in limited cases
3		Apparent, but not consistently		Apparent, but not consistently
4		Mostly apparent		Mostly apparent
5		Fully apparent		Fully apparent

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P4.9. Good practice examples advance the pedagogically sound use of technology enhanced learning services in courses and programs.

	At a course level		At a program level	
1		Not apparent		Not apparent
2		Apparent only in limited cases		Apparent only in limited cases
3		Apparent, but not consistently		Apparent, but not consistently
4		Mostly apparent		Mostly apparent
5		Fully apparent		Fully apparent

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

Initial recommendations for improvement

Benchmark 5

Staff professional development for the effective use of technology enhanced learning

Scoping Statement

The key focus is on developing teaching staff to make effective use of a range of approaches to technology enhanced learning (TEL). Staff development activities encompass individual and group delivery, face-to-face, as well as online.

Self-directed learning activities and resources are also included. Some professional development will be designed and delivered to meet the strategic needs of the organisation, whilst other activities will be provided to meet the demands of teaching staff as they arise.

Good Practice Statement

Quality learning and teaching is brought about where people are confident, enthusiastic, skilled and well supported, and learning experiences are designed to engage the learner and employ a variety of approaches.

Engagement in professional development should not be limited by factors of physical location, equity or technological skills. This means that staff development is offered flexibly, accommodates a range of entry points, is evaluated and is informed by the work of related units.

A good practice approach to the use of technology enhanced learning reflects an understanding of learners' characteristics and needs as required by different discipline contexts.

Performance Indicators

1. A framework for staff development in technology enhanced learning is part of the institution's learning and teaching strategy.
2. Processes are in place and in use to identify staff development needs in support of the institution's strategy for technology enhanced learning.
3. Educational and technical expertise is used to develop quality programs and resources addressing staff development needs.
4. Coordination occurs between those areas providing staff development for technology enhanced learning across the institution.
5. Staff development for technology enhanced learning is resourced.
6. Staff development programs are delivered flexibly and address differing skill levels.
7. Evaluation data is used to inform the planning for continuous improvement of Staff development processes.

Performance Measures

P5.1. A framework for staff development in technology enhanced learning is part of the institution's learning and teaching strategy.

1	No staff development and no alignment with strategy
2	Some staff development, but not aligned with strategy
3	Some staff development, partly aligned with strategy
4	Staff development mostly aligned with strategy
5	Extensive staff development, fully aligned with strategy

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P5.2. Processes are in place and in use to identify staff development needs in support of the institution's strategy for technology enhanced learning.

1	No processes in place
2	Some processes exist, but no evidence of use
3	Some processes exist and they are partly used
4	Processes are in place and they are partly used
5	Processes are in place and they are well used

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P5.3. Educational and technical expertise is used to develop quality programs and resources addressing staff development needs.

	Educational expertise is used	Technical expertise is used
1	No educational program or resources	No technical program or resources
2	Limited educational program/resources	Limited technical program/resources
3	Educational program, limited resources	Technical program, limited resources
4	Educational program, good resources	Technical program, good resources
5	Extensive educational program/resources	Extensive technical program/resources

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P5.4. Coordination occurs between those areas providing staff development for technology enhanced learning across the institution.

1	No coordination
2	Ad hoc coordination occurs
3	Semi regular coordination occurs
4	Regular coordination occurs
5	Comprehensive coordination occurs

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P5.5. Staff development for technology enhanced learning is resourced.

1	Not resourced
2	Inadequately resourced
3	Moderately resourced
4	Substantially resourced
5	Comprehensively resourced

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P5.6. Staff development programs are delivered flexibly and address differing skill levels.

	Delivered flexibly	Address differing skill levels
1	Not at all	Not at all
2	Limited	Limited
3	Moderate	Moderate
4	Substantial	Substantial
5	Fully	Fully

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P5.7. Evaluation data is used to inform the planning for continuous improvement of staff development processes.

1	No integration
2	Only limited or ad hoc integration exists
3	Some good examples of integration exist, but not across the board
4	Regular integration exists across most processes
5	Systematic integration exists across all programs

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
-----------------------	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--	----------	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

Initial recommendations for improvement

Benchmark 6

Staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning

Scoping Statement

Staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning encompasses both technical and educational support.

Technical support is required to deal with problems or needs related to the technological environment, including hardware and software, communications and connections, and performance.

Educational support addresses the needs of staff who want to use technologies and/or encounter difficulties while using them, and who need to be able to get ready access to and who want to maximise student learning outcomes

Out of scope. This benchmark does not include staff development which forms part of the more formal professional development framework – see Benchmark 5

Good Practice Statement

Staff are made aware of and have access to comprehensive technical and educational support for the use of technology enhanced learning tools and services: prior to and during the implementation of the technology, in formal training sessions, on a just-in-time basis, and for troubleshooting purposes.

Performance Indicators

1. Technical and educational support is aligned with the current and emerging learning technologies being deployed by the institution.
2. Procedures are in place to identify the support requirements of staff, at individual, team and institutional levels.
3. Procedures are in place to regularly evaluate the support services and resources provided for staff.
4. Coordination occurs between those areas providing support services for staff across the institution.
5. Technology enhanced learning support services are accessible and used by staff.
6. Technology enhanced learning support services are adequately resourced.
7. Technology enhanced learning support services are promoted to staff.
8. New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for staff support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.
9. There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for staff contributes to their continuous improvement.

Performance Measures

P6.1. Technical and educational support is aligned with the current and emerging learning technologies being deployed by the institution.

	For current technologies		For emerging technologies	
1		No alignment		No alignment
2		Limited alignment		Limited alignment
3		Moderate alignment		Moderate alignment
4		Considerable alignment		Considerable alignment
5		Full alignment		Full alignment

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P6.2. Procedures are in place to identify the support requirements of staff, at individual, team and institutional levels.

	For individuals		At a team level		At an institutional level	
1		Not identified		Not identified		Not identified
2		Limited identification		Limited identification		Limited identification
3		Some identification		Some identification		Some identification
4		Regular identification		Regular identification		Regular identification
5		Systematic identification		Systematic identification		Systematic identification

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P6.3. Procedures are in place to regularly evaluate the support services and resources provided for staff.

	Evaluation of support services		Evaluation of resources	
1		No evaluation occurs		No evaluation occurs
2		Limited or ad hoc evaluation occurs		Limited or ad hoc evaluation occurs
3		Semi regular evaluation occurs		Semi regular evaluation occurs
4		Mostly regular evaluation occurs		Mostly regular evaluation occurs
5		Fully and regularly evaluated		Fully and regularly evaluated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P6.4. Coordination occurs between those areas providing support services for staff across the institution.

1	No coordination
2	Ad hoc coordination occurs
3	Semi regular coordination occurs
4	Regular coordination occurs
5	Comprehensive coordination occurs

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P6.5. Technology enhanced learning support services are accessible and used by staff.

	Services are accessible to staff	Services are used by staff
1	Not at all	Not at all
2	Restricted	Limited use
3	Working hours	Moderate usage
4	Extended hours	Good usage
5	24 X 7	Extensively used

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P6.6. Technology enhanced learning support services are adequately resourced.

1	Not resourced
2	Inadequately resourced
3	Moderately resourced
4	Substantially resourced
5	Comprehensively resourced

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P6.7. Technology enhanced learning support services are promoted to staff.

1	Not promoted
2	Limited promotion
3	Moderate promotion
4	Substantial promotion
5	Systematically and comprehensively promoted

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P6.8. New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for staff support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.

	Prior to adoption	During adoption
1	No analysis occurs	No analysis occurs
2	Limited or ad hoc analysis occurs	Limited or ad hoc analysis occurs
3	Partial analysis occurs	Partial analysis occurs
4	Reasonable analysis occurs	Reasonable analysis occurs
5	Comprehensive analysis occurs	Comprehensive analysis occurs

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P6.9. There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for staff contributes to their continuous improvement.

1	No integration
2	Only limited or ad hoc integration exists
3	Some good examples of integration exist, but not across the board
4	Regular integration exists across most services
5	Systematic integration exists across all services

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

Initial recommendations for improvement

Benchmark 7

Student training for the effective use of technology enhanced learning

Scoping Statement

Technology enhanced learning services are the systems and tools used by the institution to support learning and teaching. These can include the use of: required computing equipment and software; learning management systems and associated applications; library systems; cloud-based environments; mobile technologies. Aspects of an ethical approach to technology enhanced learning are also included.

Student training refers to the applied use of such technologies in a learning context. It can take many forms and be provided by many people, for example through: specific training classes; self-help resources; or as part of a unit of study. Staff providing the training need appropriate skills which require alignment to the professional/staff development benchmark.

Out of Scope. Student training does not encompass training in other aspects of learning development (i.e. general study skills).

Good Practice Statement

The provision of student training for the effective use of the institution's technology enhanced learning services is aligned with the teaching approaches in use; is adequately resourced; is coordinated with other student support services; is flexible; is focused on the needs of students; covers a range of current technologies and reflects good practice in the use of technology.

Performance Indicators

1. Student training is aligned with the technologies and teaching approaches in use at the institution.
2. Student training for technology enhanced learning is adequately resourced.
3. There are procedures in place to regularly evaluate the training and training resources provided for students.
4. Coordination occurs between those areas providing training for students.
5. Student training programs are delivered flexibly and address differing skill levels.
6. Student training promotes an ethical approach to the use of social media and the technology enhanced learning services provided by the institution.
7. Evaluation data is used to inform the planning for continuous improvement of student development processes.
8. There are clearly defined pathways for students to access the training they require.

Performance Measures

P7.1. Student training is aligned with the technologies and teaching approaches in use at the institution.

	Aligned with the technologies used		Aligned with the teaching approaches used	
1		No alignment		No alignment
2		Limited alignment		Limited alignment
3		Moderate alignment		Moderate alignment
4		Considerable alignment		Considerable alignment
5		Full alignment		Full alignment

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P7.2. Student training for technology enhanced learning is adequately resourced.

1		Not resourced
2		Inadequately resourced
3		Moderately resourced
4		Substantially resourced
5		Comprehensively resourced

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P7.3. There are procedures in place to regularly evaluate the training and training resources provided for students.

	Evaluation of support services		Evaluation of resources	
1		No evaluation occurs		No evaluation occurs
2		Limited or ad hoc evaluation occurs		Limited or ad hoc evaluation occurs
3		Semi regular evaluation occurs		Semi regular evaluation occurs
4		Mostly regular evaluation occurs		Mostly regular evaluation occurs
5		Fully and regularly evaluated		Fully and regularly evaluated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P7.4. Coordination occurs between those areas providing training for students across the institution.

1	No coordination
2	Ad hoc coordination occurs
3	Semi regular coordination occurs
4	Regular coordination occurs
5	Comprehensive coordination occurs

Overall rating	1	2	3	4	5
----------------	---	---	---	---	---

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P7.5. Student training programs are delivered flexibly and address differing skill levels.

	Training is delivered flexibly	Training addresses different skill levels
1	Not at all	Not at all
2	Limited	Limited
3	Moderate	Moderate
4	Substantial	Substantial
5	Fully	Fully

Overall rating	1	2	3	4	5
----------------	---	---	---	---	---

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P7.6. Student training promotes an ethical approach to the use of social media and the technology enhanced learning services provided by the institution.

	For social media	For TEL services
1	Not apparent	Not apparent
2	Apparent in only limited cases	Apparent in only limited cases
3	Apparent, but not consistently applied	Apparent, but not consistently applied
4	Mostly apparent	Mostly apparent
5	Fully apparent	Fully apparent

Overall rating	1	2	3	4	5
----------------	---	---	---	---	---

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P7.7. Evaluation data is used to inform the planning for continuous improvement of student development processes.

1	No integration
2	Only limited or ad hoc integration exists
3	Some good examples of integration exist, but not across the board
4	Regular integration exists across most processes
5	Systematic integration exists across all programs

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P7.8. There are clearly defined pathways for students to access the training they require.

1	No pathways defined
2	Limited definition and not explicit
3	Defined but not explicit
4	Defined and mostly explicit
5	Comprehensively defined and explicit

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

Initial recommendations for improvement

Benchmark 8

Student support for the use of technology enhanced learning

Scoping Statement

Support for students in the use of technology enhanced learning services is defined as primarily technical but the learning context should also be acknowledged. Support should be considered in terms of the use of computers and mobile technologies; learning management systems and their associated applications; library systems, and; those cloud based systems and tools adopted by the institution. The requirements of on-campus and off-campus study should be considered.

Good Practice Statement

Students are aware of and have access to effective and well-resourced support for the technology enhanced learning services used by the institution. Student support is responsive to student needs; is coordinated with student training; and is constantly developing in response to changing technology.

Performance Indicators

1. The provision of support for students is aligned with the technology enhanced learning services used by the institution.
2. Student technology enhanced learning support services are resourced.
3. There are clearly defined pathways for students to access support services and these are promoted to the student body.
4. Support sites and resources are accessible from commonly used devices and the analytics of student usage are monitored.
5. There are procedures in place to ensure that student support services and resources are regularly evaluated.
6. There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for students contributes to their continuous improvement.
7. Coordination occurs between those areas providing support for students.
8. There are procedures in place to ensure there is an alignment between student training and student support.
9. Processes are in place to determine the ongoing support requirements of students.
10. New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for student support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.

Performance Measures

P8.1. The provision of support for students is aligned with the technology enhanced learning services used by the institution.

1	No alignment
2	Limited alignment
3	Moderate alignment
4	Considerable alignment
5	Full alignment

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P8.2. Student technology enhanced learning support services are resourced.

1	Not resourced
2	Inadequately resourced
3	Moderately resourced
4	Substantially resourced
5	Comprehensively resourced

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P8.3. There are clearly defined pathways for students to access support services and these are promoted to the student body.

	Clear pathways to support services	Support services are promoted
1	No pathways defined	Not promoted
2	Limited definition and not explicit	Limited promotion
3	Defined but not explicit	Moderate promotion
4	Defined and mostly explicit	Substantial promotion
5	Comprehensively defined and explicit	Systematically and comprehensively promoted

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P8.4. Support sites and resources are accessible from commonly used devices and the analytics of student usage are monitored.

	Accessible from commonly used devices	Student usage is monitored
1	Not accessible	Not monitored
2	Limited accessibility	Limited or ad hoc monitoring
3	Moderately accessible	Moderate levels of monitoring occur
4	Mostly accessible	Mostly monitored
5	Fully accessible	Comprehensive monitoring

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P8.5. There are procedures in place to ensure that student support services and resources are regularly evaluated.

	Support services are regularly evaluated	Support resources are regularly evaluated
1	No evaluation occurs	No evaluation occurs
2	Limited or ad hoc evaluation occurs	Limited or ad hoc evaluation occurs
3	Semi regular evaluation occurs	Semi regular evaluation occurs
4	Mostly regular evaluation occurs	Mostly regular evaluation occurs
5	Fully and regularly evaluated	Fully and regularly evaluated

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P8.6. There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for students contributes to their continuous improvement.

1	No integration
2	Only limited or ad hoc integration exists
3	Some good examples of integration exist, but not across the board
4	Regular integration exists across most services
5	Systematic integration exists across all services

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P8.7. Coordination occurs between those areas providing support for students across the institution.

1	No coordination
2	Ad hoc coordination occurs
3	Semi regular coordination occurs
4	Regular coordination occurs
5	Comprehensive coordination occurs

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P8.8. There are procedures in place to ensure there is an alignment between student training and student support.

1	No alignment
2	Limited alignment
3	Moderate alignment
4	Considerable alignment
5	Full alignment

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P8.9. Processes are in place to determine the ongoing support requirements of students.

1	No processes
2	Inadequate processes
3	Some processes
4	Regular processes
5	Comprehensive processes

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
----------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

P8.10. New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for student support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.

	Prior to adoption		During adoption	
1		No analysis occurs		No analysis occurs
2		Limited or ad hoc analysis occurs		Limited or ad hoc analysis occurs
3		Partial analysis occurs		Partial analysis occurs
4		Reasonable analysis occurs		Reasonable analysis occurs
5		Comprehensive analysis occurs		Comprehensive analysis occurs

Overall rating	1		2		3		4		5	
-----------------------	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--	---	--

Indicate where you believe you rate above.

Rationale and Evidence:

Initial recommendations for improvement

Section 3 – Team consolidation of self-assessment (if required)

Please use the table below to record your consolidated score, or the consolidated team scores for each performance indicator used.

This document may be used in preparation of your institutional report or inter-institutional activity.

Benchmark 1: Institution-wide policy and governance for technology enhanced learning	1	2	3	4	5
1. Institution strategic and operational plans support and promote the use of technology enhanced learning.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
2. Specific plans relating to the use of technology enhanced learning are aligned with the institution's strategic directions and operational plans.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
3. Planning for the ongoing use of technology enhanced learning is aligned with the institution's budget process.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
4. Institution policies, procedures and guidelines provide a framework for how technology enhanced learning should be used at both a course and program level.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
5. Policies, procedures and guidelines on the use of technology enhanced learning are well communicated and integrated into processes and systems.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
6. The institution has established mechanisms for the governance of technology enhanced learning that include representation from key stakeholders.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
7. Authority and responsibility for the operational management of the technologies used to enhance learning and teaching are clearly articulated.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
8. The institution uses a clearly articulated policy framework and governance structure when deciding on the adoption of new technologies.					
Rationale					

Evidence

Benchmark 2: Planning for institution-wide quality improvement of technology enhanced learning	1	2	3	4	5
1. Institution-wide processes for quality assurance are in place and in use to integrate technology enhanced learning at both a program and course level.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
2. Comprehensive evaluation processes are in place to support decisions relating to the implementing of technology enhanced learning services.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
3. Planning for quality improvement of the institution's technology enhanced learning systems and procedures is resourced.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
4. Evaluation cycles are in place to measure key performance indicators identified by and for all stakeholders, and are integrated in planning for continuous improvement purposes.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
5. Outcomes are reported to all levels of the institution.					
Rationale					
Evidence					

Benchmark 3: Information technology systems, services and support for technology enhanced learning	1	2	3	4	5
1. Systems and processes are in place to generate learning and educational analytic data to support decision making.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
2. There are clearly articulated processes, and responsibilities for the implementation and maintenance of the technology enhanced learning systems.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
3. Responsibilities and processes for support and training of staff and students in the use of the technology enhanced learning systems are clearly defined.					

Rationale					
Evidence					
4. Resources are allocated for the implementation and maintenance of IT services that support technology enhanced learning.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
5. Experimentation with new and emerging technologies is encouraged and resourced by the institution and supported by procedure.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
6. Professional development occurs for staff managing the services used to support technology enhanced learning (including new and emerging technologies).					
Rationale					
Evidence					
7. The institution has robust procedures and processes in place to identify and manage risk associated with all the technology enhanced learning services.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
8. Support levels and pathways for assistance for all learning technologies are clearly communicated to staff.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
Benchmark 4: The application of technology enhanced learning services					
1. The application of technology enhanced learning services are grounded in the context of the institution's learning and teaching strategy.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
2. The pedagogical intent of the application of technology enhanced learning services within individual courses and programs is readily apparent to teaching and support staff					
Rationale					
Evidence					
3. The pedagogical application of technology enhanced learning is based on sound educational research and guidelines (including compliance with legal requirements, accessibility, and learning designs) are readily available to all teaching and support staff					

Rationale					
Evidence					
4. Collegial communities exist to promote and support the use of technology enhanced learning for communicating and promoting the innovative use and its pedagogical application in learning and teaching.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
5. Resources are allocated for the ongoing development of technology enhanced learning pedagogies.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
6. The pedagogical application of technology enhanced learning services is sustainable.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
7. The pedagogical impact of technology enhanced learning services is regularly evaluated in detail at a course and program level.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
8. Evidence of the impact of technology enhanced learning is integrated into continuous improvement planning for courses and programmes.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
9. Good practice examples advance the pedagogically sound use of TEL services in courses and programs.					
Rationale					
Evidence					

Benchmark 5: Staff professional development for the effective use of technology enhanced learning	1	2	3	4	5
1. A framework for staff development in technology enhanced learning is part of the institution's learning and teaching strategy.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
2. Processes are in place and in use to identify staff development needs in support of the institution's strategy for technology enhanced learning.					
Rationale					

Evidence					
3. Educational and technical expertise is used to develop quality programs and resources addressing staff development needs.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
4. Coordination occurs between those areas providing staff development for technology enhanced learning across the institution.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
5. Staff development for technology enhanced learning is resourced.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
6. Staff development programs are delivered flexibly and address differing skill levels.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
7. Evaluation data is used to inform the planning for continuous improvement of staff development processes.					
Rationale					
Evidence					

Benchmark 6: Staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning	1	2	3	4	5
1. Technical and educational support is aligned with the current and emerging learning technologies being deployed by the institution.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
2. Procedures are in place to identify the support requirements of staff, at individual, team and institutional levels.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
3. Procedures are in place to regularly evaluate the support services and resources provided for staff.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
4. Coordination occurs between those areas providing support services for staff across the institution.					
Rationale					

Evidence					
5. Technology enhanced learning support services are accessible and used by staff.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
6. Technology enhanced learning support services are adequately resourced.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
7. Technology enhanced learning support services are promoted to staff.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
8. New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for staff support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
9. There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for staff contributes to their continuous improvement.					
Rationale					
Evidence					

Benchmark 7: Student training for the effective use of technology enhanced learning	1	2	3	4	5
1. Student training is aligned with the technologies and teaching approaches in use at the institution.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
2. Student training for technology enhanced learning is adequately resourced.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
3. There are procedures in place to regularly evaluate the training and training resources provided for students.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
4. Coordination occurs between those areas providing training for students.					
Rationale					

Evidence					
5. Student training programs are delivered flexibly and address differing skill levels.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
6. Student training promotes an ethical approach to the use of social media and the technology enhanced learning services provided by the institution.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
7. Evaluation data is used to inform the planning for continuous improvement of student development processes.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
8. There are clearly defined pathways for students to access the training they require.					
Rationale					
Evidence					

Benchmark 8: Student support for the use of technology enhanced learning	1	2	3	4	5
1. The provision of support for students is aligned with the technology enhanced learning services used by the institution.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
2. Student technology enhanced learning support services are resourced.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
3. There are clearly defined pathways for students to access support services and these are promoted to the student body.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
4. Support sites and resources are accessible from commonly used devices and the analytics of student usage are monitored.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
5. There are procedures in place to ensure that student support services and resources are regularly evaluated.					

Rationale					
Evidence					
6. There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for students contributes to their continuous improvement.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
7. Coordination occurs between those areas providing support for students.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
8. There are procedures in place to ensure there is an alignment between student training and student support.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
9. Processes are in place to determine the ongoing support requirements of students.					
Rationale					
Evidence					
10. New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for student support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.					
Rationale					
Evidence					

What next?

In preparation for an Inter-institutional activity

If you have undertaken this benchmarking as part of an inter-institutional activity it is important that you prepare a presentation of your key Rationale and Evidence you would like to share with your colleagues. To help you do this you may like to use the Team Consolidation, in Word.docx form, and this may found on the Benchmarking page within the ACODE website at: www.acode.edu.au. This document will be the same as you see above, but editable.

It is important to note that the sharing of your findings should only be done if all parties have signed the appropriate confidentiality agreement. This document may also be found on the ACODE website.

In preparing for an internal report

If you have undertaken this activity solely for internal review, it is suggested that you could also use the Team Consolidation Report, in Word.docx form, and this may found on the Benchmarking page within the ACODE website at: www.acode.edu.au. This document may be used as an appendix to any formal report being provided to your senior management.

Conclusion

We trust you have found this document useful and that it has helped you and your institution in the quest to promote quality technology enhanced learning opportunities for the staff and students at your institution.

We are keen to further improve these benchmarks, so welcome any feedback you may have on using them. Please provide this feedback to the ACode Secretariat, via email to:

secretariat@acode.edu.au

References

Bacsich, P. (2009) Benchmarking e-learning in UK universities: lessons from and for the international context. *23rd ICDE World Conference on Open Learning and Distance Education 7–10 June 2009*, Maastricht.

Goodacre, C., Bridgland, A. and Blanchard, P. (2005). *Benchmarking Project: Evaluation Report on Workability of the Framework*. Australasian Council on Open, Distance and e-Learning. Available from: <http://www.acode.edu.au/mod/page/view.php?id=23>