



**UCISA
TLIG**

**Report of a UCISA survey of support provided in Universities
and Colleges for the use of technology in teaching and learning**

Susan Armitage

University of Lancaster

Andrew Rothery

University College Worcester

Martin Jenkins

Cheltenham & Gloucester College of Higher Education

Universities and Colleges Information Systems Association

Teaching, Learning and Information Group

1999

Copyright: This report may be freely copied for use by educational institutional and organisation provided full acknowledgement is given to UCISA and the authors.

© UCISA, 1999

First published 1999

Published by Universities and Colleges Information Systems Association, Teaching, Learning and Information Group

UCISA Administration

University of Oxford

13 Banbury Road

Oxford

OX2 6NN

ISBN 0 9536194 0 0

Also available on the WWW at: <http://www.ucisa.ac.uk/TLIG/teach/docs/survey99/>

Acknowledgements

Project team: Susan Armitage (Project Leader)
Lancaster University

Andrew Rothery (Chair of UCISA-TLIG-TLSG)
University College Worcester

Martin Jenkins
Cheltenham and Gloucester College of HE

Tom Browne
Sussex University

Report written by: Susan Armitage
Andrew Rothery
Martin Jenkins

Data analysis: Clare SurrIDGE
Reading University

Data entry and organisation: Alex Hanff, Research Assistant
Lancaster University

The Project Team is the current Teaching and Learning Sub Group of UCISA-TLIG. The team is grateful to all those who contributed for their time and effort, to the main UCISA-TLIG Committee (Chaired by Aenea Read, Aberdeen University) for help and encouragement and to UCISA for funding this initiative.

Executive Summary

UCISA is aware that there is a growing new role being adopted by Computing/Information services in Learning and Teaching Technology (LaTT) support. That is, the support given to teaching staff to achieve pedagogically effective integration of technology to support learning and teaching. In order to gain an insight into the extent to which LaTT support has been developed with its member organisations, UCISA commissioned its teaching and learning sub-group to conduct a survey focusing on this issue.

The survey was conducted in two phases. Phase 1 identified existing surveys and sources of information similar in scope to the UCISA survey. Phase 2 involved the collection of data from the UCISA community about learning and teaching technology support. The subsequent analysis of the data is presented in the body of this report.

Overall, *nearly all* institutions provided some form of LaTT support, showing that such support is very widespread. The data also indicates that this type of support is likely to increase.

Within the university IT service or Information/Library services around **half** the departments provided **specific posts** for LaTT support, and **two-thirds** of the departments included LaTT support duties as part of the duties of standard support posts.

The questionnaire results also show the wide range of skills and abilities required for staff involved in LaTT support. Advice, support and training in **webware** is the most significant of all the learning technologies. Videoconferencing and computer conferencing are the next most supported learning technologies. It is particularly interesting to note that student training is currently not as common an activity as the others, however it is overwhelmingly the area with the largest indication of increased activity for the near future.

For UCISA, the implication is that its membership includes a growing number of people requiring help and assistance in this aspect of their professional work.

For the UCISA teaching, learning and information group (TLIG), the implication is that the constituency it serves is changing. This will require TLIG to reach this wider constituency and to collaborate with other bodies such as SCONUL, Association for Learning Technology (ALT) and the new Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN).

Recommendations

1. UCISA should make strategic statements about the future roles of IT departments as the landscape of HE is currently undergoing massive change;
2. UCISA should offer advice to the Funding Councils and institutions on the teaching quality enhancement fund (TQEF) in the light of the survey results;
3. UCISA's teaching learning and information subgroup (TLIG) should provide a starting point to find information about learning and teaching technology support;
4. TLIG should provide guides and links to best practice;
5. TLIG should run workshops about learning and teaching in particular about fostering good collaboration between IT services and academic staff;
6. TLIG should provide a forum for collaboration and discussion about the issues raised in this survey;
7. TLIG should reach the wider constituency through collaboration with other bodies such as SCONUL, ALT and the new LTSN;

8. UCISA can now use this survey as evidence in their public recognition that LaTT support is a significant and substantial part of the work of its member community.
9. TLIG should take into account that there are staff outside computer services who are engaged in LaTT support and it should consider ways of relating to them.

CONTENTS LIST

1. Background to survey	1
2. Survey implementation	2
2.1 Introduction	2
2.2 Identification of existing information	2
2.3 Summary of information gathered	2
2.4 Survey methodology	2
2.5 Sample selection	3
2.6 Questionnaire returns	3
3. LaTT support provision	4
3.1 Introduction	4
3.2 Specific LaTT support posts	4
3.3 LaTT support as part of duties	4
3.4 LaTT support offered by other units	5
3.5 Inter-relation between the three support types	5
3.6 Conclusions about the provision of LaTT support	5
4. Policy and drivers for LaTT support	6
4.1 Introduction	6
4.2 Policy statements	6
4.3 Main drivers	6
4.4 Conclusions	6
5. LaTT support activities	7
5.1 Introduction	7
5.2 Current activities	7
5.3 Qualitative information	8
5.4 Specific Technologies	9
5.5 The Future	10
5.6 Conclusion	10
6. Role for UCISA	11
7. Models of LaTT Support	12
7.1 Introduction	12
7.2 Integral	12
7.3 Integrated	12
7.4 Collaborative	12
7.5 Consultative	12
7.6 Conclusions	12
8. Conclusions	13
9. Recommendations	14
Bibliography	15
Appendix A - Survey Questionnaire	16

Appendix B – Cross tabulation tables	22
Appendix C - Web references	25
Appendix D - Future support activities	27

1. Background to survey

UCISA is aware that there is a growing new role being adopted by Computing/Information services in Learning and Teaching Technology (LaTT) support. Previous surveys of support provided by Computing or combined information services have covered levels of technical support, help desk support and IT training. Other research has focused on specific technologies, or lecturer and student attitudes to, and experiences of, learning technology (see Bibliography).

The focus for *this* survey is on the support given to teaching staff to achieve pedagogically effective integration of technology to support learning and teaching. Such work can be seen to involve:

- Collaboration and liaison with teaching staff in the integration of learning technology into courses;
- Consultancy;
- Staff Development activities such as awareness raising, course design using C&IT etc.;
- Collaborative initiatives aimed at promoting and/or supporting the pedagogically effective uptake of specific learning technologies;
- Development of learning technology resources.

The purpose of the survey has been:

- To identify *where* LaTT support is based within institutions;
- To identify ways in which UCISA and its sub-groups can provide help and support through e.g. workshops, advice, staff development activities for those involved in LaTT support;
- To enable UCISA to make informed responses to proposals or discussion papers in this area (e.g. no mention is made of Computing/Information services activities in the recent funding councils' consultation paper about the new Subject Centres structure);
- To identify whether specific posts exist for LaTT support, either current or proposed for the near future.

The questionnaire (appendix A) was sent to those on the UCISA Directors mailing list. We asked that the questionnaire should be passed on to the most appropriate person in the department for completion.

This report sets out the findings from the survey data and leads to conclusions of interest to the UCISA community and recommendations for UCISA and its sub-groups

2. Survey implementation

2.1 Introduction

The survey was conducted in two phases. Phase 1, conducted during November 1998, identified existing surveys and sources of information similar in scope to the UCISA survey. This ensured non-repetition of work already carried out and also sources that could support Phase 2. Phase 2, carried out during 1999, involved the collection of data from the UCISA community about learning and teaching technology support and the subsequent analysis of that data, presented in this report.

2.2 Identification of existing information

The main aim of this phase was to ensure that this survey would not be repeating work carried out elsewhere. If similar work were identified we could also use the information to corroborate our own findings. To facilitate the identification of relevant information, since it may be confidential and therefore generally unavailable, a request for pointers to relevant surveys or sources of existing information was sent to the following mailbase lists:

- cti-all (which is now a web-site rather than a mailing list)
- TLTSN
- TLT_Officers
- SEDA
- IT Training all
- TLIG correspondents

The request emphasised the desire to avoid repetition in building a picture of the support provided in Computing or Combined Services in Universities and Colleges for learning technology. It also provides background information for the design of the UCISA survey.

Eight replies were received resulting in the review of a number of sources (see Bibliography).

A number of web-searches were undertaken using relevant search terms, but nothing additional was identified.

2.3 Summary of Information gathered

In summary, there are a number of surveys focusing on lecturer use of, or attitudes towards, learning technology (Bailey, 1996), experiences of using learning technology (McCulloch, 1999, Doughty, 1995), and staff development needs in respect of learning technology (Tomes, 1998).

There are useful case studies from the Teaching and Learning Technology Support Network (TLTSN), that give an insight into how different institutions support teaching and learning. However, these are restricted to the TLTSN support centres and whilst they have depth, do not have the breadth intended for the UCISA survey.

The closest survey in terms of breadth and focus is the 1997 UCISA project to gather statistical information about HE computing services (UCISA, 1997). This started with a pilot for academic year 1996/7. This has yielded useful information about who, at least in 1997, saw teaching and learning technology support as an area for which they are responsible.

This review fed directly into second phase of the survey in terms of how to conduct the survey and how to design the questionnaire.

2.4 Survey methodology

For phase 2 of the survey, it was decided that the best way to collect data would be by questionnaire and that the questionnaire should be made available via the WWW and on paper.

The Teaching and Learning group met and designed the questionnaire (appendix A), which covered questions of where the LaTT support was based, levels of support, and particular technologies that were supported. A section on future developments was also included to try and gain an insight into the way such support is likely to develop, at least in the short term.

2.5 Sample selection

Because the survey was funded by UCISA the focus was on finding out information from UCISA members. The questionnaire (appendix A) was sent to all those on the UCISA Directors mailing list. We asked that the questionnaire should be passed on to the most appropriate person in the department for completion. In a number of cases the questionnaire was passed to the specialist unit within the institution that had responsibility for teaching and learning. However, over 90% of responses were clearly from IT services or similar functions within information services. For the remaining 10%, responses were from “centres” which may or may not have been within such services. We believe therefore that the sample is representative of UCISA membership.

2.6 Questionnaire returns

The return rate was over 50%, resulting in 70 completed questionnaires usable for the analysis. After the deadline had passed we then completed 54 ‘proxy’ returns for all those who had failed to complete a questionnaire using the information provided on their WWW sites. This was used only for the question of *whether or not specific learning technology support was provided* in order to give a better overall picture of provision within computer services. However, we were pleased to see that the proxy returns gave very similar figures to the actual returns, thus increasing our confidence that our sample is representative.

Data returned via the paper forms was entered to the web-based questionnaire. This data was then exported and analysed using Microsoft Excel and Access.

3. LaTT support provision

3.1 Introduction

In setting up the survey UCISA recognised that the provision of support for learning and teaching technology was a relatively recent addition to the portfolio of traditional services provided by IT Services and their equivalents in Combined Services. We were therefore very interested to see the extent to which such support has been developed within the services.

One of the principal aims of the survey was to identify where learning and teaching technology support is based, and to identify whether specific posts exist, either current or proposed for the near future.

3.2 Specific LaTT support posts

In question A1, respondents were asked if there were specific posts in their departments to provide learning and teaching technology support. Replies indicated that about **half did, and half did not**.

	Yes	No
Current Specific Posts	48%	52%

The number of specific LaTT posts in each department varied widely from a single individual to teams of six.

Looking into the figures, there was little difference between the pre- 1992 and post 1992 universities. (See Table 1, Appendix B)

The proxy questionnaire returns gave about the same figures as the actual returns, so we are confident that figures are representative. (See Table 2, Appendix B)

When asked if setting up specific posts was planned in the future the replies were:

	Yes	No	No reply
Planned Specific Posts	21%	49%	30%

Interestingly, of those planning the new posts, 73 per cent already had existing posts - therefore they were increasing their provision. Of those without existing posts, only 12 per cent planned more. In other words, 88 per cent of those without posts planned to stay that way. (See Table 3, Appendix B)

In conclusion it would seem that though the number of specialist posts is likely to increase, generally speaking, the balance between departments who have such posts and those who do not will remain at around 50/50.

3.3 LaTT support as part of duties

In question A2, respondents were asked if there were staff in their departments who had LaTT support as part of their duties. The majority do have such staff – around **two-thirds**.

	Yes	No
Part of duties	68%	32%

The estimated proportion of staff duties dedicated to LaTT support varied widely from 5% to over 50% of a person's time, and from one to six such people in the support service.

The proxy data appears to confirm these percentage figures.

Comparing pre- and post-1992 universities did not reveal statistically significant differences. (See Table 4, Appendix B)

When asked if such support was planned for the future, the replies were:

	Yes	No	Blank
Part of duties	18%	38%	44%

Generally speaking, only people with current posts of this type were planning it in future. Those without such posts indicated no future plans. So the implication is the proportion of institutions with such posts will remain at around two-thirds. (See Table 5, Appendix B)

3.4 LaTT support offered by other units

In question A3, respondents were asked if other units outside their support service offered LaTT support. The majority, **three-quarters** of those who replied said 'yes'.

	Yes	No	Blank
Other units	72%	24%	4%
Out of 72			
Out of 69 actual replies	75%	25%	

Again, there was little difference between pre-1992 and post-1992 institutions. (See Table 6, Appendix B)

From the description of these other units we would conclude that these units provide support for all aspects of learning and teaching, with C&IT only one of the methods employed/supported.

3.5 Inter-relation between the three support types

One might expect that if a department did not have specific posts for LaTT support, then it might instead have posts with LaTT support as part of duties, or rely instead on support from another unit. This is not the case.

The presence of any one style of support (A1/A2/A3) is not specifically related to whether the institution has the others. In other words institution with Type A1 are just as likely to have A2 or A3 as those without. This suggests the saying 'those that do, do; and those that do not, do not'. (See Tables 7-9, Appendix B)

The tables show little pattern - they merely indicate that having a unit offering LaTT support does not seem to preclude responding departments from having specific LaTT posts and possibly that responding departments are more likely to have someone with specific LaTT duties where a separate unit also exists. They also suggest that specific and partial posts also seem to co-exist: (Always assuming, of course, respondents have applied the letter of the question, as to placing of posts!)

It also indicates there are very few sites with nothing at all (or at least reporting nothing at all).

3.6 Conclusions about the provision of LaTT support

Overall, nearly all institutions provided some form of LaTT support, showing that such support is very widespread, and likely to increase.

Within the university IT service or Information/Library Services around **half** the departments provided **specific posts** for LaTT support, and **two-thirds** of the departments included LaTT support duties as part of the duties of standard support posts.

Three-quarters of institutions offered LaTT support in other units within the university.

For UCISA, the implication is that its membership includes a growing number of people requiring help and assistance in this aspect of their professional work.

4. Policy and drivers for LaTT support

4.1 Introduction

The next part of the survey set out to identify whether institutional policy and other drivers have an affect on the provision of LaTT support. These questions focused on seeking to identify if institutional learning and teaching strategies were in place and what other, internal and external, drivers affected LaTT development.

4.2 Policy statements

We were interested to find out if LaTT support was part of a stated institutional policy for this area of support, either a specific policy or part of a more general policy or service level. There was a response level of 21% saying they have an institutional policy for this area. Following the emphasis placed on developing teaching and learning policies in the Dearing report the number of respondents indicating they have a policy could be seen as quite low. It was interesting to note that cross checking against the Deliberations Web site (<http://www.lgu.ac.uk/deliberations/policies/index.cgi>) which lists policies from 20 institutions, 12 of those who had answered no or left blank the response were listed on this site. This suggests that respondents felt their policies do not, or are perceived not to contain statements on LaTT support.

When checking these policies for statements of LaTT support, specific references to the need for staff development and student IT support are often included but not specifically related to IT services. Policy statements are also sometimes hosted by the web pages of specialist units.

Where URL's were made available these are listed in Appendix C and on the UCISA TLIG web pages (<http://www.ucisa.ac.uk/TLIG/teach/docs/survey99/>).

4.3 Main Drivers

A number of drivers currently exist in Higher Education that encourage the provision of LaTT and its support. Respondents were asked to identify what they saw as the main drivers. The responses clearly split into internal and external drivers. The main internal driver identified was that of staff pressure and expectations (over 30% cited this), followed by senior management strategy (20%). Fewer respondents cited external pressures as a main driver. Of those who did, the main ones cited were external market forces (16%) and the QAA (9%).

4.4 Conclusions

The survey results suggest a relatively low proportion of institutions with policies. However, other evidence suggests this may be an under-estimate or that existing policies do not address LaTT support. The results do appear to reinforce the findings in section 3 that LaTT support is not seen as the sole preserve of IT Services or Information/Library Services across a large number of institutions.

The drivers identified as affecting change included a wide range of factors; divided between internal and external. The importance of staff champions and enthusiasts came out as a significant driver followed by management strategy. This highlights the importance given to internal as opposed to external drivers such as the QAA. These responses suggest that in many institutions there is no co-ordinated approach or driver to LaTT support.

The responses from this section of the survey highlight the need for greater collaboration. UCISA can play a part by encouraging this at inter and intra institutional level.

5. LaTT support activities

5.1 Introduction

Section B of the questionnaire aimed to find out about the kinds of activities that those involved in LaTT support were carrying out. Section C asked for an indication of future levels of support so that we could gain more than just a current snapshot of activities. It is inevitable that this is only a prediction of future activities, but it indicates to some degree the priorities for development. It also provides an indication of the type of staff needed to fulfil this role.

5.2 Current activities

In section B of the questionnaire we asked for an indication of current levels of support for a wide range of activities. The following table summarises the data where column 1 indicates the area of support and column 2 indicates the current level of support, i.e. the percentage of responding institutions who provide support in that area.

Area of Support	%
Staff development activities	71%
Awareness raising workshops and seminars	69%
Consultancy to support/promote LaTT available locally	63%
Consultancy about national initiatives	47%
Dissemination of good practice in implementing LaTT	57%
Special initiatives to promote a particular LaTT	56%
Hosting events/initiatives collaboratively with other units	67%
Liaison with national initiatives	73%
Collaboration with teaching staff on joint projects to integrate LaTT	71%
Training (staff)	69%
Training (students)	36%
Integration of existing courseware into learning and teaching provision	59%
Develop new courseware	37%

Table 5.1: Current levels of support

Over half the respondents were active in 10 of the 13 areas identified. Notable exceptions are the area of student training and new courseware development where around a third of institutions are

active. These activities are returned to in section C regarding the indications for the future levels of support.

5.3 Qualitative information

The following section of the report summarises the qualitative information provided by respondents in section B of the questionnaire. Clearly a wide variety of examples were given and this section summarises those that appeared most frequently.

Dissemination of good practice

This was handled in a variety of ways including annual events, workshops, seminars, courses, one-to-one training, web-sites and mailing lists. Where URLs have been provided these are collated in Appendix C and on the UCISA TLIG web pages <http://www.ucisa.ac.uk/TLIG/teach/docs/survey99/>

Collaboration with other units to host learning technology events/initiatives

Over two-thirds of respondents are involved in hosting events or initiatives in collaboration with other units within their University, in general this appeared to be either Staff Development or units with a wider remit for teaching and learning support than just LaTT. Interestingly a number of Scottish and Welsh Universities mentioned collaboration with other 'local' universities in organising such events.

Liaison with national initiatives

There currently exist a plethora of national initiatives to support this area of activity. From the responses it is interesting to note the spread of initiatives that are mentioned. The Computers in Teaching Initiative Centres were cited by just under half of those who indicated that they engage in national liaison activities. The Association for Learning Technology (ALT), JISC Technology Applications Programme (JTAP), and the Teaching and Learning Technology Programme (TLTP) were cited in about equal numbers among respondents, around 18%. Specific mention was made of TLTP III projects EFFECTS, ELEN and TALENT.

Interestingly the Teaching and Learning Technology Support Network was mentioned in 18% of cases, despite the fact that funding for this support network ceased at the end of 1998.

Mention of the Learning Technology Dissemination Initiative and TaLisMAN was notable among the Scottish Universities. This corresponds to the findings of this year's HEFCE report on the use of TLTP materials in UK higher education, regarding which sources were used to obtain information about using C&IT for learning and teaching (HEFCE, 1999).

Other initiatives mentioned, URLs for which are given in Appendix C and on the TLIG website <http://www.ucisa.ac.uk/TLIG/teach/docs/survey99/>, are Netskills, the Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning (FDTL), British Educational Communications and Technology Association (BECTA), Universities and Colleges Staff Development Association (UCoSDA), Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA), British Universities Film and Video Council (BUFVC), Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC), National Information Services and Systems (NISS), and the Electronic Libraries Programme (eLib).

Collaborative projects

Collaboration was indicated on a wide variety of projects e.g. Courseware, both creating new courseware and implementing existing courseware e.g. TLTP products; and implementing new technologies such as computer mediated collaboration (CMC), Web-based activity and videoconferencing. Where URL's have been provided these are collated in Appendix C and on the UCISA TLIG web pages <http://www.ucisa.ac.uk/TLIG/teach/docs/survey99/>.

Staff and student training

Staff training tends to be by courses run by IT services, other units within the institution, or external courses, as well as self-taught booklets and courseware.

Student training tends to be seen as the responsibility of the faculty or member of staff, indicative comments being “Good question!” and “academic staff teach them (or don’t)”. However from the quantitative data we can see that about one third of departments provide some training for students.

Developing new courseware

Of the small number of respondents whose departments are involved in courseware development, the role of LaTT staff is generally as a core part of a design team. This team is usually indicated to involve several areas of expertise, typically an educational technologist, subject expert and courseware designer. This is similar to the mix of skills identified by the review of the TLTP Phases I and II as leading to successful courseware (Coopers & Lybrand, 1996). Examples and URLs can be found in Appendix C.

5.4 Specific Technologies

We identified a number of technologies that are currently in use in HE for supporting learning and teaching activities and we asked for an indication of whether support was provided for these technologies in a number of ways, giving advice, providing support, providing training, working on development or pilot projects. The following table summarises the data for each technology and indicates current levels of support.

	Advice	Support	Training	Development or Pilot Projects
a. Videoconferencing	59%	49%	29%	50%
b. Computer conferencing	50%	37%	30%	43%
c. Courseware production	47%	39%	19%	29%
d. Webware	73%	64%	57%	46%
e. Computer-based Assessment	46%	39%	24%	1%
f. Creating multimedia resources	49%	37%	20%	27%
g. Video on demand	17%	13%	1%	14%

The area with the highest level of support indicated is that of *webware* with high levels of advice, support and training being offered and just under 50% of respondents involved in development or pilot projects.

The next ‘most popular’ was *videoconferencing*, with about half of respondents providing advice and support and being involved in development/pilot projects. For information and advice about videoconferencing in HE, see <http://www.vcas.video.ja.net/>

Computer Conferencing comes next with 50% of respondents providing advice about CMC, although a lower level, around a third, providing support and training.

Creating multimedia resources was again an activity that around 50% of respondents were involved in at least at the level of giving advice, with about a third also providing some level of support and about a fifth providing training and being involved in development or pilot projects.

Courseware production is similar to the previous two technologies, with just under half the respondents indicating that they give advice about this.

Computer Based Assessment – Again slightly under 50% of institutions provide advice about this technology with just over a third providing support. Only one fifth actually provided any training and only one respondent indicated that they were involved in a development/pilot project. For more information about computer aided assessment generally see <http://caacentre.ac.uk/>

Video on demand – showed very low levels of advice, support, training and development project activity. Since this is a relatively new and emerging technology this is not a surprising result.

5.5 The Future

In order to provide UCISA with more than just a snapshot of current provision we also asked respondents to indicate how their support for the various activities covered in section B were likely to change in the near future, particularly in terms of increased support.

These areas of activity are staff development, dissemination of good practice, awareness raising events and initiatives, consultancy, training, joint projects and development of new courseware.

Most areas of support activity show a slight increase of 10% or less in terms of those who currently do not provide support in these areas but intend to do so in the near future. The biggest increase is in the area of student training with 33% of respondents indicating that they will be moving to provide this support in the near future (Table 1, Appendix D).

With respect to the support activities undertaken for specific technologies, a number of different patterns emerge. As far as *webware* support is concerned this level is set to change very little in terms of increased support in the near future. Since this is the most supported area currently, identified in section B, this is not surprising.

Conversely *video on demand*, which shows the lowest current levels of support, shows the largest increase in future support at over 30% across most activities.

All the other areas show similar amounts of increased support of around 20%-30% (Table 2, Appendix D).

5.6 Conclusion

The questionnaire results for sections B and C, show the wide range of skills and abilities required for staff involved in LaTT support. It is encouraging to see high levels of involvement in such a wide range of support activities. Advice, support and training in **webware** is the most significant of all the learning technologies. Videoconferencing and computer conferencing are the next most supported learning technologies. It is particularly interesting to note that student training is currently not as common an activity as the others, however it is overwhelmingly the area with the largest indication of increased activity for the near future.

6. Role for UCISA

Section D of the questionnaire gave respondents a chance to indicate the type of support or information they wanted UCISA and its teaching, learning and information sub-group to provide.

It is apparent from these contributions that there is a great demand for the sharing of information and expertise and a willingness to collaborate with colleagues. However, it is also apparent that staff who work in institutions are not at all clear about how they should go about this. The responses indicate a great deal of activity, but happening in some isolation.

The over-riding message from the responses to section D is for UCISA TLIG to act as an information gateway on Learning and Teaching technology support. There is a demand for the TLIG web page to provide links to examples of good practice, useful information and to colleagues. Workshops were also requested, some on specific software such as groupware or CMC, but also on collaboration and promoting C&IT within an institution.

These comments provide a useful starting point for UCISA to consider future workshops and conference sessions. This should include sessions in collaboration with other bodies such as the newly formed Institute for Learning and Teaching (ILT), SCONUL and ALT.

The need for clarity of information was also important and UCISA TLIG needs to bear this in mind and review how it can act as an information gateway for LaTT support.

7. Models of LaTT Support

7.1 Introduction

Four models of LaTT support provision emerge from the data:

- Integral
- Integrated
- Collaborative
- Consultative

These are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

7.2 Integral

This is where LaTT support forms only a part of the support duties of staff within the computer service. There are no specific posts within the institution or units outside of the computer service who support LaTT. In other words there is no formally identified support. Support is provided as an integral part of the computer services work.

About 12% of institutions follow this approach.

7.3 Integrated

This is where specific post(s) exist within the computer service to support LaTT activity. Liaison with other departments such as Staff Development, Academic Research departments was frequently mentioned as part of providing a well-rounded service. In this instance the computer service would be the main or sole provider of support for LaTT.

About 44% of institutions favour this approach.

7.4 Collaborative

This refers to a situation where a specific unit outside of the computer service has responsibility for LaTT, but works in close liaison with the computer service. It also refers to the situation where there is close liaison between those in the computer service with responsibility for LaTT support and a specialist unit that exists outside of the computer service to provide this support, often in a wider learning and teaching support context.

About 40% of institutions favour this approach.

7.5 Consultative

A few of the returns, about 4%, indicated that little liaison or collaborative activities were undertaken with a specific unit that exists to support LaTT. Responsibility lies outside the computer service and is seen as separate.

7.6 Conclusions

The more widely adopted models (integrated and collaborative) bear some resemblance to the two models proposed for the siting of LaTT support in a paper from the Teaching and Learning Technology Support Network (Simpson, 1996). A common feature of these two models is that representation from all stakeholders e.g. Senior management, Staff Development, IT services, Library Service etc. all have a place on steering groups/committees that meet regularly. A more

recent paper from the TLTSN provides four in-depth case-studies regarding learning technology support within institutions (TLTSN, 1999). Three of the four cases follow the integrated approach, with the fourth following a collaborative one, giving some credence to the models presented here.

8. Conclusions

In setting up the survey UCISA recognised that the provision of support for learning and teaching technology was a relatively recent addition to the portfolio of traditional services provided by IT Services and their equivalents in Combined Services.

We were therefore very interested to see the extent to which such support has been developed within the services by identifying where learning and teaching technology support was based, and to identify whether specific posts existed, either current or proposed for the near future.

Within the university IT service or Information/Library Services around **half** the departments provided **specific posts** for LaTT support, and **two-thirds** of the departments included LaTT support duties as part of the duties of standard support posts.

Three-quarters of institutions offered LaTT support in other units within the university.

Overall, we found that nearly all institutions provided some form of LaTT support, showing that such support is very widespread and, from the data, appears likely to increase.

For UCISA, the implication is that its membership includes a growing number of people requiring help and assistance in this aspect of their professional work.

Section B of the questionnaire aimed to find out about the kinds of activities that those involved in LaTT support were carrying out. Section C asked for an indication of future levels of support so that we could gain more than just a current snapshot of activities. It is inevitable that this is only a prediction of future activities, but it indicates to some degree the priorities for development.

The results show the wide range of skills and abilities required for staff involved in LaTT support. Advice, support and training in **webware** is the most significant of all the learning technologies supported. Videoconferencing and computer conferencing are the next most supported learning technologies. It is particularly interesting to note that student training is currently not as common an activity as the others, however it is overwhelmingly the area with the largest indication of increased activity for the near future.

Four models of LaTT support provision in HE emerge from the data:

- Integral
- Integrated
- Collaborative
- Consultative

The survey responses show that LaTT support now occurs in many units across HE institutions. The consequence of this is that the constituency that UCISA TLIG serves is changing. This will require TLIG to find more ways to reach this wider constituency, for example collaboration with other bodies such as SCONUL, ALT, ILT and the new LTSN.

9. Recommendations

The mission of UCISA is to promote excellence in the application of information systems and services in support of teaching, learning, research and administration in HE. This survey has provided a valuable insight for UCISA into the level of support provided by UCISA members for learning and teaching technology support.

The survey has allowed examples of best practice to be identified and these are highlighted on TLIG's web pages at <http://www.ucisa.ac.uk/TLIG/docs/survey99/> as well as in this report.

It will also allow UCISA to inform and support policy making processes within institutions and nationally regarding the nature and extent of learning and teaching technology support provided by UCISA members.

Specific recommendations from those who completed the questionnaire and the UCISA Teaching and Learning subgroup are:

1. UCISA should make strategic statements about the future roles of IT departments as the landscape of HE is currently undergoing massive change;
2. UCISA should offer advice to HEFCE and institutions on the teaching quality enhancement fund (TQEF) in the light of the survey results;
3. UCISA's teaching learning and information subgroup (TLIG) should provide a starting point to information about learning and teaching technology support;
4. TLIG should provide guides and links to best practice;
5. TLIG should run workshops about learning and teaching in particular about fostering good collaboration between IT services and academic staff;
6. TLIG should provide a forum for collaboration and discussion about the issues raised in this survey;
7. TLIG should reach the wider constituency through collaboration with other bodies such as SCONUL, ALT and the new LTSN;
8. UCISA can now publicly recognise that LaTT support is a significant and substantial part of the work of its member community.
9. TLIG should take into account that there are staff outside computer services who are engaged in LaTT support and it should consider ways of relating to them.

Bibliography

Bailey, P., (1996), *Attitudes towards using Learning Technologies survey*, available at: <http://sh.plym.ac.uk/eds/tsl/skiltext.htm>

Coopers & Lybrand, Institute of Education, Tavistock Institute, (1996) *Evaluation of the Teaching and Learning Technology Programme*, Higher Education Funding Council for England, Reference M 21/96, executive summary available at: http://www.niss.ac.uk/education/hefce/pub96/m21_96.html

Doughty, G. et.al., "Using Learning Technologies: Interim conclusions from the TILT project", University of Glasgow, <http://www.elec.gla.ac.uk/TILT/TILT.html>

HEFCE, (1999), *Use of TLTP materials in UK higher education*, June 99/39, unavailable online.

HEFCE, (1998), *An evaluation of the Computers in Teaching Initiative and Teaching and Learning Technology Support Network*, September 98/47, available at: http://www.niss.ac.uk/education/hefce/pub98/98_47.html

McCulloch, M. (1999), *Evaluations of the use of C&IT in teaching and learning*, contact Dr Mary McCulloch, Department of Higher and Further Education, Paterson's Land, Holyrood Road, Edinburgh, EH8 8AQ. Email Mary_McCulloch@ed.ac.uk

Meek, Garnett & Grattan (1998), *Geography and Earth Sciences*, ALT-J 6(1), pp 57-63

Simpson, V., (1996) *The Hypertext Campus Project*, TLTSN Case Studies II, available at: <http://www.tltp.ac.uk/tltsn/pubs.html>

Tomes, N. and Higgison, C., (1998) *Analysis of the training needs of academic and research staff in Scottish Higher Education*. Available at: <http://www.talisman.hw.ac.uk/tna/>

TLTSN (1999), *Models of Learning Technology Support within Institutions*. Available at: <http://www.tltp.ac.uk/tltsn/pubs.html>

Appendix A: Survey Questionnaire



Support provided in Universities and Colleges for the use of technology in teaching and learning

A UCISA funded survey

Although this survey has been sent to those on the UCISA Directors mailing list we would be happy for you to pass this survey to the most appropriate person **in your department** for completion.

Please Note: The final report containing detailed results and analysis will be sent to those who complete this survey. It will not be made available to any non-contributing sites.

UCISA is aware that there is a growing new role being adopted by Computing/Information services in Learning and Teaching Technology (LaTT) support. Previous surveys of support provided by Computing or combined Information services have covered levels of technical support, help desk support and IT training. Other research has focused on specific technologies, or lecturer and student attitudes to, and experiences of, learning technology.

This survey will focus on the support given to teaching staff to achieve pedagogically effective integration of technology to support learning and teaching. Such work can be seen to involve:

- Collaboration and liaison with teaching staff in the integration of learning technology into courses;
- Consultancy;
- Staff Development activities such as awareness raising, course design using C&IT etc.;
- Collaborative initiatives aimed at promoting and/or supporting the pedagogically effective uptake of specific learning technologies;
- Development of learning technology resources.

The purpose of this survey is:

- To identify *where* LaTT support is based within institutions;
- To identify ways in which UCISA and its sub-groups can provide help and support through e.g. workshops, advice, staff development activities for those involved in LaTT support;
- To enable UCISA to make informed responses to proposals or discussion papers in this area (e.g. no mention is made of Computing/Information services activities in the recent funding councils' consultation paper about the new Subject Centres structure);
- To identify whether specific posts exist for LaTT support, either current or proposed for the near future.

Please complete and return the survey in the envelope provided, or complete the web form at

<http://ktru-main.lancs.ac.uk/PUBLIC/LaTT.nsf> by 22nd February 1999.

Survey of the support provided in Universities and Colleges for the use of technology in learning and teaching

The survey should only take about 15 minutes to complete.

1. Name of your department:
2. Name of University/College:
3. Your name:
4. Your title:
5. Your e-mail address:

Section A - Staffing

A1. Do specific posts exist in your department for Learning and Teaching Technology (LaTT) support? e.g. with a title such as Learning Technology Development Officer? Current
Y / N Planned
Y / N

A1a. If the answer to either of the above is Yes, please give details

(number of staff and title(s)):

Current	Planned

A2. Are there staff (e.g. advisory or support) for whom this is part of their general duties? Current
Y / N Planned
Y / N

A2a. If the answer to either of the above is Yes, please give details (e.g. title(s) and approximately what percentage of their time is spent on LaTT support activities):

Current	Planned

A3. Do other units within your Institution, but outside the line management of your department, offer LaTT support e.g. Staff Development Unit, Learning and Teaching Unit? Y / N

A3a. If Yes, then please give the name of the unit(s) and a brief description of the support they provide:

A3b. Please describe the extent of your liaison with such unit(s) e.g. very little liaison/regular meetings/collaborative activities :

A4. Does your institution have a policy for this area of support, either separate or part of a more general policy or service level? Y / N

A4a. If so please can you give a relevant URL below?

A5. Where are the main “drivers” for LaTT development coming from? e.g staff, students, external forces e.g. QAA?

The next sections of the survey are divided into current and planned future support for Learning and Teaching Technology so we can develop more than just a snapshot view.

Section B – Current Support

Note: If you intend to change your level of support for, or intend to begin supporting, any of the areas surveyed in this section, use the appropriate questions when completing section C.

Does your department *currently* offer the following LaTT support:

B1. Staff Development activities? Y / N

B2. Awareness raising workshops/seminars? Y / N

B3. Dissemination of good practice in implementing LaTT? Y / N

B3a. If **Yes**, please can you give some examples of how you do this (or relevant URL's)?

B4. Special initiatives to promote a particular learning/teaching technology? Y / N

B4a. If **Yes**, please can you give some examples of such initiatives (or relevant URL's)?

B5. Collaboration with other units to host learning technology events/initiatives?

B6. Liaison with national initiatives? E.g. CTI, TLTSN, JTAP, ALT etc.

B7. Collaboration with teaching staff on joint projects to integrate learning technology into courses? Y / N

B7a. If **Yes**, can you provide a brief example(s)?

B8. Training in the particular learning or teaching technology staff have chosen?

B8a. For staff? Y / N

B8b. For students? Y / N

B8c. If the answer to either (or both) of these is No – who does provide the training (if anyone)?



(cont'd): Does your department *currently* offer the following LaTT support

B9. Consultancy to support/promote learning technology available locally? Y / N

B10. Consultancy about national initiatives e.g. JTAP, TLTP,CTI's ? Y / N

B11. Integration of existing courseware into learning and teaching provision? Y / N

B12. Development of new courseware? Y / N

B12a. If the answer to this is **Yes** – what is your role in this development (e.g. part of design team, main programmer, mainly training the teaching staff in the courseware design tools, troubleshooting...)

B12b. Please can you give some courseware examples (or relevant URL's)?

B13. Which of the following learning technologies is your department involved in - Please tick the appropriate level in the following table?

	Advice	Support	Training	Development or Pilot Projects
a. Videoconferencing				
b. Computer conferencing e.g. Lotus Notes, FirstClass etc.				
c. Courseware production				
d. Webware				
e. Computer-based Assessment				
f. Creating multimedia resources – if so how? S/ware; lab etc.				
g. Video on demand				
h. Other technology				

B13j. If you'd like to expand on the support you provide for any of the above, please do so here:

Section C – Future or planned support

Note: If you intend to change your level of support for, or intend to begin supporting, any of the areas surveyed in the previous section, please answer the appropriate questions in this section. To indicate no change, leave the question unanswered.

Do you *intend* to offer in the *near future* the following LaTT support:

- C1. Staff Development activities? Y / N
- C2. Awareness raising workshops/seminars? Y / N
- C3. Dissemination of good practice in implementing LaTT? Y / N

C3a. If Yes, can you give details of your planned activity?

- C4. Special initiatives to promote a particular learning/teaching technology? Y / N

C4a. If Yes, can you give details of your planned activity?

- C5. Collaboration with other units to host learning technology events/initiatives?

- C6. Liaison with national initiatives? e.g. CTI, JTAP, TLTSN, ALT etc.

- C7. Collaboration with teaching staff on joint projects to integrate learning technology into courses? Y / N

- C8. Training in the learning or teaching technology chosen by staff?

- C8a.** For staff? Y / N
- C8b.** For students? Y / N

- C9. Consultancy to support/promote learning technology in use locally? Y / N

- C10. Consultancy about national initiatives e.g. JTAP, TLTP, CTI's ? Y / N

- C11. Integration of existing courseware into learning and teaching provision? Y / N

- C12. Development of new courseware? Y / N

C12a. If the answer to this is Yes – what will your role be in this development (e.g. part of design team, main programmer, mainly training the teaching staff in the courseware design tools, troubleshooting...)

(cont'd): Do you *intend* to offer in the *near future* the following LaTT support:

C13. Which of the following learning technologies are you intending to get involved in and in what capacity?

	Advice	Support	Training	Development or pilot projects
a. Videoconferencing				
b. Computer conferencing e.g. Lotus Notes, FirstClass etc.				
c. Courseware production				
d. Webware				
e. Computer-based Assessment				
f. Creating multimedia resources				
g. Video on demand				
h. Other technology				

C13j. If you'd like to expand on the support your department intends to provide for any of the learning technologies you have noted in question **C13**, please do so here:

Section D – UCISA help

D1. Do you have any suggestions for areas of support that you feel should be given by UCISA/TLIG e.g. workshops; consultancy/advice, information provided on the UCISA website etc.

D2. Please add any other comments you would like to add about this survey or your support for LaTT.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Please return this survey to:

Susan Armitage, Information Systems Services, Lancaster University, Lancaster Lancs. LA1 4YW

This questionnaire was developed by the Teaching and Learning Sub-group:

Susan Armitage (Lancaster University), Andrew Rothery (University College Worcester), Randall Thompson (Queen's University Belfast), Tom Browne (Sussex University), Martin Jenkins (Cheltenham and Gloucester College of HE)

Thanks also goes to the members of the wider TLIG group, and those who responded to mailbase list requests, for their help and support in designing this survey.

Appendix B: Cross tabulation tables

B1: Specific posts in responding department - current:

A1Ct	Institution Type			Total
	Post-1992	Pre-1992	(blank)	
Yes	16	18		34
Column %	46%	50%	0%	48%
No	19	18	1	38
Column %	54%	50%	100%	52%
Total	35	36	1	72

B2: Proxy responses count of specific post - current:

Specific post	Institution Type		Total
	Post-1992	Pre-1992	
Yes	10	15	25
Column %	36%	58%	46%
No	18	10	28
Column %	64%	38%	52%
(Blank)		1	1
Column %	0%	4%	2%
Total	28	26	54

B3: Specific posts in responding department - current & planned:

A1PI	A1Ct		Total
	Yes	No	
Yes	11	4	15
Column %	32%	10%	21%
No	4	31	35
Column %	12%	82%	49%
(blank)	19	3	22
Column %	56%	8%	30%
Total	34	38	72

B4: Posts including LaTT duties in responding dept - current:

	Institution Type			
A2Ct	Post-1992	Pre-1992	(blank)	Total
Yes	26	23		49
Column %	76%	62%	0%	68%
No	8	14	1	23
Column %	24%	38%	100%	32%
Total	34	37	1	72

B5: Specific duties in responding department - current & planned:

	A2Ct			
A2PI	Yes	No	Total	
Yes	13		13	
Column %	27%	0%	18%	
No	6	21	27	
Column %	12%	91%	38%	
(blank)	30	2	32	
Column %	61%	9%	44%	
Total	49	23	72	

B6: Other units offering LaTT support:

	Institution Type			
A3	Post-1992	Pre-1992	(blank)	Total
Yes	26	26		52
Column %	81%	72%	0%	75%
No	6	10	1	17
Column %	19%	28%	0%	25%
Total	32	36	1	69

B7: Specific post by post with LaTT duties - both current:

	A1Ct			
A2Ct	Yes	No	Total	
Yes	22	24	46	
No	9	14	23	
(blank)	3		3	
Total	34	38	72	

B8: Specific post by other unit offering LaTT support – current:

	A1Ct		
A3	Yes	No	Total
Yes	23	29	52
No	9	6	17
Total	32	35	69

B9: Specific duties by a unit support LaTT elsewhere:

	A2Ct			
A3	Yes	No	(blank)	Total
Yes	36	16		52
No	9	7	1	17
Total	45	23	1	69

Appendix C: Web references from survey returns

Learning and Teaching Technology Support units

University of Aberdeen	http://www.abdn.ac.uk/diss/ltu/
University of Bristol	http://www.ilrt.bris.ac.uk/ltss/
Cambridge University	http://www.ca.ac.uk/CS/
Cheltenham and Gloucester College of HE	http://www.chelt.ac.uk/lis
University of Durham	http://www.dur.ac.uk/ITS/T_and_L/
Lancaster University	http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/isslearn/
Leeds Metropolitan University	http://www.lmu.ac.uk/lss/staffsup/index.htm
University of Leicester	http://www.le.ac.uk/cc/ltg/
University of Lincolnshire and Humberside	http://home.ulh.ac.uk/cfll/
Oxford University	http://info.ox.ac.uk/oxtalent
Sheffield Hallam University	http://www.shu.ac.uk/services/lc/cmeweb/cmehome/
Southampton Institute	http://www.solent.ac.uk/ads/
University of St Andrews	http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/ITS/main/intro.html
Staffordshire University	http://web.staffs.ac.uk/services/ldc/
University of Stirling	http://www.stir.ac.uk/daice/
University of Wales, Aberystwyth	http://www.inf.aber.ac.uk/services/learningtechnology.html
University of Wales College of Medicine	http://medico.uwcm.ac.uk/cm/dacs/media/
University of Warwick	http://www.warwick.ac.uk/ETS/

Collaboration on joint projects

University of the Highlands and Islands	http://www.uhi.ac.uk/LET/
University of Leicester	http://www.le.ac.uk/cc/ltg/teach/examples.html
University of St Andrews	http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/ITS/CAL/calgeneral.html
University of Wales College of Medicine	http://medico.uwcm.ac.uk/haemy/ http://medico.uwcm.ac.uk/medilledu/opmththalmoscopy/ http://medico.uwcm.ac.uk/aspire/ (login trial, Password trial)
University of Wales, Aberystwyth	http://www.aber.ac.uk/~ieswww/cti-g.htm

Courseware Development

Birkbeck College	http://www.cryst.bbk.ac.uk/pps/ and http://www.bbk.ac.uk/Departments/Org_Psych/MSc/Study_Methods.htm#NetworkLearning
CASTLE project	http://www.le.ac.uk/castle/
University of Bristol	http://www.ILRT.bris.ac.uk/calnet/
Staffordshire University COSE project	http://web.staffs.ac.uk/COSE/
University of Wales, Aberystwyth	http://www.inf.aber.ac.uk/services/learningtechnology/caldevelopers.html

Policy for Learning Technology

Deliberations	http://www.lgu.ac.uk/deliberations/policies/index.cgi
University of Aberdeen	http://www.abdn.ac.uk/admin/plan.hti
University of Bristol	http://www.bris.ac.uk/Depts/Registrar/TSU/tlstrat.htm
University of Leicester	http://www.le.ac.uk/cc/ltg/ccltgin.html

Oxford University	http://info.ox.ac.uk/itstrat/rec-6.htm#6.1
University of Sussex	http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/TLDU/policy.html
University of Wales College of Medicine	http://www.uwcm.ac.uk/uwcm/gen/stratplan.html
University College Worcester	http://www.worc.ac.uk/services/it/itdocs/strat.html

Special Initiatives

Talent Project	http://www.le.ac.uk/TALENT/
North East Wales Institute of HE	http://www.newi.ac.uk/bdu/smart.htm
University of Bristol - web enabled databases	http://www.ilt.bris.ac.uk/ltss/training/training.html#lunch
University of Kent at Canterbury	http://speke.ukc.ac.uk/ess/events/events.html
University of Wales, Aberystwyth	http://www.inf.aber.ac.uk/services/learningtechnology/forum.html
University of Warwick	http://www.warwick.ac.uk/ETS/TELRI http://www.warwick.ac.uk/services/SED/Teaching/TDF/
University of Wales Swansea and Swansea Institute of HE event "Using PCs to reduce your workload for teaching and assessment"	http://www.swan.ac.uk/usingpcs/

National Initiatives cited in questionnaire returns

Association for Learning Technology	http://www.alt.ac.uk
British Educational Communications and Technology Association	http://www.becta.org.uk/
British Universities Film and Video Council	http://www.bufvc.ac.uk/
Computers in Teaching Initiative	http://www.cti.ac.uk/
EFFECTS	http://sh.plym.ac.uk/eds/effects/
ELEN	http://home.ulh.ac.uk/cfil/ELEN/
Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning	http://www.ncteam.ac.uk/fdtl.html
JISC Technology Applications Programme	http://www.jtap.ac.uk/
JISC	http://www.jisc.ac.uk/
Netskills	http://www.netskills.ac.uk/
NISS	http://www.niss.ac.uk/
Staff and Educational Development Association	http://www.seda.demon.co.uk/index.html
TALENT	http://www.le.ac.uk/TALENT/
TaLisMAN	http://www.talisman.hw.ac.uk/
Teaching and Learning Technology Programme	http://www.ncteam.ac.uk/tltp.html
Teaching and Learning Technology Support Network	http://www.tltp.ac.uk/tltsn/
Learning Technology Dissemination Initiative	http://www.icbl.hw.ac.uk/ltidi/
The Electronic Library Programme (eLib)	http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/services/elib/
Universities and Colleges Staff Development Association	http://www.shef.ac.uk/uni/services/ucosda/

A good place to start is also <http://www.cti.ac.uk/links/organisations/natorgs.html>

Appendix D: Future support activities

D1: shows the percentage increase indicated in support of specific activities in the near future.

Area of Support	Current Level	Future increase
Staff development activities	71%	7%
Awareness raising workshops and seminars	69%	6%
Consultancy to support/promote LaTT available locally	63%	7%
Consultancy about national initiatives	47%	9%
Dissemination of good practice in implementing LaTT	57%	4%
Special initiatives to promote a particular LaTT	56%	9%
Hosting events/initiatives collaboratively with other units	67%	0%
Liaison with national initiatives	73%	0%
Collaboration with teaching staff on joint projects to integrate LaTT	71%	0%
Training (Staff)	69%	10%
Training (Students)	36%	33%
Integration of existing courseware into learning and teaching provision	59%	9%
Develop new courseware	37%	7%

D2: shows the percentage increase in support of specific learning technologies in the near future.

	Advice	Advice increase	Support	Support increase	Training	Training increase	Development or Pilot Projects	Development or Pilot Projects increase
a. Videoconferencing	59%	6%	49%	19%	29%	26%	50%	21%
b. Computer conferencing	50%	7%	37%	21%	30%	21%	43%	13%
c. Courseware production	47%	3%	39%	21%	19%	21%	29%	20%
d. Webware	73%	1%	64%	10%	57%	14%	46%	14%
e. Computer-based Assessment	46%	23%	39%	24%	24%	27%	1%	0%
f. Creating multimedia resources	49%	4%	37%	24%	20%	30%	27%	20%
g. Video on demand	17%	1%	13%	36%	1%	34%	14%	33%

The percentage increases were calculated by taking those responses which showed a move from “No”, i.e. no support for this area currently, to “Yes” in the future. We reasoned that any other combination was open to misinterpretation.