

Responses to consultation on the HEFCE e-learning strategy

A report to HEFCE by Glenaffric Ltd

May 2004

Glenaffric Ltd *eLearning Consultants*
14 Lewiston, Drumnadrochit, Inverness, IV63 6UW
T: 01456 459106 F: 0870 052 9151
E: office@glenaffric.com W: www.glenaffric.com



Introduction

The consultation on the HEFCE e-learning strategy was published in July 2003 (HEFCE Circular letter 21/2003). Responses using the template provided were requested by 1 December 2003.

A total of 114 responses were received (Appendix A):

Higher Education Institutions	90 (79%)
Further Education Colleges	12 (10.5%)
Agencies and organisations	12 (10.5%)
Total responses received	114 (100%)

Method of analysis

In February 2004, HEFCE commissioned Glenaffric Ltd eLearning consultants to undertake an initial analysis of the responses and produce a summary report.

The majority of the responses were provided in electronic format. A spreadsheet was devised to provide an overview of the key points and to facilitate analysis of the responses to the questions and sub-questions in the consultation document. This was used to provide a breakdown of the number of responses that broadly echoed or paraphrased the proposals in the consultation document, the number of questions left blank by respondents, and the extent to which specific comments and issues are pertinent across the sector.

The responses to the yes/no questions have been quantified in terms of those who answered yes or no, those who expressed no choice but made a comment (ambivalent), and those who did not answer the question or make a comment (blank), which was usually because their responses did not follow the template.

Overview

The consultation has generated a broad spectrum of responses, reflecting the varied and disparate nature of the constituency. There is general agreement among almost all respondents that the e-learning strategy should include the seven strands that are proposed by HEFCE, but with some significant qualifications. Several responses make the comment that Strand 1 (Research, evaluation and strategic review) and Strand 6 (Quality) should be implicit in all e-learning initiatives rather than specific strands in the strategy. There are also concerns about the coherence of Strands 3 (Curriculum design, development and pedagogy, and human resources) and 5 (Collaboration, progression and student support).

The sub-question for each strand asking what priorities respondents attached to the proposed objectives was frequently (but inconsistently) misunderstood. Some respondents prioritised the strands themselves. Several noted that Strand 3 is the most important and should be given more prominence in the strategy. Others noted concomitantly that the present Strand 1 should not be the first strand as this gives undue significance to the role of research.

It was felt that a definition of e-learning, and a clear statement of the aims and objectives of the strategy, would have helped the sector to contextualise their responses more effectively. There is a strong feeling that the clear role in the strategy for institutions such as the Higher Education Academy, the funding bodies' Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) and UK e-Universities Worldwide (the UKeU) should be balanced by an analysis of the e-learning environment in the sector. There is a sense that the strategy lacks commitment to defining where the sector currently stands with e-learning, how it wishes to be placed for the future and how HEFCE can support institutions in contributing to the future vision. It is suggested that while the strategy recognises that the sector has moved considerably since the 1999 survey of the use of technology in learning and teaching in HE, it makes no provision for benchmarking the current state of play.

There is evident tension for the sector between the vision of UKeU and the reality of campus-based provision. The prominent role proposed for UKeU at the centre of the strategy meets with considerable criticism, particularly as the impact of UKeU is not yet seen by the sector as fully and positively evaluated. The emphasis on UKeU also gives rise to concerns about the extent to which it is a facilitator of change and best practice, a business partner or a privileged competitor to HEIs.

There was overwhelming resistance among respondents to ‘wholly e-based learning’, and concerted requests for a definition of e-learning that is not restricted to the use of technology for distance learning, but includes blended learning approaches appropriate to campus-based institutions. Respondents emphasised that e-learning is a process not a product.

Generally, respondents felt that the e-learning strategy should include much more emphasis on developing appropriate learner support and guidance provision, staff development provision (specifically including non-teaching staff), and the central role of libraries and information services in e-learning.

There were concerns that the costs of e-learning have not been included in the strategy, particularly given that scaling up the use of e-learning to a cost-effective model effectively demands a re-engineering of all aspects of the student experience. It was suggested that the strategy should focus on the institution-wide significance and impact of e-learning, and should be mapped with other relevant HEFCE strategies and policies such as those for learning and teaching, and human resources.

Several references were made to the concurrent DfES e-learning consultation, in particular its recognition of the need for a cross-sectoral approach to e-learning in the broader context of lifelong learning and widening participation.

Question 1

Do you agree that our e-learning strategy needs to address all the following three aspects:

- **the pervasiveness of the internet and changing student and employer expectations**
- **innovation and blending of approaches to learning and teaching**
- **wholly e-based learning?**

Yes	No	Ambivalent	Blank	Total
104 (91%)	0 (0%)	6 (5%)	4 (4%)	114

Most respondents agree with the inclusion of points one and two in the strategy, and emphasise the importance of point two. There is an overwhelming request for the strategy to emphasise blended learning approaches rather than wholly e-based learning, as this remains the most appropriate use of technology for learning in campus-based institutions. However, one response urges caution about the assumption that the currently fashionable term ‘blended learning’ will be a long term concept of any value.

It is suggested that the strategy would benefit from a clear and simple definition of e-learning such as that in the DfES consultation: ‘If someone is learning in a way that uses information and communication technologies (ICTs), they are using e-learning’.

Respondents note the contribution of the UKeU to wholly e-based learning provision, but stress that UKeU is only one of the many providers in this area. Accordingly it is felt that the UKeU’s contribution to the strategy should be commensurate with its limited experience to date. The emphasis on the UKeU over established institutional developments fails to recognise existing investment and experience, and raises the question of how they will be supported in contributing to the achievement of the strategy.

It was suggested that the strategy should also contain explicit reference to the human resource implications of advancing e-learning developments with the current limited numbers of expert staff in the sector as a whole.

Responses express the need for the e-learning strategy to reflect diversity across the sector, including different institutional size, scope and strength, the complexity of the student population and different learning styles. The importance of addressing issues of a potential digital divide is stressed, particularly in the context of widening participation.

It is felt that the strategy could do more to enthuse staff and learners about the potential of e-learning to enhance the learning experience, and to explicitly acknowledge the management of change aspects. Several respondents noted the importance of ensuring that the strategy was driven by the needs of learners and not by the availability of new or emerging technologies. The need to join e-learning with other aspects of learning and teaching (e.g. libraries and learning resources) was stressed.

One response notes the opportunities presented by other applications of e-learning such as provision of 'just in time' learning for professionals. However, a potential tension is noted between the provision of e-learning as a public service, and commercial interests that may skew e-learning when partnerships are developed with the commercial sector.

The proven benefits and cost effectiveness of e-learning were questioned by another respondent who also stressed the importance of evidence-based research.

Question 2

What is your analysis of the current state of e-learning in HE?

There is general agreement with the suggestion in the strategy document that the development of e-learning in HE remains patchy, and often the work of committed individuals. However, there has been a noticeable increase in numbers of staff engaging in e-learning and in levels of skills. Various staff development initiatives and interventions have also encouraged the further development of e-learning.

The growing adoption of commercial virtual learning environments (VLEs) masks the very limited progress made towards e-learning as a mechanism for the transformation of educational business processes – managed learning environments (MLEs). There is growing unease about the current 'duopoly' of VLEs in the HE sector, and concern that e-learning developments are being driven by the availability of new technologies rather than the needs of learners.

Respondents are aware that there needs to be a cultural shift in institutions and that the process of change management needs to be initiated and encouraged. There is a reluctance to innovate, and apparent tension with traditional perceptions of quality, exemplified in the limited use of e-assessment. A strong need for staff development and the dissemination of good practice is recognised.

As systems interoperability improves, staff and managers are now increasingly seeing the potential of e-learning and e-business. The opportunities for developing learning opportunities in rural areas are also recognised.

Question 3

Do you agree that we should feature research, evaluation and review in our e-learning strategy (Strand 1)?

Yes	No	Ambivalent	Blank	Total
104 (91%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	7 (6%)	114

There is broad agreement with the strategy outlined in the consultation document. Some say this strand is especially important; others that research should not predominate over learning and teaching; others that research should underpin all e-learning activity and should not be a separate strand.

Respondents stress the importance of mapping existing research and analysing existing evidence before embarking on new programmes and initiatives. A clear definition of what constitutes 'good practice' is required.

It is felt that the strategy is weak on partnerships, especially cross-sectoral ones. 'Partners' seems to be used as a synonym for HEFCE's own 'creatures'. Reservations are expressed about focusing research solely on UKeU. The establishment of a national centre for excellence in e-learning research was suggested.

A key development and coordination role is noted for the Higher Education Academy in helping funders think through the research agenda in relation to e-learning.

The importance is highlighted of linking any research programme to the ESRC Teaching and Learning Research Programme and of taking action to raise the status of this research with the Research Councils and within the Research Assessment Exercise process.

Respondents stress that evaluation should include stakeholders beyond HE, including suppliers and employers as well as cross-sectoral initiatives.

What priorities do you attach to the actions we describe under Strand 1?

For many respondents, the proposed actions are too narrow. They need to include comparative studies, longitudinal studies and the use of benchmarks for conventional approaches against which e-learning can be evaluated. This should include implications of e-learning for campus-based students and the identification of cost-effective products/methodologies with high impact.

Again, there is a strong request to temper the emphasis on UKeU. Several respondents say they are unclear about what experience and expertise the UKeU has with respect to evaluation, and question its narrow focus on 'wholly e-based learning' delivered via the Internet rather than a broader use of e-technologies for e-learning.

There is general support for the role of the Higher Education Academy as a focus for the evaluation of practice, research and dissemination, including cross-UK collaboration, and of partnership with JISC.

What research areas do you think we should focus on particularly?

There is a clear request that e-learning research should be practitioner-led and action-based, providing exemplars and scenarios, and should be founded on a comprehensive evaluation of e-learning initiatives to date across the UK and in a global context.

Several hundred specific research topics were suggested, summarised in the following broad areas and topics:

Area	Topic
Learning, teaching and assessment	Comparative effectiveness of delivery models Collaborative development and use of learning materials Communication, interaction, motivation and collaborative learning Authenticity in assessment Plagiarism Feedback models and formative assessment Addressing psychological and physical barriers

	Learner profiling and personal development planning Supporting workplace learning Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 (SENDA), equality, accessibility, usability
Strategic management and administration	Institutional 'e-readiness' and capacity building Impact on workforce planning, contracts, development needs Academic e-discourse and implications of new media for publication Costs, benefits and financial models Implications for recruitment, retention, performance and progression
Environmental aspects	Barriers to e-learning Intercultural issues Social aspects of e-learning Changing student profiles
New technologies	Mobile technologies Infrastructure

Question 4

Do you agree that we should feature strategic management and funding for sustainability in our e-learning strategy (Strand 2)?

Yes	No	Ambivalent	Blank	Total
102 (89%)	2 (2%)	4 (4%)	6 (5%)	114

Several respondents point out that the actions proposed do not impact sufficiently on issues of scalability and sustainability. They note that risk assessment also needs to include consideration of pedagogical risk. Some concern is expressed that the details of this strand ignore principles of joined-up thinking and planning.

What priorities do you attach to the actions we describe under Strand 2?

A high priority is given to initiatives promoting strategic management of change.

Responses note that the possible changes to the funding model that are suggested (para 21) are not further developed as a proposed action. It is felt that funding should be available for all institutions to bid for, since there is considerable expertise across the sector that is at least equal to that of the UKeU. There are concerns about the use of funding levers to encourage strategic change although others are strongly in favour of funding levers. Several respondents comment that the timescale is unrealistic.

There are concerns about the proliferation of agencies and initiatives leading to confusion of remits and additional costs.

Have we missed anything in Strand 2?

Several respondents comment that the change management strategy seems to overlook the need to address high-level issues regarding the pedagogy of e-learning, strategic e-management, and the cultural challenges of change. Issues are identified about promoting change/risk management across institutions if this is embedded in the Leadership Foundation.

The need to address human resource implications is emphasised, including changing definitions of staff roles and working practices, knowledge management and sustainability, and contractual implications.

Costing methodologies/models for developing and delivering e-learning need to be developed, including the relationship between e-learning and e-commerce. Respondents suggest that the review of UKeU should consider its impact on diversity and the potential benefits to smaller institutions. In this context, there is concern that any funding opportunities should meet the requirements of small HEIs. Some respondents also comment that it would be helpful to explore and clarify any specific issues associated with the e-learning agenda as it impacts on HE in FE, particularly foundation degrees. They also stress that measures should be in place to ensure that the proposed actions for JISC do not impact adversely on the support that JISC is able to offer FE.

It is suggested that there should be more explicit recognition of the role of representative bodies (e.g. the Association for Learning Technology, Higher Education Academy, World Universities Network) and the relationship of HEIs to other major stakeholders such as the Department of Health.

The objectives should include support for regional consortia, and incentives to use open systems. The international perspective should be considered more explicitly, including for example investigation of the Netherlands' e-university model.

Respondents would also welcome a strategic sector-wide approach to information services, including negotiations with commercial publishers and content providers.

Question 5

Do you agree that we should feature curriculum design, development and pedagogy, and human resources in our e-learning strategy (Strand 3)?

Yes	No	Ambivalent	Blank	Total
103 (90%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	7 (6%)	114

This strand is highlighted by several respondents as the most important. However, it is strongly suggested that this is an unusual grouping of essential components that should be split into two separate strands (1. Curriculum design, development and pedagogy, and 2. Human resources).

Some respondents note that this strand actually makes very little mention of pedagogy.

There is general support for consultation on Centres for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETLs), and some interest in the establishment of a generic e-learning CETL. Some respondents question the proposal for 70 CETLs and are concerned that this will promote a more disparate response instead of concerted cross-sectoral development. There is a perceived need to ensure that institutions without CETL status are not branded poor or moderate in their provision and use of e-learning. It is suggested that the strategy should clarify the significance of e-learning expertise in the establishment of CETLs.

Respondents request that objectives under this strand should be based on a synthesis of current work rather than a reinvention of the wheel. There is a need to acknowledge interrelationships with other organisations e.g. Regional Development Agencies, Strategic Partnerships, sector agencies and corporate universities (e.g. NHSU).

There is strong support for the team approach that is proposed, involving learning technologists, academics, library and media services support staff.

Clarification is sought between the roles of the Higher Education Academy and JISC in relation to developing pedagogic approaches to e-learning, and it is noted that where possible the two should work together to co-ordinate and complement developments in this area, including an

alignment of the JISC Committee for Learning and Teaching with Higher Education Academy priorities.

What priorities do you attach to the actions we describe under Strand 3?

Most respondents attach priority to objectives 3 and 4, particularly the massive expansion of staff development and continuing professional development for all staff involved in the development and delivery of e-learning.

There is strong support for rewarding excellence and better recognition for e-learning professionals, although concern is expressed about defining and possibly over-using the term 'excellence', suggesting that the objective could be restated as 'reward innovation and evaluation of e-learning'. Curriculum innovation and collaborative team-based e-learning development should be recognised and supported.

Actions that facilitate the engagement of practitioners in the strategic development and change management are also prioritised.

Respondents have mixed views about National Teaching Fellowships. Some see them as an important source of recognition and role models; others are concerned that their effectiveness is not proven.

Have we missed anything in Strand 3?

The strategy should include more actions to address the shift of emphasis from designer-led to user-led learning, actions specifically targeting innovative curriculum design and development, and the role of the student body in influencing emerging pedagogy.

Actions should be broadened to include all staff supporting learning and teaching, embedding skills development for staff that fall outside the scope of the Higher Education Academy, the Leadership Foundation and the National Teaching Fellowships (including part time staff). There may be a need to review skills and knowledge on appointment for all levels of the HE workforce. Specific funding for learning technologists posts may be required, and there should be recognised career development paths for learning technologists.

Actions should be more fully developed for the following:

- The emphasis should be on knowledge transfer rather than dissemination, and on innovation rather than invention
- Partnerships with professional bodies (e.g. British Computer Society) and actions taken to support the work of local and regional networks and consortia
- The role of e-learning in workplace learning strategies
- The development of information literacy in curriculum design and development, building on the work of SCONUL (the Society of College, National and University Libraries) and JISC
- The role of JISC TechDis.

Question 6

Do you agree that we should feature learning resources in our e-learning strategy (Strand 4)?

Yes	No	Ambivalent	Blank	Total
101 (89%)	1 (1%)	5 (4%)	7 (6%)	114

This strand caused most concern among respondents and was felt to be poorly developed and inadequate. Respondents suggest that the role of HEFCE is to provide infrastructure and support to enable institutions to develop learning resources that are appropriate to their needs and context.

There are concerns that the importance and value of content development is exaggerated in the strategy, to the detriment of the pedagogical implications of e-learning. Respondents note that there are many issues surrounding the use of the learning objects approach and an over-emphasis on re-use may prove counterproductive. There is a culture of resistance in the sector to 'off the shelf' learning packages, and the DfES consultation emphasises the importance of tools for teachers to use to create their own materials. One respondent suggests that this is a highly contentious strand, and possibly an area best left to the market place to resolve.

There is widespread support for digitisation programmes and the availability of learning resource databases. However, respondents note that databases alone are not sufficient. More evaluative work is required on the production of dynamic learning materials, and a coherent approach to development of interoperable resources.

It is felt to be essential that the significance of institutional libraries in presenting resources from a wide range of sources including JISC datasets and services is embedded in the strategy, and that issues of access and licensing as well as digitisation are addressed.

The emphasis should be on information skills and resource discovery as well as provision, and the strategy needs a clearer focus on how students access and use learning resources, how they are supported and the impact on their learning. The importance of better integration of library systems and VLEs is highlighted, as is the issue of a lack of common standards between principal VLEs.

What priorities do you attach to the actions we describe under Strand 4?

The importance of a strategic approach to the digitisation of resources and the (excellent) work of JISC on resource discovery is emphasised. However, caution is urged that the further digitisation and collection for research and archival reasons should not be undertaken under an e-learning banner unless there is strong evidence of immediate existing need. The work of the Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN) is commended.

Have we missed anything in Strand 4?

Actions should be more fully developed for the following:

- Copyright, intellectual property rights and licensing advice for locally developed and third party resources, addressing the funding implications in the use of copyright materials
- Strategic agreements with publishers and content providers, simplified licensing and collaborative purchasing arrangements, provision of high-quality digital library resources and authentication services e.g. HERON and ATHENS
- Technical advice on hosting and managing online learning resources, practical metadata systems, searchable databases and repositories, developing interoperable user interfaces
- Practical guidelines for repurposing, examples, simulations, modelling tools and case studies for embedding resources in the curriculum; cultural issues involved in convincing academics of the benefits of making their expertise available digitally; accessibility issues and the Disability Discrimination Act
- Evaluation of the impact on student performance
- Staff development in the emerging role of the librarian assisting learners and teachers and supporting pedagogic delivery
- Student support, impact on collaborative learning
- Links with industry and cross-sectoral access

The strategy should also include reference to the JISC/National Science Foundation Digital Libraries and Classroom Programme, the National Learning Network and international sources of learning materials.

Question 7

Do you agree that we should feature collaboration, progression and student support in our e-learning strategy (Strand 5)?

Yes	No	Ambivalent	Blank	Total
101 (89%)	1 (1%)	5 (4%)	7 (6%)	114

Some respondents are concerned about a lack of coherence in the issues addressed in this strand, which appears to be a mixture of disparate technical and human issues. There is some puzzlement about the reference to credit accumulation for e-learning, as the portability of credit is not a delivery issue, so embedded e-learning should use the common credit weighting. However, some institutions give credit transfer high priority.

Comments endorse the approach in the DfES strategy linking all sectors involved in lifelong learning. There is strong support for the work of JISC in infrastructure, standards and interoperability, but concern about the resource implications of extending its remit to other sectors beyond FE and HE. It is noted that the current situation of two VLE systems dominating the market may not be in the long term best interest of the sector, and that lessons of VLE implementation do not seem to be well disseminated across the sector

There is concern that too much emphasis is placed on the narrow role of the UKeU in this context.

The need for the strategy to acknowledge the costs of e-administration is noted. There is a perceived tension between the strategic drive to collaborate and the operational reality of competition, and some concern that bidding systems militate against institutions sharing good practice.

What priorities do you attach to the actions we describe under Strand 5?

Generally, priority is attached to the first two objectives (interoperability and integrated VLE/MLE developments, and the implications of e-learning for the delivery of foundation degrees).

There is less concerted support for objectives three and four.

Have we missed anything in Strand 5?

Actions should be more fully developed to address the following:

- Encourage collaboration among institutions, and specifically to address the balance of collaboration and competition
- Making the role of the Higher Education Academy effective in each institution, and how this is to be measured
- The EU dimension, specifically the Bologna Declaration on the European space for higher education (19 June 1999)
- Postgraduate education, links with Research Councils, specific SENDA provision and use of the e-environment as a mechanism to accredit in-company provision
- e-Portfolio developments, personal development plans, a national system for recording student achievement and links with agencies such as the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service, the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority and the British Standards Institute.

Question 8

Do you agree that we should feature quality in our e-learning strategy (Strand 6)?

Yes	No	Ambivalent	Blank	Total
98 (86%)	4 (4%)	4 (4%)	8 (7%)	114

This strand exercised respondents considerably. Several were clear that existing institutional quality assurance processes are sufficiently robust and a separate procedure for e-learning is not required. However, one response notes that e-learning requires the development of new ways of assessing quality. The importance is highlighted of setting up appropriate quality procedures at the outset to avoid the accumulation of bad practice.

There is a strong plea for a light touch quality enhancement approach, avoiding excessive bureaucracy. Respondents note that it would be helpful to clarify the intended actions of UKeU, Quality Assurance Agency and the Higher Education Academy, on the basis that while guidance is helpful, individual institutions should be responsible for the quality of their provision.

It is stressed that institutions, professional and statutory regulatory bodies and students must have confidence in workable methods of reviewing and monitoring the quality of e-learning provision, and so processes need to be confirmed at an early stage.

What priorities do you attach to the actions we describe under Strand 6?

There is general support for the actions proposed, although they are seen by some as narrow, lacking specificity and in need of further development. The World Universities Network does not see a role for the Higher Education Academy in the quality assurance of e-learning. The development of focused guidelines and a code of practice is supported (the example is given of the code of practice developed by the Canadian Commonwealth of Learning).

The importance of benchmarking standards and building on existing expertise in the sector is highlighted.

Revision of the 'unwieldy' QAA guidelines on e-learning is requested.

Have we missed anything in Strand 6?

Actions should be developed to include the following:

- Kite marking, legal and insurance issues
- Specific reference to key quality issues such as quality models, evaluation frameworks, metrics and embedding
- The role of support organisations such as the Universities and Colleges Information Systems Association and SCONUL
- Procedures for eliciting and implementing student feedback should be included – the extent to which students actually want e-learning is not yet proven.
- International experience and quality standards need to be addressed (Bologna Declaration)

Question 9

Do you agree that we should feature infrastructure and standards in our e-learning strategy (Strand 7)?

Yes	No	Ambivalent	Blank	Total
-----	----	------------	-------	-------

105 (92%)	0 (0%)	2 (2%)	7 (6%)	114
-----------	--------	--------	--------	-----

It is considered vital that UK, European and other non-US views are fed into the international standards development process. There is support for the (excellent) work of JISC and the Centre for Educational Technology Interoperability Standards in this context, but some confusion over the role of JISC in pedagogical development.

Respondents question whether the proposed investment in CETLs is equitable, as it may reward institutions with an already well developed e-learning infrastructure. Some concerns are also expressed in this context about competition for capital funding, and about the disproportionate costs of infrastructure development for smaller HEIs.

There are conflicting views about VLE development, with a perceived need to address the long term implications of the current 'duopoly' while avoiding proliferation and confusion, and without imposing standardisation.

There is concern that too much emphasis is placed in the untried UKeU technical platform, which is apparently significantly less functional than a number of standard platforms. There could also be a legal challenge to the UKeU as a competitor in the VLE market on the grounds that public investment has been used to derive unfair advantage.

What priorities do you attach to the actions we describe under Strand 7?

Network infrastructure, standards and interoperability are all prioritised. Several respondents highlight the upgrade to the joint academic network, SuperJANET 5, as a very welcome development.

Have we missed anything in Strand 7?

Infrastructure developments are key to the success of the strategy, including bandwidth availability and take-up of broadband, especially in rural areas. There needs to be commitment to working with government and infrastructure providers with a view to improving bandwidth, access and purchasing schemes for learners. Cross-sectoral working should be explicitly encouraged (including the leisure sector).

There should be explicit encouragement to adopt IMS Learning Design Specification. The strategy should also encourage and support the development of Open Source software that can be integrated to create custom-built solutions for institutions, and peer-to-peer technology.

Consideration should be given to funding the development of personal learning environments that allow learners registered at multiple institutions to have a common interface to their courses.

Other initiatives

Respondents noted a number of other initiatives that could be relevant for the development and implementation of the HEFCE e-learning strategy. These include:

- LTSN-funded Online Learning, Assessment and Feedback (OLAAB) project
- Distance Learning Project at Teachers' College, Columbia, <http://dlp.tc.columbia.edu/>
- International Centre for Distance Learning – a database of over 35,000 distance learning courses from over 1000 institutions in 100 countries, <http://icdl.open.ac.uk>
- Distance Learning Course Finder – a record of 60,000 e-learning courses offered by 131 countries, <http://www.dlcoursefinder.com>
- JISC infoNet, <http://www.jiscinfonet.ac.uk/>
- JISC/LTSN work such as Students' Online Learning Experiences (SOLE)
- FE partnerships

- Borderless Education Observatory and discipline-based initiatives, such as IVIMEDS (the International Virtual Medical School)
- EU 'Preparatory & Innovative Actions 2003/b – eLearning' and supporting documentation on education and ICT
- European IST Advisory Group (ISTAG) on IPR, <http://www.cordis.lu/ist/istag.htm>
- Definition and implementation licence for an open source approach to intellectual property rights between HEIs, <http://web.mit.edu/oki/>
- Functional structures and career roles for technical and pedagogic staff, <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/careers>
- The TALENT project (2000) assessed a representative sample of higher education institutions against a scale of e-learning implementation

Respondents to the consultation

Agencies

Association for Learning Technology
British Council
Engineering Training Board
Heads of eLearning Forum
Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education
Joint response from JISC, UKeU, LTSN
Learning and Teaching Support Network
NATFHE
Society of College, National and University Libraries
Universities and Colleges Information Systems Association
Ufi Ltd
Worldwide Universities Network

Further Education Colleges

Dewsbury College
Lewisham College
Newcastle College
North Warwickshire & Hinckley College
Park Lane College
Plymouth College of Art & Design
Sparsholt College
Suffolk College
Swindon College
Uxbridge College
Wakefield College
York College

Higher Education Institutions

Anglia Polytechnic University
Arts Institute at Bournemouth
Aston University
Birkbeck College
Bishop Grosseteste College
Bolton Institute of Higher Education
Bournemouth University
Buckinghamshire Chilterns University College
City University
College of St Mark & St John
De Montfort University
Edge Hill College of Higher Education
Goldsmith's College, University of London
Harper Adams University College
Imperial College London
Institute of Education
Keele University
King Alfred's College
King's College London
Kingston University
Lancaster University
Leeds Metropolitan University
Liverpool Hope University College

Liverpool John Moores University
London Metropolitan University
London School of Economics
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
Manchester Metropolitan University
Middlesex University
Newman College of Higher Education
Nottingham Trent University
Open University
Oxford Brookes University
Queen's University Belfast
Ravensbourne College of Design and Communication
Royal College of Nursing Institute
Royal Holloway, University of London
School of Pharmacy
Sheffield Hallam University
St Mary's College
Staffordshire University
Surrey Institute of Art & Design University College
Teesside University
Thames Valley University
The London Institute
University College Chester
University College Chichester
University College London
University College Northampton
University College Worcester
University of Birmingham
University of Bradford
University of Cambridge
University of Central England
University of Central Lancashire
University of Derby
University of Durham
University of East London
University of Exeter
University of Gloucestershire
University of Hertfordshire
University of Huddersfield
University of Kent
University of Leicester
University of Lincoln
University of London
University of Luton
University of Manchester
University of Newcastle
University of Northumbria at Newcastle
University of Nottingham
University of Oxford
University of Plymouth
University of Portsmouth
University of Reading
University of Salford
University of Sheffield
University of Southampton
University of Sunderland
University of Surrey

University of Surrey Roehampton
University of Sussex
University of Ulster
University of Warwick
University of Westminster
University of Wolverhampton
University of York
University of York Library
University of the West of England
York St John College