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1 Introduction

1.1 Goal of the Report

This paper is to provide an outline of the results of the SVC mandate as a joint effort between the SVC team (represented by Christian Hohnbaum) and the Swiss Centre for Innovations in Learning (SCIL), University of St. Gallen (represented by Dieter Euler and Sabine Seufert).

The SVC mandate to be addressed is focused on the main question of “how to integrate eLearning into the global strategy of teaching with the overall goal of continuous quality improvement in institutions of higher education”.

At a general level, the aim of the mandate is to explore, demonstrate by good practice examples, design and evaluate implementation strategies of eLearning at institutions of higher education in Switzerland. At the end of the SVC consolidation programme, the institutions of higher education should have achieved a gradual implementation of the financing and maintenance of the eLearning-supported courses and organisational structures (e.g. competence centres) into their regular budgets. Apart from financial sustainability in a long-term perspective, the mandate addresses relevant questions in the implementation fields of eLearning mentioned above: strategy development, pedagogy, technology, organisation and culture. One main focus will be the kind of basic infrastructure and support (e.g. in cooperation with SWITCH) required at a national level in the long run for the effective and efficient operation of SVC.

According to the SVC proposal (see SVC mandate proposal 18th of November 2005, p. 7), the mandate originally emphasizes two main foci in the form of a process-oriented consulting approach:

- **Mandate Focus I**: SVC integration strategy development and implementation, to be developed with SVC steering committee and political decision-makers,
- **Mandate Focus II**: University integration strategy development and implementation, to be developed with competence centres and eLearning project managers
- **During the joint project phase a third mandate focus has been established since it provides an effect on effectiveness and efficiency of the overall goal of the mandate: Mandate Focus III: support of the SVC team.**

1.2 Management Summary

This paper is to provide an outline of the results of the SVC mandate which can be differentiated into three foci:

1. **Mandate Focus I: SVC integration strategy development and implementation**

The goal of the first consolidation phase was to carry out an As-Is analysis of the status quo in order to be able to develop an appropriate integration and implementation strategy based on the results. The As-Is analysis related to the Project level and the CCSP level:
**Project Level:** A comparison with the evaluation of a German Funding programme provides some indications for the sustainability of the SVC projects. Finally, one could estimate based on evaluations of sustainability factors that of the SVC-sponsored projects:

- approximately 20% could be transferred into sustainable structures,
- approx. 20% of the projects still demonstrate a certain chance for being continued,
- over 50% or the majority of the projects exhibit major hindering factors for their sustainability,
- the end of the term of 10% of the projects can already be anticipated.

**CCSP Level:** Regarding the As-Is-analysis of the CCSPs the following shortcomings can be observed which represent potential dangers for the system-oriented sustainability of eLearning:

- Missing standards/ forms for organising CCSP (often still project character, commitment by university management is open),
- often the strategic alignment to the university strategy is missing, (the favourite strategy is "stretching the mould”, slow not radical changes), selective use of eLearning in projects, but the daily use of eLearning is still not widespread,
- eLearning is often not combined with the Bologna reform, the second innovation process with greater innovation power (strategic use of ICT and take the proactive advantage of the major reform),
- acceptance within the institutions is still open, in particular at the institutions without an explicitly formulated strategy and organisational anchorage of the CCSPs.

The **results of the consulting process** are mainly the formulation of strategy papers which can be found in the annex:

- Cornerstones for next steps after the SVC (Annex 1)

Some of the main results of the recommendations for the strategy development are outlined in the report.

2. **Mandate Focus II: University integration strategy development and implementation**

The hurdles are really high in practice for actually being able to successfully anchor innovative measures for the long term. In conversations with the leaders of the CCSPs and eLearning project directors, the following was also confirmed: as gate keepers for eLearning innovations, the teachers are a central critical success factor for the sustainable anchoring of eLearning at institutions of higher education. The activities of support units play a very significant role in the successful use of eLearning at organisations. A process is recommended, which consists of four steps and is based on fundamental principles of didactic measure planning:
1. What do we want to achieve?
   Deriving competence requirements in eLearning scenarios

2. Which strengths, deficits and barriers exist?
   Identification of the As-Is status (target group analysis)

3. Which measures are appropriate?
   Selection and firm establishment of measures

4. How should the measures be weighted and chronologically arranged?
   Specification of the measures portfolio

The measures developed in collaboration with eLearning experts can be broken down into the following eight areas:

1. Provide information
2. Communicate attitudes
3. Increase the willingness to take action
4. Organise educational offerings
5. Design quality development with learning in mind
6. Offer advisory support
7. Encourage exchange
8. Make innovation required

The prolongation of the mandate with focus on transfer support could lead to a collection of typical challenges and good practices for solutions along the main activities of a CCSP. Based on the already existing knowledge a handbook under the title "Typical Challenges and Good Practice Solutions for Leading and Managing a Competence Centre" could be further developed and validated by the CCSP leaders in order to effectively and efficiently support the transfer phase.

3. **Mandate Focus III: Support of the SVC team.**

The support tasks can be divided into the following three areas:

1. *Organisational support for the planning of the SVC days in 2006:* The support of the SVC team was related to the content-based preparation and planning of the SVC Days, in order to obtain as much agreement on the desired objectives of the mandate as possible.

2. *Content-based input during the SVC Days:* presentations, moderation of workshops, etc. of SCIL team members,

3. *Feedback on the SVC monitoring process:* Two questionnaires have been evaluated with regard to two objectives:
   - to gain more insights and knowledge about relevant sustainability factors of eLearning Innovations,
   - to obtain the opportunity to compare the results with other evaluation studies (e.g. BMBF study).
Final remarks and Outlook Transfer Phase

Due to the surprising and definite decision to discontinue SVC beyond 2007 by the CRUS, the direction of the SVC mandate should be changed immediately. Since the remaining time period of funding is extremely short until the end of 2007, adequate priorities have to be defined in order to reach the highest possible impact on transfer effectiveness and efficiency.

The Competence Centers represent the main catalyst for eLearning at Higher Education Institutions (HEI). The further development, implementation and integration of eLearning in teaching and learning at HEI would not be feasible without the support of the CCSPs. They have an important role in linking the strategy of the university management with the manifold eLearning-projects and to promote innovations in learning with an orientation to quality development of teaching and learning at HEI. Therefore, the main support should be devoted to the knowledge transfer of the SVC results. Also, for those Competence Centers who are likely to survive, there is a strong need for support in order to fully develop the professional toolbox for the management of eLearning at HEI.

The main question of “how to integrate eLearning into the global strategy of teaching with the overall goal of continuous quality improvement in HEI” by supporting the CCSPs as the main catalyst has to be addressed with urgency in the remaining period of the SVC consolidation programme.

2 SVC Committee: Strategy Development

2.1 Overall Goals

The first mandate focus addresses the area of SVC strategy development in cooperation with the SVC steering committee. The goal of this phase was to find common answers to the following questions (see SVC mandate proposal 18th of November 2005, p. 7):

- What is the SVC strategy for the integration of the already developed knowledge base (e.g., instruments, methods) into the overall strategy of teaching at institutions of higher education?
- How can the already developed SVC knowledge base be integrated into the global strategy of teaching at academic institutions / effectively used by institutions to leverage e-learning performance in the long run?

As a further perspective, the following question has already been considered as part of a mandate prolongation:

- What kind of basic infrastructure and support at a national level are indispensable in the long run for the effective and efficient operation of SVC?
- What are the recommendations to the SVC in terms of an elaborated SVC strategy for the further development of the programme?

The timetable, phases, goals and methods have once again been taken from the SVC proposal (see SVC mandate proposal 18th of November 2005, p. 8) and the summarised results can be found in the corresponding sections (cp. Figure 1).
2.2 Results of Consolidation Phase

2.2.1 Overview: Goals, Methods

The goal of this phase was to carry out an As-Is analysis of the status quo in order to be able to develop an appropriate integration and implementation strategy based on the results. The As-Is analysis related to the following two levels:

- **Project Level**: sustainability of eLearning focuses here on the long-term perspective of eLearning-projects (such as eLearning-supported courses)
- **CCSP Level**: sustainability of eLearning means the widespread use and integration of eLearning at the Institution of Higher Education, guaranteed by permanent support structures of the CCSPs (Competence Centres for Service and Production).

### Timetable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov.-Jan.06</td>
<td>Consolidation I</td>
<td>Reviewing existing data, Stakeholder-Analysi</td>
<td>Interviews of selected stakeholders, desk research</td>
<td>Status Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC Steering committee meeting, January 26th, 2006</td>
<td>Developing Integration Strategy SVC</td>
<td>Developing SVC integration strategy, 1st draft</td>
<td>Interviews, Validation by SVC steering committee on request</td>
<td>Consolidation I results, Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.-Mar.06</td>
<td>Consolidation II</td>
<td>Reviewing existing data, Stakeholder-Analysi</td>
<td>Interviews of selected stakeholders, desk research</td>
<td>Status Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC Days 2006, March 13th and 14th, 2006</td>
<td>Developing Integration Strategy SVC</td>
<td>Approval SVC integration strategy, 2nd draft</td>
<td>Speech, Workshop</td>
<td>Moderation workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC Steering committee meeting, March 14th, 2006</td>
<td>Developing Integration Strategy SVC</td>
<td>Developing SVC integration strategy, 3rd draft</td>
<td>Interviews, Validation by SVC steering committee on request</td>
<td>Strategy Paper: integration strategy for the modernization of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC Steering committee meeting, June, 2006</td>
<td>Developing Integration Strategy SVC</td>
<td>Developing SVC integration strategy, 4th draft</td>
<td>Interviews, Validation by SVC steering committee on request</td>
<td>Strategy Paper: integration strategy for the modernization of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC Steering committee meeting, September 2006</td>
<td>Developing SVC Framework for implementation</td>
<td>Developing SVC framework (proposal CQI)</td>
<td>Expert interviews, Validation by SVC steering committee on request</td>
<td>Generic CQI framework (continuous quality improvement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1:** Goals of the Mandate Foci I: Strategy Development

As the process-oriented consulting approach is an iterative process, the development plan has been modified according to the discussion at the SVC steering committee meetings. The following methods have been used for the consolidation phase:

- interview of selected stakeholders, 5 interviews of steering committee members,
- document analysis of SVC reports and further evaluation reports,
- analysis of the SVC website, partly comparison with website www.eteaching.org,
- comparison analysis of SVC report with German evaluation report,
- Validation by the SVC steering committee on 20th of January 2006 (presentation "1st Review and Next Steps").
The results of previous SVC mandates provided a meaningful basis for the consolidation phase. There were the following reports:

SVC Reports:
- Final Report “Programme Evaluation” (Prof. Weber),
- SVC Status Report 04 - Impulse Programme (Dr. Ritzek-Pfister, received January 4, 2006),
- SVC Monitoring Report (SVC Coordination Team, 2006).

Further Reports:
- BMBF Evaluation Report “Virtual Learning at German Universities” (Knowledge Media Research Centre, 2004),
- HIS Study (E-Learning Strategies at German Universities – 8 case studies, 2005),
- SCIL Reports (Implementation Strategies for eLearning – 4 cases studies, 2005).

The results of the As-Is analysis will be explained in the following, first on the project level in order to analyse their sustainability and then on the CCSP level in order to be able to make a statement to HEI about the structural sustainability of eLearning.

2.2.2 Project Level: Sustainability of eLearning

If one compares the evaluation reports by the SVC and BMBF on the projects being sponsored in Germany, several central aspects can be subsequently singled out, which prove to be particularly relevant for the sustainability of eLearning.

The main goals of the 100 evaluated projects could only be ranked in the German study. Improving the quality of teaching is at the top of the list. Economic goals, such as cost savings or additional financing revenue were of secondary significance.

What are the main goals of the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement in quality of teaching</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in student motivation</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility in studies (independent in time, place)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality improvement: support of students</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching out to new student groups</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing the time required for a degree</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost savings</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realization of Profits</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMBF = 223 project partners  
1 = not important  
5 = very important

Figure 2: Main Goals of eLearning-Projects
The project objectives were surveyed during the course of the SVC monitoring, however in the final evaluation report no summarising data can be found with regard to them, such that no direct comparison can be made. The experiences made in expert workshops and in conversations with project directors allow one to assume that a very similar pattern would result for the SVC.

A comparison regarding the question as to what kind of products had been created also shows great similarities. Content products prevail most strongly, whereby with 72% the SVC demonstrates a smaller share than in Germany, where nearly every project develops content. Furthermore, most of the projects are characterised by the development of tools and platforms. Overall the areas of support and consulting turn out slightly higher results with SVC.

**What kind of Products?**

![Bar Chart]

**Figure 3: Main Products of eLearning-Projects**

The most relevant question, “what is the added-value of the products?” can only be taken from the BMBF study, since this question was not addressed in the SVC evaluation report. This can be seen as one of the greatest weaknesses, since the added-value is ultimately crucial when it comes down to convincing institutions of higher education.
What is the realized **Added-Value** of the Products?

| 1 | Higher availability of the contents | 4.6 |
| 2 | Better visualization of the contents | 4.4 |
| 3 | Support of self-organized learning | 4.4 |
| 4 | Higher attractiveness (motivational aspect) | 4.4 |
| 5 | Easier updating of contents | 4.1 |
| 6 | Conversion of standard knowledge to digital formats | 4.1 |
| 7 | Unloading of presence phases (lectures) | 3.8 |
| 8 | Adapting to individual learning styles | 3.7 |
| 9 | Conversion of knowledge relevant for many subjects to dig. formats | 3.6 |
| 10 | Easier communication between teachers and students | 3.6 |
| 11 | Easier communication among students | 3.6 |
| 12 | Conversion of new knowledge/ current research results to dig. formats | 3.1 |
| 13 | Conversion of specific, elsewhere not available knowledge to dig. for. | 2.6 |

**Figure 4:** Realized Added-Value of eLearning

However on the other hand, the kinds of courses offered can be compared. The SVC offerings address Distance Learning to a greater extent (24% vs. 9.2%) with a share of over 80%. This can presumably be traced back to the fact that the SVC sponsoring programme placed great emphasis on this option from the very beginning. In the BMBF projects, the use of eLearning was primarily geared towards add-on offerings.

What kind of **Course Offerings**?

![Diagram showing types of eLearning-course offerings](image)

**Figure 5:** Types of eLearning-Course Offerings

An essential question for the sustainability of eLearning offerings is to what extent they are integrated into the curriculum and take on a binding character. In comparing the SVC with the BMBF it stands out that the SVC projects demonstrate a comparably greater weakness: only 40% of the projects are obligatory compared to 56.9% of those by the BMBF. 5 projects grant credit points for eLearning offerings and 14 projects (29.7%) define eLearning as binding.
What about the **binding character**?

![Bar chart showing binding character of the eLearning-Offerings](chart.png)

BMBF = 100 projects  
SVC = 47 projects

**Figure 6:** *Binding character of the eLearning-Offerings*

For the diffusion of an innovation it is very significant whether dominant forms of implementation can establish themselves. Thus the question “What are the main (virtual) learning forms?” is an indicator for which standards are most likely to establish themselves. Unfortunately there are no results on this for the SVC projects. The BMBF study initially shows sobering results, primarily since providing digital scripts is ranked highest on the list. However exercises and problem-based learning are learning forms with pedagogical benefits that follow closely behind.

**What are the main (virtual) learning forms?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Form</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scripts (digital, hypermedia)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercises</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-based learning</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue (teacher - students)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project work</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical work, lab</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business game</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring thesis</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7:** *Main Virtual Learning Forms*
On the SVC website one can search for various criteria (e.g. discipline, technology) in the SVC project list, but unfortunately not for learning forms or learning scenarios and teaching functions, as, for example, the further education portal www.eTeaching.org provides as a selection offering.

What are the main (virtual) learning forms?

### e-Teaching.org

![SVC](image)

- All online courses, sorted by discipline
- All online courses, sorted by AHR
- Online courses by technology
- Online courses impulse phase 1st series
- Online courses impulse phase 2nd series
- Online courses consolidation phase 3rd series

---

**Figure 8: Documentation of Main Virtual Learning Forms**

The following table shows an alternative for exemplarily pointing out the spectrum of relevant eLearning scenarios. Based on numerous expert discussions held with eLearning project directors and employees in eLearning Competence Centres, one can assume that the SVC projects are most widespread in the area of supplementing and broadening on-campus courses (scenarios 4-6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Media</th>
<th>1 Instructor centred teaching with e-Media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Cooperative learning with digital learning resources and tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Testing of learning success with e-Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Self-guided learning accompanied by e-tutorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Reflexive learning with discussion forums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 Case-study-based learning with web resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...as a supplement to on-campus courses</td>
<td>7 Discovering learning with computer-based simulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...as a significant broadening of on-campus courses</td>
<td>8 Project-oriented learning with CSCW tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...as a substitute for on-campus courses</td>
<td>9 Tele-learning with video conferencing systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Dialogue-based learning with a virtual classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 1: Spectrum of relevant eLearning scenarios**
The use of standard learning platforms is considered another relevant sustainability factor in the area of technology. The evaluation of the SVC website indicates that the proprietary in-house developments demonstrate a very high diffusion rate:

What are the main technologies?

![Bar chart showing main technologies](image)

SVC = 50 projects

**Figure 9: Main Technologies of eLearning Projects**

For the implementation of forms of technology, the question must also be posed regarding the dominant forms that would support the increasing spread of an innovation such as eLearning. Only the BMBF report addresses this aspect. The favoured technologies are reflected in the use of the learning forms: digital documents and exercise software in the area of multimedia technologies as well as e-mail and discussion forums are most widespread.

What are the main technologies?

![Bar chart showing multimedia and communication technologies](image)

BMBF = 223 project partners

**Figure 10: Main Multimedia and Communication Technologies**

Innovations are always accompanied by changes for the affected individuals. With the use of eLearning the question thus arises with regard to the changes for teachers and students. Very concrete conclusions could be made from the BMBF study. Based on it, the teacher workload...
increased in particular (far more than the student workload), which was partially confirmed in the SVC report as well. The student workload was not studied by the SVC.

What are the changes for teachers and students?

![Bar chart showing changes in teacher and student workload]

**Figure 11: Changes for Teachers and Students**

If one compares the range of both sponsored programmes, one can determine that the radiating effect of this type of financing is always limited:

- Germany: about 3-5% of students and teachers in Germany have participated in eLearning forms (J. Wedekind, Knowledge Research Centre Tübingen) in comparison to
- Switzerland: about 7.5% students in Switzerland have participated in eLearning forms (12,500 out of 165,500 students (according to the Swiss Federal Statistic Office, 2005)).

In conclusion, the overriding question must be asked as to how likely it is that the SVC financed eLearning projects will exist for as long and as sustainably as possible:

- It is barely possible to make a well-founded statement due to the scarce amount of information. Unfortunately, for example, the questions about the goals and the added-value of the projects, which represent the use and motivation of those involved in the project, and the ability to continue a project after the sponsoring funds have been discontinued, are missing.

- An above-average number of SVC projects have previously won the Medida-Prix, the prize for institutions of higher education in the area of didactic teaching innovations in the participating countries of Germany, Austria and Switzerland. This is a sign that a number of lighthouse projects with a high qualitative level have been developed, which demonstrate the didactic potential of eLearning. Winning such an award has both a financial effect on the continuation of the projects as well as a motivational effect on those involved in the projects.

- However these lighthouse projects are often very cost-intensive with regard to their production costs and can thus shine too much, meaning that they are too far removed from current practices for them to be able to be realised – without future financial sponsoring. Within the scope of the SVC it is unlikely that “dominant learning designs”, which would be able to be more easily implemented on a broader scale, emerged.
The following projects are to be understood with big question marks with regard to their sustainability:

- eLearning offerings as an optional non-binding learning offering,
- expensive individually designed learning software programmes, which lead to high maintenance costs,
- large projects, which could not agree on uniform standards

Finally one would estimate - based on the evaluations described above - that of the SVC-sponsored projects, approximately 20% could be transferred into sustainable structures, approx. 20% of the projects still demonstrate a certain chance for being continued, over 50% or the majority of the projects exhibit major hindering factors for their sustainability and that the end of the term of 10% of the projects can already be anticipated.¹

### 2.2.3 CCSP Level: Sustainability of eLearning

In addition to the project-oriented sustainability, the system-oriented sustainability of eLearning can furthermore be analysed, which focuses on the comprehensive organisation-wide spread of eLearning in the area of teaching. As empirical research results confirm, the development of support structures is of central significance for the further diffusion of eLearning as an innovation.

The other activities in the consolidation phase thus relate, on the one hand, to the As-Is analysis of the organisational models of the CCSPs at the respective institutions and, on the other hand, to the question of further support from a central coordination unit.

**As-Is Analysis of the Organisational CCSP Models**

The results of this analysis were presented and briefly discussed at the Steering Committee meeting on 19th May 2005. Based on these results, one can see that 5 various organisational models for CCSPs are very widespread; they have been briefly outlined below.

¹ Please note that the given figures are based on assumptions according to the evaluated sustainability factors.
## Organisational Models of CCSPs

**Figure 12: Organisational Models of CCSPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Model of CCSPs</th>
<th>Characteristic, Example</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New part of existing Unit</td>
<td>Anchorage in existing structures by integrating new tasks, e.g., new position in central support unit. Example: &quot;one-person-solution&quot; (e.g., SVC coordinator at UAS).</td>
<td>- efficient use of resources, using synergies, - fast approach (no restructuring needed)</td>
<td>- low stability of structures (sustainability) - position connected to „external“ funding - project character with implemented time limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or restructured Unit</td>
<td>New Unit devoted to innovations in learning. Example: eLearning-Center as new Support Unit at the University of Zurich</td>
<td>- demonstrates high commitment of the university management - higher stability of structures - less coordination duties</td>
<td>- higher costs, personnel-intensive (considering economies of scale) - lower synergies with other support units, more overlapping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Organisational Models of CCSPs

#### As-Is Analysis: Priorities of a Central Coordination in a further Funding Phase

The As-Is analysis also touched on the question as to which central support possibilities the CCSPs need in order to be able to implement the sustainability of eLearning throughout the entire organisation. The results of the monitoring that was performed were used for this purpose:

- Monitoring Results: Feedback of the Project Leaders:
  - Funding after 2007 (maintenance of projects, rewards for successful teams, a special grant, according to reached goals),
  - Technical Platform at a national level; continuity of the existing platforms,
– Real “Virtual Campus”: for foreign students (AAI), common marketing (Vision and Mission SVC, course catalogue, Swiss Quality Seal, exchange of modules),
– Support: centrally organised consulting access, legal advice, etc.,
– Exchange of experiences and results.

• Monitoring Results: Feedback of the CCSP Leaders:
  – Funding after 2007 (maintenance of existing projects, launching new projects, assistance for further funding),
  – Support: eLearning Portal (e.g., access to SVC courses), clearer vision, goals of SVC, provision of services for CCSPs,
  – Technical Platform at a national level, common infrastructure for exchanging modules (clearinghouse),

• Exchange of experiences: publication of the actual output so far, networking, community of experts.

**Final Remarks of the As-Is Analysis:**
The Competence Centres represent the main catalyst for eLearning at Higher Education Institutions (HEI). The further development, implementation and integration of eLearning in teaching and learning at HEI would not be feasible without the support of the CCSPs. They have an important role in linking the strategy of the university management with the manifold eLearning projects and to promote innovations in learning with an orientation to quality development of teaching and learning at HEI.

![Organisational Models of CCSPs](image)

**Figure 13: Central Role of CCSPs**
The following shortcomings can be observed which represent potential dangers for the system-oriented sustainability of eLearning:

• Missing standards/forms for organising CCSP (often still project character, commitment by university management is open),
• often the strategic alignment to the university strategy is missing, (the favourite strategy is "stretching the mould", slow not radical changes), selective use of eLearning in projects, but the daily use of eLearning is still not widespread,

• eLearning is often not combined with the Bologna reform, the second innovation process with greater innovation power (strategic use of ICT and take the proactive advantage of the major reform),

• acceptance within the institutions is still open, in particular at the institutions without an explicitly formulated strategy and organisational anchorage of the CCSPs.

Considering the extreme time pressure until the end of 2007, further support is needed for most of the centres set up with the start of the SVC-consolidation programme. Without further funding, the organisational anchorage of some CCSPs remains in a very precarious state. The CCSPs can be clustered in:

• "A" = sustainability is definitely in severe danger (red), about 3-5 CCSPs,

• "B" = sustainability is to some extent uncertain (yellow), the know-how and the services required are not completely developed, main group

• "C" = sustainability is certain (green), even though there is a need for additional know-how transfer: about 5 CCSPs, the "big ones", strategically anchored CCSPs

The loss of some CCSPs would finally mean that on the one hand a considerable amount of funding in the SVC consolidation phase comes out as bad investment and on the other hand the already initiated impulses for developing the quality of teaching suffer a tremendous setback at the concerned HEI.

Without the efficient and effective support by the CCSPs, the maintenance of existing eLearning projects as well as the entire management of eLearning at HEI would be in danger. This must be avoided as students are increasingly "native" to information technology. Even students who are still technology "immigrants" increasingly find IT a fundamental part of their environment. Consequently, students expect to learn in technology-enabled learning environments. Without concerted support in the time remaining, the continued development of eLearning as an instrument for quality improvement in teaching and learning as well as the orientation on future student needs and positive learning outcomes would grind to a halt at most HEI. The transfer activities planned play an important role in securing long-term effects from the resources invested in the SVC programme so far.

2.3 Formulation of a Strategy

2.3.1 Overview: Goals, Methods

The goal of this phase was to give support in the development and formulation of a strategy in order to be able to support the integration of eLearning into the HEI in an additional SVC sponsoring phase. At the same time, the strategic orientation was set as the normative goal in order to improve the qualitative development of teaching and to support a new teaching and learning culture at HEI, based on student-centred learning.
For this area, the method of the process-oriented consulting approach was primarily used in order to be able to develop the SVC strategy paper in editing cycles. The following steps were undertaken for this development phase:

- Interviews of the steering committee members,
- Stakeholder analysis during preparation for the SVC Days,
- Preparation of input and discussion during the SVC steering committees and the phone-/e-mail communication between the meetings:
  - 20th of January, 2006 (consolidation results as a basis for the strategy)
  - 14th of March, 2006 (SVC days)
  - 19th of May, 2006 (input strategy, 1st draft of strategy paper), building of a taskforce devoted to the strategy formulation,
  - Feedback on the paper by Christian Hohnbaum and Urs Groehbiel "Message_2008.doc",
  - 21st of July, 2006 (2nd draft of strategy paper), in advance: feedback-round with the task force: Ch. Hohnbaum, M. Jufer and F. Flückiger,
  - 22nd of September, 2006 (already discussing switch in strategy)

Unfortunately at the SVC steering committee meetings only a short amount of time was allowed for holding a strategy discussion, such that this process turned out to be quite difficult.

2.3.2 Results of the Process and Outlook

The results of the consulting process can be found in the annex:

- Cornerstones for next steps after the SVC (Annex 1)

Some of the main results of the recommendations for the strategy development are outlined below:

**Starting Point and Context:**

SVC has been successful in achieving the main goals during the two different phases, namely setting impulses for new approaches of technology-enhanced teaching and learning and starting the consolidation of structures in order to reach sustainability in the innovations triggered. There is an impressive potential of eLearning examples ready for broader transfer and diffusion coming out of the projects funded by the SVC.

At the SVC days in March 2006, Prof. Dr. Paul Bacsich (Consultant in Benchmarking, eLearning and Director of Matic Media Ltd., Great Britain) presented his results of a benchmarking study in which he compared the effectiveness of national funding programmes in 7 European countries. According to Prof. Bacsich's study, the SVC programme can be seen as a success and as a benchmark for other national programmes.
A positive decision on a new funding programme would have led to a subsequent distribution of the SVC results as well as to a further quality development of technology-enhanced teaching and learning. As it is the case with most innovations (even successful ones), the diffusion is confined to innovators and early adopters. It needs specific effort to transfer them to a wider practice in order to avoid them being forgotten or neglected. Recent experiences demonstrate that all-embracing theories about university development and quality assurance are gaining importance. The challenge for most Swiss institutions of higher education right now is to bring together and bundle the different innovation processes originating in the Bologna Reform. The CCSPs could take over the role of integrating the innovation streams responsible for quality management issues. In terms of implementing the Bologna Reform, teaching and learning dramatically changes at Swiss institutions of higher education.

At a curricular **macro-level** the main changes for the design of *study programmes* are:

- interdisciplinary, module-based studies, more research-based teaching and learning,
- output-oriented (instead of input-oriented) organisation of studies, calculating workloads for students and teachers.

At a **micro-level** the main changes for the design of *courses* are:

- student-centred (instead of teacher-centred) learning, strengthening the importance of self-regulated learning (in the context of preparing students for lifelong learning),
- technology-enhanced teaching and learning: using the potential of information and communication technologies for integrated learning (designing effective learning environments).

The changes described imply that students and teachers are faced with a new culture on campus: on the one hand, new objectives and competencies (e.g. competencies relating to self-organised learning, teachers as facilitators) are addressed; on the other hand, new teaching and learning methods have to be considered. A new culture of teaching and learning requires substantial changes in organisations. These developments challenge Swiss institutions of higher education with new demands.

**Strategic Agenda: Overall Goals and Expected Results**

Nine years after the creation of the Swiss Virtual Campus, a learning infrastructure exists. However, much work remains to be done on the more significant challenge - finding ways to ensure that people, pedagogy and technology support student success. To address that challenge, it is recommended to adopt the *mission* of "Advancing Learning Through IT Innovation". The *mission of the Swiss Campus Programme* is then to create new learning environments that harness the power of information technology to improve the quality of teaching and learning.

**Main Implementation Strategy**

A paradigm shift of the Programme "Swiss Campus" has been recommended as the main implementation strategy with the following indicators:
• from Swiss Virtual Campus to Swiss Campus (showing the relevance of the "real campus"),

• from "separate" eLearning-products to integrated learning with focus on a "new learning culture",

• from the production of eLearning content to quality improvement of technology-enhanced teaching and learning

• from input- to output-orientation, in terms of funding by reaching milestones, developing strategy and clear outcomes at the institutions,

• from project-funding to university/CCSP-funding: Institutions cooperating with CCSPs are responsible for strategy and organisational development,

• from Learning infrastructure to strategic improvement of teaching and learning

• from bottom-up-developments to top-down-anchorage: resource allocation according to the strategy,

• from individual innovators and early adopters to institutional transformation and decision-makers,

• from a "one-serves-all" approach to "differentiated approaches": autonomy of institutions as the highest principle but with clear incentives for cooperation strategies.

Implementation: Measures and Approaches

Given the objectives outlined above, the following four approaches have been recommended by the task force and outlined in the strategy paper:

1. Strategic and pedagogic support,
2. Technical support: National Platform,
3. Transfer programme for the valorisation and diffusion of advanced learning,
4. Participating in European project initiatives.

Final remarks to the strategy development and outlook:

Since a follow-up programme to the SVC is not supported any longer, the manifold consequences should not be neglected and the following implications seem to be likely:

• As to the consolidation of the Competence Centres for Service and Production (CCSP), further support is needed at least for most of the centres set up with the start of the SVC-consolidation programme. Without further funding the organisational anchorage of some CCSPs remains in an uncertain status. Without efficient and effective support by the CCSPs the maintenance of existing eLearning projects would be in danger as well.

• The loss of some CCSPs would finally mean that a considerable amount of funding in the SVC consolidation phase comes out as false investment. Furthermore, it would mean that
already implemented initiatives for developing the quality of teaching won't be pursued any-more at the concerned HEI.

- The 4th project series could not reach the same quality standards as the other two project series with respect to equal opportunities.
- The termination of the funding might be interpreted as a failure of the SVC programme in the international arena. The risk is in drastically damaging the up-to-now excellent international reputation.

Due to the surprising and definite decision to discontinue SVC beyond 2007 by the CRUS, the direction of the SVC mandate should be changed immediately as already discussed within the proposal for the mandate prolongation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SVC Mandate originally planned til Nov. 06</th>
<th>SVC Mandate Prolongation starts Sept. 06 – End 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy Development</strong> Process-oriented consulting</td>
<td><strong>Transfer Support</strong> Process-oriented consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main result:</td>
<td>Main Result:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategy paper</td>
<td>- Knowledge repositories (Documentations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continuous support</td>
<td>- Continuous support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(SVC days, feedback on monitoring process, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for the CCSPs:</td>
<td>Support for the CCSPs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- „Longer“-term focus,</td>
<td>- Short-term focus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strategy Development</td>
<td>- Know How Transfer,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- (Survival Tactics)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Immediate switch of the SVC Mandate

3 CCSPs: Organisational Development

3.1 Overview: Goals, Methods

The second mandate focus addresses the support for the CCSPs as the main catalyst for the integration of eLearning at HEI. The goal of this phase was to find answers to the following questions in cooperation with the eLearning project leaders and CCSP leaders (see SVC mandate proposal 18th of November 2005, p. 7):

- How can eLearning be integrated into the overall strategy of teaching and learning at institutions of higher education?
- What factors influence the sustainability of eLearning with the focus of university-wide implementation? What are practicable guidelines and recommendations for the responsible implementers?

As a further perspective, the following question has already been considered as part of a mandate prolongation:
• How can they **transfer and apply** the SVC strategy (generic) framework into their university setting (developing their specific framework)?

The following methods were selected for the joint collaboration with eLearning experts:

• Individual conversations and selected interviews, while at the same time making sure there was a mixture of Universities of Applied Sciences (e.g. UAS Solothurn, UAS Winterthur) and Universities (e.g. University of Zurich, University of Basel, etc.),

• Expert workshops during the course of the SVC Days,

• Case study analysis in an international context.

The timetable, phases, goals and methods have once again been taken from the SVC proposal (see SVC mandate proposal 18th of November 2005, p. 9) and the summarised results can be found in the corresponding sections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timetable</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Deliverable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov.-Jan.06</td>
<td>Consolidation II</td>
<td>Reviewing existing evaluation data</td>
<td>Analysis of evaluation data, analysis of the contextual factors</td>
<td>Status Report, clustering different “types” of Institutions and competence centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC Steering committee meeting, January 20th, 2006</td>
<td>Developing Inte-gration Strategy SVC</td>
<td>Developing SVC integration strategy, 1st draft</td>
<td>Interviews, Validation by SVC steering committee on request</td>
<td>Consolidation I results. Discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.-Mar.06</td>
<td>Consolidation II</td>
<td>Reviewing existing evaluation data</td>
<td>Analysis of evaluation data, analysis of the contextual factors</td>
<td>Status Report, clustering different “types” of Institutions and competence centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC Steering committee meeting, March 14th, 2006</td>
<td>Developing Integration Strategy SVC</td>
<td>Developing SVC integration strategy, 2nd draft</td>
<td>Interviews, Validation by SVC steering committee on request</td>
<td>Strategy Paper: integration strategy for the modernization of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC Steering committee meeting, May 2006</td>
<td>Strategy Development</td>
<td>Applying the generic SVC framework</td>
<td>usability testing with selected experts, Workshop with competence center leaders</td>
<td>Specific CQI framework, questionnaire deduced from the framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVC Steering committee meeting, September 2006</td>
<td>Strategy Development</td>
<td>Applying the generic SVC framework</td>
<td>usability testing with selected experts, Workshop with competence center leaders</td>
<td>Specific CQI framework, questionnaire deduced from the framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1. Results of the Consolidation Phase

3. CCSPs: Organisational Development

not relevant anymore due to the changes - shift of the mandate (2nd proposal)

Figure 15: **Goals of the Mandate Foci II: Organisational Developmen**

3.2 Results of the Process and Outlook

3.2.1 Overview

In various studies and research reports, influencing factors have been identified, which encourage or hinder the sustained implementation of educational innovations (Betts, 1998; Hebert, 2003; Owston, 2004; Pajo & Wallace, 2001; Schönwald, Euler, & Seufert, 2004). This makes it clear how high the hurdles really are in practice for actually being able to successfully anchor innovative measures for the long term. In conversations with the leaders of the CCSPs and eLearning project directors, the following was also confirmed: as gate keepers for eLearning innovations, the teachers are a central critical success factor for the sustainable anchoring of eLearning at institutions of higher education. However a “good” eLearning
product by no means “speaks for itself”. The activities of support units play a very significant role in the successful use of eLearning at organisations.

A process is recommended, which consists of four steps and is based on fundamental principles of didactic measure planning:

1. **What do we want to achieve?**
   Deriving competence requirements in eLearning scenarios

2. **Which strengths, deficits and barriers exist?**
   Identification of the As-Is status (target group analysis)

3. **Which measures are appropriate?**
   Selection and firm establishment of measures

4. **How should the measures be weighted and chronologically arranged?**
   Specification of the measures portfolio

The measures developed in collaboration with eLearning experts can be broken down into the following eight areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Provide information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All measures that play a role in ensuring that relevant information about eLearning is broadly communicated (information via print media or internet, newsletters, brochures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Communicate attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measures which pertain to the attitude level and which lead to teachers becoming more interested, curious and open towards the topic of eLearning (within the framework of a communications strategy: e.g. marketing, events, sweepstakes …)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase the willingness to take action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This particularly has to do with incentives that lead to teachers becoming more involved in the area of eLearning (announce eLearning projects, award premiums for good projects / or implement project fundraising)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organise educational offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This includes all types of organised measures which impart knowledge and skills in various formats and levels of intensity, for example courses, workshops, presentations …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Design quality development with learning in mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measures for monitoring, securing and developing quality support the acquisition of competence within the scope of certifications or accreditations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Offer advisory support
Measures through which the teachers are supported in the planning, development and implementation of eLearning, so that competence can be developed

7 Encourage exchange
All measures that support communication among teachers about new forms of using instructional media, i.e. encourage meetings between colleagues, set up work groups …

8 Make innovation required
Measures which play a role in ensuring that the participants become involved and take on responsibility (“Process Ownership”)

Figure 16: CCSP-Measures for the Competence Development of Higher Education Teachers

Here one must note that it is possible for concrete measures to be assigned to completely different areas. A workshop on the topic of “Learning Platforms”, for example, can serve as both information and marketing as well as network-building or qualification. Thus in the following, the basic functions of the measure areas will be systematised, which can then be converted into concrete measures at various intensities. The systematisation should therefore act as an aid for being able to plan and analytically arrange concrete measures. It also is useful for examining where an institution’s measures portfolio has its strengths and weaknesses.

3.2.2 Measure: Provide Information

In order to support the use of eLearning, information about eLearning must be provided to the target groups. In the following, possible measures will be presented and systematised in more detail. It will thus become clear that a decision must be made as to which information should be created or provided (“make or buy”). Furthermore, the significant question arises as to how the variety of information on this topic can be compiled.

Objectives:
In the measure area “Provide information” primarily factual information on the subject of eLearning will be communicated. At the same time, each piece of information will always carry an emotional message as well, which can contribute to developing attitudes.

Structural Aspects
- Information about eLearning for developing teacher competence can relate to
  - general information about eLearning (techniques, didactics etc.)
  - teaching materials and learning resources available on the internet
  - eLearning technologies and services available on campus
• General information about eLearning should be obtained externally from a single institution of higher education, if at all possible. The amount of effort and the expenses needed for editorial support and the updating of corresponding pages seem to be unreasonably high. General information about eLearning can be intelligently tied to information about local activities and services.

• The individual interests regarding general information about eLearning are heterogeneous. For example, the humanities and social sciences have different learning cultures compared to the engineering or natural sciences and are therefore tied to different teaching-learning scenarios.

• Information about the availability of subject-specific teaching / learning materials in one’s own subject area is especially important for the individual teachers. This information can be provided through links to appropriate portals.

• Information on eLearning technologies and services available on campus generally pertain to different (central) institutions. The presentation and structuring of corresponding information should not follow the logic of the institutions’ organisation, but rather the logic of the customer’s processes. The organisational structure hidden “behind” the solutions to the problems is irrelevant for the customer.

• The available information should be compiled for the teachers target group and the topic of “Instructional Support” on a central information page on the internet, where the information on all current services will be centrally managed and regularly updated (single point of information).

• It is the information distributed over the internet that acts as the “business card” for every institution involved in eLearning. If this internet presence is not convincing, then the users of the institution will attribute it with little competence in the subject of eLearning – even before they become better acquainted with it.

**Case Study Example**

E-advice column at Northeastern University: there is an “Advice Column” at Northeastern University which sends tips on the topic of teaching on a regular weekly basis. The newsletter can be traced back to the initiative of a support group, which sends these tips under the pseudonym Jonas Chalk.

### 3.2.3 Measure: Communicate Attitudes

The use of eLearning in teaching depends on one’s interest and willingness to engage in eLearning. At the same time, attitudes also develop in the discussion about eLearning. That is why the measure area “Communicate attitudes” is particularly relevant for attracting new target groups.

The significance of information is generally recognised at institutions of higher education, however the significance of marketing communication is generally underestimated. “Information” is provided about (new) services and products, but the “marketing” character of the messages is misperceived. Thus the service is not made attractive enough for the potential
customer; the information “as such” does not reliably generate enough attractiveness and demand.

Objectives:
For the long-lasting diffusion of eLearning on campus it is not enough to merely inform teachers about eLearning; interest for the subject must be awakened and a positive attitude about the subject must be developed. Choosing to use new forms of eLearning in teaching by no means goes without saying, but instead remains primarily an individual consideration. The individuals must thoroughly ask themselves why they should give up their previous patterns of teaching and integrate new elements into their repertoire. Changing attitudes connected to this takes place slowly and requires numerous cycles of experience, which regularly decide whether the person’s interest can be sustained.

On the one hand, there are individuals who are and remain fundamentally for or against eLearning. However for most people, the attitude towards eLearning is generally less “rigid”. The individuals are not simply for or against eLearning, but instead develop an attitude over the course of time, which changes depending on experiences and is influenced by external factors and experiences. The development of an attitude is thus the result of a learning process.

Structural Aspects
• The measures for developing an attitude support the development of competence on an affective level and contribute to gearing the teachers’ attention and interest towards the subject of eLearning.
• A positive attitude towards eLearning does not automatically lead to a goal-oriented use of eLearning. A number of intervening variables influence the relationship between attitude and behaviour with regard to eLearning.
• Various aspects are relevant during attitude development, based on the phases of attention given to eLearning. In the pre-contact phase (“Pre-sales”), the person must first be attracted to be generally interested in eLearning and in the usage phase (“After-sales”) the person must be convinced of the eLearning services available.
• Labelling products and services has a signalling character and contributes to developing an attitude.
• The subject of eLearning should receive a consistent look and feel in the communications strategy both in print media as well as on the web interface in order to increase the recognition value (also business cards, templates for written documents, document folders …).
• New instruments and ways of communication, beyond print materials and information on the internet, should be created with a marketing nature in order to affectively address the target group.
• An effective starting point for marketing would be “Success Stories” tied to individuals: good examples must be made visible. Descriptions of concrete cases, experiences, products or implementation scenarios are especially convincing.
* Professional consulting and support for the communication strategy would be particularly helpful, since marketing communication is generally not the core business of the central support institutions.

**Case Study Examples**

Name competition for the newly introduced learning platform at the University of St. Gallen, which involved both students and instructors. Today the name “StudyNet” has been very well accepted and established. E-Starter Kit as a welcome package for new employees at the Polytechnic NorthWest: the eLearning centre is regularly informed about the hiring dates of new employees. Furthermore, these individuals are also contacted by telephone during their first work week to welcome them and offer short-term support for e-Services.

**3.2.4 Measure: Increase the Willingness to Take Action**

Even with available information and a positive attitude towards eLearning, the willingness to actually try or implement eLearning is still not automatic by any means. Therefore, the following is concerned with the question as to whether and how the willingness of instructors to implement eLearning innovations in their own teaching can be positively influenced.

**Objectives:**

These measures aim at motivating instructors to try and/or permanently implement eLearning innovations in their own teaching – with the goal that instructors acquire competencies in this way.

Finally, the measures in the area “Increase the willingness to take action” should have the result that the members of the organisation emphatically learn about the organisation’s goals and think about the contributions they could make to fulfilling these goals in their field. The ultimate goal is for as broad of a group of members of the organisation to become engaged in the subject matter and therefore develop competence themselves.

**Structural Aspects**

* Scholars work within the framework of a system that spans institutions of higher education and often the international academic community, which significantly influence an individual’s career chances, thus strongly shaping one’s behaviour. In the view of the affected individuals, the social and/or institutional framework of a “Home Institution” provides little gratification and therefore few opportunities for influencing its members’ willingness to take action.

* The institution of higher education, however, has limited possibilities to influence the instructors’ willingness to take action through monetary and non-monetary incentives. Unfortunately they are often not used in a sufficiently goal-oriented manner for a willingness to take action to develop and for these strategic incentives to be able to provide reasonable support.

* (Up to now) monetary incentives have less to do with personal profit-sharing but rather with donations to institutions. For a long time they were granted individually for projects in connection with an application, which were either not further examined with regard to
fulfilling goals or were sanctioned. The (subsequent) awarding of premiums for results once they have been achieved is becoming more significant. This belated disbursement can be considered to be more beneficial. It strengthens goal-orientation, personal responsibility in the sense of acting in a business-like manner and maintaining motivation.

- Measures with a competitive nature (such as bidding proposals, awards etc.) demonstrate their effects not only through the awarded prize and its scope, but also through the overall process (submission, appraisal, selection, presentation, award etc.), which should signalise “attention” and “appreciation”. In carrying out the measure, one should therefore place great emphasis on the quality of these processes because they communicate the importance of the whole measure. The disbursal or awarding can be staged as an event. The awarding of such a prize or the disbursal of premiums should have as high a priority as possible and be publicised internally.

- Non-monetary incentives can prove to have a higher degree of effectiveness in the long run than monetary incentives, however costs arise with non-monetary incentives as well. Non-monetary incentives can only be successful if they are available in connection with necessary expenses.

- Intensifying the use of eLearning can be codified within the framework of objective agreements. These agreements can be made with organisational units and/or hierarchical levels as well as with individuals.

**Case Study Example: Incentive Systems at the University of Berkeley**

In an example made by UC Berkeley, the intensity and range of lines of actions, which successful institutions of higher education work with, can be clearly followed. In the area of application-based funding allocations, the university issues, for example “Mini-grants” and “Classroom Technology Grants”, which are intended for smaller media projects between 1,000 and 3,500 USD. For accomplishment-based funding allocations, the university issues an “Educational Initiatives Award”, which honours innovative teaching methods and also takes eLearning into consideration. This focuses on pedagogical innovation and the development of a clear added-value and new qualities for the university’s offerings and accomplishments. Furthermore, individual accomplishments in teaching are also recognised; they are honoured with one-time bonus payments of 10,000 USD.

**3.2.5 Measure: Offer Advisory Support**

The target group of teachers is characterised by a high level of self-instructional competence, they are accustomed to independently learning new material. However there are also hurdles that are difficult for the individual to overcome, and can lead to a quick loss of interest in eLearning. Advisory support is needed here. It should serve to make sure that the necessary competence is developed and can be successfully applied in practice.

**Objectives:**

Advisory support should be used to ensure that teachers acquire necessary competence. It has already been mentioned that one could question whether “advising” makes sense at all or is efficient for the target group discussed here: learning new material and methods and working on new subject areas on one’s own corresponds to the self-conception of a scholar. Advising does not “sell” itself on its own within an institution of higher education, even if it is offered
without transferring the costs to the customer. So why should advisory support be offered at all?

**Structural Aspects**

- Advisory support is a significant building block precisely for developing “skills” as a significant element of competence in the area of eLearning. In order to make sure that skills are acquired, “advisory support” must be applied such that media conception and implementation are not “handed over” to a central institution as a production order, but instead that cooperation develops between teachers and the service institution in which the work is shared: developing the competence of teachers requires that the customer be involved in the implementation of media projects. A pure order-based relationship between teachers and the service institution does not ensure that the person receiving support will develop competence.

- Conflicts can be expected when the teacher has different expectations of the “advisory support”: the customer probably expects implementation to be taken over by the service institution. For this reason, the types of service offerings must be clearly communicated so that no false expectations arise.

- The employees in the service institutions may also have different expectations and a different self-conception of their job. They are likely to feel more like “developers” and a media agency. The idea that their institution is responsible and ultimately very crucial for developing the competence of their customers (as “teachers” for the “teachers”?) is likely to be unfamiliar to them.

- Consistently focusing the support area towards the idea of “developing the competence” of teaching personnel / academic personnel is a fundamental challenge – and provides enough reason for conflicts. It should become clear that developing the competence of teaching personnel can be seen as one of the decisive, strategic challenges for the institution of higher education as a whole. The production of media is likely to be important, but it is ultimately only a communicating element that can be used precisely for supporting this competence development.

- An initial consultation in the pre-contact phase is directed at individuals and attempts to overcome existing hurdles (lack of information, knowledge, skills). It should be set up to be more proactive than reactive and look specifically for individual teachers to conduct informational briefings.

- In the conception and development of media, one should focus primarily on scalable services, which can be presented to a broad group of teachers. For this reason, network-based support offerings should also be included (FAQ lists, step-by-step instructions, “showcase” for “good practice”). Intense involvement with individual projects is problematic with regard to the overall goal of developing broad competence and effectively anchoring eLearning.

**Case Study Example: STARS Programme at Wake Forest University**

STARS (Student Technology Advisors) follows the approach that students and instructors both become involved and support each other in using eLearning in teaching. Students with
technical know-how serve as co-trainers and advisors for instructors and accompany them during an entire semester. Advanced first-year students, students in the second half of their studies and juniors can apply for a position as a STAR. If they are selected, during their final year of studies they will accompany individual faculty members in various departments and work together with them to develop solutions for adequately implementing technology in teaching. Before the semester begins and in staff meetings during the semester, STARS are qualified by certified trainers for the newest, university-relevant software applications. The programme is directed by the Wake Forest University Information Systems Support and Outreach Services, a centre devoted to developing the media competence of students and instructors equally. STARS are responsible for accompanying and advising their faculty member with regard to technology applications for teaching. University instructors can apply for a STAR online by specifically providing project information about the goals they wish to achieve with their STAR. Students can apply online for a STAR position in the same way. The STAR assists in the realisation of the university instructor’s ideas through technology which supports teaching. STARS and instructors act as colleagues in this process.

3.2.6 Measure: Encourage Exchange

The measure area “Encourage Exchange” has to do with all activities that are directed at communication between teachers and at building networks, and therefore concerns the area of “informal learning”. Experiences from colleagues are much more convincing and make more of an impression than information that is “didactically” prepared and made available to the teachers. The “exchange” does not necessarily have to focus only on eLearning topics, but instead has the deeper meaning of building social networks at one’s own institution of higher education. The teachers can turn to these contacts in their social network when they have questions, wish to cooperate with a colleague or if they, for example, simply wish to vent their frustration.

Objectives:

The measures aim to support teacher exchange on the subjects of teaching and eLearning as well as build a social network within and beyond the institution of higher education. The exchange of information in these networks can be encouraged through:

- general information: eLearning approaches, eLearning technology
- concrete information: eLearning approaches in the specific academic area / on campus, eLearning technology on campus (contact persons …).

Social connections create network structures both among colleagues as well as with employees from the support institutions, which are important for the implementation of eLearning. The subject area specific contents are exchanged on the same level between colleagues. Thus communication does not take place through a “didactic” authority.

Structural Aspects

- Due to the specifics of the social network system in the academic field, lateral communication among equal colleagues will have a higher value, particularly in the area of “developing attitudes”. In addition to individual competence, social and subject matter competence can be developed by encouraging social exchange.
Social exchange can be organised through both on-campus meetings as well as through internet-based formats. On-campus events must avoid taking on the nature of a purely presentation-oriented event; there must be enough opportunities for personal encounters and communication. This includes having inviting spatial surroundings and responsive support.

There is also the option of having network-based formats after on-campus meetings (seminars, workshops, e-Day etc.). At the on-campus event the Community Forum should already be available and presented / introduced to the participants. One should consider with the participants which activities are desired and which measures might be conceivable for supporting the development of a community.

Today the technical setup of forums for “Communities” on web servers can be considered trivial. However the organisation and active design of network-based forms of social exchange are completely demanding and challenging tasks. A real and active “exchange” must take place between the participants, who are stimulated and supported by specific activities on the part of supporting individuals. Otherwise there is too great of a risk that a living “Community” will not develop. “Stimulating Activities” include live chats with invited individuals, temporary discussions in forums (including with guest discussion participants, as needed) and the inclusion of external, current contents and news.

Case Study Example: Professional Community at the University of Vienna

Faculty Learning Communities (FLC) are structured learning groups, ideally composed of six to fifteen people, with the goal of improving the quality of teaching and learning at the university. Their activities are not limited to the pure transfer of information and knowledge, but instead the instructors become motivated to try out new teaching methods within the framework of a specific course or project, share their experiences and insights with colleagues in the community and support each other with a possible implementation of their own. FLCs can be found in two different forms: on the one hand there are cohort-based communities, which are composed of employees from a specific cohort or department and work on a broad spectrum of topics in this group – depending on the needs and interests of the participants. On the other hand there are subject-based communities, which allow for certain learning contents to be developed outside the borders of the department. Members of the university can send topic suggestions to the responsible person in the FLC, who will post them, and thus make them accessible to the members of all departments.

In order to get the success of the communities started, it is crucial that representative members and/or departments are won over to participate, as they contribute to spreading the awareness and benefits of such learning communities in the university. In certain cases the participants can also be given incentives in the form of additional time off or a small monetary compensation. However in every case it is important that a basis of trust can develop between the members of the community so that they can be motivated to openly exchange their knowledge and experiences. Ideally the exchange between community members will not only take place face-to-face, but instead can be complemented by internet technology (e.g. through setting up an online portal), so that communication independent of time and place can be made possible.
3.2.7 Measure: Organise Educational Offerings

The measure area “Organise Educational Offerings” refers to curricular-based learning offerings, i.e. learning offerings that are geared towards clearly defined learning objectives target groups, contain didactically planned learning situations and often include a test and/or the certification of learned results.

Objectives:

Over the last few years the measure area “Organise Educational Offerings” has gained more significance. Within the framework of the Bologna Reform, “teaching” is increasingly being perceived as a core process at institutions of higher education. This process not only has to do with the reorganisation of university course offerings and degrees, but also a content-based and didactic-methodical renewal, which can be described with the phrase “the shift from teaching to learning”.

Structural Aspects

- Educational offerings are relatively time-consuming measures, which ultimately are only able to address a small number of individuals when one considers the entire institution of higher education. Their orientation should therefore be carefully considered.
- The right target group must be reached. Here there is traditionally the challenge of how to address tenured faculty. Up and coming academics are significant as a target group, particularly as promoters of innovative teaching-learning forms in the departments and institutes. They should be strengthened in this role.
- Educational offerings in an on-campus format should primarily focus on skill acquisition. For the target group discussed here, imparting knowledge can also be efficiently realised through media-supported formats. That means that practice and application elements should play a significant role in the on-campus events.
- The educational offerings have a model character; they are one of the few opportunities the participants have to experience alternative teaching-learning forms for themselves. The offerings should therefore use innovative learning methods and media, for example through implementing problem-oriented didactics and through internet-based support in the preparatory and follow-up phases.
- The educational offering should demonstrate an appropriate depth and range of the programme, i.e. it should not address too few people, but the offering should also not be too shallow.
- Instead of an arbitrary collection of individual events, the offering should be universally modularised and set up in levels. An incentive lies in a corresponding proof of acquired competencies through the acquisition of certifications. Instead of “Certificates of Participation” the certificates should correspond to standards, as have been developed by the AHD (Arbeitsgemeinschaft Hochschuldidaktik [Association for Research and Development in Higher Education] http://www.ahd-hochschuldidaktik.de/) and the British SEDA (Staff and Educational Development Association: http://www.seda.ac.uk/).
- The contents of the training programmes should be closely tied to the activities and developments in the subject areas, e.g. parallel to the introduction of new curricula in university programmes. In consideration of the intended addressees, the development of educational...
offerings should be agreed upon with the departments / programme directors with regard to the contents.

- When working closely with a department, the acquisition or selection of participants can also be left up to the departments. Within the framework of individual objective agreements, attending certain further education offerings could be included, for example.

**Case Study Example: Faculty Development Programme at Tufts University**

The “Academic Technology’s Faculty Development Programme” offers instructors at Tufts University the chance and opportunity to hear external experts from their subject area, learn about their work at their universities and discuss and reflect upon best practices with regard to the use of educational technology in their teaching. Through workshops, training and publications, the programme offers application-oriented further education on specific technology and its integration into the classroom and research. It serves to further and promote existing educational technology services and resources at Tufts University.

### 3.2.8 Measure: Design Quality Development with Learning in Mind

This measure area concerns activities which take place within the context of processes related to quality development at institutions of higher education. They can be designed such that the development of relevant teaching competencies is also furthered with the development of the institution and its services.

**Objectives:**

The subject “quality development” has been increasingly discussed over the past few years within the context of institutions of higher education. This has to do with how the quality of teaching and research can be systematically (1) made visible and comparable and (2) improved and further developed through methodically reflected processes. The processes for evaluation-based quality development in the sector of institutions of higher education demonstrate a significantly high number of similarities: they are based on a three-step process consisting of a self-evaluation report, an outside evaluation report (generally with an on-campus visit / discussions with stakeholders) and a follow-up evaluation report (Spiel, 2001).

On the one hand, the process can be set up as an evaluation by an external authority, in order to make a decision, for example, about setting up a program of study or a research group (generally with a binary decision: “go” / “no-go”). However it can also be set up as a process that the institution of higher education uses internally in order to be able to better position itself and to recognise and make use of its own potential.

These processes are connected with a significant amount of time and effort on the part of the participants and are often carried out as a burdensome obligatory task. However the process can be set up such that it can contribute to developing the participants’ competence and therefore can be understood as a chance for developing those involved. Relevant learning potential can be seen in reflecting upon one’s own strengths and weaknesses, recognising the outside perceptions of one’s accomplishments and the exchange of evaluations in an institution, as well as the collaborative development of perspectives for the institution. This contributes to
positioning and further developing the institution as a whole, but also involves increasing the competence of the participating individuals.

**Structural Aspects**

- The process of institutional quality development involves a significant amount of potential for developing competence on the part of the individuals. This relates in particular to the area of personal competence, the ability to recognise strengths and weaknesses, developing perspectives and planning their implementation. Within this framework, the issue should be brought up as to which contribution eLearning and other eServices can make in the further development of products and services at an academic institution (study and research programmes).

- Institutional quality development does not automatically lead to the development of the competencies of the individuals involved. Instead it should be designed so that such a combination is possible. In particular, this requires that the individuals involved experience “Process Ownership” themselves, i.e. that they feel responsible for the development of the quality of their institution and do not regard corresponding processes as remotely controlled measures forced upon them from the outside.

- The processes for quality development are methodically relatively similar, yet depending on their orientation, have differing potential with regard to the development of individual competence. Variations of self-evaluation with peer review, evaluation in a network and participating in benchmarks appear to be particularly interesting. The process of using external agencies, which is still common in Germany for accrediting courses of study – while methodically similarly structured – seems to be less effective from the perspective of developing competence, because, among other things, it tends to lack the element of personal responsibility on the part of the individuals involved.

3.2.9 Measure: Develop Responsibility (Involvement)

This includes measures which contribute to making sure that the implementation of eLearning innovations in teaching is required. Developing competence occurs here by people getting involved in processes and taking over certain tasks and responsibilities (“process ownership”). This initially has an effect on one’s attitude towards a subject. By being involved in processes, people learn more about the subject than if they were “standing on the outside”. Finally, by taking an active role in the processes within a concretely organised framework, they learn more about how eLearning “works” in reality. The individuals develop insight and competencies in these processes, which they would hardly have been able to develop on their own “behind a desk.” In this way, the targeted involvement of individuals can be considered and designed as an important element for competence development.

**Objectives:**

The integration of eLearning thus takes place by having the teachers make a commitment. Learning is encouraged by creating a general framework based on communication processes within a social organisation; the framework has defined structures and processes, can influence the actions of its members through establishing norms and goals and can control gratifications and sanctions.
Structural Aspects

- The more instructors and faculty members accept and consider the intended innovation to be their own and above all a collaborative effort, the more warmly they will attempt to implement it in their own work. Making an innovation required in an educational organisation primarily requires the following criteria for success:

- The development strategy for the corresponding educational innovation requires a balance between top-down and bottom-up processes, which can primarily be created through the support of the directors of the institution of higher education, as well as through organising the process owners in the line.

- Despite low budgets, resources must be obtained and planned systematically, involving, for example, individuals who are experts in their fields as process owners and are able to implement the goals of the educational innovation specifically for their subject area. Since the methodical implementation is left up to the instructors, the autonomy of teaching is maintained.

- The introduction and realisation of innovative learning forms in an educational organisation is always a complex organisational effort. It can be considered to be an incremental innovation, whose progress can be accelerated by regular optimisation and improvement processes within the framework of systematic quality management.

- Establishing support structures must take place in such a way that the various organs are both aware of each other and cooperate with one another and are able to be perceived by potential customers as an integrative concept for promotion and support.

Case Study Example: New Concept of Teaching at the University of St. Gallen

A study group was formed by the rector of the University of St. Gallen in 1999 for implementing a new concept of studies, which was intended to plan and develop the complete reorganisation of studies at the university into a two-level bachelor and master degree programme. The group consisted of the rector, a representative from each of the four departments (BWLBusiness Studies, VWL-Economics, KWL-Cultural Studies, RW-Law) and a project group for the operative implementation. Within the framework of numerous workshops, agreements in internal committees, obtaining external expert knowledge and carrying out a benchmark study on Business Schools, a new degree programme architecture was developed and passed by a large majority in the senate and university council.

The overall strategy carried out by the University of St. Gallen “Vision 2005” has the primary objective “to assert itself as an internationally leading academic university and to send extremely well-educated graduates into academic research and the practical working world.” An explicit part of this strategy is that it offers a comprehensive degree program which is able to meet up to high academic and practical demands. The degree programme architecture of the University of St. Gallen consists of three levels (Assessment, Bachelor, Master) and three columns (contact, self-guided and context studies), whose objectives are each illustrated in mission statements. Self studies, for example, make up 25 percent of the studies and examination volume and follow the didactic mission statement of cooperative self-guided learning with new media in addition to demanding disciplinary and interdisciplinary learning objectives.
The approach to the development of institutions of higher education used by the University of St. Gallen corresponds to a bi-polar model development strategy, which combines top-down processes with a bottom-up approach. The top-down approach obligates all instructors to shift to the new concept of study programmes, while at the same time professors, as process owners, are obligated to implement the provided framework in their department. The process owners are obligated towards those responsible for the programme, which exist for the areas Assessment Level, Bachelor Level and Master Level. Furthermore, they are also obligated towards those responsible for the self-guided studies programme to methodically and didactically realise the new concept of studies in their teaching.

3.2.10 Final Remarks and Outlook

The results presented are directed at those organising support management, in order to support them in their persuasion efforts. It is meant to make a contribution to professionalizing the activities of the support area in eLearning. Employees in support institutions plan and organise measures, aimed at the sustainable implementation of eLearning and at supporting instructors in doing so. The question that arises for the CCSPs with regard to an integration strategy is: how can instructors be persuaded to use eLearning in their everyday teaching? The 9 measure areas that crystallised during collaborations with eLearning experts support the CCSPs in being able to approach this difficult change management undertaking in a differentiated and goal-oriented manner.

Since there is no additional sponsoring phase for the CCSPs, time is pressing even more to secure the sustainability of the CCSPs for the remainder of their duration until the end of 2007. As has already been determined in the As-Is analysis, the long-term securing of the existence of most of the CCSPs is still uncertain.

In view of the urgency of the matter, immediate support should be given to the CCSPs. In order to prioritize the remaining resources it would make sense to differentiate the support according to the CCSPs Clusters described in 2.2.3. The strategy of the transfer support could differentiate among these three clusters and highlight crucial issues and react on urgent needs as stated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Strategy</th>
<th>Cluster A</th>
<th>Cluster B</th>
<th>Cluster C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Survival Kit&quot;</td>
<td>Stabilize</td>
<td>Optimize</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Support</td>
<td>Analysing/ Defining minimum configuration</td>
<td>Strategy Auditing, Defining Business needs</td>
<td>Elaborating/ Feedback on Diffusion Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing Business Plan (finance plan)</td>
<td>Stakeholder Management, moderation with the university management</td>
<td>Exploring/ systematising transfer mechanisms of SVC results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder Management, moderation with the university management</td>
<td>Exploring transfer mechanisms of SVC results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Clustering CCSPs for strategic alignment
According to the analysis of the existing situation, the setting-up of sustainable support structures has to be planned based on criteria such as:

- minimal configuration/ set-up,
- minimal standards for the activities,
- potential stages of expansion, development paths,
- specifications of the Competence Centre, job specifications,
- finances, budgetary demands,
- agreement on goals, performance results and measurement with the university management, etc.

The consolidation of the transfer support leads to a collection of typical challenges and good practices for solutions along the main activities of a CCSP. Based on the already existing knowledge a handbook under the title "Typical Challenges and Good Practice Solutions for Leading and Managing a Competence Centre" could be further developed and validated by the CCSP leaders in order to effectively and efficiently support the transfer phase.

4 SVC Team: Coordination Support

4.1 Support of SVC Days

In Spring 2006 the support of the SVC team was related to the content-based preparation and planning of the SVC Days, in order to obtain as much agreement on the desired objectives of the mandate as possible. The support tasks can be divided into the following areas:

Organisational support for the planning of the programme:

The content-based part of the programme (formulation of the title and the abstract) was created in collaboration with Christian Hohnbaum. Agreement on the concrete contents was also carried out with all contributors within the framework of the SVC mandate (e.g. specification of central questions, content-related examination of the slides, etc.).

Content-based input during the SVC Days:

- 3 members of the SCIL team were actively involved in the SVC Days:
- D. Euler: Presentation on strategy and on pedagogical issues, moderation expert workshop (mainly representatives of the CCSPs)
- I. Schönwald: Moderation of the workshop "change management"
- S. Seufert: Moderation of the 1st day, co-moderation expert workshop (CCSPs leader)

Results of the SVC Days as discussed during the SVC steering committee on 19th of May 2006:

The positive feedback was confirmed by the SVC steering committee members:

- clear roadmap, thematic orientation,
• good speeches, fruitful discussions,
• looking beyond one’s own nose (outside view),
• great opportunity for informal exchange, positive atmosphere.

Open points or some critical issues in regard to the feedback on the SVC days:
• SVC future (Ch. Kleiber emphasized that he is not willing to continue the SVC),
• 2nd day: less participation in the workshops – to some extent contradictory to expressed needs (experience exchange),
• Heterogeneous group: gap between “project people” and “strategic-oriented” people (CC leaders, etc.).

4.2 Support of Monitoring
The SVC monitoring process established so far and questions have been evaluated with regard to two objectives:
• to gain more insights and knowledge about relevant sustainability factors of eLearning Innovations,
• to obtain the opportunity to compare the results with other evaluation studies (e.g. BMBF study).

Therefore, feedback was given on the two questionnaires: Monitoring CCSPs and Monitoring Projects and a proposal for additional questions addressing the above-mentioned objectives has been elaborated (see Annex III).

5 Outlook Transfer Phase
The current proposal (see Annex IV) has been developed on the basis of the recent changes of the SVC funding politics and the discussion/feedback provided by the president of the SVC steering committee. Due to the surprising and definite decision to discontinue SVC beyond 2007 by the CRUS, the direction of the SVC mandate should be changed immediately.

The new orientation of the mandate needs to take effect immediately. Since the remaining time period of funding is extremely short until the end of 2007, adequate priorities have to be defined in order to reach the highest possible impact on transfer effectiveness and efficiency.

The Competence Centers represent the main catalyst for eLearning at Higher Education Institutions (HEI). The further development, implementation and integration of eLearning in teaching and learning at HEI would not be feasible without the support of the CCSPs. They have an important role in linking the strategy of the university management with the manifold eLearning-projects and to promote innovations in learning with an orientation to quality development of teaching and learning at HEI.

Therefore, the main support should be devoted to the knowledge transfer of the SVC results. Also, for those Competence Centers who are likely to survive, there is a strong need for sup-
port in order to fully develop the professional toolbox for the management of eLearning at HEI.

The main question of “how to integrate elearning into the global strategy of teaching with the overall goal of continuous quality improvement in HEI” has to be addressed in the remaining period of the SVC consolidation programme. As stated in the SVC joint proposal in November 2005 (p. 6), the further perspectives as part of a mandate prolongation are focused on:

- Transfer/ application of the strategy at the Institutions of Higher Education,
- Integration of elearning into a university-wide teaching strategy.

These goals are still valid and could be focused in concerted activities in order to reach the highest possible:

- Transfer effectiveness: how to do the right things? What are the right priorities in the remaining time, what are appropriate criteria for defining the priorities (the SVC steering committee functions as main decision maker)?
- Transfer efficiency: how to do the things right? At an operational level, efficient methods have to be selected. In this context, the ratio of invested time and gained benefits for all the involved parties (e.g. SVC team, CCSPs, SVC steering committee) has to be optimized.

As a joint proposal we recommend to focus the activities of the SVC mandate on the following three key areas (see following figure):

![Figure 17: Three Key Areas of the SVC Mandate Prolongation](image)

These three key areas with their corresponding activities, methods and results are explained in more detail in the next section. The three key areas are interrelated and are build on each other. The sustainability/ transfer support is devoted to CCSPs as defined in section 1: as the main platform and catalyst for eLearning at HEI. As an additional effect, the mandate will provide benefit for any future (to this day unknown) strategy of the Conference of the Universities of Applied Sciences Switzerland (CUAS).
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Cornerstones for next steps after the SVC

Context
SVC has been successful in achieving the main goals during the two different phases, namely setting impulses for new approaches of technology enhanced teaching and learning and starting the consolidation of structures in order to reach sustainability of the innovations triggered off.

There is an impressive potential of eLearning examples ready for broader transfer and diffusion coming out of the projects funded by the SVC.

In the course of the programme, both the context of eLearning and the priorities within universities have changed. eLearning in most cases has been integrated in contexts widely termed as 'blended learning', whereas the production and dissemination of technically sophisticated eContent turned out to be neither the core of innovation nor is it fundable due to the high production and maintenance costs. Priorities within the eLearning discussion at universities have shifted to the question on how eLearning components can contribute to the further improvement of teaching and learning.

As is the case with most innovations (even successful ones), the diffusion is confined to innovators and early adopters. It needs specific efforts to transfer them to a wider practice in order to avoid them being forgotten or neglected.

Objectives
The main challenge with respect to the sustainability of the SVC results can be phrased as follows: How can the innovative products and experiences of SVC be safeguarded and diffused to other Swiss Institutions of Higher Education not yet benefiting from the SVC-programme?

In that setting, eLearning is to be regarded as instrumental for overarching objectives. According to the relevant policy papers on the future of Swiss Institutions of Higher Education (linked to the implementation of the Bologna process), one major objective linked to the SVC outcome is the further improvement of the teaching and learning culture by progressively introducing and implementing new learning methods. In that frame, eLearning (as an instrument) is to be embedded and integrated in innovative methods of teaching and learning. Definitely, shifting the claim for 'new teaching and learning cultures' from programmatic to practice doesn't happen just by chance but requires a major boost.
Measures and approaches

Given these objectives, the following approaches could be considered:

a) Consolidation of the Competence Centers for Service and Production (CCSP) by requiring them to come up with a strategic orientation and commitment and focussing their resources on the implementation of that strategy.

b) A programme for the transfer and diffusion of innovative approaches and outcomes of SVC.

c) A support network or platform, providing different kind of support and bringing in continuous reflection and knowledge exchange, benchmarking processes into the discussion and providing practical support for the universities.

As to the consolidation of CCSP, further support is needed at least for most of the centers set up with the start of the SVC-consolidation programme. In line with the considerations outlined above, a shift from eLearning to the quality improvement of teaching and learning has to be linked to that support. For example, the provision of support and further funding should be dependant on the existence of a CCSP-strategy and a realistic action plan with provable milestones devoted to the achievement of the goals set out in the strategy.

A new programme for the transfer and diffusion of innovative approaches is to be directed to the adaption of existing experiences and the development and organisation of transfer activities. It has to be discussed on whether the underlying approaches are to be confined to SVC outcomes or whether a broader access would be appropriate. This suggestion is based on the assumption that the transfer of innovation is not a process of copying but rather a process of integrating situated experiences into now contexts.

As for the support network or platform, one should distinguish between:

* Practical support and services, for example: national technical platform, pedagogical support, quality checks in terms of continuous quality improvement of teaching and learning, etc. Within that context, it has to be investigated which services are to be provided locally and which are to be organized regionally or nationally within a support network or plattform.

* Knowledge updating, sharing experiences and promoting good practices: It has to be considered on how the ongoing activities in innovating the teaching and learning of university education can be linked and catalysed by knowledge management activities. For example, experiences from other countries could be exploited, transferred into the Swiss context and used for a reflected and strategically founded way of fuelling the process. Apart from that, there would be an opportunity CCSP and other innovators at universities could to turn to in order to receive updated knowledge, good practices and opportunities for the exchange of experiences and knowledge etc.
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Technology-enhanced Learning on Swiss Campus:
Promoting Continuous Quality Improvement of Technology-enhanced Teaching and Learning at Swiss Institutions of Higher Education

1. Context

SVC has been successful in achieving the main goals during the two different phases, namely setting impulses for new approaches of technology enhanced teaching and learning and starting the consolidation of structures in order to reach sustainability of the innovations triggered off. There is an impressive potential of eLearning examples ready for broader transfer and diffusion coming out of the projects funded by the SVC.

At the SVC days in March 2006, Prof. Dr. Paul Bacsich (Consultant in Benchmarking, eLearning and Director of Matic Media Ltd., Great Britain) presented his results of a benchmarking study in which he compared the effectiveness of national funding programmes in 7 European Countries. According to Prof. Bacsich's study, the SVC programme can be seen as a success and as a benchmark for other national programmes.

In the course of the SVC programme, both the context of eLearning and the priorities within universities have changed. eLearning in most cases has been integrated in contexts widely termed as 'blended learning', whereas the production and dissemination of technically sophisticated eContent turned out to be neither at the core of innovation nor fundable in the long run due to the high production and maintenance costs. Priorities within the eLearning discussion at universities have shifted to the question of how eLearning components can contribute to further quality improvement of teaching and learning.

In consequence, blended learning may become a combination of two phase-out models: "traditional" classroom lectures with web-based training emulating classic programmed instruction. Blended learning should not be considered merely a compensation for the shortcomings of eLearning. Instead of mixing the mode “virtual” and “face-to-face”, the focus should rather be on the proactive element of blended learning: how to integrate eLearning in the classrooms or in team-based learning scenarios on campus in a useful didactic way? How to cultivate a new culture of learning and teaching based on personal responsibility and problem-solving

---

2 Swiss Institutions of Higher Education stands for Universities, Federal Institutes of Technology and Universities of Applied Sciences in Switzerland.
strategies within a cooperative environment? The distinction between “new” and “traditional” forms of learning is then becoming more and more obsolete. As a result of that discussion, at the SVC days in March 2006 the term "integrated learning" was proposed to make clear that a transition in the overall learning design has to be considered in order to exploit the potential of technology-enhanced learning and teaching.

If a follow-up programme to the SVC is not supported, the manifold consequences should not be neglected:

• As to the consolidation of the Competence Centers for Service and Production (CCSP), further support is needed at least for most of the centers set up with the start of the SVC-consolidation programme. Without further funding the organisational anchorage of some CCSPs remains in an uncertain status. Without the efficient and effective support by the CCSPs the maintenance of existing eLearning projects would be in danger as well.

• The 4th project series could not reach the same quality standards as the other two project series with respect to equal opportunities.

• The termination of the funding might be interpreted as a failure of the SVC programme in the international arena. The risk is to drastically damage the so far excellent international reputation.

A positive decision on a new funding programme will lead to a consequent distribution of the SVC results as well as to a further quality development of technology-enhanced teaching and learning. As it is the case with most innovations (even successful ones), the diffusion is confined to innovators and early adopters. It needs specific efforts to transfer them to a wider practice in order to avoid them being forgotten or neglected. Recent experiences demonstrate that all-embracing theories about university development and quality assurance are gaining importance. The challenge for most Swiss Institutions of Higher Education is it right now to bring together and bundle the different innovation processes originating in the Bologna Reform. The CCSPs could take over the role of integrating the innovation streams responsible for quality management issues. In terms of implementing the Bologna Reform, teaching and learning dramatically changes at Swiss Institutions of Higher Education.

At a curricular macro-level the main changes for the design of study programmes are:

• interdisciplinary, module-based studies, more research-based teaching and learning,
• output-oriented (instead of input-oriented) organisation of studies, calculating workloads for students and teachers.

At a micro-level the main changes for the design of courses are:

• student-centred (instead of teacher-centred) learning, strengthening the importance of self-regulated learning (in the context of preparing students for lifelong learning),
• technology-enhanced teaching and learning: using the potential of information and communication technologies for integrated learning (designing effective learning environments).

The changes described imply that students and teachers are faced with a new culture on campus: on the one hand, new objectives and competencies (e.g. competencies relating to self-organised learning, teachers as facilitators) are addressed; on the other hand, new teaching and
learning methods have to be considered. A new culture of teaching and learning requires substantial changes in organisations. These developments challenge Swiss Institutions of Higher Education with new demands.

2. Strategic Agenda: Overall Goals and expected results

The main challenge with respect to the sustainability of the SVC results can be phrased as follows: How can the innovative products and experiences of SVC be safeguarded and diffused to other Swiss Institutions of Higher Education not yet benefiting from the SVC-programme? How can the new programme further support the quality development of technology-enhanced teaching and learning? What are the other important actions (integrating eLearning or not) to promote in order to improve teaching quality and efficiency?

Nine years after the creation of the Swiss Virtual Campus, a learning infrastructure exists. However, much work remains to be done on the more significant challenge - finding ways to ensure that people, pedagogy and technology support student success. To address that challenge, it is recommended to adopt the mission of "Advancing Learning Through IT Innovation". The mission of the Swiss Campus Programme is then to create new learning environments that harness the power of information technology to improve the quality of teaching and learning, contain or reduce rising costs, and provide greater access to higher education. It is the goal to promulgate a vision of a Swiss Campus as a national initiative, by projecting its characteristics and capabilities, and by devising strategies to make it a reality. The vision of a Swiss Campus can be briefly outlined as follows:

*Increasingly, students are "native" to technology; their lives have been shaped by IT. Students who are still technology "immigrants" increasingly find IT a fundamental part of their environment. In such a changing environment, the distinction between "traditional" and "new" or "eLearning and without eLearning" is becoming more and more obsolete. The primary focus of the Swiss Campus has to be on the learner, positive learning outcomes and successful learning. The use of IT should be predicated on learner needs rather than IT capabilities in order to improve the quality of teaching and learning and the institutional performance. To express the role of IT for a Swiss Campus as a main strategic advantage in a growing competitive education market, the terms "technology-enhanced" or "technology-enabled" are appropriate. The new value proposition of the Swiss Campus addresses learning as the fundamental priority for higher education institutions and will appeal to a broader constituency.*

Successful learning requires an understanding of the learner as well as the integration of pedagogy and technology. Placing learning and the learner at the heart of Swiss Campus work on transforming teaching and learning will differentiate the Swiss Campus from other initiatives and programmes, strengthen its focus and provide valuable service to Swiss higher education institutions. Learners and learning provide us with a positive focus that draws attention from staff, faculty, administrators, and university management. A value proposition predicated on awareness, enablement and integration will drive additional interest in the Swiss Campus Programme.

In that setting, eLearning is to be regarded as instrumental for overarching objectives. IT is a necessary ingredient in any systemic attempt to improve performance, but not a sufficient ingredient for improving the quality of teaching and learning systematically. According to the relevant policy papers on the future of Swiss Institutions of Higher Education (linked to the implementation of the Bologna process), one major objective linked to the SVC outcome is
The further improvement of the teaching and learning culture by progressively introducing and implementing new learning methods. In that frame, eLearning (as an instrument) is to be embedded and integrated in innovative methods of teaching and learning. Definitely, shifting the claim for "new teaching and learning cultures" from programmatic to practice doesn't happen just by chance but requires a major boost.

Swiss institutions of higher education have generated a great potential for the modernization of teaching and learning by developing products and know-how in the area of new learning technologies. This potential should be unfolded to foster the sustainable modernization of Swiss higher education by continuing research, development, dissemination of teaching and learning scenarios supported by new learning technologies.

In summary, the following goals are addressed:

1. Safeguarding the SVC products, knowledge and experiences: the goal is to guarantee the maintenance and quality assurance of the 4th project series (focus on project-oriented sustainability),

2. Further Consolidation of the CCSP: further funding is needed for the strategic development and organizational anchorage of necessary support structures in order to reach a widespread use of technology-enhanced teaching and learning. The goal is to reach financial sustainability of the CCSPs in the next funding phase by developing strategy and business models (focus on system-oriented sustainability)

3. Swiss-wide quality development of technology-enhanced teaching and learning: the goal is that Swiss Institutions of Higher Education enhance and integrate evaluation schemes in order to continuously improve the quality of teaching and learning by using the potentials of technology-enhanced teaching and learning (focus on potential-oriented sustainability).

Core conditions for achieving sustainability in terms of quality development are an evident pedagogical added-value, economic resource efficiency, flexibility and efficiency with respect to organisational structures and processes, technology that is stable and problem-adequate as well as a target-oriented development in the field of learning culture and organisational culture.

4. Further diffusion and valorisation of the outcomes: finally, the goal is to promote the transfer of the results and knowledge into other contexts (e.g., other academic institutions, other disciplines, other markets such as corporate learning) by the support of concerted marketing activities.

3. Main Implementation Strategy

As for the overall implementation strategy, it emerges that the main direction is not just a continuation of the existing Swiss Virtual Campus Programme. The underlying strategy rather defines a new programme "Swiss Campus" as a clear new start that is nevertheless based on the existing experiences and thereby safeguards both the results obtained in the course of the SVC programme and its indirect effects of innovations in teaching and learning.

The implementation strategy and measures are based on results of profound analysis:

- evaluation data of the two phases of the SVC programme,
• needs analysis by the CCSP,
• benchmarking analysis by international experts,
• empirical studies from research.

The Paradigm shift of the Programme "Swiss Campus" can be characterized as follows:
• from Swiss Virtual Campus to Swiss Campus (showing the relevance of the "real campus"),
• from "separate" eLearning-products to integrated learning with focus on a "new learning culture",
• from the production of eLearning content to quality improvement of technology-enhanced teaching and learning,
• from input- to output-orientation, in terms of funding by reaching milestones, developing strategy and clear outcomes at the institutions,
• from project-funding to university/CCSP-funding: Institutions cooperating with CCSPs are responsible for strategy and organizational development,
• from Learning infrastructure to strategic improvement of teaching and learning
• from bottom-up-developments to top-down-anchorage: resource allocation according to the strategy,
• from individual innovators and early adopters to institutional transformation and decision makers,
• from a "one-serves-all" approach to "differentiated approaches": autonomy of institutions as highest principle but with clear incentives for cooperation strategies.

4. Implementation: Measures and Approaches

Given the objectives outlined above, the following four approaches will be considered:

Strategic and pedagogic support,
Technical support: National Platform,
Transfer programme for the valorisation and diffusion of advanced learning,
Participating in European project initiatives.

These measures and approaches will support institutions in their effort to understand learners and to ensure successful learning. In the following, the four approaches are explained in more detail.

add 1: Strategic and pedagogic support:

a) CCSP funding: as to the consolidation of the Competence Centres for Service and Production (CCSP), further support is needed at least for most of the centres that were set up with the start of the SVC-consolidation programme. In line with the considerations outlined above, a shift from eLearning to quality improvement of technology-enhanced teaching and learning has to be linked to that support. The provision of support and further funding should be dependant on the existence of a CCSP-strategy and a realistic action plan with provable milestones devoted to the achievement of the goals set out in the strategy,
b) Project funding via CCSPs: only devoted to the last projects series for maintenance reasons and to assure the quality of these projects, responsible for the strategic resource allocation are the CCSPs. The focus is clearly on quality improvement of teaching and learning.

c) Pedagogic support: Pedagogic consulting, evaluation of (technology-enhanced or not) courses, providing quality criteria, standards and evaluation methods (such as quality checks), probably defining quality criteria in cooperation with the national developments of OAQ (Organization for Accreditation and Quality Assurance). The institutions will get support how to integrate the components necessary to ensure successful learning.

d) Project "Livre Blanc, open": open budget for projects, such as for example: effectiveness research on technology-enhanced teaching as one of the main quality criteria.

**add 2: Technical Support:**

a) Hosting of two national learning management systems: one commercial, one open source platform,

b) Providing central technical services and further development of technical services (e.g. authentification AAI, etc.).

**add 3: Transfer programme for diffusion and valorisation**

a) Coordination and monitoring CCSP strategy development,

b) Content brokerage, experience exchange, e.g. supported by a Swiss Campus Portal as a unified access point,

c) Marketing, exploitation of market potentials, e.g. developing exemplary marketing and business models for courses and programmes.

**add 4: Participation in European project initiatives**

a) Support of European project cooperations in discipline-specific fields, such as medicine, history, engineering, etc.

b) Participation in the organisation of the MediaPrix in cooperation with Austria and Germany
The financial implications conclude the budget for Swiss Campus 2008-2011:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic and Pedagogic Support:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CCSP</td>
<td>2'000</td>
<td>2'000</td>
<td>1'500</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>6'500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mainentance projects 4th series</td>
<td>2'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pedagogic and evaluation support</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>4'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project &quot;Livre Blanc&quot;</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Support:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting national platforms, technical services</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>1'000</td>
<td>3'800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transfer Programme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valorisation and diffusion, Coordination CRUS</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation in European Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation projects</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1'000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6'650</td>
<td>5'550</td>
<td>3'950</td>
<td>3'350</td>
<td>19'500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Budget Swiss Campus 2008-2011
Annex III

Monitoring Projects: Proposal for additional questions

Sustainability Factors for Projects

General Question

What is/ are the main goal(s) of the project?
- quality improvement of teaching
- increase of student motivation
- flexibility of studies (time-, place independent)
- quality improvement of student support
- reaching out to new student groups
- reducing the time required for a degree
- cost savings
- realization of profits
- others:…..

2.1.2 Pedagogy

What is/ are the pedagogical added value(s) of the project?
- higher availability of the contents
- better visualization of the contents
- support of self-organized learning
- higher attractiveness (motivational aspects)
- easier updating of contents
- conversion of standard knowledge to digital formats
- unloading of presence phases (lectures)
- adapting to individual learning styles
- conversion of knowledge relevant for many subjetcs to digital formats
- easier communication between teachers and students
- easier communication among students
- Conversion of new knowledge/ current research results to dig. formats
• Conversion of specific, elsewhere not available knowledge to dig. formats.

What are the main learning forms:
• Scripts (digital, hypermedia)
• Exercises
• Problem-based learning
• Lecture
• Dialogue (teacher - students)
• Online Seminar
• Case Study
• Project work
• Practical work, lab
• Library
• Business game
• Tutoring thesis
• others: …

In terms of social forms of learning:
• Individual Work
• Group Work Partner Work
• Class Work

2.1.3. Technology

What are the main technologies
in terms of Multimedia Technologies:
• Documents (html, pdf)
• Exercise software
• Animations (not interactive)
• Simulations (interactive)
• Hypermedia
• Tutorial
• Archive
• Video
• Integration of tools
• Intelligent Tutoring System
• Virtual Reality
• Others: …

in terms of Communication Technologies:
• E-Mail
• Discussion forums
• Mailing list
• Text-Chat
• Groupware (e.g., BSCW)
• Application-Sharing
• Whiteboard
• Video-Transmission
• Video-Conference
• Audio-Conference
• Wikis
• Blogs
• Podcasts
• others: …

2.1.4 Quality Development

Does a systematic quality management system exist? Are the evaluation procedures derived from and reviewed regularly according to the overall quality management approach of teaching and learning?

How are the different stakeholders (students, teachers, university management) involved in the quality development approach?

What kind of evaluation method are used?
• usability tests,
• oral interviews, focus groups with students,
• written surveys,
• quasi-experimental design,
• no answer
What are main evaluation criteria?

- Student satisfaction with the technology-enabled course,
- acceptance of eLearning
- learning outcome of the course
- no answer/ others:…

2.1.5 Sustainability (2.1.3)

How is the technical sustainability supported?

- hardware is sustainably integrated
- software will be maintained
- software will be further developed
- software is documented
- open source
- freeware, licencefree
- open, use of platform independent standard
- no answer/ others:…

How is the financial sustainability supported?

- external funding
- further funding by the university/ institute/ department
- permanent post(s) arranged
- commercialization of products, royalties
- no answer/ others:…

How is the sustainability of the learning content supported?

- learning content is popular, widely-used
- learning content is relevant for several disciplines
- learning content has a high half-life period
- Further development by a subject/ discipline community
- Open Content
- no answer/ others:…
How is the curricular sustainability supported?
• Integration in the curriculum, in the course scheme
• external acknowledgement of the grading
• transferable certification (e.g., creditpoints)
• transfer of the results to other universities in the same discipline/subject
• transfer of the results to other universities in other disciplines/subjects
• diffusion by multiplicators
• cooperative study programme, in cooperation with other universities
• no answer/others: …

Monitoring CCSPs - Proposal for additional questions

Sustainability Factors for CCSPs

How is eLearning strategically aligned to the University Strategy?
• explicite formulation of an eLearning-strategy
• eLearning as a Part of the Gesamtstrategie: Modernization of teaching and learning
• integration into an overall quality management system
• alignment with the Bologna Reform
• strategy-related resource allocation (strategy-related project funding)
• no strategic alignment
• others: …

Who is responsible for the Strategy Implementation?
• University management: rectorat, strategic committee
• committee involving the departments at a strategic level (e.g., deans of the departments)
• Unit of the department, coordinators in the department
• CCSP leader
• no responsibility
• Others: …

How is the organisational sustainability supported?
• (temporary) project organisation
• permanent post(s) arranged
• permanent unit
How is the financial sustainability supported?
- further external funding
- further funding by the university/institute/department
- commercialization of products, royalties
- others:…..

How is the technical sustainability supported?
- hardware is sustainably integrated
- software will be maintained
- software will be further developed
- software is documented
- open source
- freeware, licencefree
- open, use of platform independent standard
- no answer/others:…..

Open Question:
What are main problems which the CCSPs are facing?

Final comment:
additional questions 2.1. to 2.4 (see Project file) could be here appropriate as well
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1. **Introduction: Purpose of this paper**

The aim of this paper is to provide an outline of the basic approach, the objectives and results of the prolongation of the SVC mandate as a joint effort between the SVC team (represented by Christian Hohnbaum) and the Swiss Centre for Innovations in Learning (SCIL), University of St. Gallen (represented by Dieter Euler and Sabine Seufert).

The current proposal has been developed on the basis of the recent changes of the SVC funding politics and the discussion/feedback provided by the president of the SVC steering committee. Due to the surprising and definite decision to discontinue SVC beyond 2007 by the CRUS, the direction of the SVC mandate should be changed immediately as fig. 1 visualizes:

![Figure 1: Immediate switch of the SVC Mandate](image)

**Figure 1: Immediate switch of the SVC Mandate**

The new orientation of the mandate needs to take effect immediately. Since the remaining time period of funding is extremely short until the end of 2007, adequate priorities have to be defined in order to reach the highest possible impact on transfer effectiveness and efficiency.

The Competence Centers represent the main catalyst for eLearning at Higher Education Institutions (HEI). The further development, implementation and integration of eLearning in teaching and learning at HEI would not be feasible without the support of the CCSPs. They have an important role in linking the strategy of the university management with the manifold eLearning-projects and to promote innovations in learning with an orientation to quality development of teaching and learning at HEI.

Therefore, the main support should be devoted to the knowledge transfer of the SVC results. Also, for those Competence Centers who are likely to survive, there is a strong need for support in order to fully develop the professional toolbox for the management of eLearning at HEI.

2. **Context: Sustainability Framework for eLearning as Innovations in Teaching and Learning at Higher Education Institutions (HEI)**

The mandate still addresses the basic question of innovation in learning and teaching in higher education, in particular of how to leverage existing know-how and performance in order to
improve the quality of teaching and learning. Based on the SCIL framework, the aspects in the different strategy and implementation fields (see proposal November 2005, p. 4) have been identified as contributing to the sustainability of eLearning as innovation in teaching and learning at HEI. These factors are still valid and have to be considered as relevant.

Considering the extreme time pressure until the end of 2007, further support is needed for most of the centres set up with the start of the SVC-consolidation programme. Without further funding, the organisational anchorage of some CCSPs remains in a very precarious state. Without the efficient and effective support by the CCSPs, the maintenance of existing eLearning projects as well as the entire management of eLearning at HEI would be in danger. This must be avoided as students are increasingly "native" to information technology. Even students who are still technology "immigrants" increasingly find IT a fundamental part of their environment. Consequently, students expect to learn in technology-enabled learning environments. Without a concerted support in the time remaining, the continued development of eLearning as an instrument for quality improvement in teaching and learning as well as the orientation on future student needs and positive learning outcomes would grind to a halt at most HEI. The transfer activities planned play an important role in securing long-term effects of the resources invested in the SVC programme so far.

3. Scope of the Mandate Prolongation

3.1. General Scope

The main question of “how to integrate eLearning into the global strategy of teaching with the overall goal of continuous quality improvement in Institutions of Higher Education” has to be addressed in the remaining period of the SVC consolidation programme.

As stated in the SVC joint proposal in November 2005 (p. 6), the further perspectives as part of a mandate prolongation are focused on:

* Transfer/ application of the strategy at the Institutions of Higher Education,
* Integration of eLearning into a university-wide teaching strategy.

These goals are still valid and could be focused in concerted activities in order to reach the highest possible:

* Transfer effectiveness: how to do the right things? What are the right priorities in the remaining time, what are appropriate criteria for defining the priorities (the SVC steering committee functions as main decision maker)?
* Transfer efficiency: how to do the things right? At an operational level, efficient methods have to be selected. In this context, the ratio of invested time and gained benefits for all the involved parties (e.g. SVC team, CCSPs, SVC steering committee) has to be optimized.

As a joint proposal we recommend to focus the activities of the SVC mandate on the following three key areas (see fig. 2):
These three key areas with their corresponding activities, methods and results are explained in more detail in the next section. The three key areas are interrelated and are build on each other. The sustainability/ transfer support is devoted to CCSPs as defined in section 1: as the main platform and catalyst for eLearning at HEI. As an additional effect, the mandate will provide benefit for any future (to this day unknown) strategy of the Conference of the Universities of Applied Sciences Switzerland (CUAS).

3.2. Key Areas for Transfer/ Sustainability Support

3.2.1. Transfer/ Sustainability support for the Competence Centres at Universities and Universities of Applied Sciences (UAS).

In view of the urgency of the matter, immediate support should be given to the CCSPs. In order to prioritize the remaining resources it would make sense to cluster the CCSPs in:

- "A" = the sustainability is definitely in severe danger (red),
- "B" = the sustainability is to some extent uncertain (yellow), the know-how and the services required are not completely developed,
- "C" = the sustainability is certain (green), even though there is a need for additional know how transfer.

The strategy of the transfer support could differentiate among these three clusters and highlight crucial issues and react on urgent needs as stated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster A</th>
<th>Cluster B</th>
<th>Cluster C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Strategy</td>
<td>&quot;Survival Kit&quot;</td>
<td>Stabilize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of Support</td>
<td>Analysing/ Defining minimum configuration</td>
<td>- Strategy Auditing, Defining Business needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing Business Plan (finance plan)</td>
<td>- Stakeholder Management, moderation with the university management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder Management, moderation with the university management</td>
<td>- Exploring transfer mechanisms of SVC results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Clustering CCSPs for strategic Alignment

The starting point for transfer/ sustainability support could be the analysis and definition of an appropriate portfolio of the CCSPs. The following matrix gives an example of an approach
how to analyse and define core competences/ activities of a CCSPs and where a cooperation strategy might be the better solution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Dimensions / Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Counselling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Competence Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Concept Development / Production / Implementation</td>
<td>X (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Project-Management</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Brokerage</td>
<td>X (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Quality-Assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Communication / Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be read: e.g. A1 = "Counselling on Strategy", B5 = "Brokerage of pedagogical content" (B5)

X indicates assumed main points to be focused

Some of these are illustrated in the following:

(1) Development of a strategy related to teaching and learning, eLearning etc.
(2) Managing the development of new courses
(3) Brokerage of content for new courses
(4) Production of multimedia-software
(5) Brokerage of IT-services
(6) Counselling on legal issues
(7) Brokerage of services
(8) Exchange of experiences
(9) Acquisition of resources and funding
(10) Allocation and controlling of funds

According to the analysis of the existing situation, the setting-up of sustainable support structures has to be planned based on criteria such as:

- minimal configuration/ set-up,
- minimal standards for the activities,
- potential stages of expansion, development paths,
- specifications of the Competence Centre, job specifications,
- finances, budgetary demands,
• agreement on goals, performance results and measurement with the university management, etc.

The consolidation of the transfer support leads to a collection of typical challenges and good practices for solutions along the main activities of a CCSP.

**Goal:**
Support for the CCSPs as defined above in order to secure their sustainability and to promote the necessary know how transfer.

**Timeline:**

**Method:**
Process-oriented consulting, interviews and direct coaching, transfer workshops with CC leaders/ project managers in coordination with other initiatives such as SVC-transfer.

**Result:**
Handbook "Typical Challenges and Good Practice Solutions for Leading and Managing a Competence Centre".

### 3.2.2. Transfer Support for SVC Knowledge and Experiences

The second key area to be addressed is interwoven with the first one: "How can the already developed SVC knowledge basis be integrated into the global strategy of teaching at academic institutions? How can the gained knowledge and experiences of the SVC programme be used effectively by institutions to leverage e-learning performance in the long run?"

The planned activities in this field are manifold and mainly devoted to document the gained knowledge and experiences in various forms and to advise/ support the SVC team in organising events, mainly the SVC days in 2007. The programme of the final SVC days should consequently be planned under the motto "Transfer Effectiveness and Efficiency of the SVC".

**Goal:**
Safeguarding products, knowledge and experiences of the SVC.

**Timeline:**

**Method:**
Process-oriented consulting, support of SVC team in organising documentations and SVC days, interviews with mandate project leaders, usability tests of good practices report.

**Result:**
Knowledge Repositories for the SVC results such as:

- publication, documentation of the projects, written by the project leaders (developing case guideline, framework for cases, etc.),
- Good practices report: what are successful "lighthouse-projects"? What is transferable to "low-budget learning scenarios"?
- Navigation map for the mandate results (overview and orientation guidelines),
- "SVC days" booklet, who is who, knowledge expert pathfinder,
- New structuring of the website www.swissvirtualcampus.ch.

3.2.3. Support for the final Evaluation of the SVC Results

This kind of support has already started during the first phase of the mandate by giving feedback on the existing evaluation method and criteria to the SVC team and by adapting the evaluation scheme with new quality criteria. Therefore, the suggestion would be to continue the evaluation support until the end of the SVC programme in 2007.

Goal:
Evaluation of the outcomes of the SVC.

Timeline:
ongoing, until end of 2007.

Method:
Process-oriented consulting, support of the SVC team.

Result:
Final Evaluation Report of the SVC outcomes, (partly) comparison/benchmarking with other funding programmes

4. Summary

Why? Due to the recent changes, there is an urgent need for the support of transfer activities devoted to the maintenance of the CCSPs and to the SVC outcomes. The overall goal of all the activities is the continued quality development of teaching and learning at HEI by using technologies which students know and expect to use in a modern learning environment.

What? Three key areas are identified: 1. sustainability support for the CCSPs, 2. transfer support for SVC knowledge, 3. support for the final evaluation of the SVC outcomes.

How? Process-oriented consulting as the main approach with clear deliverables/results in the three key areas, general support for the SVC team.

When? The strategic change of the mandate will be implemented immediately, the mandate will last until the end of 2007.

Who? The whole SCIL team (e.g. all members are involved in organising the SVC days), led by Prof. Dr. Dieter Euler and by Prof. Dr. Sabine Seufert.
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