

Chapter Five

The eFellowship Program: Developing Champions for Cascading ICT Integration Skills.

Jerome Terpase Dooga

1. Introduction

The University of Jos began to show interest in embracing the use of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) since the 1980s, when the University acquired its first three Macintosh Apple computers. These were housed in the Faculties of Medical, Natural and Social Sciences respectively and were used for administrative purposes, statistical analyses and research (*History of ICT at UniJos 2006:25*). By 1995, a University Computer Center was erected, and from then on, the University has made giant strides in developing its ICT infrastructure. Considerable consolidation followed with the ICT intervention of the Jos Carnegie Partnership, which focused on strengthening the university's ICT infrastructure and services. Over the years, additional support has been provided by a host of other investment partners and donor agencies.

The uptake of ICTs to support administrative functions at the University of Jos has been quite rapid especially in administration, where several services are rendered using technology. For example, student registration and fee payments are done online. By 2006, some academics had begun to engage with learners using technology. But the affordances offered by ICT did not appear to have been exploited as extensively in teaching and learning, which is one of the core functions of Higher Education Institutions (HEIs). Optimum use of ICT infrastructure has been hampered by lack of skilled human resources to cope with technology change and user demands as well as limited opportunities for staff training. The eLearning Fellowship was therefore established to help scale-up the skill base of academics to use technology for learning, teaching and research and to form a nucleus of a community of practice in eLearning. This chapter examines the program, its operation and potential as a viable model for providing functional staff training in eLearning.

2. Modalities of Training University Academics to Use Technology for Teaching

Various factors have been cited by individuals and institutions for adopting technology-enabled learning. Some institutions believe that making course content and materials publicly available at a global level is a way to enhance their reputation and lower the cost

for student access to educational materials (Omollo, 2011:6). Technology is also thought to redress HEI challenges especially faced in developing countries, such as escalating student enrolments in the face of diminishing physical space as well as dwindling or obsolete equipment and limited human resource (Dooga, 2010). The result of these as well as other factors is that technology-enabled learning is fast becoming pervasive in higher education around the world with available evidence indicating that the use of ICT in the educational process is spreading faster than any other form of curricula change and innovation in the world (Gilbert, 1997).

In response to this change, many universities have adopted various training models to equip university academics with skills in online facilitation and integration of ICT. At the University of Cape Town (UCT), a Teaching with Technology Grant was started at its Centre for Educational Technology (CET) in 2005, made possible by donor funding which ended in 2011 (Cox, 2010). But an advert on the UCT website shows that the Andrew Mellon Foundation renewed that grant from 2012-2015 (<http://www.cet.uct.ac.za/grants>). UCT staff are able to apply for grants of up to R25,000 (N433,000) which can be used to buy or adapt specialised software to support student learning; buy in specialised expertise to develop online teaching and learning resources, or pay for training for educators or tutors to develop or use educational technology more effectively. In addition, CET set up an online training program termed Facilitating Online, a self-paced teach-yourself online course for academics who are interested in acquiring skills to teach online. And, as published on the UCT website, CET offers regular face-to-face seminars, workshops and show-and-tell demonstrations on the use of technology for teaching and learning. Such efforts have had a huge impact on technology adoption and integration at the University of Cape Town as shown in the work of Cox (2010).

Similarly, at the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT), one model is the compulsory induction course for newly recruited lecturers called the Teaching Development Programme (TDP) (<https://www.cput.ac.za/tdp>). This incorporates the use of technology in most of its modules and thus starts the new recruits on the path of technology-enabled teaching and learning. The CPUT has other staff development programs which are also aimed at providing staff with needed technological and pedagogical skills. There is the optional program which focuses on the use of technology at the Teaching and Learning Centre of the University called Fundani. Here, each member of staff has to make effort to catch up on the classes according to their schedules and needs. There are staff development options through further study and research and CPUT is favourably disposed to pay for these. Informal communities of learning are also emerging, where mentoring and sharing of experiences take place (Morkel 2012).

3. In Search of a Massification and Sustainability Model

Once eLearning was introduced at the University of Jos in the mid 2000s, the question of ensuring the sustainability of eLearning at the institutional level became a pertinent topic. Internal players and development partners wanted to use the ICT infrastructure for more teaching and learning. Of course, the immediate concern was to build capacity for implementation and practice. There was a considerable institutional drive to mobilise faculty to develop content for use on Moodle, the preferred university LMS. This initiative was spearheaded and driven by ICT Applications, an intervention of the Jos Carnegie Partnership. Administrators of the eLearning program of this intervention understood one word: “training.” They were confident that if academic staff were “trained”, they would adopt the use of technology for teaching and learning. But in the early days of the eLearning initiative, the term “training” meant different things and the objectives of the training were often not clearly defined. Most times, it simply meant holding workshops and seminars of a few days, usually with different groups each time and with no clear strategy for continuity. In principle, those who attended the first phase of these workshops were expected to attend a second and perhaps third phase in order to move from basic to advanced knowledge and skill. But in practice, it was not possible to graduate the training in this way. As a result, many resources were expended for “training,” and on paper, many academic staff were trained in this workshop-type, one-off style. Yet, the expectations from the University as well as Carnegie Corporation, the strategic partners, were high. Upon completion of such two or three-day workshops, participants were expected to design and implement their courses online. They were also expected to become trainers in their departments, faculties and units thereby training others who could not attend the workshops. But after more than three years of such training with nearly 100 academic staff participating, only four courses (three from the Department of Mathematics and one from the Department of English) were designed and implemented on the LMS. These were ENG 102 in the Department of English in the Arts Faculty and MTH 103, MTH406 and MTH520 in the Department of Mathematics of the Faculty of Natural Sciences. The Department of Mathematics participated in the eLearning initiatives of the ICT Applications intervention but also had parallel programs. It pursued its programs using multiple grants from a number of donors to improve human and physical resources, as well as for course redesign and development. On the other hand, the course in English was unfunded, driven merely by enthusiasm and self-motivation. It thus became clear that the mode of training of the ICT Applications intervention was not working.

This also became apparent in the time it took to implement even the four courses on eLearning platform. For example, course redesign for the first three courses from the Department of Mathematics (funded first by the Jos-Carnegie Partnership, and later by Hewlett Packard (HP) and the World Bank) took nearly two years to prepare and pilot. These courses are annually updated through additional modifications stimulated by experiences, gained when in use. Indeed, designing a good online course takes time (Klemm, 2001). But evidence in the literature also shows that designing eLearning courses requires specialized skills, which have to be learned (*Connections* Editorial, June 2011).

The low uptake despite series of training workshops and the route of the Maths team to develop their courses made it apparent that skills in online course design and other aspects of eLearning were scarce. Course creation does not consist merely in digitizing notes and uploading them onto the learning management system. The question for those who dared to experiment with eLearning at this time was: 'Now that we have digitized lecture notes and uploaded on the LMS, what then?' In other words, how does one "teach" online? With little or no skill in engaging with learners, these early practitioners made an impact only in the courses they taught, which was negligible in the overall course offerings in even their immediate departments. The eLearning practice in the Departments of English and Mathematics helped bring to the fore core systemic and infrastructural challenges such as inadequate bandwidth and electricity supply, which for sceptics were factors that accentuated their resistance to eLearning. Resistance was seen within the circle of early adopters as a symptom of ignorance about what eLearning meant and a consequence of lack of skills needed to operate in the new teaching and learning environment. Even among University administrators, eLearning was seen as a convenient pastime for enthusiasts, not as something that had any significance to departments or the institution as a whole. This could be seen in the lack of clear institutional frameworks to define the role of departments and faculties in the implementation of eLearning. In order to address these challenges, the Jos Carnegie Partnership which had invested heavily in eLearning determined that a best practice presentation of practitioners who were successfully integrating eLearning in their teaching would be more persuasive than mere advocacy.

4. The eLearning Fellowship Program

4.1 Motivation: The University of Jos eFellowship program was started in 2008 as an initiative of the ICT Applications intervention of the Jos Carnegie Partnership. Adewumi et al (2011:262) aptly captures the core objectives of the eFellowship program, stating:

This eLearning Fellowship has been conceived as a teaching commons, 'a conceptual space in which communities of educators committed to pedagogical inquiry and innovation come together to exchange ideas about teaching and learning and use them to meet the challenges of preparing students for personal, professional, and civic life.'

The eLearning Fellowship was seen as a strategy which would successfully exploit and leverage the experience and capabilities of a trained core of academics in order to speed up the process of institutionalization of eLearning. Such an elite group would contribute to the practical realisation of the overall eLearning strategy at the institutional level and the rapid establishment of an eLearning competence community. Schmitt & Bögli (2005) observed that "the institutionalization of e-Learning is not, as it is sometimes suggested, following a rational, top-down approach, but is interactively and simultaneously developed from different levels." Accordingly, the eFellowship was to be just one of many initiatives involved in institutionalizing eLearning at the University of Jos. Others included the Departmental Initiative, which encouraged academic departments to propose departmental projects for funding, the design and development of a course unit which would be facilitated online, and an institution-wide template that was designed as a guide to help individual academics design their online courses. eFellows would form a Community of Practice for E-Learning (COPE-L), a group of Unijos practitioners who meet to discuss research, best practices, and innovations in technology-enhanced, blended, and online learning environments. Above all, they would act as role models in using technology for teaching and learning and provide the initial skill base in their departments and units to support late adopters of technology for teaching. This "cascade model of staff development" (Adewumi, et al, 2011:262) differed significantly from the previous approach of short-term seminars and workshops. The implementation of the eFellowship would provide eLearning managers with an opportunity to prepare a blueprint for future institution-wide implementation of eLearning programs. It was felt that such a model would facilitate both the institutionalization process and ensure sustainability.

4.2The eFellowship Curriculum:The eFellowship curriculum is informed by the recognition that several factors play a part in the successful implementation of eLearning. As a result, the curriculum covers a wide range of issues, including "learning theories and their application to online learning, alignment of technological tools with learning objectives and outcomes, online learning design and management, use of digital images in education, and face-to-face and online facilitation" (Adewumi, et al, 264). Of these, pedagogy is at the centre because the main objective of the academic enterprise in Higher Education, whether -on or off-line, is to ensure best practice in the knowledge building process. In addition, the eFellowship curriculum recognises that "as a pre-condition for any successful eLearning

integration, the university has to develop an ICT strategy that aligns learning with its core business processes and suits its specific context and conditions” (Schneckenberg 2006:204). The model for the eFellowship program has four areas around the training, namely, Pedagogy, Technology, the Fellowship Project and Community of practice.



Figure 19 Model for Innovations in Learning

The model assumes that variables from five different implementation areas have to be taken into account in order to drive a sustainable education innovation forward in higher education institutions. In addition, “ICT-based teaching competences for academic staff [are] seen as one focal element of eLearning innovation” (Schneckenberg 2006:205). The eFellowship curriculum recognises that one key objective of eLearning is to improve the quality of the teaching and learning experience through the adoption of technological affordances, thus the focus on pedagogy. This has been especially helpful because a majority of academics had no prior formal training in education. Technology is seen simply as a tool that affords its users the opportunity to do more or to do the same things differently in ways that may otherwise have been impossible or difficult within the context. Hence, the focus is not on technology for its own sake, rather, it is on technology as a means to an end—as a means to improved teaching, greater students access and more flexible learning. eFellows are therefore exposed to a variety of technological tools and

trained to consider their context, including available supporting infrastructure, their learners, and their needs and to appropriate technological affordances.

The eFellowship project is an important component of the program. Here, eFellows apply the skills and techniques they are learning to design and develop their courses. Each Fellow is assigned a mentor, someone who has experience in the use of technology for teaching. Effort is made to assign to fellows mentors who work in an area related to each Fellow if at all possible. The course design and development is concurrent with the fellowship period. Mentors provide direction and support in this process. Thus, a well designed, peer-reviewed and sometimes piloted online course emerges as a deliverable by the time the training period is over. The project also includes an optional research tract which trainees are encouraged to consider. As an incentive, those who develop a research paper are sponsored to present it at a conference or seminar.

The design and development of individual courses by each eFellow is progressively reviewed and critiqued by fellow trainees, mentors and facilitators. This constant collaborative exercise has created a culture of peer-support. Over time, this support has emerged into a growing community of practitioners and enthusiasts who regularly interact through an institutional mailserv. Commenting on his fellowship experience, one Fellow wrote: *“There was the development of inter-personal relationship among the fellows which has become a focus of offline and online consultations acting as checks for my performances. The fellows are from different professional backgrounds and this certainly adds colour to the training as the learning horizon is automatically widened.”*

Furthermore, the curriculum was based on the principles of constructivism. According to (Kafai and Resnick, 1996:1):

Constructivism suggests that learners are particularly likely to make new ideas when they are actively engaged in making some type of external artefact — be it a robot, a poem, a sand castle, or a computer program — which they can reflect upon and share with others. Thus, constructivism involves two intertwined types of construction: the construction of knowledge in the context of building personally meaningful artefacts (Introduction).

As suggested by Kafai and Resnick (1996), two valued tenets of constructivist practice are the process of collaborative learning and deep personal introspection into one’s own learning process (Brooks & Brooks, 1993, 1996). But as argued in the online essay “Constructivism in Practice: The Case for Meaning-Making in the Virtual World,”

dialogue, is not the only active means of knowledge construction at our disposal. Mental manipulation, visualization, and the process of developing, testing and discarding hypotheses (Shank, 1992, Shank et al, 1994) are also indicative actions of an individual actively engaged in the knowledge construction process (web).

Fellows meet face-to-face for two to three hours at least once or twice each week for the most part of the fellowship year to receive instruction. But they also meet at least once a month to share ideas as well as discoveries and mutual challenges. Activities during these meetings include project presentations, demonstrations and dialogue. Fellows each keep a journal on Moodle, which is a resource for self-reflection on their training, research and practice. In addition, Fellows are encouraged to regularly share their ideas, intuitions, research findings and other useful information with their fellow trainees through the Moodle training course page as well as by mail. A local eLearning consultant meets with the fellows each week and coordinates their weekly activities. Guest lecturers are invited from time to time to address specific pedagogical, technological or theoretical issues. And at least once during the fellowship year, an external consultant and/or one of the mentors visit to make presentations on some of the issues covered in the eFellowship curriculum.

4.3 Rollout of the Training: The first round of training, sponsored by Jos Carnegie Partnership, comprised seven academics from the faculties of Arts, Medical Sciences, Natural Sciences, Pharmaceutical Sciences and the Library who graduated in November 2009 (the next section provides information on the selection criteria as well as information on what the sponsorship was used for). Thereafter, the Jos-Partnership for Higher Education in Africa Educational Technology Initiative (PHEA ETI) collaborated with the Jos Carnegie Partnership group to select and train two subsequent sets of eFellows. Thus twelve candidates from across nearly all faculties were awarded a fellowship in the second and third rounds of training, from a pool of 54 and 68 applications for the second and third sets respectively. Four of these were sponsored by Jos Carnegie Partnership in each of the two sets, while the remaining eight were sponsored by the PHEA-ETI in each set. PHEA-ETI sponsored eight more from December 2012 before the end of the project. The Jos Carnegie Partnership could no longer sponsor any more in the last year of the project in 2012. The following table shows the distribution of eFellows in all four sets across the University according to faculty.

Table 9. Distribution of Trained eFellows According to Faculty

The 4 Sets of eFellows by Faculty 2008-2013					
	2008-2009	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	Total
Arts	1	1		2	4
Environmental Sciences		1			1
Law			2		2
Library	1	1			2
Medical Sciences	3	2	3	5	13
Natural Sciences	1	5	6		12
Pharmaceutical Sciences	1	1			2
Social Sciences			1	1	2
Grand Total					38

4.4 The Selection Process: The criteria for selecting participants for the eFellowship program were built around the primary frame of “INTEREST.” Such interest was to be determined by the following indicators:

- background and skills in ICT (at least using some Microsoft applications and using the Internet).
- interest in using ICT for learning, teaching, and research.
- willingness to share experiences with colleagues and cascade skills at faculty and department levels at the end of the training.
- willingness to sit for the International Microsoft Certification Examinations in Word, Excel, PowerPoint, and Internet (this was later made optional, and the Moodle Certification Certificate was prioritized).

Applicants were required to demonstrate their proficiency in ICT skills in part by completing the application online. This was the first phase. All those who submitted incomplete applications were disqualified at this stage. However, those who met the preliminary requirements, were required to submit a proposal stating their motivation for the program as well as their planned projects or the teaching challenges they faced in their disciplines which they felt the fellowship would equip them to handle. The proposal was to be submitted in PowerPoint with no more than ten slides uploaded on the eFellowship page in Moodle. At this stage, many withdrew, but the final selection was made from those who successfully completed this task.

4.5 Expectations: The aims and objectives of the eFellowship course are stated as follows:

By the end of this Fellowship, you will be able to:

- *Demonstrate ICT basic skills necessary for successful eLearning initiatives*
- *Analyze principles and best practices in online and blended teaching and learning*
- *Apply technological solutions to improve teaching and learning strategies*
- *Solve pedagogical challenges facing the University of Jos*
- *Present research on discipline specific pedagogical issues*

Furthermore, the following outcomes are envisaged: By the end of the fellowship each fellow will:

- build a model classroom on the University of Jos Learning Management System
- Lead workshops on teaching and learning techniques for staff in his or her faculty
- Complete a research project addressing discipline-specific, online pedagogical issues
- Deliver and evaluate an online course pilot.

From the aims/objectives as well as the outcomes, the success on the eFellowship program is measured by two main factors: the completion of a research project addressing discipline-specific online pedagogical issues, and the delivery of an online course pilot. The two sometimes may conflate, because the research project may consist of designing, building and implementing a course in the blended learning format. But the project could also be in the form of a research paper which is delivered at a conference/workshop or published in a peer-reviewed journal. The eFellows who have completed the training have delivered on both expectations of the program.

4.6 Incentives: Two key stimuli have been identified as crucial to the success of eLearning initiatives in Higher Educational Institutions. These are: the need to foster a supportive climate in all phases and facets of the eLearning program, and formal policies for a reward system, especially for promotion and tenure consideration (EDUCAUSE, 2003:71). At the University of Jos, neither of these indicators is in place. Research publications are still the major (perhaps the only) way to be rewarded and/or promoted. As a result, many faculty members, would-be adopters of technology for teaching focus their time and energy on research and publication. But even in the field of research, faculty members are not likely to be rewarded for researching into and publishing in such innovative areas as the role of ICT in higher education. Evaluators would argue that such research is “not relevant” to his/her field, except of course if such an academic is in the Faculty of Education or Natural Sciences (specifically Computer Science).

While tenure and promotions represent longer-term incentives to faculty eLearning adoption, and is the wish of practitioners at the University of Jos, the eFellowship program also needed to offer short-term “carrots” to tip the perceived benefit balance. All those who were sponsored as eFellows enjoyed the following incentives captured in Adewumi, et al (2011:263-264):

- a PC tablet installed with the current version of Microsoft Office,
- one-year antivirus subscription.
- a modem for mobile Internet connection and payment for connectivity for the period of the eFellowship.
- a monthly stipend to cover transport and other incidental expenses associated with the program.
- sponsorship for the most outstanding eFellow(s) to attend a national or international ICT conference.

It is noteworthy that the call for applications for the eFellowship program does not include an advertisement of the incentives, and thus many applicants are not aware of them at the time of application. Thus, it can be argued that the increased interest in the program may not be attributed to the incentives. Of course it can also be argued that subsequent applicants may have been aware of the incentives and hence the rising number of applications. The challenge in this model of incentives is sustainability, but it can be argued that since training necessarily involves some cost, institutions may consider including such short-term incentives as part of the cost.

4.7 Impact of the eFellowship Program: In the course of the implementation of the first two sets of the program, many outcomes were recorded. These ranged from the predicted or expected deliverables, namely: a fully developed course on Moodle and a possible research output as well as many positive, but unexpected or unintended outcomes. From a capacity building point of view, all 19 participants who already completed the program learned something new which they found useful, especially in the use of technological tools and crucially in theoretical aspects of pedagogy and theories of learning. This was expressed in their final reports. One wrote: “Experiences gathered are worthwhile, in particular is the use of ICT on pedagogy/ teaching methods.” Most faculty members had no prior training or exposure to pedagogical issues in the use of technological tools. The program also provided vital advocacy on the value and merits of eLearning. But such gains are not easy to gauge using statistical measures of evaluation. Yet they impact significantly on the long term practices of beneficiaries. The following measurable outcomes were recorded between January 2009 and August 2011. An institution-wide evaluation of the

eFellowship program is being carried out and may shed more light on its impact. In the meantime, the following information is available.

4.8 Course Development: As mentioned above, prior to the commencement of the eFellowship program in October 2008, there were only four courses available on Moodle, the University's LMS. Adewumi, et al (2011:264) note the increase in the number of courses on the LMS as a result of the eFellowship program:

By November 2009, a year from the launch of the eLearning Fellowship Program, there were seven additional courses available on Moodle, each developed by participants in the eLearning Fellowship Program. By August 2010, all of the eFellows had either developed additional courses for online delivery or encouraged and assisted members of their faculties or departments to develop their own courses, and the number of courses with an online component has grown exponentially.

A survey conducted in 2012 (by the author) revealed that out of the 8 Fellows who responded, 6 had influenced the creation of additional courses in their departments and faculties and 3 had provided support to colleagues within or outside their faculties to create courses for online interaction. In addition, 2 had provided training to colleagues in their faculty to use other technological tools such as creating PowerPoint slides that incorporate illustrative pictures. They also trained their colleagues to use the Course Development Template, a tool that was designed by the Jos Carnegie Partnership's ICT Applications intervention to guide academic staff in designing and implementing pedagogically sound courses, whether for use off or online. The result was that by the beginning of the third quarter of 2010, a total of 59 viable courses were reported on Moodle (Adiuku-Brown, 2010). A quick Moodle survey conducted in December 2011 showed that the number of courses on Moodle had increased to 69 with a combined student enrolment of 4,434.

4.9 Research: In addition to creating courses and implementing them online using the blended learning format, eFellows were also researching various aspects of teaching with technology, documenting their findings and sharing these in various ways. By the end of 2011, they had produced five journal articles, twelve conference/workshop paper presentations and hosted two roundtable discussions at international eLearning fora.

4.10 Unintended Outcomes: The activities of eFellows impacted on the eLearning drive of the University of Jos in other more salient ways. For example, eFellows who began to use ICT infrastructure for teaching provided insights into technological gaps that existed. They

identified infrastructure needs and human resource capacity that was needed by the University. By their practice, they became the pilot to test both user learner attitudes to new media and factors influencing the uptake of technology in the institution. This forced eLearning implementers and managers to see the need to evaluate the e-readiness of the institution, using various parameters. For example, the University discovered that it needed to assess the ICT needs of all faculties and departments and the ICT skill levels of academics in all faculties to determine the nature and level of training required to adopt eLearning. As more staff and students began to access resources on the University network, it became clear that the bandwidth needed to be expanded and that the data centre be provided with reliable power supply. Most of these changes have either already taken place, or are in the process of being implemented.

4.11 Looking Ahead: The eFellowship program has the potential to significantly impact on the teaching and learning practices of the University of Jos community. Self-motivated academics who are early adopters of technology for teaching have made noticeable strides within their departments and faculties. Even so, eLearning has not yet snapped into place at the University of Jos. Because it has not yet been adopted as the means for delivering all courses for a program in the University, nor the primary means by which any department teaches, it is fair to say that eLearning is yet to significantly change teaching at the University. And if the drive is not taken forward beyond the project level, it might become just a temporary hype which will soon be replaced by another experiment. Research into similar eLearning projects in many universities in Europe show that, like the eFellowship program, such projects which were started with great enthusiasm, were abandoned after the project funding came to an end. Instead, “the promises and high expectations toward digital universities were replaced by a “wait-and-see” attitude” (Schönwald, 2003).

The eFellowship program and indeed the eLearning drive at the University of Jos needs to be sustained beyond the period of external funding, and become an institution-wide change process. Already, the fourth set of eFellows is being trained by a cohort of past eFellows. This is an encouraging sign of the cascade model. But this is made possible by donor funding to pay some stipend to these for facilitation.

5. Conclusion

The eFellowship program has proven to be an effective model for training academics to adopt the use of technology for teaching, particularly compared to workshop-type training provided over a few days. Evidence for this is seen in the number and quality of courses designed by eFellows and the engagement with learners. The courses designed by eFellows were evaluated for quality by external evaluators provided by the South African Institute

for Distance Education (SAIDE). The program has also produced a growing community of eLearning practitioners who are mutually supportive and the built-in incentives have helped to address, in the short term, some of the thorny questions often asked by academics, namely: if I am not required to do so, why should I expend so much extra time and effort developing a course online? What is in it for me? The challenge in this model of incentives is sustainability, but it can be argued that since training necessarily involves some cost, institutions may consider including such short-term incentives as part of the cost.

6. References and Bibliography

- Adewumi, S.E., Dooga, J., Dakas, D.C.J., Yakmut, D.I., & Mafwil, T.J. (2011). "The eLearning Fellowship Program at the University of Jos, Nigeria." *Distance Education*, 32:2, 261-268.
- Adiukwu-Brown, O. (2010). Analysis of Moodle usage within the University of Jos as at August 2010 (Jos–PHEA and JCPC eLearning Consultant Report). Jos: University of Jos.
- Brake, C. (2000). *Politikfeld Multimedia*. Münster, Waxmann.
- Brown, S. (2002). *The University. Handbook on Information Technologies for Education and Training*. H. H. Adelsberger, Collis, B. Pawlowski, Jan M. Berlin; Heidelberg; New York, Barcelona; Hong Kong; London; Milan; Paris; Tokyo, Springer: 577-598.
- Collis, B., van der Wende, Marijk (2002). *Models of Technology and Change In Higher Education*, Center for Higher Education Policy Studies (CHEPS), Twente (online: <http://www.utwente.nl/cheps/documenten/ictrapport.pdf>).
- Connections Editorial (2011). "Cutting Corners Threatens Future of eLearning." Vol 16. No. 2. June 2011. Commonwealth of Learning.*
- Cox, G. (2010). "Sustaining innovations in educational technology: Views of innovators at the University of Cape Town." In C.H. Steel, M.J. Keppell, P. Gerbic & S. Housego (Eds.), *Curriculum, technology & transformation for an unknown future. Proceedings ascilite Sydney 2010* (pp.240-243). <http://ascilite.org.au/conferences/sydney10/procs/Cox-concise.pdf>
- Seufert, S., and Euler, D. (2003). *Nachhaltigkeit von eLearning-Innovationen*. SCILArbeitsbericht 1. St. Gallen.
- Brooks, J. G. & Brooks, M.G. 1996. *In Search of Understanding: The case for constructivist classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Dooga, J.T. (2010). A discourse analysis of a forum discussion in Moodle. In Proceedings of AICTTRA 2010, the Fifth International Conference on ICT Application (pp. 43–54). Jos: University of Jos. Retrieved from [http://dspace.unijos.edu.ng/bitstream/10485/1083/1/A Discourse Analysis of a Forum Discussion.pdf](http://dspace.unijos.edu.ng/bitstream/10485/1083/1/A%20Discourse%20Analysis%20of%20a%20Forum%20Discussion.pdf).

EDUCAUSE Centre for Applied Research (2003) "Challenges to E-Learning Support" Vol. 3, 2003.

Gilbert, S.W. (1997) 'Re-focus on learning and teaching: educational uses of information technology for everyone,' *The Technology Source*, 1997, <http://ts/mivu.org>, retrieved June 20, 2010.

Kafai, Y and Resnick, M (Eds.) (1996). *Constructionism in practice: Designing, thinking and learning in a digital world*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Klemm, R. W. (2001). "Creating Online Courses: A Step-by-Step Guide" *The Technology Source*, May/June 2001. Available online at <http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=1034> (Retrieved May 28, 2009).

Nafukho, F. M. (2007). "The Place of E-Learning in Africa's Institutions of Higher Learning" *Higher Education Policy*. International Association of Universities, (20) pp. 19-43.

Nafukho, F. M. and Park, O.D. (2004). 'Essential Tips for Planning and Development of Online Courses,' in D. Christopher and S. Jaderstrom (eds) *E-World: Virtual Learning, Collaborative Environments, and Future Technologies*. Reston, V.A: National Business Education Association, pp. 209-222.

Ludewig-Omolloy, K.. (2011). *Growing an Institutional Health OER Initiative: A Case Study of the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology*. The Regents of the University of Michigan, and Saide.

Morkel, J (2012). "Other Approaches to Professional Development" in Online Discussion Forum, e/merge Africa Online Seminar, <http://emergeafrica.net/live/emergeforums/topic/other-approaches-to-professional-development>

Schmitt, R. & Bögli, K. (2005). Institutionalizing e-learning when facing scarce resources. In G. Richards (Ed.), *Proceedings of World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education 2005* (p. 1093). Chesapeake, VA: AACE. Available online at <http://www.editlib.org/p/21331>. web. January 10, 2012.

Schneckenberg, D. (2006) "ECompetence in European Higher Education—ICT Policy Goals, Change Processes and Research Perspectives" in Mac Labhrainn, I., McDonald Legg, C., Schneckenberg, D., Wildt, J., Galway. *The Challenge of eCompetence in Academic Staff Development*. CELT, 2006. www.ecompetence.info.

Schönwald, I. (2003) "Sustainable implementation of E-Learning as a change process at universities." <http://www.scii.ch.2003-12-online-edu-shoenwald.pdf>.

Teasley, S. D. (2010). "Efficiency or Innovation: Can Learning Management Systems Be a Part of Future Learning Spaces?" www.stellarnet.eu/index.php/download_file/-/view/560 (Retrieved May 16, 2010).