



**MONITORING and  
EVALUATION of CEMCA's  
HIGHER EDUCATION  
INITIATIVES**

2015

REPORT





Commonwealth Educational Media  
Centre for Asia

**MONITORING and  
EVALUATION of CEMCA's  
HIGHER EDUCATION  
INITIATIVES**

**2015**

**REPORT**

*The Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia (CEMCA) is an international organisation established by the Commonwealth of Learning (COL), Vancouver, Canada to promote the meaningful, relevant and appropriate use of ICTs to serve the educational and training needs of Commonwealth member states of Asia. CEMCA receives diplomatic privileges and immunities in India under section 3 of the United Nations (Privileges and Immunities) Act, 1947.*

**Reported by:**



Educational Technology and Management Academy  
Gurgaon, Haryana.  
E-mail: [etma.india@gmail.com](mailto:etma.india@gmail.com)  
Website: [etma-india.in](http://etma-india.in)



Copyright © CEMCA, 2015. Monitoring and Evaluation of CEMCA's Higher Education Initiatives is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution Share-Alike 4.0 Licence (international): <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

*For the avoidance of doubt, by applying this licence the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) and the Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia (CEMCA) do not waive any privileges or immunities from claims that they may be entitled to assert, nor do COL/CEMCA submit themselves to the jurisdiction, courts, legal processes or laws of any jurisdiction.*

**For further information, contact:**

Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia  
7/8, Sarv Priya Vihar  
New Delhi - 110016  
<http://www.cemca.org.in>

**Printed and published on behalf of Director, CEMCA by**  
Mr. R. Thyagarajan, Head (Administration and Finance)  
CEMCA  
7/8 Sarv Priya Vihar  
New Delhi - 110016, India.

## Contents

1. Executive Summary .....	05
2. The Context .....	10
3. Activity Context .....	16
4. Monitoring & Evaluation Purposes .....	22
5. Monitoring & Evaluation Design & Implementation .....	23
6. Findings/Results .....	26
7. Conclusions .....	36
8. Recommendations .....	40
9. Annexes .....	42
10. Illustrative quotes from Interviews .....	46



# Executive Summary

# 1

## Backdrop

1. The Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia (CEMCA) was established by Commonwealth of Learning (COL) in 1994 to provide academic and professional support for improvement of open and distance learning in the eight commonwealth countries in South Asia. These are Bangladesh, Brunei, India, Malaysia, Maldives, Pakistan, Singapore, and Sri Lanka.
2. During the 2012-2015 cycles, CEMCA has undertaken three activities under higher education initiatives for quality improvement in open and distance education. These three activities are (a) **Capacity Building for use of OER based eLearning**, (b) **Strengthening ODL institutions in use of ICT**, and (c) **Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources**.
3. In order to enhance programme effectiveness, CEMCA decided to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (M&E), and field-test the Framework during the period 2012-15 on the three sets of programmes mentioned above.
4. Educational Technology and Management Academy (ETMA), Gurgaon was commissioned as a Consultant in 2013 to collaborate with CEMCA and develop the M&E Framework, field test and submit a report.

## Methodology

1. Initially, the document prepared by CEMCA on the M&E Framework was critically examined, adopted and adapted.
2. Research instruments like observation schedule, interview schedule and information blank were created by the consulting investigator.
3. The consulting investigator personally participated in five of the sixteen workshops held in Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.
4. During her participation, the consulting investigator carried out process study with detailed notes; she interacted with large number of participants seeking understanding, views, etc. of the participants and the resource persons. She also interviewed number of leaders in ODL, like Prof. G. Dhanarajan, Prof. Mohan Menon, and others.
5. In view of the nature of collaboration between ETMA and CEMCA, a continuous dialogue, discussion, exchange of views and reviews of the draft documents/ reports was done in the last 26 months.

## Activity Description

1. COL established CEMCA in 1994 to fulfill the needs of the Commonwealth countries of the Asian region for effective utilization of educational media resources for distance education. CEMCA works closely with eight Commonwealth countries (Bangladesh, Brunei, India, Malaysia, Maldives, Pakistan, Singapore and Sri Lanka) in the Asian region.
2. Education, particularly Higher Education, is one of the important sector areas where CEMCA has clearly defined and developed its programme interventions. These interventions have been planned and implemented in a three year cycle. In the past CEMCA has initiated number of activities under its higher education sector, but in the 2012-2015 cycle, CEMCA has undertaken the following activities:
  - o With the increasing focus on OER for open and distance education, CEMCA decided to undertake capacity building for use of OER based eLearning so that members of the faculty of ODL institutions can effectively use OER to enhance the quality of material with reduced course development cost.
  - o ICT is a powerful tool for Strengthening ODL institutions. CEMCA decided to create a development intervention on effective use of ICT in ODL institutions. CEMCA, within its three-year plan, 2012-15 decided to assist higher education institutions in use of emerging technologies and practices to support ODL policies, systems and quality material development for overall improvement of quality in open and distance education.
  - o OER is a strong source of rich digital Multimedia Learning Material. However, there is no set of criteria and guidelines to consider the quality of OER in a particular context. Therefore, it was decided to develop a set of quality guidelines for quality assessment of OER to assist the users.
3. Under **Capacity Building for use of OER based eLearning**, three programmes were conducted in Wawasan Open University (WOU), Malaysia from 29<sup>th</sup> January to 1<sup>st</sup> February, 2013, 10<sup>th</sup> to 14<sup>th</sup> June, 2013 and 14<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> October, 2014. The fourth programme was conducted at Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Open University (BRAOU), Hyderabad, India from 7<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> January, 2014. All the four programmes were conducted by Prof. Som Naidu. The first three programmes conducted in Malaysia were attended by 26, 18 and 21 participants respectively whereas the fourth programme conducted in India had 22 participants from different universities.

There was one programme conducted at Open University of Sri Lanka (OUSL), another at Inter University Center of University Grants Commission on Electronic Media New Delhi from 22<sup>nd</sup>- 24<sup>th</sup> December 2014 the last programme was conducted at Uttarakhand Open University, India on 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> February 2015.
4. Three programmes were conducted on **Strengthening ODL institutions in use of ICT** — one each at Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Open University (BRAOU), Hyderabad India from 24<sup>th</sup> to 26<sup>th</sup> February, 2013, Open University of Sri Lanka (OUSL), Sri Lanka



from 6<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> June, 2014 and Bangladesh Open University (BOU) in December 2014. The programmes were participated by 119 policymakers and vice chancellors (94 men and 25 women scholars) from various countries in the region. Programmes received academic support of experts from Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, Australia, USA and UK.

5. Under **Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources**, one workshop was conducted in Maulana Azad National Urdu University (MANUU), Hyderabad from 13<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> March 2013 with expert guidance of Prof. Paul Kawachi; the workshop was attended by 54 participants who included policymakers, vice chancellors, pro vice chancellors, professors, associate professors and assistant professors. Out of 54 participants, 11 were women and rest was men. Another programme was held at AIOU, Pakistan. Four other workshops were conducted by CEMCA exclusively for faculty members of higher education institutions of India.

## Outputs/Outcomes for the Activity

1. In the domain of **Capacity Building for use of OER based eLearning**, 26 participants attended the first workshop. Same participants attended the other two workshops also as the objective of these workshops was to design and develop five modules on OER based eLearning. During the workshops, presentations were made by the facilitators. The participants worked in five different groups; and developed five modules. Consequently, a three/four-month online programme on OER based eLearning for teachers of higher education institutions was developed. The pilot online course based on the said learning material was taken by 40 faculty members from ten different institutions in the year 2014.

The net outcome of these workshops was planning of five modules where the teachers developed the learning outcomes, structured the content of each module, developed learning scenario, created learning design and assessment activities. Currently, 14 faculty members from OUSL are actively undergoing the online programme and 65 faculty members are enrolled in MOOCs course at WOU.

2. In the second theme, namely **Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT**, 119 participants attended the three workshops at different times. There were four keynote addresses, nine panel discussions and six sessions of group activities in all.

The tangible outcome of the workshops was: development of strategic plan for ICT use in teaching and learning; implementation of technology plan; and integration of ICT in teaching-learning processes. Intangible benefits among others were: institutions embracing ICT in a systemic way and thereby benefiting the faculty members in number of universities.

3. In the area of **Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources**, the Outputs were: (a) 212 participants attended the workshops; (b) there were nine keynote

presentations by experts; (c) nine papers were presented by the participants; and (d) other papers were presented on criteria for quality assessment of open educational resources.

The net outcome in this area was (a) Construction of Guidelines on quality of OERs for teachers and/or students as original authors or adapters of OER; (b) Development of a Training module for authors and adapter; and (c) Development of a new concept of a new domain suffix as [dot] Oer (.oer). The important achievement of this activity was updation and publication of Quality Assurance Guidelines for Open Educational Resources: TIPS Framework (Teaching and learning process; Information and material content; Presentation, product and format; and System, technical and technology Framework) Version 2.0 which was based on the inputs received from several experts.

## Purpose of the Monitoring and Evaluation

Purpose of developing a Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) Framework, was to find out whether the activities proposed by CEMCA have actually produced the intended outcomes. Thus, the Monitoring and Evaluation report should inform CEMCA on whether goals and objectives laid down for the programmes are being achieved and also whether there is an outcome and impact of these programmes.

## Findings – expected & unexpected

1. Expected outcomes are indicated under the head 'output and outcome'. There are some unexpected developments. For example, some of the participants of the first workshop (**Capacity Building for use of OER based eLearning**) did not attend the second workshop. They were replaced by a group of new teachers and policy makers. Thus, there was a lack of continuity among a group of participants.
2. In Sri Lanka, Vice Chancellors from all the formal universities were not present for the capacity building programme. Hence, there was a difference between number of participants targeted and actual number of participants who attended the programme.
3. Two universities (Wawasan Open University and Open University of Sri Lanka) launched online programme on OER based eLearning.
4. Four Institutional Case Studies on OER based eLearning were published.
5. 'ICT Leadership in Higher Education- Selected Readings' was published for larger dissemination.
6. Wawasan Open University in Malaysia launched MOOCs on OER based eLearning.

## Conclusions

1. On the basis of the study conducted on the M&E Framework, it can be concluded that the intended outputs and outcomes were appropriate. Further, the designs of the programmes were contextual and appropriate. However, quality of the programmes could have been improved by involving multiple resource persons.
2. CEMCA designed comprehensive interventions in all the three activities which was a departure from convention.
3. Several agencies have collaborated and supported the three sets of activities; they are Bangladesh Open University (BOU), Bangladesh; Wawasan Open University, Malaysia; Open University of Sri Lanka; Maulana Azad National Urdu University (MANUU) and Dr B. R. Ambedkar Open University (BRAOU), Hyderabad; Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU), New Delhi, Uttarakhand Open University (UOU), India and British Council, New Delhi..
4. The output and the outcome of the programmes: efficiency with which the programmes were conducted and number of partners mobilized to support these programmes indicates highly effective programme management on the part of CEMCA.
5. Conclusive trend of all the three activities was the satisfaction of the participants in the various face to face programmes and eLearning courses.

# 2

## The Context

Commonwealth of Learning established Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia (CEMCA) in 1994 to equip the Open and Distance Learning (ODL) institutions in the Commonwealth countries of the Asian region for effective utilization of educational media resources in distance education. CEMCA's jurisdiction of work in the Asian region comprises eight countries, namely, Bangladesh, Brunei, India, Malaysia, Maldives, Pakistan, Singapore, and Sri Lanka.

CEMCA works at all levels of education. One of the areas of focus is higher education. CEMCA defined and developed three major programme interventions in higher education for the three year cycle - 2012-2015. These are:

- **Capacity Building in use of OER based eLearning;**
- **Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT and**
- **Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources.**

CEMCA initiated an innovative Result-Based Management Model (RBM) for improving programme effectiveness. It decided to develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework and review, and vet all its higher education programmes for the period 2012-15 through this framework. CEMCA had twin objectives – field trial of the M & E Framework and assessing effectiveness of programmes mentioned above in terms of output, outcome and also indicators of success.

Educational Technology and Management Academy (ETMA) was commissioned as consultant to collaborate with CEMCA in developing the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework, and then to field-trial the Framework on the programmes scheduled during the 2012-15 cycle. In the process, the output, outcome and impact of programmes/activities in each of these areas were assessed.

Several other agencies and institutions from the Asian region collaborated in programme organization and management of activities. Some of the ODL institutions also provided financial support to cover direct and indirect costs for the programmes.

Since all the activities of this M&E Framework and exercises are spread over three areas, a brief description of each programme intervention in these areas is in order.

### Programme Interventions

As mentioned earlier, there were three programme interventions scheduled for the period 2012-15. Here are brief descriptions of the programme interventions.

## Capacity Building in use of OER based eLearning

One of the objectives of CEMCA is to support capacity building of ODL professionals in various institutions. With the emergence of Open Education Resources (OER) and OER based courses to enrich the quality of course materials and reduce the course development cost, it became necessary to come up with a new domain of capacity building in use of OER based eLearning. CEMCA initiated programme interventions to help ODL faculty members in the Asian countries develop understanding of the concepts and issues concerning OER and skills for utilizing OER for enhancing quality of ODL courses. Faculty members were oriented to the five modules of the OER based eLearning course, so that they take the responsibility of moderator and facilitators for online course.

## Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT

ICT has opened a new vista for quality improvement in education including higher education. Nonetheless, integrating ICT in ODL programmes and activities within the institutions is a complex process. Among many other factors, strong leadership support and institutional commitment play significant role in such integration. CEMCA chose to introduce a new programme in its 2012-15 plans to assist ODL institutions to formulate policies, use emerging technologies and practices, develop quality materials, etc. Its strategic intervention was to engage with Vice Chancellors and educational leaders in Universities in Commonwealth Asian region, starting with Indian universities in the year 2013.

Two more events were organized in Open University of Sri Lanka and Bangladesh Open University respectively in 2014. All the three programmes were attended by not only the leaders from Open Universities but were represented by conventional universities.

## Quality Assurance of Open Educational Resources

Quality of OER is one of the major issues; this has been raised in several forums ever since its emergence. Users of OER do not have a set of criteria and guidelines to assess quality before using OER in their respective context. This is one of the significant challenges in use of OER by the ODL institutions. CEMCA's response to this challenge was to develop a set of quality guidelines for OER. The objective in this case was to assist OER users to assess quality through a lens devised by them using the criteria and the guidelines.

CEMCA in association with Creative Commons organized a workshop in New Delhi on OER and Open Licensing Policies in Indian context. It also supported three more workshops on OER during 2012-2013. These workshops were organized for the teachers of the universities both from conventional as well as open and distance education institutions. The workshops laid significant emphasis on the history and development of OER, its significance in the educational context, wiki editing skills and open licensing issues.

## Activities Conducted (2012-2015)

During the three years, sixteen activities were conducted – seven in Capacity Building for use of OER based eLearning, three activities for Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT and six on Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources (Table 1a )

**Table 1 (a): Summary of Activities**

Sl. No.	Activity	Venue	Date	Expert Faculty	Format	No. of Participants*	Participating Countries	Level
1.	<b>Capacity Building in use of OER based eLearning</b>	Wawasan Open University, Penang, Malaysia	29 <sup>th</sup> Jan to 1 <sup>st</sup> February 2013	Dr. Som Naidu, Australia	Presentation by Expert Working in Groups	<b>26</b> 9 (M) and 17 (F)	India, Malaysia, Pakistan and Sri Lanka	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors
		Wawasan Open University Penang, Malaysia	10 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> June 2013	Dr. Som Naidu, Australia	Presentation by Expert Working in Groups	<b>18</b> 10 (M) and 8 (F)	India, Malaysia, and Sri Lanka	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors
		Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open University Hyderabad	7 <sup>th</sup> -9 <sup>th</sup> January 2014	Dr. Som Naidu, Australia	Presentation by Expert Working in Groups	<b>21</b> 12 (M) and 9 (F)	India, Malaysia, and Sri Lanka	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors
		Wawasan Open University Penang, Malaysia	14 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	Dr. Som Naidu, Australia	Presentation by Expert Working in Groups	<b>22</b> 5 (M) and 17(F)	Malaysia	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors
		Open University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka	16 <sup>th</sup> -19 <sup>th</sup> December 2014	Dr. Som Naidu, Australia	Presentation by Expert Working in Groups	<b>40</b> 22 (M) and 18 (F)	Sri Lanka	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors
		Inter University Consortium, New Delhi, India	22 <sup>nd</sup> -24 <sup>th</sup> December 2014	Dr. Som Naidu, Australia	Presentation by Expert Working in Groups	<b>26</b> 16 (M) and 10 (F)	India	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors

		Uttarakand Open University, India	18 <sup>th</sup> -19 <sup>th</sup> February 2015	Dr. R. C. Sharma, India	Presentation by Expert Working in Groups	<b>30</b> 21 (M) and 9 (F)	India	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors
2.	<b>Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT</b>	Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open University Hyderabad, India	24 <sup>th</sup> -26 <sup>th</sup> February 2013		Presentations by Experts Group Work	<b>56</b> 43 (M) and 13 (F)	India, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, UK and USA.	Vice Chancellors and Policy Makers
		Open University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka.	6 <sup>th</sup> -7 <sup>th</sup> June 2014		Presentation by Experts Group Work	<b>33</b> 25 (M) and 8 (F)	Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, and UK.	Vice Chancellors and Policy Makers
		Bangladesh Open University, Bangladesh	11 <sup>th</sup> -12 <sup>th</sup> Dec. 2014		Presentation by Experts Group Work	<b>30</b> 26 (M) and 4 (F)	Bangladesh and India	Vice Chancellors and Policy Makers
3.	<b>Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources</b>	Maulana Azad National Urdu University, Hyderabad, India	13 <sup>th</sup> -15 <sup>th</sup> March, 2013	Prof. Paul Kawachi, Japan	Expert Presentations, Group Discussion & Presentation by Participants	<b>54</b> 43 (M) and 11 (F)	Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, and Pakistan	Policy Makers, Vice-Chancellors/ Pro. Vice-Chancellors,
		AIOU, Pakistan	1 <sup>st</sup> October 2013		Expert Presentations, Group Discussion	<b>40</b> 23 (M) and 17 (F)	Bangladesh, India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors
4.	<b>OER and Open Licensing Policies in Indian Context</b>	India International Center, New Delhi, India	22 <sup>nd</sup> February 2013		Expert Presentations and Group Discussion	<b>36</b> 21(M) and 15 (F)	India	Policy Makers, Vice-Chancellors
5.	<b>Workshop on Open</b>	Apeejay Sathya University	26 <sup>th</sup> -28 <sup>th</sup> April 2013	Dr. Savithri Singh, New Delhi	Expert Presentations	<b>28</b> 18 (M) and 10 (F)	India	Policy Makers,

	<b>Educational Resources</b>	Sohna, Haryana, India				<b>34</b> 18 (M) and 16 (F)		Vice Chancellors
6.	<b>Workshop on OER and Self Learning Material Development</b>	Delhi University Delhi, India	8 <sup>th</sup> - 10 <sup>th</sup> May 2013	Dr. R. C. Sharma and Dr. Pankaj Khare, New Delhi.	Expert Presentations	<b>20</b> 11 (M) and 9 (F)	India	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors
7.	<b>Workshop on Open Education Resources</b>	V.M. Open University, Kota, Rajasthan India	17 <sup>th</sup> -19 <sup>th</sup> May 2013		Expert Presentations		India	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors  Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors

*\*Total number of participants includes trainees, experts and others*

Besides the above activities, CEMCA co-hosted two workshops on Open Educational Resources for Development. These activities were part of the Research on Open Educational Resources for Development (ROER4D). This is a project for investigating into the attitudes, motivations, barriers and perception of quality of OER amongst teachers in Indian Higher Education Institutions.

**Table 1 (b): Summary of Activities**

Sl. No.	Activity	Venue	Date	Expert Faculty	Format	No. of Participants*	Level
1.	<b>Workshop on Open Educational Resources for Development</b>	Maulana Azad National Urdu University, Hyderabad, India	7 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	Dr. Sanjaya Mishra, India	Expert Presentations	<b>27</b>	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors
		K.K. Handiqui State Open University, Guwahati, India	15 <sup>th</sup> -18 <sup>th</sup> October 2014	Dr. Sanjaya Mishra, India	Expert Presentations	<b>29</b>	Professors, Associate and Assistant Professors

*\*Male/Female breakup not available*



The two tables above reveal a few notable trends:

- Five out of eight Commonwealth countries in the region participated in the programmes. However, Brunei, Singapore and Maldives did not participate in any of the programmes;
- The Programmes were held in five countries, namely Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Out of sixteen programmes, nine were conducted in India;
- In all the three activities, experts were drawn from Bangladesh, India, Sri Lanka, Malaysia, Australia, Japan and UK.
- Participants were policy makers, vice-chancellors, pro-vice chancellors, and academic staff like professors, associate professors and assistant professors.
- A total of sixteen programmes were conducted under the three activities;
- Maximum numbers of programmes (seven) were conducted under the Capacity Building for use of OER-based eLearning activity.
- In all, 514 persons participated in these programmes out of whom only 191 were females i.e. only about 37%;
- In addition, 56 faculty members belonging to two universities from India were trained in the development of OER. This was a part of the research activity related to OER.

# 3

## Activity Context

Description of Intended Outputs/Outcomes and related success indicators

Different terminologies like Output, Outcome and Success Indicators are used in this section and in this report. It is important to differentiate between these terminologies.

**Output** is the immediate effect of the activity. It is also the intervention made during the programme. Like the number of people participated in various activities, number of experts invited for the programmes, number of modules developed in case of Capacity Building for use of OER – based eLearning etc.

**Outcomes** are the effect of interventions and are linked with the programme objectives and goals.

**Success Indicators** are long term effects. These indicators show as to how the intended behaviour of participants has changed as a result of the outcome. These changes will essentially be in knowledge, behaviour and attitudes of the participants.

The Intended Output, Intended Outcome and the Success Indicators as described in the Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Annexure 1) are given in Table 2:

Table 2: Intended Output/Outcome and Success Indicators

Sl. No.	Activity	Intended Output	Intended Outcome	Success Indicators
1.	<b>Capacity Building for use of OER – based eLearning</b>	<p>Five Modules will be developed.</p> <p>Number of teachers trained in content development by using OER.</p> <p>Number of teachers exposed to learning through OER.</p> <p>Number of teachers with access to Online course.</p> <p>Universities adopt OER.</p> <p>An online programme</p>	<p>There will be an increased access of the teachers to online course.</p> <p>Increased performance due to use of OER.</p> <p>Increased capacities of universities to offer OER.</p> <p>Female Faculty use of OER and online course.</p>	<p>Increase in the number of citizens in the Commonwealth countries (Asia) who will acquire the knowledge and skills.</p>

		will be developed collectively by institutions of Commonwealth countries in Asia		
2.	<b>Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT</b>	Development of template for OER Policy. 60 Heads of various higher education institutions participate in ICT Leadership workshop. Heads of Institutions trained in Integration of ICT. Number of institutions adopting OER policy.	Increased use of technology to transmit learning. OER Quality Assurance Framework Developed.	Increase in number of Institutions acquiring knowledge and skills of integrating ICT for teaching, learning and management.
3.	<b>Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources</b>	Guidelines on Quality OER developed and revised. Countries and Open Universities will adopt quality guidelines for OER.		Increase in the number of Institutions for using Quality Assurance Criteria in developing content using OER.

## Actions Implemented to achieve Outputs/Outcomes

Elaborating and implementing the action is an important step to achieve the intended outputs/outcomes set for the programme. This section will give a picture as to what precise actions have been implemented to achieve the defined output/outcomes. The actions implemented against each activity are given in Table 3 below.

**Table 3: Actions to Achieve Outputs/Outcomes**

Sl. No.	Activity	Actions Implemented
1.	<b>Capacity Building for use of OER – based eLearning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEMCA invited the ODL professionals from 8 Commonwealth Asian Countries.</li> <li>• Five groups were formed to develop the modules on OER based eLearning.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curriculum of the five modules was decided</li> <li>• Faculty members were trained in various concepts of instructional design, how to develop scenario based content etc.</li> <li>• Facilitators made presentations and assisted the group work.</li> <li>• An Online programme for Professional Development of teachers was developed.</li> <li>• Faculty members of WOU and OUSL were oriented to the five modules of the OER –based eLearning.</li> <li>• Faculty members were trained to become efficient moderators and facilitators for online courses.</li> <li>• Two reports on OER-based eLearning Module were prepared by the consultants.</li> </ul>
2.	<b>Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Experts from countries other than the Commonwealth Asian region were invited to make presentations on various aspects related to use of ICT in higher education.</li> <li>• Participants were grouped to discuss various themes and develop tentative guidelines on various issues like OER policy template etc.</li> <li>• Reviewed institutional OER policy developed by CEMCA.</li> <li>• Discussed institutional OER policy developed by universities during the programme.</li> </ul>
3.	<b>Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expert on OER was invited to develop the quality guidelines.</li> <li>• Guidelines were discussed during the workshop and also discussed with large number of people over the internet.</li> </ul>

## Partners Involved

CEMCA conducts all its activities with the support of its partners. It engages wide range of partners to ensure the achievement of the results. Partners include not only the government organizations but also non-governmental agencies. For execution of the higher education activities of CEMCA during July 2012 - March 2015, CEMCAs

partners offered expertise, knowledge and experience. They supported in organizing the workshops/training programmes. CEMCA maintained continuous communication with its partners. These partners were closely involved even in the design of the programmes.

There were two primary players involved in the activities:

#### **CEMCA which**

- Coordinated all activities;
- Facilitated;
- Shared its resources;
- Funded the initiatives.

#### **Partner Institutions' which**

- Provided the infrastructural facilities;
- Liaisoned with other institutions in their respective countries;
- Supported implementation;
- Shared human resources in implementation.

The list of the organizations which supported the three major activities of CEMCA during the last twenty six months is given in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: List of Partners**

Sl. No.	Activity	Partners Involved	Date/s and Venue of the Programmes
1.	<b>Capacity Building for use of OER – based eLearning</b>	• Wawasan Open University Penang, Malaysia.	29 <sup>th</sup> January- 1 <sup>st</sup> February 2013, 10 <sup>th</sup> -14 <sup>th</sup> June 2013, 14 <sup>th</sup> -16 <sup>th</sup> October 2014 Wawasan Open University Penang, Malaysia.
		• Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Open University, Hyderabad, India	7 <sup>th</sup> - 9 <sup>th</sup> January 2014, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Open University, Hyderabad, India.
		• Open University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka.	16 <sup>th</sup> -19 <sup>th</sup> December 2014, Open University of Sri Lanka.
		• Inter University Center, New Delhi, India.	22 <sup>nd</sup> -24 <sup>th</sup> December 2014, IUC, New Delhi, India.
		• Uttarakhand Open University, India.	18 <sup>th</sup> - 19 <sup>th</sup> February 2015, Uttarakhand Open University, Haldawani, India.

2.	<b>Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Open University, Hyderabad, India.</li> <li>• Indira Gandhi National Open University, India.</li> <li>• British Council, New Delhi.</li> </ul>	24 <sup>th</sup> - 26 <sup>th</sup> February 2013, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Open University, Hyderabad, India.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open University of Sri Lanka, Sri Lanka.</li> </ul>	6 <sup>th</sup> -7 <sup>th</sup> June 2014, Kandy, Sri Lanka.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bangladesh Open University, Bangladesh</li> </ul>	11 <sup>th</sup> -12 <sup>th</sup> December 2014, Dhaka, Bangladesh Open University, Bangladesh.
3.	<b>Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maulana Azad National Urdu University Hyderabad, India.</li> </ul>	13 <sup>th</sup> - 15 <sup>th</sup> March 2013, Maulana Azad National Urdu University, Hyderabad, India.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allama Iqbal Open University, Pakistan.</li> </ul>	1 <sup>st</sup> Oct. 2013, Allama Iqbal Open University, Pakistan.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CEMCA.</li> </ul>	22 <sup>nd</sup> Feb 2013, India International Center, New Delhi, India.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apeejay Sathya University Sohna, Haryana, India.</li> </ul>	26 <sup>th</sup> - 28 <sup>th</sup> April, 2013, Apeejay Sathya University, Sohna, Haryana, India.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Delhi University, Delhi, India.</li> </ul>	8 <sup>th</sup> - 10 <sup>th</sup> May 2013, Delhi University, Delhi, India.
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vardhman Mahaveer Open University, Kota, Rajasthan, India.</li> </ul>	17 <sup>th</sup> - 19 <sup>th</sup> May 2013, Vardhman Mahaveer Open University, Kota, Rajasthan, India.

Above table shows that CEMCA partnered with institutions from Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Wawasan Open University in Malaysia, Open University of Sri Lanka and Dr. B. R. Ambedkar Open University, India provided the venue for capacity building programmes for use of OER, whereas IGNOU supported the travel of State Open Universities Vice Chancellors from India for the activity in use of ICT in higher education. For the same programme, British Council provided support to the experts from UK for key note presentations on OER Policy. Open University of Sri Lanka organised the second workshop in use of ICT in Kandy Sri Lanka and Bangladesh Open University organized the third programme in BOU at Dhaka. They also invited vice chancellors of formal universities of their countries.

## Limitations of the Evaluation

Evaluation of such activities is not easy more so when their spread is cross-national and multi-cultural. Each activity comprises several components that are mutually dependent. There are a number of processes and products in such programme evaluation. Hence there were certain limitations. Let us recount a few of them.

- Firstly, it was not easy, rather possible, to evaluate the various aspects of each of the programmes with absolute objectivity.
- Secondly, programmes under the activity- capacity building for use of OER based eLearning had single faculty resource person. Though it has the advantage of cost saving and continuity, it suffers from single person point of view and regimentation on a subject as creative and divergent as OER. Further, non-involvement of experts from the beneficiary countries risk weak affiliation which is necessary condition for adoption of any innovation in local environment.
- Thirdly, all the programmes under the three activities were spread in Bangladesh, various parts of India, Malaysia and Sri Lanka. It was not possible for the evaluator to be present in every programme for onsite observation and interviewing the experts. Evaluation was dependent on the programme reports/data prepared by respective institutions/coordinators. Validity of the data could not be established from the reports except the number of participants.
- Fourthly, the activities were not spread to other institutions. Like under the activity-capacity building for use of OER based eLearning, only three institutions partnered in the launch of online course.
- Lastly, Interviews gave a fuzzy idea about the outcome. Actual impact of the outcome is still not known. The skills learnt during the programmes will be known later when institutions will adopt and implement ICT fully. This is possible if only ethnographic studies on selected institutions are carried out.

## Acknowledgements

The development of this Monitoring and Evaluation report is a collaborative effort of ETMA and CEMCA. CEMCA Director and other staff members provided all the reports and support whenever needed.

We would like to thank all the stakeholders at all levels. Our thanks to the experts and all the participants of various programmes. Our sincere gratitude to the partner institutions for supporting the various activities.

# 4

## Monitoring & Evaluation Purposes

Commonwealth Educational Media Center for Asia (CEMCA) is an inter-governmental organization setting pace in Asia for quality of distance education through implementation of a series of path-breaking innovations. CEMCA, established in 1994, has a mission to assist governments and institutions to expand the scale, efficiency and quality of learning by using multiple media in open, distance and technology-enhanced learning.

CEMCAs work space covers all the Commonwealth countries in Asia. Among such countries, there are developed, developing and underdeveloped countries. Operating in such a complex contour is very challenging. Also, quality of ODE institutions, and their programmes, vary widely even within the same country. Improving quality of open and distance education at such different baselines is a challenge to the leadership. CEMCA has been responding to this complex challenge rather magnificently.

The strategic option for quality improvement in ODE is human resource development, innovative programmes and dissemination of information. It is necessary for planning a Monitoring & Evaluation Framework for number of reasons for CEMCA to be effective in its role as a leader in ODE in Asia.

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is a document that focuses on the key components of a Monitoring & Evaluation System. These components trace a logical sequence from need of a plan to the objectives, indicators, stakeholders and data analysis. Plan was referred throughout the period for which it was developed. The M&E helps individual or any organization keep track of the progress of the activities and the outcome. It provides a regular flow of information on the performance of the organization and its activities. It ensures that data are collected on time, and individuals/organizations are accountable to the successful conduct of the activities.



# Monitoring & Evaluation Design & Implementation

# 5

## M&E format/design for the Activity report

The Monitoring and Evaluation Plan developed by ETMA, focused on the key components like need of a plan, objectives, indicators, stakeholders and data analysis.

The format of the M&E plan is not discussed here as the details of the format are given in the Plan.

## Data Collection Strategies

There were number of strategies used to monitor and evaluate the three main activities under the higher education sector. A mix of monitoring and evaluation strategies and tools for each activity is given in the table below:

**Table 5: Data Collection Strategies**

Sl. No.	Activity	Data Collection Strategies	Data Collection Tools
1.	<b>Capacity Building for use of OER – based eLearning</b>	Observation of various aspects during the programme. Review of five modules developed on different themes for course on OER. Review of reports prepared by consultants.	Workshop Reports. Check List. Structured Questionnaire and Interview Schedule. Consultant’s report.
2.	<b>Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT</b>	Observation during the programmes. Interviewing the heads of universities.	Structured observation schedule and interviews. Document reviews.
3.	<b>Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources</b>	Document review of the quality assurance guidelines on OER developed during the workshop.	Document review.

Data were collected by the consultant (ETMA) personally by visiting and observing few programmes in Malaysia, Sri Lanka and India. Besides observing and making detailed notes, she interacted with the participants; being herself an ODL professional, occasionally made professional inputs to the programme. She interviewed ODL leaders and vice-chancellors of certain universities like Wawasan Open University, Bangladesh Open University, vice chancellors of state open universities from India and the participants.

Visit to the programmes helped the evaluator to validate the output and the process indicators. It helped her to assess the progress during the programme and understand the problems. The workshop reports provided an update on the major achievements and the constraints.

Feedback related to the management, implementation and outcome of the activities was gathered from Heads of institutions, experts and participants of various programmes. Onsite interviews were conducted. The interviews were recorded with the permission and later transcribed.

Some illustrative quotes from the interviews are given in Annexes.

## Issues Arising during Implementation

There are several issues with regard to the implementation of the programmes. We flag a few issues that deserve attention:

- **The issue of ICT Policy in ODL:** Innovations and change can only be sporadic by some enthusiastic teachers in the ODL system. Such innovators or early adopters come under peer pressure to fall back to convention. They also lack facilities and institutional support. According to research and experience, sustainability of innovations especially with respect to ICT Integration in ODL systems depend upon a strong and well articulated policy on ICT in ODL. As the ICT penetrates every home, every learner's life, CEMCA may have to provide leadership in generating an ecosystem for ICT in ODL system.
- **The involvement of the Vice-Chancellors (VCs):** Vice-Chancellors occupy the top leadership position in the universities. Research on Management of Change clearly identifies institutional leadership as the single most determining factor for change and quality improvement in education. Implementation of ICT Policy in ODL or carrying forward the lead given by CEMCA will depend upon the leadership skills and qualities of the vice-chancellors. In many countries in the region, appointments to the post of VC are political and administrative where academic leadership is largely a non-issue. Further, such appointments are term appointments. While majority of the top leadership remains busy in housekeeping, few institution builders struggle hard against time and tide of bureaucracy.

- **Issue is sustainability of learning:** Training loss in case of one-shot training is estimated at about 80% within few months. However, training loss can be substantially minimized by periodic follow up. In majority of the cases, different professionals participate in the first and the follow up training benefitting neither. This is largely due to 'principle of equity' (everybody must get a chance) practiced by the universities. In these programmes too, several participants of the first training did not participate in the follow up programme.
- **Issue about the trainers and resource persons:** Single faculty training deprives participants' exposure to alternative viewpoints and strategies. Instructional Design, developing multimedia material are creative endeavors'; hence dependent upon divergent thinking. Single faculty exposure runs the risk of regimentation or 'one shirt for all' syndrome. Secondly, all resource persons coming from outside the region also needs reconsideration. Ideally, such workshops should be conducted by a team of experts from within the region and outside.

It was not possible to visit all the places where activities were implemented. It would have been too costly to personally check the implementation of the outcomes.

# 6

## Findings/Results

### Achievement of Intended Outputs/Outcomes

Monitoring & Evaluation Plan projected certain intended outputs and outcomes in three activity areas, namely, **Capacity Building in use of OER based eLearning**, **Strengthening ODL Institutions' in Use of ICT**, and **Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources** for the period 2012-15. There were multiple targets and criteria laid down in the Result Based Management Framework. The field study was conducted simultaneously with CEMCA activities to assess the degree of achievement against different criteria.

Scheduled activities were started in the beginning of January 2013. The results described here are of the last 26 months. The various intended outputs/outcomes and achievements are presented in table 6 below. Against each intended output/outcome, table also contains remarks with respect to degree of achievement of intended targets.

**Table 6: Achievements of Intended Output/Outcomes**

Sl. No.	Domain/Area	Intended Output/Outcome	Achievement	Comments
		<b>Output</b>		
1.	<b>Capacity Building for use of OER - based eLearning</b>	Five Modules will be developed.	Five groups worked on five modules and developed five modules. These are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concept and Practices of OER;</li> <li>2. Designing Learning experiences for OER-based eLearning;</li> <li>3. Search and Evaluation of OER Materials;</li> <li>4. Licensing and Copyright and</li> <li>5. Integrating OER in eLearning.</li> </ol>	Fully Achieved

	Number of teachers trained in content development by using OER.	Seven workshops were conducted for use of OER- based eLearning.	
	Number of teachers exposed to learning through OER	More than 130 teachers from different universities from Commonwealth countries (Asia) were trained and exposed to learning through OER. Case Studies (four) on OER-based e Learning were published.	Fully Achieved
	An online programme will be developed collectively by institutions of Commonwealth countries in Asia.	Three/Four month Online Professional Development Programme for teachers on OER- based eLearning has been developed.	Achieved
	Number of teachers with access to Online Course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22 teachers oriented in online professional development course on OER-based eLearning at WOU.</li> <li>• 35 teachers oriented in online professional development course on OER-based eLearning in OUSL.</li> </ul>	As the number was not defined, 57 teachers oriented in online course.
	Universities adopt OER.	More than ten universities benefitted from this activity.	10 universities participated; too early to conclude on benefits.
	<b>Outcome</b>		
	There will be an increased access of the teachers to online course.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online course consisted of five modules.</li> </ul>	There was no quantified target; hence, in all 130

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Online Programme was taken by 40 faculty members from ten different institutions as pilot experiment in 2014. Only 4 completed all the five modules.</li> <li>• Out of 35 faculty members oriented in online programme, 14 are active learners in OUSL.</li> <li>• 65 faculty members have been enrolled in the MOOCs programme in Malaysia.</li> </ul>	participants is good achievement in a short period of time.
		Increased Performance due to use of OER.		Too early to say as there is no evidence at present.
		Increased capacities of Universities to offer OER.	Participants were able to develop scenario based content in the modules.	Achieved
		Female Faculty use of OER and online course.	More than 50 female faculties were trained in use of OER-based eLearning.	There is gender disparity in ODL institutions. Data not adequate to conclude on achievement of the output/outcome

Sl. No.	Domain/Area	Intended Output/Outcome	Achievement	Comments
		<b>Output</b>		
2.	<b>Strengthening ODL Institutions' in Use of ICT</b>	Development of template for OER Policy	OER policy template was developed	Achieved

		<p>60 Heads of various higher education institutions participate in ICT leadership workshop.</p> <p>Heads of Institutions trained in integration of ICT</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three workshops were conducted on Use of ICT in ODL.</li> <li>• Three workshops had four keynote addresses; nine panel discussions; and six group activity sessions.</li> <li>• 119 People participated in the three workshops.</li> <li>• More than 60 Universities (open and distance education and conventional) benefited from this workshop.</li> </ul>	Fully Achieved
			<p>“ICT Leadership in Higher Education: Selected Readings” were published in form of a book.</p>	Unexpected Achievement
		<p>Number of institution adopting OER policy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three Universities developed OER policies.</li> <li>• Open University of Sri Lanka developed national ODL policy.</li> <li>• India developed open license policy for NMEICT materials.</li> </ul>	Achieved. Indian Open License Policy indirectly linked to CEMCA initiative.
		<b>Outcome</b>		
		<p>Increased use of technology to transmit learning.</p>	<p>Outcome cannot be assessed immediately after the activity.</p>	

Sl. No.	Domain/Area	Intended Output/Outcome	Achievement	Comments
		<b>Output</b>		
3.	<b>Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources</b>	Guidelines on Quality OER developed and revised.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 94 people attended the workshop from Bangladesh, India, Malaysia, Pakistan and Sri Lanka.</li> <li>• Nine Keynote presentations and nine paper presentations were made by the participants on Quality Criteria.</li> <li>• Large number of people was involved in the discussion for development of Quality Criteria through Internet.</li> <li>• Based on the participants' input on the quality guidelines developed, the quality assurance criteria were being revised continuously.</li> </ul>	Achieved
		Countries and Open Universities will adopt quality guidelines for OER		No data to confirm as of now. Also it is posted in future ('will adopt')
		<b>Outcome</b>		
		OER Quality Assurance Framework Developed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The framework consists of 19 categories and 65 criteria.</li> <li>• Version 1.0 was published and feedback was received from experts in OER.</li> </ul>	CEMCA website.



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality Assurance Guidelines for Open Educational Resources: TIPS Framework Version 2.0 was published.</li> <li>• Impact studies are being conducted to validate the content which will help to improve the guidelines further.</li> <li>• Development of a new concept of a new domain suffix as (dot).oer.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--	--	--

The M&E plan developed by ETMA was based on the Logic Model designed by CEMCA. Intended output and outcomes were listed against each activity. The plan also provides certain indicators of success. All the indicators of success are rightly posted in the future beyond the three year plan period of 2012-15. It is important to note that most of the intended outputs and outcomes cannot happen in the initial stages of plan implementation during the 2012-15 periods. Such innovative approaches need time to sink in the individuals and institutions before bearing fruits or tangible results. Individuals and institutions have to make constant efforts over a period of time to bring about the desired output and outcomes.

Let us flag a few major revelations from the table above.

#### A. Achievement of the intended outcome in the first activity, namely, ***Capacity Building for Use of OER based eLearning:***

1. Five modules on OER based eLearning have been developed; furthermore, these five modules have been developed by inter-country team of experts who worked face to face during the three successive workshops and also online during the interim periods between the face-to-face programmes. It is an interesting case of cross-border academic collaboration indicating tremendous potential for inter-institutional and inter-country collaboration for course development.
2. More than 130 teachers from four countries were trained in learning through OER. This was achieved through seven workshops held in Malaysia, India and Sri Lanka. 35 teachers from OUSL and 22 teachers from WOU were oriented in five modules on OER- based eLearning. In the process, four institutional Case Studies on OER-based eLearning were developed and published for larger outreach. The net outcome is training and orientation of more than 185 higher

education professionals trained and/or oriented to eLearning through OER increasing the number of knowledgeable people on the subject in the Asian Region.

3. A three/four month online programme on OER based eLearning for teachers of higher education institutions was developed. Two universities (WOU and OUSL) have launched the online course for their faculty members. Another university - Uttarakhand Open University has confirmed to adopt OER to develop courses.
4. At least 10 universities in the region participated in the programmes conducted by CEMCA. Though against the total number of conventional, dual mode and open universities, this number is small. But it is a major breakthrough to involve universities in such innovative venture.
5. There is an apparent gender disparity among the participants in various workshops, training programmes conducted during 2012-2015. Women participants accounted for 37%. However, this gender disparity has to be read against the background of the gender composition of the academic faculty in higher education institutions in general and ODL in particular. Since male to female ratio in academics do not correspond to each other to apparent gender disparity may not stand the test of rigorous analysis of metadata in this area.
6. The four institutional case studies (Open University of Sri Lanka, Indira Gandhi National Open University, National Institute of Open Schooling and Wawasan Open University) published by CEMCA give an insight into the challenges of the institutions in application of OER. Publication will be helpful in dissemination of implications of use of OER to other educational institutions.

In terms of Outcome, it has sown the seeds of increased access to eLearning using OER. The five-module online programme was put to piloting first in India. Online programme was taken by 40 faculty members from 10 different institutions; 14 faculty members from OUSL are undergoing the online programme and 65 faculty members are enrolled in MOOCs programme from Malaysia.

**B. The intended output of the activities for *Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT* was to train 60 Heads of various higher education institutions in ICT leadership workshop. In three programmes;**

1. OER Policy Template was developed that will go a long way beyond the targeted 60 heads of universities;
2. 119 heads and deputy heads of universities both open and conventional were trained in OER Policy formulation and integration of ICT.

3. Three universities have already adopted the OER Policy. Open University of Sri Lanka developed ODL policy and Govt. of India with help of CEMCA developed licensing policy under NMEICT.
4. The intended impact of increased use of technology for learning is not possible to measure right away. Such an outcome requires longer time span as institutions have to put in strategic plans and management in place to institutionalize such an innovation that demands change of skills and attitudes of the people working in universities. However, an informal discussion with the vice chancellors of few state open universities in India reveals that they will be developing OER policy.
5. Selected papers presented during the three programmes were published in the form of book: "ICT Leadership in Higher Education" for larger dissemination.

C. The achievements against intended output of activities on ***Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources*** are:

1. 94 people attended the workshop from India, Malaysia, Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. Nine Keynote presentations and nine papers were presented by the participants on Quality Criteria. Thus, there were quality inputs in developing quality criteria.
2. Large number of people participated in the creation of quality guidelines through online discussions. This was yet another instance of collaboration via technology breaking the barriers of inter-country distances.
3. Net effect is the development of a set of quality criteria. However, the achievement should be seen as interim as individuals and institutions engaged in designing courses using OER will take more time to judge its effectiveness.
4. Based on the participants' input on the quality guidelines developed, the quality assurance criteria are being revised continuously.

With respect to developing Quality Assurance Framework for OER based learning as outcome, a Framework of Quality Assurance has been created consisting of 19 categories and 65 criteria. Version 1.0 was published in 2013 and feedback was received from experts in OER. Quality Assurance Guidelines for Open Educational Resources Version 2.0 was published in year 2014. Impact studies are being conducted in Pakistan, India, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh which will validate the content further and improve the guidelines.

In the foregoing pages, we have presented the outputs and outcomes against the intended ones set prior to the beginning of the activities as a part of the M&E Plan. There were however, several other outputs and outcomes neither foreseen nor specified. Some of the unintended or unexpected output and outcomes are worth reviewing for posterity (Table 7).

**Table 7: Unexpected Output/Outcome**

Sl. No.	Activities	Unexpected Output	Unexpected Outcome
1.	<b>Capacity Building for use of OER – based eLearning</b>	Lack of continuity – few teachers who were part of the first capacity building programme did not participate in the second and third programmes.	Participants of the workshop developed four case studies. Case Studies published for larger dissemination.
		35 faculty members enrolled in the online eLearning course from Sri Lanka open university and 65 enrolled in MOOCs in Malaysia.	One State Open University in India decided to undertake the OER based eLearning capacity building programme with help of CEMCA.
			WOU in Malaysia launched MOOCs in OER in eLearning
2.	<b>Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT</b>	Number of Vice Chancellors who were targeted in the second workshop did not participate.	Eight Vice Chancellors were able to draft strategic plan for their respective institutions.
		17 Vice Chancellors from conventional universities participated in workshop held in Bangladesh.	Selected papers published for larger dissemination
3.	<b>Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources</b>	Version 1.0 of quality assurance guidelines has been published and circulated. It is also available on the net.  Quality Assurance Guidelines for Open Educational Resources: TIPS Framework Version 2.0 was published.	Development of a new concept of a domain.

As would be evident from the table, unintended or unexpected outcomes were both positive and negative. Some of the positive developments are:

- a. Development and publication of four institutional case studies;
- b. Publication of selected readings on ICT Leadership in Higher Education;
- c. Enrollment of faculty members in online course in Malaysia and Sri Lanka;
- d. Participation of Vice-Chancellors in various programmes;
- e. One Indian State Open University decided to continue the capacity building of their faculty in OER based eLearning;
- f. WOU launched MOOC's in OER- based eLearning;
- g. Publication and posting of Quality Assurance Guidelines on the Web; and
- h. Draft Strategic Plans for OER policy was developed by eight Vice Chancellors.

The negative outcomes were restricted to continuity of participation, e.g.

- i. Lack of continuity in participation – some of the people who participated in the 1<sup>st</sup> workshop on capacity building for use of OER-based eLearning did not participate in the follow up 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> workshop amounting to drop out and loss of output;
- j. Number of Vice-chancellors targeted in for the 2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop on strengthening ODL institutions in use of ICT did not participate;
- k. Large numbers of teachers enrolled in online course on OER- based eLearning dropped out from pilot experiment of the online course.

# 7

## Conclusions

The development and field testing of the M&E Framework was an interesting and innovative exercise with far reaching implications. It is possible to draw certain conclusions. Some of the conclusions may be tentative as they are really located in the womb of future. Further, certain conclusions are generic in nature emanating out of the missions and goals of the project itself. Certain other conclusions are more specific linked to the three specific areas identified in the project and the specific activities.

### Generic Conclusions

1. One of the major generic conclusions is that an M&E Framework is possible to be developed. By field testing the model, it is possible to refine and adopt on a larger scale for enhancing programme efficiency.
2. Second such conclusion is with respect to the systems design that guided the choice of areas and activities in each area based on the Result-Based Management Approach.
3. Third is the operability of collaboration of a consulting agency, ETMA, with the agency actually involved in implementing the tri-annual plan, 2012-15 instead of completely outsourcing the project to the consulting agency. The collaborative arrangement has helped the implementing agency to build capacities further.

### Specific Conclusions

Specific conclusions can be drawn with respect to area, activities, intended outputs and outcomes and actual achievement. Here are some of the conclusions with respect to each of the areas and activities.

### Capacity Building for use of OER–based eLearning

The objective of this activity was to build skills of using OER material for course development by the teachers of higher education institutions. To achieve this objective, the intended output was to develop five modules on various themes using OER material. The five modules have been developed. Hence, it can be concluded that the goals was well set and has been fully achieved.

Another intended outcome was to develop an online programme collectively by institutions of Commonwealth Countries in Asia. The objective was achieved as seven workshops were held, five modules were developed, four case studies were published and an online course was launched in India, OUSL and Malaysia.

On the third agenda of enrolling teachers in the online course, 35 teachers from OUSL were oriented. As per available information, 14 are actively pursuing the online course on OER-based eLearning. Though apparently only 40% are pursuing and 60% have discontinued, it is difficult to conclude whether 40% continuation is acceptable level of performance or not. Such dropouts and discontinuation is not at all uncommon especially in an activity that requires application and engagement over a period of time.

Fourth intended outcome was to expose number of teachers to learn through OER. As many as 130 teachers were trained which is quiet good given the innovativeness of the programme and budgetary limitation of involving more teachers from different countries to be exposed through face to face mode. On a related matter, 40 participants were enrolled in India in an OER-based eLearning online course. Only four participants completed the course. This is just 10%. As many as 90% dropped out at different stages, though the course itself was of short duration spread over three to four months. Immediate conclusion is not very comfortable. It sparks off several research questions – whether 90% dropping off in online course among teachers is high or average or low; at what stages the participants dropped out; what was the reaction of those who dropped out about the programme and each module (some kind of exit interview).

M&E Framework also aimed at improving the performance by using OER. The OER is gaining attention world over in this context. During the programme teachers were trained in using open sources to create online courses. The modules were developed, as mentioned earlier, using open sources. Also, an online course was developed as a pilot course. However, it is premature to conclude as to whether performance has improved by using OER. This conclusion has to be postponed to a future date – may be between one to three years. The seed of the innovation has been sown; it must get time to sprout, mature and bear fruits. The initiative by CEMCA is commendable.

It was intended that universities would adopt OER. As many as 10 universities participated in this programme. It is too early to conclude whether the objective has been achieved or not.

Although participation of women faculty has been flagged off as one of the intended outcomes, there was not enough data to derive any conclusion. However, gender difference in such an area is unlikely though there is a wide gender disparity in academic staff of higher education against women.

One general and conclusive trend was the satisfaction of the participants in various face to face programmes conducted during this period; and also satisfaction of the participants about the eLearning course with the five modules.

## Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT

ICT is a comprehensive concept and terminology. It is a set where OER, eLearning, Computer Based Learning/Computer Assisted Learning, educational media and others are subsets. However, in this project, use of ICT was restricted to developing OER policy, ICT integration, capacity building in both these areas and increased use of ICT in transmitting knowledge.

Success of the programme can be counted confidently in terms of capacity building in OER Policy development and ICT Integration. More than 119 heads of open universities and from conventional universities attended the programmes. This is a big number. Considering that there are not so many open universities in this region, it was commendable as a strategy to open up the programmes to heads of conventional universities. Since large majority of heads and deputy heads of open universities are recruited from the conventional universities, it can be considered as an investment in future.

There are several factors for the successful ICT integration. Leadership support is, by far the most important factor. Hence involvement and training of heads of universities was rightly factored into the scheme of ICT Integration. Out of 10 universities trained on developing OER Policy, only 3 universities have drafted a policy. It is again difficult to conclude whether the agenda is successful or not. Policy development is a rigorous exercise that needs to take into several considerations, namely, state of readiness of the university for ICT intervention, staff capabilities and personal access to ICT facilities, overall policy context of the university and the overarching national policies on higher education and ICT or even IT policies in operation. Policies developed in a hurry during the project period may be apparently satisfying on their surface value, but may not meet the quality criteria. CEMCA may have to pursue this agenda further with the universities.

Further, the statement of intended outcome vis-à-vis ICT integration is open ended. There are no set areas of specification or criteria for evaluation. Hence, no conclusion is possible. Most importantly, it must be recognized that ICT integration is a continuing and pervasive process. It needs to be pursued over a period of time. There are no short cuts and evidence that one shot training in ICT integration actually gets implemented in an institution. A good example is that of WOU. WOU was already working on developing online courses; in fact it preceded CEMCA initiative. In such case the ground was ready or more than ready for integration of ICT as well as increased access of teachers to online courses.

Implementation of actions in this activity area is still not known. The informal discussions with the heads indicated that only few heads would implement the actions learnt during the programme. Informal discussions with the leaders and documented evidences also revealed that the participating institutions were using ICT in the management of institutions and in the teaching learning process.



An important lesson learnt from this programme is that along with the heads of the universities, there should be participation of senior IT professional to carry forward the message with skills and convictions.

## Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources

The objective of developing a set of criteria for OER is laudable, especially since a whole range of ideas, concepts and practices prevail under the name of OER. Strategy was to develop a set of criteria as guidelines for quality assurance for OER. The guidelines were developed through a series of workshops and consultations involving 95 professionals from four countries. Whether the countries and open learning institutions will adopt the guidelines is a question that only future is entitled to answer. Same is true for the outcome goals.

There are two issues from the angle of evaluation. Firstly, by the time the quality assurance guidelines were developed and published, the eLearning online courses based on OER were already launched by WOU and OUSL. The faculty did not refer to the guidelines developed under this activity.

Secondly, to understand the effectiveness of CEMCA's contribution for this activity, the quality criteria constructed need to be evaluated. COL - UNESCO has already developed guidelines for production of OER. The new framework developed (TIPS) by CEMCA need to be tested and compared with what COL has already published. It is not clear what the need for developing another set of guidelines was. The only possibility is modification of COL guidelines on quality assurance to suit the region-specific requirements. Nonetheless, the utility of these guidelines will be in demand only after universities and institutions chose to develop and deliver OER-based eLearning programmes. Except Malaysia, WOU in particular and partly OUSL, there is no encouraging evidence on use of OER based eLearning programme in the region.

## Conclusion

The programme interventions were well planned and well executed. These programmes also created opportunities for CEMCA to generate collaboration with several agencies located in different countries.

Capacity building, rather training goals is tangible. Such goals have been achieved totally. But intangible goals especially those need time for implementation, cannot be answered now. CEMCA should be credited to make a departure from conventional training interventions by designing more comprehensive intervention system.

# 8

## Recommendations

On the basis of the results and certain conclusions, a few recommendations are in order. Purpose of the recommendations is to improve programme efficiency and effectiveness, and also set certain perspectives in right places. We submit our recommendations under two broad heads, namely generic or programme-based and specific or activity-based.

### Generic Recommendations

Some of the participating universities and people had already worked in the area of ICT integration in higher education and had relevant experience in the three areas of activities selected in the M&E Framework. The programmes and activities would have been richer by assessing their work and integrating their experience and expertise in designing the programmes and activities. We recommend a survey of capacities and programmes of the ODL institutions (Open Universities) in the region to assess their capabilities and programme on OER-based eLearning, ICT Integration in ODL and Quality Assurance in ODL in general and OER in particular.

Along with experts from various other countries, ETMA recommends involvement of ODL experts from the countries in the region on the basis of their capabilities, programmes and accomplishments to create an ecosystem of 'growing together' – a better alternative for sporadic innovations and quality management.

CEMCA can avoid using single faculty to eliminate the risk of regimentation of mind and development strategies. ODL is a dynamic system with wide variations. Issue need not be convergence rather it should be modernization, quality and cost-effectiveness.

Lastly, many intended outputs and almost all outcomes cannot be immediate. CEMCA may consider agencies/institutions to carry out a study on post programme development with respect to all the three thrust areas.

### Specific Recommendations

#### A. Capacity Building for use of OER based eLearning

- The development of five modules was a major achievement. We recommend a study for external scrutiny of quality of the modules including vetting against the set of criteria, UNESCO-COL guidelines or the framework developed during the programme on Quality Assurance of OER.
- Further, a tracer study should be mounted on the participants who took the online courses on time taken to complete the course, satisfaction of the teachers, causes of dropout and phases of drop out.

## B. Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT

- In order to reduce training loss and improve programme impact, CEMCA will have to plan refresher programmes in the selected areas during 2015-2018, especially 2015-16 i.e. initial year of the next cycle.
- Instead of training heads and deputy heads, universities should be exposed to OER Policies, ICT Integration scenarios for widening the horizon. CEMCA should encourage participation of a senior IT professional from the targeted institutions who can bring in skills and convictions of ICT integration in ODL system. This will help in programme implementation and sustainability especially because heads and deputy heads of universities are appointed for fixed tenure. His/her training and exposure runs the risk with his/her moving out of the university.
- Programmes should end up with an action plan for implementation by the participants in their respective institutions. In the instant case CEMCA should ask for an action plan and or call for a short workshop to develop action plans. This may include the ICT policy plan for respective institution, areas of application of ICT and the time line.
- CEMCA should continue to pursue countries and institutions to create ICT policy in higher education as well as the OER policy.
- In the lines of UNESCO - Intel initiative on developing ICT Policy in Education Toolkit, CEMCA may initiate action to develop a Policy Toolkit for OER and ICT integration in ODL.

## C. Quality Assurance of Open Education Resources

- CEMCA should adequately disseminate Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the eight Commonwealth Asian countries where CEMCA is operating.
- CEMCA should put in place a mechanism for checking whether stakeholders are using the guidelines for quality assurance and to what extent and advantage.
- CEMCA with the help of stakeholders should review the guidelines periodically.

## Conclusion

Findings and the results show that organisation and quality of the programmes conducted under the initiative are highly satisfactory. However, there is no one-to-one correlation between quality of programme and impact on the field. CEMCA needs to define its work space – whether training and capacity building or bringing in change in the working of the ODL institutions, especially in adopting and institutionalizing innovations for technology- intervened and assisted learning system. Ensuring change will demand a large variety of follow-up interventions. This may include follow-up refresher capacity building programmes, monitoring visits to the institutions in the region and launching research and evaluation projects in collaboration with the host institutions.

## Data Collection Instruments

In the last 26 months the evaluator attended five programmes, two under the activity Capacity Building for use of OER-based eLearning and three for Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT.

Interview and Observation Schedules were developed to assess the programmes as per the framework. These are:

Interview Schedule to collect data from experts/participants who attended the programme on

### ***Capacity Building for use of OER – based eLearning***

1. You are Involved in OER movement. How OER is relevant to Malaysian Context and in other countries.
2. How to train large number of faculty in the use of OER?
3. How the faculty members are benefitted by this capacity building programme in Wawasan Open University and in other universities in the Commonwealth countries?
4. What were your expectations from this workshop?
5. CEMCA - COL has initiated this activity. What other support does your university expect from CEMCA- COL?
6. What steps will your university take forward for successful implementation of OER in your university?
7. How do you visualise this eLearning course which is being developed. How this course takes off and how will it be delivered?

Interview Schedule to collect data from the Heads of the Universities who attended the programme on

### ***Strengthening ODL Institutions in Use of ICT***

1. How long have you been in this leadership position?
2. How would you describe the objectives of your organization?
3. What are the ICT challenges faced by your organization?

4. What are the strategic initiatives identified by the organisation after attending the workshop?
5. What particular skills have you learnt during the workshop?
6. What challenges is your staff facing for the integration of ICT?
7. Any long term and short term vision you have set up for your organisation in the use of ICT.
8. What is the outcome of this Workshop?

## Contractor Terms of Reference

### Statement of Work

The Consultant shall be responsible to:

- 1.1.1 Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan for the activities under Higher Education in the current Three Year Plan (2012-15) of CEMCA;
- 1.1.2 Ensure that the M&E Plan adequately addresses the Outcomes and Performance Indicators as articulated in the 2012-2015 TYP;
- 1.1.3 Help the Director (CEMCA) formulate a process-oriented outcome Evaluation Plan by 1 August 2013;
- 1.1.4 Review the draft Evaluation Plan with the Director (CEMCA) to ensure full understanding of the initiative to be evaluated;
- 1.1.5 Assist in the identification of appropriate data to be collected and in the development of data collection strategies;
- 1.1.6 Gather baseline data on the Performance Indicators to set benchmarks for evaluation;
- 1.1.7 Facilitate the integration of gender by collecting gender-disaggregated data and tracking CEMCA's interventions on gender equality;
- 1.1.8 Provide evidence on whether the use of technology and eLearning advocated by CEMCA has been relevant to the outcomes sought;
- 1.1.9 Provide periodic updates to CEMCA on a regular basis over the term of the contract on the status of the activities undertaken, upcoming schedules and any issues or problems encountered;
- 1.1.10 Undertake M&E as per the plan and provide reports to Director (CEMCA) according to the attached "Monitoring & Evaluation Report Format " (Annex-A) as follows:
  - 1.1.10.1 Interim Report of the Consultant: 1 August 2014
  - 1.1.10.2 Final Report of the Consultant: 1 April 2015
- 1.1.11 Assign Dr. Madhu Parhar (madhu.parhar@gmail.com) as the contact and lead for this contract to develop the evaluation plan and carryout the M&E activities till completion of the report.

## Contributors

The sixteen programmes conducted by CEMCA were academically contributed by number of experts. Some were the facilitators of the programmes and others were the experts in their respective fields. Some of the names of the contributors are given in the box below.

### Box: Contributors

<b>Tan Sri Dato Prof. Gajaraj Dhanarajan</b> Wawasan Open University 54, Jalan Sultan Ahmed Shah 10050 Penang Malaysia	<b>Prof. Paul Kawachi</b> Professor of Instructional Design Editor Asian Journal of Distance Education 1927-1-206 Higashi Kushiwara Kurume City, Fuukuoka 8300003, Japan
<b>Prof. Mohan B. Menon</b> Assistant Vice Chancellor Wawasan Open University, 54, Jalan Sultan Ahmed Shah 10050 Penang, Malaysia.	<b>Prof. V.S. Prasad</b> Flat No.302,Hallmark Residency Arora Colony, Road No. 3, Banjara Hills Hyderabad - 500 034 A.P., India
<b>Dr. Som Naidu</b> Monash University, Australia	<b>Mr. Paul Sellers</b> Director South India British Council
<b>Dr. Vijitha Nanayakkara</b> Vice Chancellor The Open University of Sri Lanka P.O. Box 21, Nawala Nugegoda 10250, Sri Lanka	<b>Dr. P. Prakash</b> Vice Chancellor Dr. B.R. Ambedkar Open University Hyderabad, India
<b>Prof. Dr. Abdul Mannan</b> Vice Chancellor European University of Bangladesh Rupayan Sheldford, Plot # 23/6, Block # B, Mirpur Road, Dhaka, Bangladesh	<b>Dr. Allison Littlejohn</b> Director, Caledonian Academy Glasgow Caledonian University, 70, Cowcaddens Road Glasgow G40BA, UK
<b>Ms. Kyriaki Anagnostopoulou</b> Head, elearning University of Bath Claverton Down Bath , BA2 7AY, UK	<b>Prof. V. Venkaiah</b> Vice-Chancellor Krishna University AJ Kalasala Campus, Rajupeta, Machilipatnam - 521 001, Andhra Pradesh, India
<b>Dr. B. Phalachandra</b> Wawasan Open University, Penang, Malaysia	<b>Ms. Catherine Casserly</b> Creative Commons Licensing USA
<b>Ms. Gwen van der Velden</b> Director, Learning and Teaching Enhancement University of Bath, Claverton Down Bath - BA 2 7AY, UK	<b>Dr. Sanjaya Mishra</b> Director, CEMCA (from 2012-2014) New Delhi - 110016, India Present: Education Specialist (eLearning) , COL, Vancouver, Canada
<b>Prof. Arun Nigavekar</b> Senior Advisor, Science & Technology Park University of Pune Campus, Pune - 411007	<b>Prof. M.A. Mannan</b> Vice Chancellor Bangladesh Open University Bangladesh

<p><b>Prof. Badrul Khane</b> Learning and Educational Technologist, USA</p>	<p><b>Mr. Anir Chowdhury</b> Policy Advisor Prime Minister's Office Dhaka, Bangladesh.</p>
<p><b>Dr. Ramesh C. Sharma</b> Director Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia, 13/14, Sarvpriya Vihar New Delhi - 110016, India</p>	<p><b>Prof. Shironica Karunanayaka</b> Dean, Faculty of Education OUSL, Sri Lanka</p>
<p><b>Prof. Rajbir Singh</b> Director, IUC CEC, UGCAruna Asif Road, New Delhi India</p>	<p><b>Dr. Manas Ranjan Panigrahi</b> Programme Officer (Education) CEMCA, New Delhi, India</p>
<p><b>Dr. Savithri Singh</b> Principal Acharya Narendra Dev College, University of Delhi, New Delhi.</p>	

# 10

## Illustrative quotes from Interviews

*Our group had previous knowledge in Open Education Resources. Dr. Som Naidu gave us the introduction on Scenario Based Learning. We learnt about Licensing, how to find resources, Blooms Taxonomy etc. We also learnt how to work in groups. But I wish, certain guidelines' were given during the workshop. If we had a framework in the beginning things would have been easier for the group. (Participant)*

*Wawasan University has already a policy in place for use of OER. I knew about OER as I was part of the policy making body of the University. In Wawasan University, many course coordinators were using OER before this training programme. This workshop was not a cultural shock. We are the consumers of OER. We learnt Scenario Based Learning, learnt the intricacies of designing e-learning courses. In my group, few left and hence it is taking time. (Participant)*

*We had in-house training on OER in 2011. Scenario Based Learning was only new thing to learn. I had attended conferences on OER earlier and written and published papers on OER. (Participant)*

*I gained knowledge in OER and related issues like, open licenses and integrate OER in teaching and learning. It was a great experience to work collaboratively along with faculties from other universities. Developed Module 2: **Designing Learning Experiences for OER-based eLearning**. I also worked as Moodle Administrator and facilitator for the Online Professional Development Certificate in OER-based eLearning launched by CEMCA during April-July 2014 in India. (Participant)*

*In Wawasan Open University, Moodle is in place since the inception of the university. Board of Governors of the university decided to develop the policy on use of OER in 2012. The Capacity Building programme by COL-CEMCA gave hands on experience to the participants. Wawasan is spending money on course writing. Use of OER will cut the cost which will be the major achievement. University will maintain the quality. We are planning to convert our courses to OER based which will be a major task in hand. University has to see that how all the faculty members and course writers are trained in the use of OER. The e Learning course developed in the workshop will help to train and orient the rest of the colleagues. (Expert)*

*Wawasan Open University has developed its policy on OER in 2012 last year. Policy was started out of needs. We sort of pre-empted the requirement. We are active in this field of OER, with leadership from Tan Shri Raj and my team. We are pushing OER for various reasons. It has lot to do to bring the cost down. It has come to the point that it is expensive. It is because we have very vigorous course development process. We have checks and balances. We are trying to reduce the royalty payments that we have been doing to OUHK since we started operating. In the early days it was to jump start the university? 5-6 years down the lane we are paying the royalty. One way was to develop our courses. We wanted to develop from scratch. Reinventing the wheel is not a good idea. So many blended resources are available especially under the umbrella of OER.*



*This training is the example. Then the question is legality. We can use the creative commons criteria. Some sort of policy at least we should have within the university. It is not only to promote but lay the foundation. We need to be careful. Policy does allow and sets the platform for thinking and make it legal within the university and official. Many universities are not thinking on this issue. We are pre-empting some of the emerging possible challenges ahead. One important point is to encourage our staff and start thinking towards it and develop OER based courses. This training will help to set the environment to develop courses using OER. (Expert)*

*The OER-based eLearning course can be considered as a very useful professional development programme for the academics of OUSL. The concept of OER has been relatively new at OUSL, and there has been much interest among academics from all disciplines to enroll in this course, but some couldn't continue with it due to their work loads and time constraints. Currently, at a time when the University has taken initiatives to publish certain course materials as OER, and when there is an OER Policy being developed for OUSL, the academics appreciate the opportunity that has been made available for them through this course, to become more aware about OER-related concepts, practices and issues, and engage in fruitful discussions. They appreciate the design of this course, which enable them to meaningfully engage in activities related to authentic issues, individually, as well as collaboratively. Especially, the group discussions that happen throughout the Modules have been very productive and members have been very actively contributing and openly discussing on various topics that are very relevant and useful to all academics at OUSL. I am very happy about the progress made so far, and I thank CEMCA for this initiative, and for the opportunity given for me to contribute to the development of the programme, as well as taking the leadership to implement it at OUSL. (Participant)*

## ICT Workshop

*In Bangladesh Open University, we have all the technology and after this workshop we are planning to use them in near future. We are planning to launch e platform by next year. We have experts who can develop and implement the technology and solve our problems. This workshop was on conventional universities which are lacking the utilities and innovations of ICT, eLearning in higher education. I felt that the people have been sensitized well and they have also claimed that they have benefited from the workshop and they would go for the implementation of the ICT after the policy has been formulated by the government. This workshop was very useful in creating awareness about the use of ICT among the university administrators. The main challenge is with the faculty members who are not aware about the use of ICT and as they are not experts so they don't know about its uses. The institutions are not ready. Funding is another problem. Government needs to provide adequate funds (Expert).*

There is lot of finance which is required to implement ICT in higher education and we would require support from the government and UGC. At present with limited resources we are moving ahead. There is a need for teachers to be ready to implement new things in their field but it's difficult for them to learn new technology and implement it.

*We got to meet experts from different areas and listen to their views. Also this workshop has helped all of us to come to a common platform where we can discuss common issues and maybe we can find some solutions. We will get expert support from organisations like CEMCA. (Expert)*

Such workshops give lot of exposure to network with each other and learn from each other. Although we have made lot of new changes in our university, it was enriching to be part to this workshop and learn more. ICT can be very effective if we have trained professionals and train our staff. Having infrastructure is one thing and having trained staff is another.

*Students should get access to ICT based learning opportunities in different areas they are staying (Expert).*

In terms of the achievement of the initiatives taken by CEMCA under Higher Education, following two activities are highlighted first:

- *Capacity Building for use of OER-based eLearning and*
- *Development of OER TIPS Framework.*

OER –based eLearning activity was taken by Malaysia, Sri Lanka and India. 130 faculty members are trained and around 100 have enrolled in the online course. A robust OER TIPS Framework was developed and tested. The framework is helping the teachers to adapt and assess the criteria.

Three programmes in three countries were conducted under the third activity i.e. Strengthening ODL Institutions in use of ICT. Response from the leaders was mixed. There is a need to engage the leaders of higher education institutions.

Activities under higher education were very successful. Two institutions developed the ICT Policy and the third is under the process of completion. Engagements with higher education institutions will have a long term impact.

*The most important success factor for me was working with the right institutions and right kind of experts. Our partners played a great role in implementing the higher education initiatives of CEMCA. Partner institutions' interest and professional level was the basic factor for success of the activities. (Sanjaya Mishra, COL)*

We will continue the initiatives taken under the Higher Education specially the capacity building in use of OER- based eLearning and development of OER TIPS Framework as both the issues are the need of the hour and in demand in Asian region. CEMCA will also focus on helping institutions in developing OER policy framework. Secondly, CEMCA will try to do some activity in Pakistan like in Virtual University of Pakistan and other countries where CEMCA is yet to create an impact. There is a need to upgrade their resources.

CEMCA will also try to transit to mobile learning or any other technology which the Commonwealth countries in Asia require. It is satisfying that CEMCA is able to meet the targets and outcomes are fulfilled. (Ramesh C. Sharma, Director CEMCA)





**Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia**

7/8, Sarv Priya Vihar  
New Delhi - 110 016, India  
<http://www.cemca.org.in>