Migrating to a new institution-wide learning management system: Challenges for staff development

Kel Jackson and Nic D'Alessandro
Flexible Education Unit
University of Tasmania

This paper outlines the planning and development of a new staff development package to facilitate the implementation of WebCT Vista at the University of Tasmania. It explores the issues and challenges that change presents as the University migrates from the 'comfort zone' of WebCT Campus Edition 3.8. The change has provided the opportunity to reappraise our staff development and support activities for online teaching and learning, and to take a closer look at the climate in which that staff development takes place and the implications that this has for planning and future development. What has emerged is a flexible suite of inter-related but relatively independent resources and staff development activities that can be adapted to particular end user needs and circumstances and utilised by a range of staff development providers – at both central and local (school/faculty) level.

Keywords: staff development, WebCT Vista, online

Introduction

The University of Tasmania is to adopt WebCT Vista 3.0 as its centrally supported learning management system (LMS) beginning semester one, 2005. Vista will replace WebCT Campus Edition, which has been the central LMS at UTAS since the University first moved strategically into online teaching and learning in 2000. Over 2004, Vista 2.0 has been piloted with a limited number of units, whilst Campus Edition maintained as the primary LMS. The Flexible Education Unit (FEU) at UTAS is responsible for both WebCT administration and provision of training and support for staff and students.

The changeover to Vista presents the FEU with two major challenges. The first is to migrate current Campus Edition users—staff and students—across to Vista as smoothly and seamlessly as possible. Staff comfortable with using Campus Edition will need to be convinced of the merits of the change, and provided the necessary support as they venture outside their 'comfort zone'. The challenge will also be to encourage them to further explore and exploit the capabilities and opportunities for online teaching and learning that Vista presents. The second major challenge is to leverage Vista to mainstream adoption of online teaching and learning at UTAS. Some 25 percent of current undergraduate units have an online presence, strongly suggesting that, in Rogers (1995) characterisation of the diffusion of an innovation, we have only attracted the innovators, early adopters and a proportion of the early majority. The majority of staff remains untouched and/or unmoved by calls to adopt online teaching and learning as part of the University's expansion agenda for flexible teaching and learning (University of Tasmania Teaching and Learning Development Plan 2004-2006).

To meet these challenges, a major activity and imperative over 2004 has been the development of an appropriate staff development and training program for Vista and suite of complementary support resources. These will replace the current Campus Edition specific resources and the purpose designed introductory training program, *Serving It Up* (SIU). The imminent implementation of Vista as the main LMS has provided the FEU with impetus to review and critically reflect on the strengths and limitations of the current staff development program and associated support resources, the changing institutional climate, and to generally consider the challenges that a change in learning management system will present and how they might be met.

Reflections on staff development and support for WebCT Campus edition (3.1-3.8): 2000-2004

Up to the present, the FEU has supported and promoted online teaching in two primary ways:

1. Provision of a range of central and school based staff development/training programs, in particular *Serving It Up*. The SIU program, designed for those new to WebCT, was developed for UTAS by staff of the Teaching and Learning Centre at the University of New England in 2001. (See Clarke et al., 2002, for a description of the design, development and initial delivery of this program at UTAS.)

2. Maintenance of a *Supporting Teaching Online* web site, which provides staff with access to a range of resources and information.

These services have been in place for around three years and raise the key question—what have we learnt from our experiences? More particularly, what has worked well; not so well? What impediments to success have there been? How can these experiences inform the move to Vista?

Identified strengths of *Serving It Up*

The following strengths have been derived from course evaluation surveys, and discussions with course participants and course facilitators.

- *Blended hybrid nature of the program*: SIU consisted of two face to face workshops and five online modules. The introductory and plenary face to face workshops acted as 'bookends' to the intervening self paced online modules. The face to face workshops provided a forum for the sharing of ideas and concerns and hands on experience, all in a mutually supportive and guided environment. The value that participants place on the combination of hands on experience and discussion when beginning induction into the use of new technology for online teaching and learning has been reported by others (e.g. Spratt et al., 2003; McNaught et al., 2000; Felton & Evans, 2003). The first session in particular was seen as critical for 'confidence building, collaboration and sharing of ideas and knowledge' and addressing the real anxieties that staff may have (Felton & Evans, 2003). These anxieties include doubt about their abilities to master the technology, and scepticism regarding the real effectiveness of online teaching and learning (Shannon & Doube, 2004; Gruba, 2001).

  The online modules allowed participants to work through the course largely at their own pace (within an agreed time window – usually around two weeks) and place of choosing. This flexibility increased access to those staff unable to find a single block of time where they could complete the course. Lack of time (and blocks of effective time) to learn computer based skills is one of the main barriers to the uptake of computer facilitated learning (McNaught et al., 2000).

- *Immersion as online learners*: WebCT itself was used to present the online modules, and participants engaged with the content, communications and assessment tools as they progressed through the program. These modules allowed them to explore for themselves what learning online can be like, and how that learning environment can be constructed. Immersing staff as learners in the online environment as a critical part of their induction into online teaching and learning is a practice in numerous Australian universities (for example the *interactive Learning Online* program at Southern Cross University - O'Reilly & Brown, 2001; the **adapt** program at Griffith University - Collom et al., 2002). As Wills (1998) argues, staff ' … should be able to put themselves into the learners' shoes and actively experience the learning environments that are advocated for their students'. (p.5)

- *Close integration of the pedagogical with the technical*: Both the workshops and online modules developed technical skills in the context of educational use and value. This helped take the focus off the technology (and the 'threat' that this can pose for some beginning their online teaching and learning journey (Fenton & Evans, 2003; McNaught et al., 2000) and onto the opportunities for innovation in their own teaching, as argued by Donovan (1997). Achieving the right balance between the technical and the pedagogical is difficult—early adopters, confident in their abilities to integrate technologies into their teaching (Jacobsen, 2000), are keen to find out how to do things; mainstream staff are more cautious and seek justification before engaging with the technology (Wilson & Stacey, 2003; McNaught et al., 2000; Gruba, 2001).

- *Simplicity and succinctness*: SIU focussed on practical experiences of core online activities as a basis for exploration of educational matters (Clarke et al., 2002). The program achieved its teaching goals/outcomes in as short as possible time considered reasonable by all parties (a maximum of

around 12 hours commitment). This was to avoid staff feeling overwhelmed by the need to learn how to use a new technology in a climate where there was (and is) increasing demands on their time (Slay, 1999) and being generally overwhelmed by the amount of information to absorb about both the pedagogy and technology (Spratt et al., 2003).

Simplicity and succinctness was built into the design interface for the online modules. Succinct, easy to follow instructions (the tutorial guide) appeared in a fairly narrow (200 pixel) right hand frame; with a left window for developing the participant's WebCT unit shell and for generally exploring the features and potential of the system. The instructions themselves kept to the basics and away from the more detailed capabilities of the software likely to overwhelm the less computer confident (McNaught et al., 2000).

Identified limitations of *Serving It Up*

Limitations in SIU itself and its implementation at UTAS emerged in the years it operated, particularly the following:

- *Failure to complete the program common*: Even though participants expressed enthusiasm for the flexibility of SIU, that enthusiasm rarely translated into the time/self management required to actually complete all the online modules. Only around half the participants completed the full program, and only around 15 percent completed a self assessed skills checklist for submission to obtain a Certificate of Completion. Clearly there has been, to the present, little real incentive to complete the program and gain certification. No doubt, one reason for failure to complete the program on the part of a significant proportion of participants was that they were not yet at the point of developing their own online units, and so knowledge and skills were not immediately relevant to them – the major reason cited by Ellis and Phelps (2000) for failure to complete the equivalent program at Southern Cross University.

- *Lack of flexibility*: The program was designed for those new to online teaching and learning and around basic use of the main WebCT tools, with the assumption that users would be and both developing and teaching through WebCT. It did not cater for the different levels or types of engagement possible—designer only; teaching assistant/instructor only; designer & instructor, nor for those who might only have a limited number of tools or intentions in mind. Furthermore, it did not provide for different levels of entry skills and/or understandings (e.g. of other LMSs). It was essentially a fixed, 'stand alone', 'one size fits all' course with only the one entry and planned exit point. These matters highlighted the need for a more flexible program, with multiple entry and exit points, to meet the varying immediate needs, entry skills and interests of faculty, and to avoid programs imploding because of participants' failure to complete particular components.

- *Unfulfilled 'product' expectations*: An integral part of the module activities was the intended building by participants of their own online unit, which they could then 'showcase' at the plenary workshop. In reality, few participants completed any significant work for a variety of reasons, including the fact that they only intended to play a teaching not designer role, as yet uncrystallised ideas on the proposed purpose of the online component in their course, and lack of developed content to use in building their online unit.

- *Marginal value of online discussion*: By and large, participants did not engage in any substantial way in the online communications activities. They were not seen as compellingly relevant in a time pressured day (nor designed as an essential, progress stopping series of activities). Disparate interests meant engagement with some discussions but not others. This strongly suggested to us that common interests, understandings and shared concerns are requirements for effective online engagement, and these are more likely to be found at the school level. Macchiusi and Trinidad (2000) point out that discipline based networks are the ones that most faculty staff relate to. Some participants valued the opportunities for cross discipline discussion—certainly in the face to face workshops—but on balance a more local focus for training would seem necessary for maximum engagement.

- *Uptake by school based facilitators minimal*: Although a facilitator's guide for SIU was produced, with the intention of empowering faculty/school based support staff or leader/facilitators to run their own in-house programs, this facility was rarely optioned. There were a number of possible reasons for

this, including no institutional strategies or procedures to embed this particular form of training support at school/faculty level (e.g. through formalised position/role descriptions, or time allowance/release for facilitators), and lack of promotion of school based activities on the FEU's part (as little demand was evident).

Articulation of SIU with other support resources

A range of resources and dedicated web site were developed to support staff in online teaching and learning, independent of the development of SIU. Materials available online through *Supporting Teaching Online* (STO) included UTAS policies and procedures, design and development advice and information, maintenance and evaluation advice, and 'Help' sheets on the use of the various WebCT tools. Because of their independent development, they were not integrated with the SIU training resources, and duplication existed. Hence there was a need to rationalise and integrate resources, and to provide a single gateway portal for all training and support resources (a feature of the **adapt** initiative at Griffith University – see Collom et al., 2002).

Specific challenges that the change to Vista presents

Vista has a significantly different interface to Campus Edition 3.8; there are new tools and changes in the way old, familiar tools work, and new ways tools interact with each other. A number of staff have expressed concern that, having just got up to speed with Campus Edition, they now face the need to re-learn how to use the LMS. Fear has also been expressed by some staff that their current online units may need to be reworked or rebuilt in some way because of migration problems, necessitating further work on their part. The perceived need to re-learn and perhaps rebuild is creating a climate of apprehension, and it's therefore critical that the changeover is managed sensitively. This means:

- 'selling' the need for, and advantages of changing to Vista (particularly the reduced complexity of many tasks from a user's perspective, and the simpler, more intuitive interface);
- showcasing Vista based teaching and learning;
- making the transition as smooth, seamless and painless as possible—by emphasising similarities in function and addressing any migration issues promptly; and
- getting the timing right—recognising different stages or levels of readiness/preparedness amongst staff (Ellis & Phelps 2000; Wilson & Stacey, 2003), and moving them only when they are ready. This means giving staff opportunities to 'test the waters' and explore Vista without the pressures to make a commitment to go online.

These requirements mirror Rogers' five determinants for the diffusion of an innovation throughout an organisation: advantage, compatibility, simplification, trialability and observability (Rogers, 1995).

Vista also challenges staff regarding their use of learning management systems—to think about creating learning environments and seamless learning pathways (Oliver, 2000), rather than thinking of the tools in isolation. This is a challenge to both current WebCT users and new staff who may come into staff development programs with pre-conceived ideas about online teaching and learning and how they will use the LMS (e.g. for posting content such as lecture notes).

Changing climate for staff development in online teaching and learning

The environment for both UTAS faculty staff and staff within the FEU has changed appreciably since *Serving it Up* was first introduced. We have seen the following:

Increasing time pressures on faculty staff
The timing of staff development has become increasingly problematic—windows of training opportunities have diminished, and the time staff can devote to staff development activities put under pressure (a situation also reported at Adelaide University – Shannon & Doube, 2004). The time horizons of faculty staff appear to be shrinking, increasing demands for 'just in time' training and access to resources focussed on immediate needs. These time pressures have implications for design in terms of

length of program, degree of modularisation, balance between self paced and 'class' based activities, and the balance between active/practical and reflective.

Resources/support uncertainty at school/faculty level
Because of uncertainties regarding provision of local support staff, teaching staff have become increasingly unsure of the technical skills and software they themselves will need to acquire to develop and maintain their online units. Some online units developed with specialist help have collapsed because that support was withdrawn and the teaching staff lacked the skills to maintain them. Clearly, online initiatives need to be sustainable.

There has also been uncertainty about the respective roles and responsibilities of the central FEU and faculty/schools regarding the provision of support and resources for online teaching and learning. Service level agreements with faculty have attempted to be struck, but with limited success. Various authors— Reid (2002), Spratt et al. (2003), Shannon & Doube (2004)—have argued for school based teamwork and collaboration between central and operational staff as the most effective form of staff development, and so clarification of roles is critical if such collaborative initiatives are to eventuate.

Growing importance of teaching innovation within faculty
Increasing importance has been placed on teaching and learning innovations through promotions and recognition of good practice. There has been more concerted strategic planning at school/faculty level for flexible delivery (and online teaching and learning in particular) in response to University directives to improve student access to programs and grow student numbers (University of Tasmania Teaching and Learning Development Plan 2004-2006). Strategic planning for online teaching initiatives will be further spurred on by proposed Teaching Performance incentives, making it increasingly difficult for staff to ignore the pressures to 'go online'. The profile of staff seeking training and support is therefore likely to appreciably change to include more of the mainstream majority. Staff may also increasingly need to provide formal evidence of their completion (or at least participation) in staff development activities, so appropriate certification processes will need to be put in place.

Maturation of online teaching and learning as a valued innovation at UTAS.
We have seen continued growth in the number of units hosted through WebCT, and increased sophistication of use and integration with face to face and other teaching strategies. Currently around 25 percent of undergraduate units have a WebCT presence – without mandated use. Our focus for training must then shift from the 'innovators' and 'early adopters'—those confident in their ability to integrate technology into their teaching (Jacobsen, 2000)—and who make up the first 16 percent of the population to adopt an innovation (Rogers, 1995), and increasingly to the early and late majority and 'laggards' who lack the background knowledge, skills and attitudes (the 'essentials') to readily adopt online teaching and learning. This has immediate implications for staff development programs that target this group. The mainstream majority are pragmatic and somewhat risk averse, resistant to change unless that change is of proven value, favour incremental change, and generally unengaged with information technology in their teaching. Their professional/personal networks tend to be discipline based in comparison to the more cross disciplinary connections of the early adopters, and so look to discipline based ideas and practice. There is a general reticence to attend university-wide, cross discipline staff development programs (Wilson and Stacey, 2003; Geoghegan, 1995; Rogers, 1995).

Student pressures
Student expectations have grown that most, it not all, units will have some sort of online presence to facilitate their access to resources, teaching staff and other students. This has created further pressure on mainstream staff to go online.

Increasing pressure on the FEU to address mainstream needs
As faculties have responded to the increasing profile awarded teaching and learning innovation, more pressure has been placed on the Flexible Education Unit (FEU) to provide appropriate staff development and training. With human resources limited, the dilemma is that many mainstream staff prefer just in time, one on one training and support, particularly as they make their first moves to go online (Felton & Evans, 2003; Rebazo, 1998). They prefer to stay in or nearby their offices rather than seek out like minded faculty colleagues (Donovan & Macklin, 1999). As Wilson and Stacey (2003) highlight, the challenge is in trying to balance the customised needs of individual teachers with the more general

strategies for assisting mainstream staff to adopt innovation. One solution is to leverage faculty based support staff and leaders by providing them with the resources and support to meet both individual and strategic needs within faculty. Another is to provide readily available 'just in time' support through carefully prepared 'self help' resources – targeted according to role (designer; instructor), specific online tools to be used, learning styles/preferences, and stage of engagement with the learning management system (beginners, intermediate etc).

The emerging design

Based on the lessons learnt from *Serving It Up*, an analysis of the climate at UTAS and understandings of factors for successful adoption of innovation gathered from the literature, the following design and resultant materials emerged to support staff development for online teaching and learning through Vista. To overview, we have put together an integrated package of professional development/training activities and support resources that can be configured (mixed and matched) for a variety of learning contexts— individual self paced, or face to face workshops facilitated by centre support staff and/or school/faculty staff. Whilst the resources are inter-dependent, the individual components are effectively learning objects, which can be selected and repackaged in various ways. All objects are openly available to UTAS staff through the one web portal/repository – *Teaching and Learning Online* (www.utas.edu.au/tlo). With this design approach we have built in much greater capacity to support a distributed or integrated model of staff development and training (Reid, 2002). The main components are as follows:

- A suite of self paced online modules and tutorials individually available on request and selected by staff on an 'as needed/interest' basis. Each module and tutorial comes with its own set of learning outcomes and knowledge/skills self assessment checklist
- A structured staff development program for beginners – *Teaching Online Essentials* (TOE), the replacement for *Serving It Up*, and based on the modules above
- Online case studies, tips and ideas, to disseminate exemplars of best practice
- A range of help guides and other resources for staff (and students)—both in text and multimedia format—to meet 'just in time' demand and different learning preferences. The text based guides (with embedded screen shots) come in three different 'styles' to meet different levels of need (as 'refresher' quick guides, first time user step by step and comprehensive guides, conversion guides for those moving from Campus Edition to Vista). They are audience specific in most cases – either for designers, instructors or students. These resources are integrated with the training materials (TOE and online modules)
- Resources for facilitators: suggested session plans, PowerPoint presentations, handouts for participants.

Teaching Online Essentials (TOE)

The core of the staff development initiative is the *Teaching Online Essentials* (TOE) program, which replaces *Serving It Up*. It has three basic components:

1. *Foundations workshop:* This is a face to face workshop, designed for all intending users (designers, teacher/instructors), and of around 2.5 hours duration. This in turn is modularised to facilitate unpacking or spreading over a number of shorter sessions: Two modules (*Introduction to Teaching and Learning Online* and *Preparing for Teaching Online*) primarily address the pedagogy and the potentials for online teaching and learning and how staff can prepare for it, as well as promote discussion about the value of online teaching and learning and concerns staff may have. Two further modules (*Exploring the Student View in Vista*, and *Exploring the Teach View in Vista*) immerse participants in the Vista environment from the perspective of both a student/learner and online teacher. Their primary purpose is to stimulate interest, showcase aspects of online teaching and learning (the use of different tools) and get participants comfortable with the technology—all within a guided social environment. Exploration is through a fictitious *Introduction to Unidentified Flying Objects* course, which provided the developers with ample scope for the imagination and has provided much amusement to participants. It has allowed us to use rich media and demonstrate facets of online teaching and learning in a light hearted way that, judging from the reaction of staff so far, has helped to break down the barriers of scepticism. These exploratory modules are sufficiently rich in activities

that participants can return and explore them further outside the confines of the foundation workshop. The completion of the foundations workshop is a point where some staff may choose to exit, after having put their TOE in the water.

2. *Pathways modules*: These are self paced modules presented through the Vista interface, immersing participants as learners in the Vista environment. They focus on five key areas; online communications, collaboration, assessment, engagement with content, and building a course. Within these modules are tutorials that walk participants through the use of particular Vista tools to achieve educational ends. The modules put educational purpose at the forefront. Each takes around 1.5-2 hours to complete.

   Flexible pathways are provided for designer/ developers, and teacher/instructors; there are four modules in all to choose from, with a minimum of two required for TOE certification. Optional pathways (e.g. with respect to the tutorials they take, depth of detail) are provided within a number of modules. The pathways modules thus take into account the different roles in Vista (designer, instructor, teaching assistant) and cater for the different teaching or development interests/purposes staff may have, and to some extent the different levels of competence and willingness to engage with computer technology.

   The tutorials within are generally scenario based, and participants are guided through the Vista tools to solve the educational 'problem' to achieve the desired outcome. The two panel approach successful in *Serving It Up* is used, with the main (left) panel/screen as their play/test bed/building shell or instructor ready unit. Participants now have access to a range of ready to use materials (content, assessment tasks and questions, communication topics etc.) to build or teach with. These materials are drawn from or based on the *Unidentified Flying Objects* unit they should already be familiar with, and the numerous activities show how different parts of the unit were built. Notwithstanding, participants who wish to build their own unit as they go have the option to do so, using the instructions provided in the right hand panel. These tutorials complement, but do not duplicate the tool focussed help guides available, which are now woven into the training modules/tutorials as appropriate.

3. *Plenary face to face workshop* This workshop is designed as a two hour forum for reviewing earlier modules, airing issues and concerns that have arisen from their experiences, and for planning or actioning their online teaching.

Together, these three components will require around 8-10 hours of a participant's time (depending on pathways chosen). Breaking the program into around 1.5-2.5 hour chunks was seen as optimum for busy staff seeking an opportune time window. The overall timeframe planned for centrally offered university-wide programs is around two weeks; school based program timeframes are to be negotiable, to fit staff availability.

Because of the modular nature of the program, participants will not necessarily have to remain with the one training cohort, but can exit and re-enter at another time of offering at recognised points in the program.

Completion of TOE will satisfy the University's *Base Quality Assurance Standards for Units with Online Components* regarding staff training. Submission of a self assessment skills checklist will be taken as evidence of completion of a self paced pathways module (along with the record of access and enrolment), and the basis for certification of participation/completion.

TOE delivery options:
TOE can be offered centrally by FEU staff, or adapted and offered for school/faculty focussed staff development programs. The modular structure, and 'learning objects' nature of the resources allows for unpacking and rebuilding to meet specific 'client' needs and circumstances. School or faculty based TOE can be facilitated by either FEU staff, local support staff or leaders using the resources developed for facilitators, or taught collaboratively. In this way, the innovators and early adopters within faculty can share their ideas and experiences and help trigger a 'critical mass' of adopters (Macchiusi & Trinidad, 2000).

Post-TOE advanced modules and self paced options

A suite of five advanced modules for self paced, 'on demand' online study are in the design phase. They explore advanced use of particular Vista tools, and the management capabilities of Vista, and articulate with the UTAS *Exemplary Quality Assurance Standards for Units with Online Components.*

Single modules and tutorials developed as part of TOE or advanced training are to be available online on demand, with requests made online and records of access maintained. This will give staff access to the materials they want even if they cannot, or do not wish to enrol formally in TOE for whatever reason(s). They also will have the option of progressively completing modules and fulfilling the requirements of TOE over a longer timeframe. Groups of staff can also choose to workshop a particular module.

Other design features of TOE and online modules

Whilst TOE was developed to support the implementation of WebCT Vista 3.0, we have preserved an element of design flexibility regarding the actual LMS platform. The Vista specific resources are effectively learning objects that can be easily updated and/or replaced as necessary. So while preserving the overall training strategy, it allows for version updates in Vista or even a change in propriety LMS.

Templates and resources have been designed to allow for easy re-badging and reconfiguring by other institutions, and other resources kept free of UTAS identification. This gives UTAS the opportunity to offer other interested parties access to the resources on either a commercial or collaborative basis.

Supporting those staff migrating from Campus Edition to Vista

A three pronged support strategy has been adopted and implemented throughout 2004:

- Firstly, a face to face conversion workshop of around two hours duration is offered. In that workshop the advantages of changing over to Vista (technical and educational) are covered, key differences and similarities between Vista and Campus edition summarised, and the migration process explained. Participants then explore the Vista interface using the *Exploring Student View in Vista* tutorial developed for TOE, with opportunities to discuss their findings in a group environment.
- Secondly, participants are automatically given access to the online modules of TOE to explore as they choose.
- Thirdly, a number of text based conversion guides (with embedded screen shots) that focus on specific aspects of Vista have been produced, and are freely available, along with all the other Vista resources, to UTAS staff through the *Teaching and Learning Online* (TLO) portal.

Conclusion

We hope that we have achieved a number of things with this design:

1. A staff development program that meets the needs and levels of readiness of individual staff —the structure of the program is consistent with the sorts of staff development activities advocated for staff at different levels or stages of engagement with online teaching and learning (Wilson & Stacey, 2003; Ellis & Phelps, 2000; Wills, 1998); a program that '…uses incremental steps to match readiness levels of the mainstream staff and exposes them to a less risky journey to moving online' (Wilson & Stacey, p.547)
2. 'Just in time' training and support through the provision of readily available or on demand resources matched to specific needs, learning preferences, and time staff have to devote to upskilling
3. Overall increased flexibility regarding staff access training and support (in what, where, when and how), a need identified by Shannon & Doube (2004). Support is now 'flexible, appropriate and adaptable' (McNaught et al., 2000, p.131) and able to be customised to individual need
4. Building blocks of resources, activities and support that can be assembled for individual school use and used by school based staff alone or in collaboration with FEU staff. The latter will hopefully lead to collaboration between central and operational staff on team based projects situated in the local professional environment (Spratt et al, 2003).

Evaluating the effectiveness of the design will be an imperative over the coming year, as we too move out of our 'comfort zone' and explore new ways of supporting staff of faculty.

References

Clarke, C., Chapman, L., Mackay, I. & Jackson, K. (2002). Teaching for online teaching: A mixed-mode approach. Paper presented at the WebCT 2002 Asia Pacific Conference, Melbourne. 24-27 March.

Collom, G., Dallas, A., Jong, R. & Obexer, R. (2002). Six months in a leaky boat: Framing the knowledge and skills needed to teach well online. In *Winds of Change in the Sea of Learning: Proceedings 19th ASCILITE Conference*. Auckland, New Zealand, 8-11 December. http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/auckland02/proceedings/papers/181.pdf

Devonshire, L. & Phillip, R. (2001). Managing innovation and change in flexible times: Reflecting on the role of the educational developer. Paper presented at the Open and Distance Learning Association of Australia (ODLAA) 15th Biennial Forum (September 21-24, 2001) Sydney, New South Wales.

Donovan, M. & Macklin, S. (1999). The Catalyst Project: Supporting faculty uses of the web … with the web. *CAUSE/EFFECT*, 22(3). [26 July 2004, verified 30 Oct 2004]. http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/html/cem/cem99/cem9934.html

Donovan, M. (1999). Rethinking faculty support. *The Technology Source*, (September/October 1999). [17 July 2004, verified 30 Oct 2004]. http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=612

Ellis, A. & Phelps, R. (2000). Staff development for online delivery: A collaborative, team based action learning model. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 16(1), 26-44. http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet16/ellis.html

Felton, E. & Evans, P. (2003). Teaching technology training: A hurdle for online programs. *Campus Review*, May 28-June 3, p.17.

Geoghegan, W. (1995). Stuck at the barricades: Can information technology really enter the mainstream of teaching and learning? *Change*, 27(2), pp.22-30.

Gruba, P. (2001). Developing staff IT skills in the arts. *Proceedings 18th ASCILITE Conference*. The University of Melbourne, 225-133. http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/melbourne01/pdf/papers/grubap.pdf

Jacobsen, M. (2000). Excellent teaching and early adopters of instructional technology. Paper presented at ED-MEDIA 2000: World Conference on Educational Multimedia/Hypermedia and Educational Telecommunication (June 26-July 1, 2000). Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

Macchiusi, L. & Trinidad, S. (2000). Implementing IT at an Australian university: Implications for university leaders. In A. Herrmann and M. M. Kulski (Eds), *Flexible Futures in Tertiary Teaching*. Proceedings of the 9th Annual Teaching and Learning Forum, 1-2 February 2000. Perth: Curtin University of Technology. http://lsn.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2000/macchiusi.html

McNaught, C., Phillips, R., Rossiter, D & Winn, J. (2000). *Developing a framework for a useable and useful inventory of computer-facilitated learning and support materials in Australian universities*. Canberra, Evaluations and Investigations Programme Report 99/11, Higher Education Division, Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs. http://www.detya.gov.au/archive/highered/eippubs/eip99-11/developframework.pdf

Oliver, R. (2000). When teaching meets learning: Design principles and strategies for web-based learning environments that support knowledge construction. *Proceedings 17th ASCILITE Conference*, Coffs Harbour, New South Wales, 9-14 December. http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/coffs00/papers/ron_oliver_keynote.pdf

O'Reilly, M. & Brown, J. (2001). Staff development by immersion in InterActive Learning Online. *Proceedings AusWeb2001: The Seventh Australian World Wide Web Conference*, Coffs Harbour, New South Wales, 21-25 April. http://ausweb.scu.edu.au/aw01/papers/refereed/o_reilly.html

Rebaza, C. (1998). Where are they? Why technology education for teachers can be so difficult. *The Technology Source*, June 1998. [27 July 2004] http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=88

Reid, A. (2002). Is there an 'ideal' approach for academic development? *Spheres of Influence: Ventures and visions in educational Development* (ICED), 3-6 July 2002, Perth, Australia. [viewed 29 July 2004] http://www.csd.uwa.edu.au/iced2002/publication/Anna_Reid.pdf

Rogers, E. M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovation* (4th ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Shannon, S. & Doube, L. (2004). Valuing and using web supported teaching: A staff development role in closing the gaps. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology* 20(1), 114-136. http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet20/shannon.html

Slay, J. (1999). Creating an on-line learning environment: Issues in academic staff development. *Proceedings AusWeb99: The Fifth Australian World Wide Web Conference*, Southern Cross University, Lismore, New South Wales. [viewed 27 July 2004, verified 30 Oct 2004] http://ausweb.scu.edu.au/aw99/papers/slay2/paper.html

Spratt. C., Weaver, D., Maskill, L. & Kish, K. (2003). Online pedagogy and the challenges for academic staff development. *Proceedings of the Exploring Educational Technologies (EET) Conference*, 16-17 July. Monash University, Clayton, Victoria.

University of Tasmania (2004). Teaching and Learning Development Plan 2004-2006. http://www.utas.edu.au/tl/policies/index.htm

University of Tasmania (2003). Base quality assurance standards for units with online components. http://www.utas.edu.au/teachingonline/policies/qualityassurance/base_standards_list.html

University of Tasmania (2003). Exemplary quality assurance standards for units with online components. http://www.utas.edu.au/teachingonline/policies/qualityassurance/exemplary_standards_list.html

Wills, S. (1998). Teaching academics about flexible delivery. Keynote address at RIBIE98, (October 1998), Brasilia. [7 Mar 2001, verified 30 Oct 2004] http://cedir.uow.edu.au/CEDIR/resources/wills3.html

Wilson, G. and Stacey. E. (2003). Online interaction impacts on learning: Teaching the teachers to teach online. In G. Crisp, D. Thiele, I. Scholten, S. Barker and J. Baron (Eds), *Interact, Integrate, Impact: Proceedings 20th ASCILITE Conference*, Adelaide, 7-10 December. http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/adelaide03/docs/pdf/541.pdf

Kelvin Jackson: Flexible Education Unit, University of Tasmania, Locked Bag 1341, Launceston, TAS 7250. kelvin.jackson@utas.edu.au
Nic D'Alessandro: Flexible Education Unit, University of Tasmania, Locked Bag 1341, Launceston, TAS 7250. nicholas.dalessandro@utas.edu.au

Please cite as: Jackson, K. **&** D'Alessandro, N. (2004). Migrating to a new institution-wide learning management system: Challenges for staff development. In R. Atkinson, C. McBeath, D. Jonas-Dwyer & R. Phillips (Eds), *Beyond the comfort zone: Proceedings of the 21st ASCILITE Conference* (pp. 458-467). Perth, 5-8 December. http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/perth04/procs/jackson.html