

Our 5 steps strategy (first contact, interview, direct support, community of practice (egroup), workshops) was implemented as planned except for the interviews which were completed in July instead of April (it was difficult to schedule meetings with some projects) and their analyses then completed in October instead of June. Meanwhile, the 15¹ interviews and analyses paralleled our direct support actions, which involved 13 out of the 16 projects. We have also collaborated with the international community and presented communications in 4 international conferences. The interviews' analyses confirmed the perceptions we had after the first two rounds of site visits. The situation described in our March report still prevails; it may be consulted for further details (section "publications" of our website). Meanwhile, the situation slightly evolved for a few projects, mainly in respect to the integration of active pedagogy (collaborative tasks/tools, reflexive activities/tools), the systematisation of the development process (guidelines) and the evaluation (questionnaire, orientations). In addition to our general actions towards innovative pedagogy, we have contributed to raise teams' attention to important issues: 1- coherence between pedagogical objectives, proposed activities and evaluation; 2- making of the objectives and expectations explicit; 3- taking into consideration the characteristics/limitations of the target students then reducing the workload and providing explicit guidelines. The recent analyses had permitted to organize and deepen our understanding of the problems and needs encountered by the projects. As our plan of action per se, the emerging model of factors is systemic and encompasses the following dimensions (from global to specific) which have been observed in many projects:

1-Societal aspects (being part of the SVC with the inherited conditions and constraints):

- a. Imposed condition of at least 3 universities partners...often not collaborators as start, it strongly impedes the effectiveness;
- b. Managing multi-universities projects is time consuming and complex (culture, involvement, vision, goals, conditions, politics);
- c. Multi-languages activities involve high cost/time/energy for developers and cognitive overload for students, underestimated;
- d. A 3 years project is short for innovation: 6 months/1 year is required to launch/establish the collaboration and a shared vision;
- e. SVC orientations/expectations not clear to projects, dissents with projects' goals, pressure from SVC (platform, full eLearning);
- f. Financing and management constraints, not adapted to innovative projects (ex.: changes in funds distribution across years).

2-Institutional/inter-institutional (context, politics, involvement, support):

- a. Culture of eLearning is to be developed and officially supported (vision, curriculum, evaluation, resources, recognition);
- b. Conditions differ (goals, programs, resources, institutional involvement, language, students);
- c. Endorsement of the projects by universities, inter-institutions contracts, real support provided (still problematic);
- d. Internal management rules/procedures not adapted, coordinator institutional status (not being a professor, less service);
- e. Involvement, delivery problems with some partners (most projects), and a local support centre (a few projects).

3-Actors' representations, attitudes, abilities, resources, practice (professors, coordinators, tutors, developers, students, etc.):

- a. General lack of eLearning culture, to be developed by 80 to 90 %...this slows down the actions and reduces the outputs since they have to learn as they do the project... But this is an important contribution of the SVC program...(see recommendation 1);
 - i. Pedagogy per se (many professors are domain experts but have low interest in pedagogy), active pedagogy (almost all);
 - ii. ELearning/ICT tools, their existence, pedagogical potential and conditions of use;
 - iii. Designing instructional mediated activities/tools/environments (systematic design process) is new, no systematic method;
- b. No time for reflection, for many the vision is: put the face to face course online with little modifications, local or Web resources not known or used, focused on and immersed in action and Web delivery to meet the project initial goals.

4-Learning Environment (products and development process):

a. Technology

- i. Platform limits, no knowledge/experience of them, the decision is then time/energy consuming;
- ii. Interface design is often basic and would benefit to be refined (too much text, complex navigation);
- iii. Mostly delivery activities, exercises, quiz, some animation, simulation;
- iv. Communication and knowledge construction tools are emerging lately;

b. Pedagogy

- i. Basically expositive, a few projects are integrating active pedagogy, some integrate active and reflexive activities/tools;
- ii. Too much content is targeted, in eLearning everything needs to be more explicit/planned/addressed, so what is essential ?;
- iii. Text-based conception inherited from traditional teaching/writing, PowerPoint and quiz... rethink activities?;
- iv. Goals are not always presented clearly, with activities and evaluation in harmony;
- v. Cognitive overload with new learning activities, new content and course activities in non native language;
- vi. New roles: Students, tutors and teachers need guidelines and procedures support for active eLearning;

c. Development process

- i. Mostly intuitive, only a few have a design procedure guideline and pedagogical scenario;
- ii. Main energy is invested in production, very little analyses, design, evaluation, wider adoption/implementation concerns;
- iii. Evaluation and implementation issues are just being considered... but should at start;
- iv. Coordinators are over charged, management and development (content, web pages, pedagogical models and procedures...).

The major problems: 1- a lack of culture/deep vision of pedagogy, active pedagogy and eLearning; 2- the difficulty to find/hire competent professionals that can be fully operational; 3- the conditions in which the projects are lead are not optimal (imposed team partners, no pedagogical commitment of many professors towards adapting their pedagogy to eLearning, lack of time and resources, lack of experience of management of innovative projects).

¹ It was not possible to meet with one of the projects to make this interview meanwhile we had a support meeting with them.

Emerging recommendations

- Projects evaluation should emphasize the evolution process towards innovative eLearning pedagogy, not only the product.
- Pedagogy should be addressed and supported at start, even before the deposit of the projects (guidelines and meetings)
- A clear and shared vision of eLearning, innovation and pedagogy should be initiated/fostered by the SVC.
- A clear commitment of institutions and professors to invest energy, resource and time should be made.
- Define/delimit the roles and responsibilities of all actors, consider the definition of a new role: “agent of change/innovation”.
- Officially provide instructional activities for actors (professors, coordinators, tutors, students), require that it should be attended.

Plan of action of InterTICES

- Workshops on: evaluation of students’ learning, eLearning collaborative and reflexive tools (tour, examples, conditions of use). Each involving at least 4 different projects in their development/delivery of the workshops (in the end 12 projects involved).
- Workshops on tutoring in eLearning in collaboration with NTE and Edutech.
- Work with our projects on:
 1. Accompaniment to foster a vision/culture of eLearning pedagogy (active participation of projects in collective reflection)
 2. Direct support to the projects (scenarios, methodological guides for teachers/learners, integration of communication/knowledge construction/collaboration activities/tools)
- Develop an evaluation framework to assess the innovative character of pedagogy in eLearning projects.