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The Vice Chancellor and President, University of the South Pacific (USP), invited the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) to chair an international panel to review flexible learning (FL) at the university. As an intergovernmental organization that promotes “learning for development” using a variety of open, distance and flexible approaches, COL is committed to strengthening institutions as they travel the road from being not just “good but excellent,” the theme of USP’s current strategic plan.

The university’s Strategic Plan 2013–2018 aspires to position the university as “the region’s knowledge hub, and as one of the world’s leading universities in flexible and technology supported learning” (Strategic Plan 2013–2018, p. 20). That the review was initiated by the university itself demonstrates the leadership’s commitment to promoting an “ethos of continuous improvement” (Strategic Plan 2013–2018, p. 5). The campus community that we interacted with recognized the Strategic Plan as an important and helpful articulation of the goals and direction of the university. The Strategic Plan is an ambitious project, but the Review Panel believes that it can be achieved. It is in this spirit that the panel has made its recommendations.

In this report, we have presented commendations, affirmations and recommendations. The commendations recognise the significant positive achievements of the university. The affirmations commend the University for identifying areas that need further attention. The recommendations identify the gaps and suggest ways in which these can be addressed.

The review was based on a range of supporting documents. Flexible Learning at the University of the South Pacific Self Review, submitted by the Centre for Flexible Learning (CFL), provided a useful starting point for the panel’s visit. The panel held focus group meetings and interviews with over 100 staff members and students at the Laucala campus, Suva, and at the regional centres in Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands. The objective was to analyse the various aspects of FL at the university, and the role of the CFL, in order to suggest concrete ways of making the learning experience at USP not just “good but excellent.”

COL has recently established a Pacific Centre for Flexible and Open Learning for Development (PACFOLD), which is hosted by USP and located at the Laucala campus. While this “network of networks” aims to serve the capacity-building needs of the Commonwealth member states in the region, it will also complement the university’s efforts as it implements the recommendations in the report.

It would not have been possible for the panel to complete its work without the clear guidance and focused directions provided by the Vice Chancellor and his senior management team. The meticulous arrangements and diligent support provided by the Planning and Quality Office made the task an extremely enjoyable and memorable one. USP colleagues from the different faculties, centres and units gave unstintingly and generously of their time. We are very grateful to them.

I express my warm thanks to the members of the panel, who brought with them a rich diversity of expertise and experience. Each member contributed a unique perspective and commitment to the entire process and continued to collaborate online as we prepared the report from our dispersed locations. This report is presented on behalf of the distinguished panel.

Professor Asha Kanwar
Chair, Review Panel
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADRI</td>
<td>approach, deployment, results and improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASQC</td>
<td>Academic Standards and Quality Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>compact disk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFL</td>
<td>Centre for Flexible Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL</td>
<td>Commonwealth of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTP</td>
<td>desktop publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVC</td>
<td>Deputy Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD</td>
<td>digital video disk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLITE</td>
<td>eLearning Innovations and Technical Enhancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERR</td>
<td>electronic research repository</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWS</td>
<td>early warning system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2F</td>
<td>face-to-face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FALE</td>
<td>Faculty of Arts, Law and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>flexible learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>frequency modulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSTE</td>
<td>Faculty of Science, Technology and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>information and communication technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;T</td>
<td>learning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>learning management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHz</td>
<td>megahertz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>memorandum of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER</td>
<td>open educational resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGCTT</td>
<td>Postgraduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICTS</td>
<td>Pacific Island countries and territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>quality assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACT</td>
<td>remote education and conferencing tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEC</td>
<td>student evaluation of courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLS</td>
<td>student learning specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMT</td>
<td>senior management team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR</td>
<td>strategic total academic review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPE</td>
<td>universal primary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USP</td>
<td>University of the South Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USPNet</td>
<td>USP Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>Vice Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASC</td>
<td>Western Association of Schools and Colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Background and Introduction to the Report

1.1 Purpose

The University of the South Pacific (USP) requested the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) to lead an international panel to review the efficiency and effectiveness of its flexible learning (FL) education programmes. The panel was invited to review the overall strategic direction and operational effectiveness of FL at USP, the FL programmes and courses, the structures that support FL and the development and delivery of FL and to recommend steps that would deliver the university’s strategy and aspiration to be “internationally recognized as the region’s knowledge hub, and as one of the world’s leading universities in flexible and technology supported learning” (*Strategic Plan 2013–2018*, p. 20). The review of the Centre for Flexible Learning (CFL) was initiated by USP rather than by an external assessment or accreditation agency, demonstrating the leadership’s commitment to promoting transparency, engagement and an “ethos of continuous improvement” (*Strategic Plan 2013–2018*, p. 5).

The panel was tasked with assessing strengths and gaps in existing practices and processes related to the coherence of the FL strategy and with providing the Vice Chancellor and the senior management team (SMT) with recommendations, commendations and affirmations of progress that can contribute to USP’s further development.

This process can be described as an internally commissioned external peer review of the USP to:

- appraise the structures that support FL and the development and delivery of FL;
- make recommendations for improved actions based on international benchmarks and practices; and
- provide a roadmap for achieving the key performance indicators and objectives identified in the USP Strategic Plan.

COL and USP signed an MOU for collaboration and joint activities, one of which was to conduct a review of FL activities and the CFL during 2013–2015. USP funded the entire project, with COL contributing in terms of staff time.

The previous review of FL at USP was led by Prof. Fred Lockwood in 2000.
1.2 Terms of Reference

The review panel was charged with the following responsibilities:

(a) Undertake a review and evaluation of the management and leadership, organisation and structure, demonstrated operational effectiveness and overall strategic direction for USP’s FL mode activities and provisions; this includes assessing the university’s vision, initiatives and specific objectives in FL, as outlined in the Strategic Plan 2013–2018.

(b) Review USP’s FL programmes and courses (print, online and blended) with respect to design approach, service delivery and quality assurance.

(c) Review the current USP-wide learning support system for FL students in all the campuses in terms of organisation and management, and make any suggestions regarding the adoption of more learner-friendly, effective and qualitative learner support systems and mechanisms.

(d) Review the current use and effectiveness of media and technology (including USPNet) for FL as well as blended- and online-mode programmes and courses as tools for:
   i. curriculum design and development;
   ii. teaching, learning and delivery, especially use of video lectures, interactive content and peer-to-peer learning; and
   iii. assignments and examinations

(e) Assess the equivalence of FL mode programmes with face-to-face mode programmes in terms of students and staff workload, learning outcomes and student success rates.

(f) Review the effectiveness of faculties, CFL and the university’s campuses (including management, physical resources and human resources) in providing FL-mode courses and programmes, and suggest any mechanisms for more effective operation of FL promotion and delivery.

(g) Review:
   i. the quality assurance mechanisms for FL provision, including quality indicators, benchmarks and procedures for FL, and suggest mechanism to enhance these;
   ii. the research development strategies and activities for FL; and
   iii. the professional development strategies and activities for FL staff.

(h) Review and comment on the university’s plans for FL provision in terms of:
   i. mainstreaming into faculties and empowering teaching staff; and
   ii. blending modes to maximise student access to USP programmes.

(i) Visit the USP campuses at:
   i. Fiji (Laucala campus);
   ii. Solomon Islands (and Solomon Islands regional centres);
   iii. Kiribati; and
   iv. Emalus, Vanuatu;

   and make use of the USP videoconferencing and ICT infrastructure to facilitate discussion and interaction with stakeholders across all USP campuses.

(j) Comment on any other aspects of FL, as the Review Panel considers appropriate.

The Review Panel spent three days at the Laucala campus, Suva, and then groups of two members travelled to the Emalus campus, Vanuatu, and the Solomons Islands. Given time constraints, the Review Panel was unable to visit the Kiribati regional campus.
1.3 Members of the Panel

The Review Panel consisted of a Chair and a member from the Commonwealth of Learning, and two external members, who are experts in tertiary education and FL delivery. The panel was composed of:

- Prof. Asha Kanwar, President and CEO, Commonwealth of Learning, Canada (Chair);
- Prof. Belinda Tynan, PVC (L&T), Open University, UK;
- Prof. Mark Brown, Director, National Institute for Digital Learning, Dublin City University, Ireland; and
- Dr. Sanjaya Mishra, Director, Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia, India.

The panel’s Secretariat consisted of Sereana Kubuabola, Rohit Dev, and Timoci Ravarava, who organised the visits and made all the arrangements related to the panel’s visit to USP and its regional campuses at Solomon Islands and Vanuatu.

1.4 Preparation for the Visits of the Panel

The panel received a self-review document prepared by the CFL that addressed the following questions:

A. Where do we want to go?
B. What have we done?
C. What are we doing?
D. How do we get there?

This document was received two weeks before the panel’s visit, and the members of the panel studied the USP’s Strategic Plan 2013–2018: Towards Excellence in Learning and Knowledge Creation. The panel was also guided by the Review Report (2000) conducted by Fred Lockwood et al., and by the terms of reference of that review.

1.5 Working Methods of the Panel

The panel had focus group meetings and one-on-one interviews with over 100 different stakeholders of the university. The Review Panel visited USP campuses during 19–25 August 2014 (see Annexure 1 for the visiting schedule). The panel met with key internal stakeholders of the university (see the list of interviewees in Annexure 2). These included faculty and support staff at the Laucala Campus, Suva as well as all 13 Campus Directors during a face-to-face roundtable discussion also at Laucala campus. The Review Panel divided into two groups and visited the Emalus campus and the Solomon Island campus. USP videoconferencing facilities were also used to speak to students at regional campuses in seven countries. In addition, there were face-to-face (F2F) meetings with students at the Laucala, Emalus and Solomon Islands campuses.

The broad reach across stakeholder groups enabled the panel to draw out and analyse the key issues to inform the identification of commendations, affirmations and recommendations. USP provided excellent support for the meetings at all the campuses.
1.6 Timelines

- Self-Review to reach Chair of the Review Panel: at least six weeks ahead of the visit.
- Chair of the Review Panel to submit a draft report to the Vice Chancellor: no later than four weeks post-visit.
- Head of Section to identify any factual errors in the draft and submit to Chair of the Review Panel: no later than one week after receipt of the draft report.
- Chair of the Review Panel submit the final report to the Vice Chancellor: no later than six weeks post-visit.
- Head of Section to submit to Vice Chancellor an Action Plan based on the report: no later than four weeks after submission of the final report.
- Vice Chancellor and senior management to review progress made on Action Plan: six months after the panel’s visit.

1.7 Organisation of the Report

All the members contributed to the report. The panel had in camera discussions after each meeting and identified key issues and discussion points. These were reorganised according to the emerging themes and shaped the structure of the report, which includes the following:

- **Context of the Review**: sets the context of the USP as a regional university and its regional role to improve access to quality tertiary education, and discusses the current status of the CFL.
- **Organisation, Governance and Management**: clarifies the meaning of flexibility in higher education and analyses the vision, mission and strategy of the USP, as well as the roles and relationships of the CFL with other units of USP.
- **Course Design, Development and Delivery**: reviews the delivery modes, flexi-schools and programme development at USP.
- **Learner Support**: analyses and recommends steps to strengthen the support services provided to flexible learners at USP.
- **Flexible Learning Technologies**: analyses the availability of technologies for learning at USP, covers the provision of interactive satellite tutorials, Moodle and other technologies, and recommends considering technology in a comprehensive manner to meet the needs of the 12 member countries.

- **Quality Management**: analyses the provisions of quality management at USP.

A debriefing session was held with the Vice Chancellor and President, Prof. Rajesh Chandra, and the DVC (Research and International), Prof. John Bythell, on emergent findings and recommendations, on the final day of the visit, when the panel travelled back to Suva. The panel used email and BaseCamp for communication and for drafting its report. The draft was submitted to the VC and the SMT for them to identify factual inaccuracies before the final version was submitted to the Vice Chancellor. All members of the panel contributed to the collation of discussions, analyses and refinement of the affirmations, commendations and recommendations within the report. The Chair of the panel acted as the chief moderator and editor of the report findings.

USP is committed to developing a concrete plan of action to implement the recommendations in the report.
2 Context of the Review

2.1 The University of the South Pacific and the Regional Context

The University of the South Pacific is recognised as the leading university in the region, serving 12 Pacific countries spread over 33 million square kilometres of ocean. These countries are culturally diverse and face differing social and economic challenges. The region also has a very young population, with the median age ranging between 20 and 35 years; education and employment therefore remain priority areas for improving the people’s livelihoods. The gross enrolment ratio in tertiary education for the countries in the Pacific is less than five per cent, while Fiji’s rate is about 15 per cent (Strategic Plan 2013–2018, p. 16).

Access to information and communication technology (ICT) is relatively inadequate in most of the countries, and where it is available, the cost of connectivity remains high. The university is the premier provider of online/distance education in the 12 member countries. Higher education is still developing in the region, and many countries depend on USP to provide and support tertiary education opportunities. USP has been nurturing the ecosystem of higher education since its inception and has used distance and flexible modes since 1971.

Being a regional university, it is important for USP to focus on the needs and requirements of the region and address regional imbalances by providing increased opportunities for quality tertiary education. The establishment of the regional institution for higher education was based on the premise that small states, with their very small populations and modest resources, would be unable to establish and sustain a national university from their own resources. The general trend in the region, was to invest in universal primary education (UPE) rather than tertiary education. While this notion is changing as more countries are establishing national universities, USP has a strong role to play in supporting emergent institutions and maintaining its own brand and imprint. USP has the unique mandate to be the regional university for the Pacific. In the Framework for Pacific Regionalism, the forum leaders defined Pacific regionalism as:

> the expression of a common sense of identity and purpose, leading progressively to sharing of institutions, resources, and markets, with a purpose of complementing national efforts, overcoming common constraints, and enhancing sustainable and inclusive development within Pacific countries and territories and for the Pacific region as a whole.

Within the Framework for Pacific Regionalism, USP continues to assist the Pacific nations in strengthening their national systems of higher education while maintaining its institutional character as a regional tertiary education provider. Since 1968, USP has promoted co-operation among the different member countries, and has complemented national efforts to build higher-education capacities for national and regional development. The university has been playing the role of an agent of development — striving to meet the human resource needs of the countries in the region and providing assistance to governments in their planning and implementation of development programmes.

1 Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.
From a modest distance-education operation in 1973, the university has grown into a multi-modal, flexible teaching institution that makes extensive use of technology for the delivery of teaching and learning to geographically dispersed communities in the member countries. Trends in ICT in East Asia and the Pacific during 2004–2013 indicate that access to ICTs is increasing but remains far from universal. Only ten per cent of the region’s people have access to fixed broadband; 40 per cent have access to the Internet, while mobile subscriptions cover nearly 95 per cent of the population. These data include countries such as Australia and New Zealand. In some of the Pacific Island countries and territories (PICTS), broadband penetration is as low as one percent, and monthly fees for basic broadband can cost USD 25–1,000 per month (Secretariat of the Pacific Community, 2010). The unevenness of the availability of ICT and ICT infrastructure in the region adds to the twin challenges of deploying the appropriate technology options to reach the well-connected in urban centres on the one hand as well as people in remote and distant islands on the other.

USP’s vision is to enable graduates of the university to work and participate in a highly competitive world system, and to take USP from “good to excellent.” At the time of review, the university had 537 courses on offer through F2F, print, blended, online and flexi-school modes. Table 1 presents some statistics about the university’s enrolment and courses.

Table 1: USP in Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headcount of Registered Students</th>
<th>20,737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Courses on Offer</td>
<td>537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Offered in Single Mode</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Offered in Multiple Modes</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Offered in F2F Mode</td>
<td>392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Offered in FL Mode</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Offered in Print Mode</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Offered in Online Mode</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Offered in Blended Mode</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 The Centre for Flexible Learning

The Centre for Flexible Learning was first founded in 1973 as Extension Studies, which then became the Distance Education Unit. In 2007, its core functions developed and expanded considerably. Its mandate is to provide services to both the staff and the students of USP in (a) supporting the development of FL materials; (b) supporting F2F learning through Moodle; (c) staff and student training in learning technologies and (d) research. Originally, it acted as an external service (off-campus) unit of the university. It has been restructured on several occasions, in response to the changing nature of online/distance learning and to reflect the evolving institutional ethos and requirements of USP. The CFL currently combines two roles: providing service to the USP community, with a particular focus on the development of online and other flexible course offerings, professional development and training in learning technologies and emerging pedagogies, and contributing to the scholarship on best practices in FL and teaching.

---

The CFL has a resource base of 50 staff (47 in place, three vacant; see Annexure 3) and has four main teams: (a) Programme Design and Development, (b) Learning Systems, (c) Multimedia and (d) Administration. Two senior positions — Director and Deputy Director of CFL — have been vacant for some time, and one of the instructional designers is heading the CFL until those positions are filled.

USP’s Strategic Plan 2013–2018 makes it clear that the CFL’s focus is to lead the enhancement of quality in all aspects of FL design and development. Specifically, the role of CFL is to:

- leverage technology and integrate new pedagogies for designing and developing all USP programmes in flexible and online modes so as to exemplify excellence in knowledge creation;
- develop collaboratively — with faculties, campuses and regional agencies — high-quality and innovative learning courses and programmes for the region in both formal and continuing community education;
- provide professional development opportunities for staff and training for students to develop exemplary and innovative learning and teaching practices and skills for lifelong learning; and
- promote scholarship and undertake practice-based and applied research in the design of FL materials and experiences.

The CFL has recently developed a strategic plan, aligned with the USP’s Strategic Plan 2013–2018, which focuses on the latter’s Strategic Priority Area 1, Learning and Teaching. This plan provides a valuable framework for the future work of the CFL but also needs to be reviewed and refreshed annually to ensure it remains relevant to serving the needs of staff and faculty as new priorities emerge.

---

6 Centre for Flexible Learning Strategic Plan (2013–2018).
3 Organisation, Governance and Management of Flexible Learning at USP

3.1 Flexibility in Higher Education

Flexible provision has the potential to enhance student learning, widen opportunities for participation and develop graduates who are well equipped to contribute to today’s rapidly changing world (Barnett, 2014). However, the concept of flexibility in higher education can be interpreted in a number of ways. Irrespective of the definition at the heart of flexibility is a higher education system that is more responsive to the different needs of stakeholders, including learners, staff, employers and the regions and local communities that universities serve. This broad conception of flexibility suggests there are different layers of flexible provision, and at the institution level an important distinction needs to be made between systems flexibility and pedagogical flexibility (Barnett, 2014).

It follows that both institutional systems and pedagogical models need to be strategically aligned and operating in concert to promote conditions for the greatest possible FL. The development of world-class FL requires a holistic understanding of the need to align and adequately resource complex systems, based on a strong pedagogical commitment to learner responsiveness, which needs to be woven throughout the fabric of the institution. In the context of this review, therefore, evidence of an institutional commitment to promoting good to excellent FL should be evident in, and a core feature of, high-level strategies and policies, along with faculty plans, regional campus development plans and strategic and operational plans of relevant service units.

3.2 Meaning of Flexible Learning

The Self Review (2014) refers to FL at USP as the concept and practices that allow “students to make choices about their learning experiences based on personal circumstances” (p. 6). In elaborating on this definition, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (DVC), Research and International, is quoted as describing FL as a learner-centred approach to higher education, supported by a range of delivery modes, which “expands choices about what, when, where and how people learn” (Self Review, 2014, p. 6). This conception of FL encapsulates the key principle of learner responsiveness.

While the Review Panel offers a commendation of this general philosophy of FL, the definition provided in the Self Review does not appear in high-level strategic and policy documents. Although flexible provision is undoubtedly a strength of USP, the absence of a high-level statement offering a shared institutional philosophy may help to explain why relatively few staff members were able to clearly articulate what FL means at USP. The current delivery modes also appeared to add to a lack of clarity, as they combine the mode of delivery (i.e., internal or external) with the way study materials are packaged and made available to students. Moreover, it is widely accepted that the original definitions of these modes, provided by Allen, Seaman and Garrett (2007), which attempt to distinguish between

---

the proportion of online content and interactivity, are problematic; notably the Online Learning Consortium (previously the Sloan Consortium) intends to develop more appropriate categories over the next 12 months. Further comments about revising the current delivery modes appear later in the report.

It also needs to be noted that on a number of occasions, the Review Panel was told that internal F2F teaching is better than other delivery modes, especially for certain disciplines. This type of comment gave the impression that not everyone at USP was fully committed to the provision of FL. The development of a new Learning and Teaching Policy, which clearly affirms USP’s commitment to promoting FL and equivalence for all students, irrespective of campus location or delivery mode, may provide an opportunity to address the aforementioned issues.

3.3 Vision, Mission and Strategic Plan

USP’s Strategic Plan 2013–2018: Towards Excellence in Learning and Knowledge Creation outlines its vision and mission, as well as its organisational values, priority areas, graduate attributes and the aspiration to move from “good to excellent.” We see the clear articulation of these priority areas, with the target of 60 per cent of programmes being available via FL by 2018, as a very progressive performance indicator for providing quality tertiary education to the people of the Pacific.

To translate these aspirations into action, the university needs financial resources and adequate human resources committed to FL. During our discussions with the staff, however, we found that commitment to FL is inadequate to carry forward the university’s strategic plan. Faculty members are typically focused on F2F teaching, and development of FL programmes takes a back seat.

Commendation 1: The Review Panel commends the university’s aspiration to make the transition from good to excellent, and its target-oriented approach to delivering FL for all.

Commendation 2: The Review Panel commends the broad conception of FL at USP, with a strong focus on the learner experience in recognition that different students have differing needs, depending on their personal circumstances.

Affirmation 1: The Review Panel affirms the intent to revise the Teaching and Learning Policy to align with the new Strategic Plan, as this should provide a stronger framework to help guide future decisions about the nature of FL.

Affirmation 2: The Review Panel affirms the financial commitment of the university to implement the Strategic Plan and to deliver results within specified time frames.

Recommendation 1: The Review Panel recommends that, following a consultation process engaging staff and students on all campuses, an explicit policy statement be developed about what FL means at USP.

Recommendation 2: The Review Panel strongly recommends that USP undertake advocacy at the middle management level of heads of schools and at the disciplinary level to better understand the changes required to achieve the FL aspirations, and that teachers begin to offer FL simultaneously with F2F courses. The senior management needs to work with academic staff to develop a common understanding of the direction and mechanisms to achieve this change.
3.4 The CFL within USP: Roles and Relationships

The CFL is a service centre within USP, and USP staff are expected to provide professional services to the faculty members to design and develop courses and programmes for flexible delivery modes. The responsibility of course and programme development remains at the faculty level, not with the CFL, and the centre is reliant for scheduling purposes on faculty staff. At times, this is delayed and creates issues for the CFL in delivering on schedule for release to students. There was also a perception among some interviewees that CFL is not adding value to the course development process, and that faculty can just as well develop their own materials, especially for the online delivery of courses using the Moodle learning management system (LMS).

The CFL presented themselves as a cohesive and professional team. The sub-teams within the CFL appear to work well together, and under challenging circumstances the Acting Director has provided good leadership, particularly in maintaining morale, systems and processes and in delivering a service that others value. There is clear evidence of the relationships staff have within faculties and across the various campuses in the region. During interviews and discussions, it was noted many times that the CFL members were approachable, efficient, knowledgeable and relevant to staff.

The panel found a tension in participant responses between the work and priorities of the CFL, on the one hand, and some of the highly innovative local initiatives underway within faculties, on the other. For example, the Faculty of Science, Technology and Environment (FSTE) in some cases is developing courses independently, with little input from the CFL on learning design or quality assurance. That said, such a tension is not unusual for central service units, especially in the areas of teaching and learning. Moreover, this tension can both support and inhibit curriculum innovation. While the panel recognises the importance of developing a culture of local innovation that encourages academic staff in faculties to pursue new models of teaching and learning, this must be balanced against some of the risks and opportunities if the goal is to promote scalable and sustainable curriculum enhancements across USP. At the very least, these local innovations need to be identified and evaluated and the experiences shared with the wider USP community. The CFL has an important role to play in sharing these innovations, helping faculty staff conduct evaluations and disseminating the findings to appropriate groups. The key point is a partnership model between the CFL and faculties; this is essential for fully harnessing the potential of FL, especially when resources are limited.

A central service unit should be developing under the auspices of agreed policy design, development and delivery standards for FL, to include quality control, uniformity of styles, and other relevant issues. The CFL is not (and should not be) concerned with disciplinary content but does have a role to play in what the learner experience feels like. Without this guidance, the proliferation of multiple learning experiences for learners is likely to degrade the quality of the learner experience. Faculty members should be drawing upon the services of the qualified staff at the CFL — well-trained specialists in online learning who have expertise in student learning styles and in the pedagogical affordances of technologies. A consideration for USP is the level of “back to the desktop” and independent instructional design that will be tolerated within quality guidelines, as mentioned previously. This work traditionally takes more time and impacts directly on the university’s need to develop its research profile and provide teaching and support to its students. However, there is a place for innovation, and independent development in partnership with the CFL and evaluated via research and scholarship could bring enormous benefit to the university. In other areas of the university, interactions with faculties and the College of Foundation Studies revealed close collaboration with CFL staff. The Law School at the Emalus campus has access to an instructional designer and therefore has been able to develop its fully online law programme. Some of the courses we previewed have innovative instructional design to support learning online and to develop competencies.
The panel affirms examples where a programme approach to course redesign has been adopted, in which the CFL has worked with a group of faculty staff to enhance the overall student experience. This approach is particularly effective when driven by faculty priorities and institutional data that help to identify programmes in most need of development, based on key performance indicators. Importantly, this approach moves away from an emphasis on converting units to FL, to a model where a team of staff commits to redesigning the programme to promote coherence between learning outcomes, related assessment tasks and the overarching graduate profile.

Consistent with a partnership model of curriculum development, regular fora such as the current eLearning Innovations and Technical Enhancements (eLITE) Group and proposed Teaching and Learning Committee play an important role. There may be scope to build on an existing forum or establish a new one with the purpose of building a stronger network between staff members who have a research interest in FL. Although research and scholarship is emerging within the CFL, finding ways of enabling and supporting research on teaching and learning within faculties should be given priority, alongside current efforts to initiate research projects.

During discussions, the panel also observed the high level of awareness and interest of CFL staff in using open educational resources (OER). The CFL had organised professional development workshops on OER and learning design for USP staff, and the centre takes an active interest in staff development on a continuous basis, which needs further encouragement and support.

Commendation 3: The CFL's Strategic Plan demonstrates a commitment to the wider university strategy.

Commendation 4: The Review Panel commends the Learning and Teaching Fellowship scheme proposed in the strategic plan of the CFL, seeing it as an important initiative to create champions for FL in the USP faculties and schools.

Commendation 5: The Review Panel commends the commitment of staff to draw upon and use OER and open learning design to increase efficiency and participation in global directions.

Affirmation 3: The Review Panel affirms the complexity and importance of the course-team approach to programme development and the proactive approach that CFL staff members have adopted to develop collaborative partnerships to serve the internal stakeholders.

Affirmation 4: The Review Panel affirms the need to accept the CFL as a central service of USP that provides central leadership in FL across the university, ensures quality and equity of student learning experience across campuses, provides course design and development templates and standards, and works collaboratively with faculties to empower their staff in FL.

Recommendation 3: The Review Panel recommends that a Programme Innovation Award be developed to recognise teams of staff who commit to curriculum redesign on a large scale and who make innovative use of FL throughout the student experience.

Recommendation 4: The Review Panel recommends that some form of distributed research network be established, building on the proposed Learning and Teaching Fellowship scheme, to connect those staff members who have an interest in innovation and research in the area of FL.

Recommendation 5: The Review Panel recommends that a number of small grants be made available to the above Fellows to support research by faculty staff in the area of FL, and that the findings should be shared widely across and beyond the USP community.
Recommendation 6: The Review Panel strongly recommends early recruitment for the senior staff positions of the CFL to provide direction in order to further implement FL in the university. The Review Panel strongly feels the need for strengthening the lead position at a sufficient level in the university hierarchy to empower the CFL to play a leadership role in promoting the integration of FL within the institution.

Recommendation 7: The Review Panel also recommends that the CFL align staff training and professional development activities with the ‘Flexible Learning Programme Design and Development Quality Assurance Framework’, especially in areas that need capacity building, and that USP promote the value and importance of meeting the guidelines (Appendix 2 of the QA Framework) as evidence of effective teaching.

3.5 Leadership across USP for FL

Leadership for FL is not the responsibility of the CFL alone. As per the organisational requirements and strategic plan, it is important that there be distributed leadership promoting FL in the university. To appreciate the understanding that faculty held in relation to adopting FL, we asked all interviewees the following questions:

- What are your views about FL?
- How do you ensure quality in FL courses?
- What plans are in place to meet the target outlined for flexible delivery in the university’s Strategic Plan 2013–2018?

Invariably, the appreciation for FL was low, and some of the faculty members had strong views against flexible delivery; this was especially so in the middle leadership, at the level of heads of schools, who revealed mixed commitment to the strategy. The scale of response was from those engaging with the strategy quite successfully to those with a focus on the F2F teaching as a priority, who had few specific plans for retrofitting or for starting courses or programmes for flexible delivery. This was due in part to their commitment to the student receiving F2F tuition as an essential component of the blend. Whether others agree with this or otherwise, it is quite understandable when one is trying to meet the learning styles of students across 12 nations where “oral” culture is strong and where English is at times the fourth language. This was echoed at levels within the leadership, including regional directors and their staff, who while willing to engage with strategy, had few tools or resources with which to do so, nor did they have the capacity to engage, especially in relation to resources and technology access and connectivity. It is very important for USP to develop an agreed understanding about its delivery modes and the ways in which it will support staff at all levels; a comprehensive, evidence-based change plan also needs to be developed at the highest level to bring staff along. We note that the newly appointed Deputy Vice Chancellor, Learning, Teaching and Student Services (DVC (LTSS)) may well fulfil this brief.

Due to the vacancies in the senior management positions within the CFL, and at the time of this report also in the DVC (LTSS) position, staff members generally lack direction and drive to lead FL at USP.

Recommendation 8: While the Review Panel believes that the continuing vacancies in the senior positions in the CFL are not conducive to the overall health of the unit and the adoption of FL within the university, it recognises the need to reorganise the CFL. The Director position of the CFL should be upgraded to a senior management position at the level of Pro Vice Chancellor or equivalent. The panel’s proposed restructuring of the CFL is given in Annexure 4.
**Recommendation 9**: The Review Panel strongly recommends that the new DVC (LTSS) develop, implement and monitor a comprehensive change plan for the FL strategy, which defines the offer for the 12 member nations, defines the responsibilities of deans and includes a focus on middle management, amongst other stakeholders.
4.1 Delivery Modes

In the absence of an agreed definition for FL, and given the predominance of F2F as the current delivery mode, staff as a default proxy often used online, blended and print as synonymous for FL. Although only approved by the university senate in 2011, the delivery modes as previously outlined are problematic. Furthermore, the Review Panel found there were different interpretations of these modes, and in several cases, staff and students continued to refer to “DFL” as a distinct delivery mode. More specifically, there appears to be confusion between the particular type of delivery mode and the specific learning design or package of the study materials. There are two different factors at play here.

Simplifying the delivery modes and unpacking the different course design or study materials options available to staff when developing courses could address this confusion. For example, for the sake of simplicity it may be possible to define two basic delivery modes: (a) F2F and (b) flexible. Of course, some students would complete their study through a combination of both modes (i.e., multimodal students).

In the case of the F2F mode, most, if not all, courses would be supported by an online environment (i.e., Moodle). Put another way, when learners are studying through the F2F mode, regardless of campus location, a blended approach would be the normal student experience. This expectation is consistent with the current strategic direction to increasingly digitise the learning experience, and in many respects, the term blended becomes redundant. On the other hand, it may be useful to retain a category to monitor the adoption and effectiveness of blended courses, and to indicate to F2F students when a paper does not have a supporting online environment. This requirement could be achieved by indicating “yes” or “no” to the question of whether a paper is supported by Moodle.

Importantly, the most appropriate blend of F2F teaching and online interactivity, including access to study materials, depends on the particular students, the nature of the discipline, the intended learning outcomes, and so on. There is no one-size-fits-all model of blended learning. Thus, beyond basic administrative features and some core expectations for the use of Moodle, it is problematic under the F2F mode to set performance targets for the percentage of course materials that should be accessible online. This is partly why the original online learning categories defined by Allen, Seaman and Garrett (2007) have become problematic. That said, it is highly desirable for each programme to define the minimum expectation or follow a set of agreed guidelines for the way in which staff use the online learning environment to enhance the student experience.

In the case of the flexible mode, there could be a number of defined FL options available to staff for packaging the study materials, depending on the student’s needs, location, personal circumstances and specific programme of study. For example, to simplify options under the flexible mode, it may be possible to distinguish between four basic course designs for interactivity and the delivery of study materials: (a) fully online, (b) partially online, (c) print only and (d) flexi-school. Each of these options would require an appropriate definition statement to ensure that staff and students clearly understand the expectations of studying through one of these course designs.
Recommendation 10: The Review Panel recommends that the current delivery modes be revised to simplify the distinction between F2F teaching and more flexible study options, and to clarify the confusion between modes of delivery and methods of packaging study materials.

4.2 Flexi-Schools

The flexi-school option appears to be a successful method of course design for offering some degree of F2F teaching, which many students appear to appreciate when studying at remote locations and/or through regional campuses. In keeping with international trends, the preference for F2F teaching when studying through a FL mode is likely to reduce as Internet access becomes more widely available and staff learn how to better harness the pedagogical affordances of new digital technologies; however, the flexi-school option has considerable potential in the context of USP. For this reason, a policy and related procedures document would be helpful in ensuring that Flexi-Schools are strategically developed to support student success in key courses and in the provision of F2F teaching on regional campuses.

Commendation 6: The Review Panel commends the University for its flexi-schools.

Affirmation 5: The Review Panel affirms the work currently underway to develop a flexi-school policy, which should help to clarify the procedures, expectations and resourcing requirements associated with this method of course design and delivery.

4.3 Programme Development

A focus on programme development is likely to lead to the most transformative long-term outcomes in the effective implementation of new digital technologies for teaching and learning purposes. Such an approach typically involves a team of academic staff working together in partnership with learning designers and other key stakeholders, such as the library and student learning support, to design excellent papers and programmes. Following this model of development, associate deans of teaching and learning and programme leaders play key roles, using relevant data from learning analytics — including retention and completion rates and responses to student evaluations of teaching — to inform the design process. In many respects, the term “conversion,” which appears in the Strategic Plan 2013–2018 and was frequently used by staff when referring to the task of adding an online dimension to their papers, does not adequately encapsulate the dynamic, iterative and pedagogical nature of this process. This point is not just a matter of semantics. The literature suggests that a continuous process of reflection, reconception and course redevelopment is required at both paper and programme levels to fully harness the benefits of new digital technologies. A culture of quality enhancement is required, wherein academic staff members are actively involved in peer review of course design, including the online learning environment. Academic quality belongs in faculties rather than in central services.

We understand that the university has moved from a course development approach to a programme development approach. While this is evidenced from the performance indicators in the Strategic Plan 2013–2018, we do not see a strong, co-ordinated approach to programme development. Courses are approved and developed at the school level by the faculty, and the CFL plays only a facilitator role by converting the content for Moodle delivery. There is also a process for course approval before the CFL staff works on conversion for flexible delivery. While the CFL’s programme development targets are within reach, the Review Panel is concerned about the absence of a co-ordinated programme development effort, which may jeopardise the achievement of the targets. We also understand that there are significant delays
in course development for flexible delivery, as courses are first approved for F2F delivery and later converted for flexible delivery. Such an approach leads to a belief within the faculty that their primary role is to teach F2F, and that the development of distance/online courses is a secondary role for which additional payment is available. While this may be a cost-effective way of course development, timely development of the course and availability of the course in an equitable manner for all modes of learning is affected. The university need to reconsider more seriously its course development and delivery approach for FL.

We also observed that while there is a common course development approach for new and revised courses, there are different methods of quality assurance (QA). Online courses developed at the CFL are externally reviewed by faculty at the University of Tasmania, while courses developed at the faculty level without the assistance of the CFL have a different level of QA. As indicated before, quality should be the responsibility of the faculty, and course development needs to be an iterative process of review, reflection and continuous revision and updating. However, a common system of peer review and checking would be highly desirable, rather than dependence on external faculty for validation. From this point of view, “The Flexible Learning Programme Design and Development Quality Assurance Framework,” including the quality standards for online course development, is a good beginning.

The university also has a policy for the external review of its academic programmes every three years by engaging an external adviser or a panel of reviewers. The external adviser is required to examine and make comments on the teaching materials and arrangements for students studying through the FL mode. This is definitely a good practice to make the courses relevant and up-to-date.

We also tried to look into the workload of the faculty for the development of FL courses. Interviews with faculty provided us with different views. The weight of the workload indicated for FL courses vis-à-vis F2F courses ranged from 50 to 80 per cent. While variation may be acceptable due to differences in subjects, it is important to have clarity on how much time is expected from a faculty member to develop a course. Certainly, available information for multimedia and online course development indicates that it would be either equivalent to or more time consuming than a F2F course. Therefore, strategically the university should consider blending faculty roles for teaching F2F and FL courses. Such an approach will give parity to teaching a FL course, and thereby improve the acceptance amongst the faculty for FL as a mainstay of their work. This issue of the convergence of roles can be addressed by incorporating these requirements into the job descriptions and recruitment considerations of new faculty.

Of late, the university has taken note of the OER movement for the development of courses. The Vice Chancellor indicated the creation of a Centre for OER within the university to further facilitate interest amongst teachers to use OER. This is certainly a good development; will reduce the time and costs for the development of courses and facilitate the simultaneous release of quality courses for F2F and FL modes.

**Commendation 7:** The Review Panel commends the Vice Chancellor for initiating the use of OER in the university.

**Affirmation 6:** The Review Panel affirms the commitment to a programme-based approach to course development in order to transform USP’s pedagogy and curriculum.

**Affirmation 7:** The Review Panel affirms the availability of a robust QA process for curriculum for flexible delivery.

**Affirmation 8:** The Review Panel affirms that the three-year review of programmes is a good practice to keep the teaching and learning in the flexible mode relevant and up-to-date.
Recommendation 11: The Review Panel recommends that courses with flexible modes of delivery and F2F instruction be offered simultaneously. It is recommended that a programme development timeline be adopted at the faculty level, with the CFL co-ordinating the actual development of the courses along with the faculty.

Recommendation 12: The Review Panel recommends the institutionalisation of the QA process by integrating QA into the course development procedure, as approved by the senate.

Recommendation 13: The Review Panel recommends that the university review the faculty workload for FL courses and develop appropriate incentives to encourage the adoption of FL.

Recommendation 14: The Review Panel recommends that the proposed Centre for OER be treated as part of the Design and Development Team and placed within the CFL, as part of the university’s initiative to strengthen the CFL. The university needs to develop an institution-wide OER policy to enable effective implementation of OER development, adoption and reuse.
Supporting students within a FL framework is about ensuring that learners have the appropriate mechanisms to support their choices regarding when, where and how learning occurs (the pace, place and mode of delivery). The increasingly diverse range of students across USP, and particularly the specific needs of regional centres, require substantial co-ordination and consideration. Specifically, access and connectivity to the Internet and other suitable technologies are essential for the success of learners.

Learner support typically falls within three areas. According to the Commonwealth of Learning publication *Learner Support*, this includes: personal support, such as advice or counselling; academic support, such as tutoring, grading and examining; and F2F or mediated support. Within this review of FL, aspects of learner support were investigated and interviews undertaken with students, key learning support staff, various academic staff with responsibilities for programme coordination, heads of schools, and many others.

During the discussions, we observed a growing concern for the low success rate of learners in the FL mode. However, the data presented to us were not convincing in light of international trends showing high dropout rates in distance learning courses. It may also be noted that students in open and distance learning have different needs and therefore may not take the final examinations. Therefore, comparing the F2F success rate with that of the FL is not desirable. However, the university’s calculation of success rate is based on students appearing for the final examination and successfully completing the course. This seems to be a better way of comparing success rate in F2F and FL modes. We were also informed that the university is examining in-depth the reasons for the low success of the students in FL modes. Certainly the FL students face several disadvantages, including poor access to the Internet and lack of tutoring support.

We have considered the course development workload of the faculty previously under programme development. However, in the context of the FL modes, especially in the online mode, it is necessary to consider the teaching load of the faculty and/or teaching assistants. Particularly in the fully online courses, it is highly desirable that a 1:20 tutor–student ratio be kept for effective online discussion and tutor support. While we suggest this, the university needs to consider the online teaching workload on the basis of student enrolment.

During interaction with faculty at the regional campuses, it came to our notice that the number of students withdrawing from flexible courses (blended and online modes) is on the rise. Staff members believe that this is due to lack of adequate support to FL students in the university. Students, however, had different reasons for joining flexible courses, and the reasons for withdrawal by more students may be further investigated. Students and staff at regional campuses also urged that the withdrawal period given to students should be the same across the university, and the time should be reasonable.

### 5.1 Laucala Campus and Regional Campuses

Strong views were expressed by interviewees across USP that students at the university learn best in the F2F mode and that the tutorial system is essential for student success. Learning in English presents many challenges, and it was observed that in some cases English is a third or

---

fourth language. During our interviews, it was also noted that there was a perception amongst some employers that a graduate’s English was weak and therefore the academic quality of the qualification or award was insufficient.

There is confusion within the University Handbook about what students can expect to receive as support. It states that online and distance learners will not receive F2F tuition. However, this is largely ignored, as teaching assistants are considered desirable and essential within the USP context. Students themselves believe they should have more F2F tuition, and in some cases they only opt for online because that is the only choice they have, but they would prefer a tutor as part of the learning experience.

The allocation of teaching assistants is a point of contention, and again it is unclear about who is responsible and accountable and what numbers are required. Accounts were provided of some teaching assistants not being paid in a timely fashion, teaching assistants not being appointed at all, uncoordinated systems and slow response from faculties, variable quality in teaching assistants, and teaching assistants’ remuneration not taking into account regional differences in the cost of living (which has an impact on the type of teaching assistants prepared to work for minimal salary). Campus directors, in particular, felt that the decision to remove their authority in relation to the appointment of teaching assistants had had an unintentional impact on their ability to ensure that students were provided with their entitlements, and had contributed to a breakdown in communication with the faculties.

Several examples of good online support were observed, and students who had had a good experience indicated that they enjoyed online learning. There was no doubt that those academic staff members and student support officers who had regular access to their students and had contributed to the design for online learning were able to deliver the largest numbers of motivated, satisfied and successful students.

Regional directors are committed to the welfare and progress of their students. Some describe an active community, whereas others struggle to provide adequate support. Poor access to technology (e.g., computers), other equipment and textbooks is a continuing source of frustration to learners. Connectivity remains an issue and is not always available for students. It is unclear how budgets and resources are allocated in transparent ways. The role of Campus Director appears to be increasingly one of implementing decisions made elsewhere rather than participating in the decision-making process. Given their direct engagement with FL students, the local communities, and providing direct feedback to the university, a greater involvement in the decision-making process is recommended. The directors seem to be dealing with practical issues on the ground and appear far removed from the aspirations in the university’s Strategic Plan 2013–2018. As one staff member put it, “we need to move from bad to good rather than from good to excellent in the regional centres.” However, the university’s Strategic Plan does indicate that 20 per cent of central academic staff will be relocated to the regions. The process is underway, and could make a real difference to achieving the vision and goals within the plan’s timeline.

At the Solomon Islands campus, space was a major problem, with students being accommodated in tents and on the hillside. Lack of space in computer laboratories and the library led to overcrowding, and this was compounded by the challenge of low connectivity, a major source of frustration for students trying to access their courses on Moodle. This is a concern, since most staff and students do not have access to the Internet at home due to prohibitive costs. Because of the free Internet, most students prefer to come to the regional campus. Another challenge was lack of qualified staff, although CFL staff came to train academics in Moodle, and staff from faculties visited from time to time to provide academic support and lectures to students.
The USP brand is well respected, and despite the hardships, students still prefer to enrol at USP. A new campus is envisaged for the Solomon Islands in 2016, but some measures need to be taken in the interim to support the large body of students. These would include (a) building a large shed with fans and seating facilities; (b) additional canteen facilities; (c) faster connectivity; and (d) more teaching assistants and mentors.

Staff members, interviewed across USP, are highly committed to serving USP students, including at their regional campuses, and to providing access to high-quality education in the region. There were concerns that the university’s strategy did not take adequate account of the varied contexts across the Pacific within which the university operates. More comprehensive planning and delivery mechanisms for FL are needed if the Strategic Plan is to succeed. Regional campus staff felt that the same facilities that headquarters enjoy should be provided to them. There is a perception that senior managers are not fully aware of the challenges the regional campus staff face, and the university strategy can only succeed through a deeper appreciation and acknowledgement of the efforts required in the regions.

Affirmation 9: The Review Panel affirms the concerns and commitment of the regional/campus directors to provide better learner support services to the FL students.

Affirmation 10: The Review Panel affirms the university’s concern for increasing the success rate of FL students and appreciates the current efforts to do more analysis of available data.

Recommendation 15: The Review Panel strongly recommends that the university clarify the level of support to be provided to the FL students and develop a clear policy with respect to the hours of contact, the technology to be used for support, the procedures for engaging teaching assistants, the payment norms, etc. Students should, at their time of admission, receive a clear statement of what to expect.

Recommendation 16: The Review Panel recommends that the appointment of teaching assistants be delegated to the campus directors, and that faculty provide the norms for appointment and regularly review such appointments. Accordingly, the budget for organising tutorials may also be delegated from the faculties to the campuses.

Recommendation 17: The Review Panel recommends that the university develop norms for faculty workload based on student enrolment.

5.2 Student Learning Support

The current model at USP is a decentralised one when it comes to academic support such as tutoring, grading and examining, and F2F or mediated support. For students to achieve the stated learning outcomes within the institutional FL strategy, equitable access to equipment and media is essential for course and tutorial support. There is some confusion between
modalities regarding what students are entitled to in relation to academic support such as tutoring, grading and examining, and with respect to F2F and mediated support.

Typical issues that arose included: lack of textbooks; inability to attend tutorial support; inadequate physical spaces for satellite tutorials, whereby some students can attend but are unable to contribute to discussions due to lack of chairs and too many students being in attendance; lack of a tutor in a particular discipline area due to the unavailability of suitable teaching assistants; and insufficient students to justify a tutorial. There was some confusion about how many students are required for a tutorial, with figures ranging from 10 to 30. There was some concern amongst regional campuses that there were inadequate numbers of computers, with the ratio in Vanuatu quoted as being 1:12 (one computer for every 12 students). The ratio at the Solomon Islands campus was much higher, with only 80 computers for 4,000 students (a ratio of 1:50). However, with the phenomenal growth of mobile devices, the university may consider deploying these lower-cost options to reach more students.

Learner support within the decentralised model appears to be disconnected and lacks cohesion, resulting in duplication of effort, lack of consistency, silo behaviours across faculties and a disparity in services to students. While faculties may have specific needs, which is understandable, the lack of a coordinated approach is undermining efforts to ensure all students have access to appropriate learner support. Insufficient coordination is hampering efforts to achieve the university’s strategic vision of FL.

There is a perceived lack of support for distance learners, who make up at least 50 per cent of the student numbers at USP. Efforts to support students seem to be focused on the campus-based learner.

Critical to the success of students is an appropriate orientation and induction to learning. Regardless of modality, all students would benefit from a more extensive commitment to the programme Success@USP. This programme received accolades from students and staff alike; however, it is not a mandatory requirement and is inconsistently applied across the university.

There does not appear to be an integrated approach to learning design and the design of activities for students within the curriculum that could better prepare learners for their studies. Learning design needs to take into account learning activities that require Internet use and to classify these as essential, desirable or optional so as to address the considerable access and connectivity issues across the region.

USP has student learning specialists (SLSs) to provide some kinds of learner support, and they are currently located at the faculties. However, these staff members were earlier located at the CFL, and none of those interviewed had an idea as to why the decentralisation had happened. Some SLSs also felt that this had resulted in a duplication of effort, while others indicated that it was helping them to get to know the faculty more closely and thereby solve students’ issues in a practical manner.

The university also has a highly successful student mentor programme, whereby senior students who have completed a course are engaged as mentors for a group of students to assist them with learning. The mentors also receive an honorarium for their services. A student who served as a mentor to several courses indicated that this helped her to develop subject-level mastery. This practice should be replicated more widely across both headquarters and regional centres.

During interactions with the faculty and regional campus staff, we understood that the local teaching assistants and regional campus staff do not have access to Moodle or the assignment submission records of the learners. This creates a disconnect between the students and the learner support system in the university; it is highly desirable that such access be provided course-wise to teaching assistants, and that access to all courses be made available to the
SLS staff and regional campus staff. A dashboard showing assignments submitted and grades would help these groups of support staff to provide more effective services.

During our interactions with students and regional campus staff, we realised that the university is facing huge challenges in the timely delivery of study materials to its learners. While this has been reduced over the years due to the introduction of Moodle, students still prefer hard copies. Many a time, late arrival of materials in the book shop is due to postal/delivery issues. It is therefore important for the university to consider setting up desktop publishing (DTP) systems in the regional campuses to print materials locally for low-enrolment courses.

During interactions, one of the major problems students shared was delay in turnaround time for their submitted assignments. On further scrutiny, we found that not all students submit assignments using the Moodle Turnitin interface. Many do submit their assignments in hard copy, and evaluating these takes time. Also, these evaluated assignments are returned by post, which leads to delays for various reasons.

**Commendation 8:** The Review Panel commends the peer mentor programme and the opportunities provided to students for personal growth and development.

**Commendation 9:** The Review Panel commends the availability of the Success@USP programme in the university.

**Recommendation 18:** The Review Panel recommends the appointment of a “Coordinator” or “Head of Student Support and Engagement” to oversee the activities of student support across the headquarters and regional campuses. This position would coordinate the “student support journey,” ensuring that flexible learners are appropriately catered to and that both physical and virtual resources are planned for and championed. The coordination of the student support system should include campus life, first-year experience coordinators, the library, SLSs, student administration, and potentially course coordinators of large initial courses such as UU114 (English for Academic Purposes).

**Recommendation 19:** The Review Panel recommends that USP develop a student support lifecycle to inform the development of a set of minimum expectations for all students.

**Recommendation 20:** The Review Panel recommends that Success@USP be mainstreamed throughout the university and made mandatory for all students at the beginning of their study at USP. This could be one of the responsibilities of CFL.

**Recommendation 21:** The Review Panel recommends that teaching assistants, SLS staff and regional campus staff be provided with access to key Moodle data to monitor and provide effective learner support.

**Recommendation 22:** The Review Panel recommends that the university review its study material delivery approach and consider setting up DTP units at the regional campuses to facilitate timely access to books and study materials.

**Recommendation 23:** The Review Panel recommends that students be encouraged to submit assignments using the Moodle Turnitin interface. It may be useful for the university to make this a requirement, as reasonable computer time and Internet access are increasingly provided by the university to prepare assignments.

**Recommendation 24:** The Review Panel recommends that the following Australian Council of Open and Distance Education Benchmarks be reviewed and addressed as a matter of urgency:

---

Student training for the effective use of technology enhanced learning

- Student training is aligned with the technologies and teaching approaches in use at the institution.
- Student training for technology enhanced learning is adequately resourced.
- There are procedures in place to regularly evaluate the training and training resources provided for students.
- Coordination occurs between those areas providing training for students.
- Student training programmes are delivered flexibly and address differing skill levels.
- Student training promotes an ethical approach to the use of social media and the technology enhanced learning services provided by the institution.
- Evaluation data is used to inform the planning for continuous improvement of student development processes.
- There are clearly defined pathways for students to access the training they require.

Student support for the use of technology enhanced learning

- The provision of support for students is aligned with the technology enhanced learning services used by the institution.
- Student technology enhanced learning support services are resourced.
- There are clearly defined pathways for students to access support services and these are promoted to the student body.
- Support sites and resources are accessible from commonly used devices and the analytics of student usage are monitored.
- There are procedures in place to ensure that student support services and resources are regularly evaluated.
- There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for students contributes to their continuous improvement.
- Coordination occurs between those areas providing support for students.
- There are procedures in place to ensure there is an alignment between student training and student support.
- Processes are in place to determine the ongoing support requirements of students.
- New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for student support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.

Staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning

- Technical and educational support is aligned with the current and emerging learning technologies being deployed by the institution.
- Procedures are in place to identify the support requirements of staff, at individual, team and institutional levels.
- Procedures are in place to regularly evaluate the support services and resources provided for staff.
- Coordination occurs between those areas providing support services for staff across the institution.
- Technology enhanced learning support services are accessible and used by staff.
- Technology enhanced learning support services are adequately resourced.
- Technology enhanced learning support services are promoted to staff.
- New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for staff support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.
- There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for staff contributes to their continuous improvement.
Flexible Learning Technologies

USP has been a pioneer in the use of ICT for the delivery of education since 1972. The university is committed to ICT-leveraged education and has a sophisticated satellite network, strong Moodle support, and various innovations under the eLITE initiative, comprising university-wide representation and led by the Dean of the Faculty of Science, Technology and Environment (FSTE). The university has been looking into areas of mLearning, learning analytics, and distributed architecture for Moodle and has developed an artificial intelligence-based early warning system (EWS) for Moodle. USP member countries have varied ICT penetration and Internet access, and this creates a substantial challenge for the university to provide students with access to appropriate technologies for FL.

6.1 USPNet

Currently, the USPNet is central to teaching and learning at USP. The university has developed a special project to upgrade and re-engineer it for optimal performance. The elements of this upgrade completed so far include the following:

- change of the satellite system from Gilat to iDirect, giving the university greater control of the system and the ability to allocate and monitor resources and track the quality of services more accurately;
- change of the audio and videoconferencing system from Click to Meet to REACT, a new interactive distance learning system customized for USP’s regional network;
- introduction of an additional satellite system (Ku-band) to complement the original C-band system, providing scalable network expansion at lower costs;
- upgrade of the Internet gateway from STM1 to STM4, quadrupling the speed from 155 kbps to 622 kbps;
- increase in the satellite bandwidth, initially by 5 MHz and more recently by a further 10 MHz; and
- introduction of new servers in regional campuses and the regionalisation of significant USPNet functions.
The Review Panel used the USPNet’s REACT system to interact with students in seven member countries and therefore gained first-hand experience of the technology and its advantages and disadvantages. The panel observed a lack of a robust professional approach for the maintenance and operation of remote sites. This could be due either to lack of training of the staff managing at the remote end or to turnover in the staff managing the system. Some faculty suggested that the technology does not give eye-level contact during teaching, and therefore, the students do not feel that the teacher is talking to them. As indicated previously, space at the remote centres is limited, although at some places there are two studios. Students complained that some of the courses use marks for participation and interaction through REACT, and this generates substantial inequity, as not all the students have the opportunity/connectivity for interaction. Satellite-based technology is also susceptible to weather conditions, and therefore issues of reception and quality are also encountered. We also understand that there are better two-way videoconferencing systems available (open source as well as proprietary) that could potentially replace the REACT system. An investigation into these systems would seem appropriate for both pedagogical and efficiency reasons.

6.2 Moodle

USP is using the Moodle LMS for most of its courses (F2F as well as FL). It has a strong, experienced and talented Learning Systems Team that manages 537 courses on Moodle. The university has made a strategic choice with the open source Moodle LMS, which is supported by the global community. The Review Panel was satisfied with most of the courses that were provided for review. The course review revealed some consistency and access issues related to design style. Some of the courses, especially from the Law School, are exemplary and demonstrate simple, innovative and highly effective quality instructional design, comparable with the best across the globe. The Law School also has very clear guidelines for the online lecturer and the lead coordinator of courses. In addition, the Law School has developed a clear framework for how the blended, online and F2F courses are treated in the Moodle environment (see Annexure 5). The Moodle developer team has developed an EWS that is currently being implemented for some of the courses of the FSTE. While we commend the strong Moodle support, there is a need for a university-wide style guide to provide a uniform course view for learners, regardless of who develops courses — faculties or the CFL. This should be developed at the institutional level for coherence and consistency.
Commendation 10: The Review Panel commends the development of the EWS for Moodle by the FSTE to support student success.

Commendation 11: The Review Panel commends the Law School for offering a full law programme online using Moodle and for ensuring that good instructional design principles underpin the courses. The Law School has examples of good practices for online delivery that need to be emulated by others within the institution.

Commendation 12: The Review Panel commends the professional and talented staff of the Learning Systems Team for their service and exemplary dedication to providing effective services to stakeholders.

Affirmation 11: The Review Panel affirms the concern of the university’s senior management to provide high-speed Internet access to the learners at the regional campuses.

Recommendation 25: The Review Panel recommends rebranding the Moodle site of USP to reflect the nature of the online learning experience. The panel further recommends that the Moodle site (which may be rebranded as eLearn@USP) include both library and student learning support blocks to widen the concept of online learning.

Recommendation 26: The Review Panel recommends that a style guide for Moodle courses be developed based on the already existing work of the Law School, and also that the university provide a set of guidelines or basic expectations for the use of the online learning environment, the role of teaching assistants, the date by which Moodle courses should be made available to students, etc.

Recommendation 27: The Review Panel recommends that the EWS be mainstreamed in all the Moodle courses offered by the university.

Recommendation 28: The Review Panel recommends that the REACT system be reviewed and compared using appropriate criteria for pedagogical, delivery and efficiency aspects in order to meet international standards for using web-based two-way videoconference systems, to include open source options such as Big Blue Button.

Recommendation 29: The Review Panel recommends that the recorded satellite tutorial sessions be posted on a suitable media server for access to all learners via the Internet.

6.3 Other Technologies at USP

One of the biggest concerns at USP (both at the Laucala campus and regional campuses) is access to computers and the Internet. While the university is providing free Internet access, and at some places keeps the computer labs open 24 hours, the reality for students is a shortage of computers. This is not necessarily due to a lack of computers, but rather to a lack of management of available resources. For example, there is no booking system for computers/work stations, and there is no rationalisation to prevent the continuous use of a computer by one student. In the absence of any such policy, a first-come-first-serve method is in operation, and many students therefore have difficulty accessing available resources. Some students do have their own laptops/tablets and come to the university for free Internet, as this is costly elsewhere.

The University subscribes to various databases and online resources, and these are also available to the learners through the Internet via Ezyproxy. Most students, with challenges relating to Internet access, depend on the facilities at the regional campuses to access library resources. The university has local networks to provide services to the students.
While we were not introduced to the FM radio station available at the Laucala campus, through interaction with the CFL staff, we realised that the university also has a radio station, called Pacific Radio, operated by the Faculty of Arts, Law and Education (FALE). Considering the geographical location and low cost of this technology, the Review Panel is of the opinion that the university should consider the use of FM radio more aggressively in all the member countries. At present, FM radio in the university is probably considered a low priority; we feel the university could optimise this opportunity to solve some of the issues associated with F2F tutorials via satellite and help reach the last mile. As students in the Pacific region come from oral traditions, the use of radio may be a great source of learning for them, and an audio programme, once developed, can be delivered through radio, CDs, podcasts and Web-streaming, all at low cost.

**Commendation 13:** The Review Panel commends the university for providing free Internet facilities to the learners at its campuses.

**Recommendation 30:** The Review Panel recommends that the university urgently develop a media integration plan for teaching and learning, covering the use of audio (radio, Web-streaming, CD), video (DVD, YouTube), LMS, videoconferencing and social media.

**Recommendation 31:** The Review Panel recommends that USP consider the use of FM radio for strengthening learner support and tutoring, and suggests the possibility of setting up FM stations across the campuses.

**Recommendation 32:** The Review Panel recommends that the university urgently implement a system to rationalise the use of computers on the regional campuses outside Laucala and install a manual/computerised booking system to provide maximum two-hour slots per day, per student.

**Recommendation 33:** The Review Panel recommends that the university implement a single sign-on system to provide remote access to its library resources, online databases, and Moodle platform.

**Recommendation 34:** The Review Panel recommends that the Multimedia Team at the CFL be charged with the responsibility of strengthening and implementing the multimedia teaching learning strategy to include audio, radio and social media channels.
USP has a strong commitment to QA. In the Strategic Plan 2013–2018, Prof. Rajesh Chandra, Vice Chancellor of USP, says, “The provision of high-quality, internationally recognised tertiary education will assist in establishing a beneficial, seamless system that facilitates efficient collaboration between national, regional and international institutions.” In its commitment to moving from “good to excellent,” the university focuses on enhancing the quality of teaching, learning, research and services as measured through the international accreditation of programmes, and therefore provides both currency and credibility for USP qualifications. To improve the quality of teaching and learning, the university has taken up the following three initiatives (Strategic Plan 2013–2018, p. 24):

- ensure that the teaching staff complete or hold PGCTT or equivalent;
- expand continuing professional development for teaching excellence; and
- improve the quality and impact of teaching.

The university is also committed to improving the quality of its student support services and its research impact. USP is leveraging ICT to improve the quality of its education. It is also committed to undertaking the following (Strategic Plan 2013–2018, p. 29):

- conduct a second institutional quality audit and seek Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation;
- ensure a full administrative review; and
- seek international accreditation of academic programmes.

The Strategic Plan 2013–2018 gives high priority to all aspects of quality and its management. The university has initiated the Strategic Total Academic Review (STAR), which received appreciation in the 2013 Academic Audit.\(^\text{11}\) The Academic Review (2013) also states that the university has a quality framework in place that adopts the ADRI cycle — approach, deployment, results and improvement. The university, in its commitment to improvement, has undertaken self-review and external validation of several of its activities, and the review of the CFL is one of these. We also note that the university collects student feedback through the Student Evaluation of Courses (SEC) Survey. This survey is administered to all the students of the university, for all the courses, at the end of each semester. However, incentives should be provided to encourage participation by FL students.

As discussed previously, the development of flexible courses starts only after formal approval of a course by the university’s Academic Standards and Quality Committee (ASQC) and the senate. However, there is no uniform mechanism for assuring the quality of the courses developed. Although CFL has developed a robust quality framework and checklist and also uses external review of all online courses, it does not have the authority for all course development. There is little demonstration of or evidence for how reviews, and data more generally, inform the enhancement of learning and teaching, and this is a missed opportunity. Analytics is becoming increasingly important for providing support and assisting students in reaching their goals. We have already deliberated on this matter before and would like to emphasise the need for developing a culture of quality within the organisation through self-check and peer review, with an eye for quality enhancement rather than just Quality

---

\(^\text{11}\) Report of the 2013 Academic Audit of the University of the South Pacific, prepared by the Academic Quality Agency for New Zealand Universities (2013).
Assurance (QA). We also believe that quality enhancement and management for flexible courses should be the responsibility of a separate team within the CFL, which we have included within the proposed new structure. Excellent free QA resources are available for all modes of learning, including OER, and these should be identified and adapted to suit the USP context. A co-ordinated approach to implementation that involves all stakeholders would lead to developing a sustainable culture of quality within the institution.

We also view professional development of faculty and staff as crucial for ensuring quality in the organisation. While interacting with the staff and faculty, we came across several instances in which QA activities were not appreciated and the large number of reviews undertaken were seen as unnecessary. This is due to insufficient engagement with the faculty and staff, and shortfalls in their understanding of QA within the university. We asked many of the faculty members to articulate what they do to ensure quality of student learning experiences in the flexible courses. Mostly, we received responses related to material development by experts as indicative of QA. This is a limited view of quality, which does not encompass the overall FL experiences of the students. This calls for a systematic approach to quality matters, including predictably enhancing staff awareness and professional development. We recognise the imperative of regularly training staff in an institution such as the USP, where FL is a core activity which involves significant numbers of students, and where faculty turnover is high compared to other universities.

We also asked the faculty and the CFL staff about their focus on research into various aspects of FL. The self-study report of the CFL mentions the need for institutional research to analyse the pass rate of the FL students. USP has in place a recognition and reward system for teaching, research and publications. The USP research office has a central Electronic Research Repository (ERR) system (http://repository.usp.ac.fj), where faculty/staff members are allowed to upload their research outputs and academic publications. The ERR is also integrated into the staff appraisal system as a basis for recognition, rewards and incentives. However, institutional research on FL is not visible within the university. It may be noted that research — both discipline-based and systemic — needs to be considered an integral part of the university’s QA system, especially for its relevance to evidence-based development and quality enhancement. A research and evaluation system for FL may be coordinated from the CFL to help develop new models and provide support for evidence-based decision making.

Commendation 14: The Review Panel commends the university for its commitment to quality, as reflected in the Strategic Plan 2013–2018 and its activities around quality reviews within the university.

Recommendation 35: The Review Panel recommends that the university consider the creation of a Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team within the CFL to oversee the management and development of the quality of flexible course development and delivery.

Recommendation 36: The Review Panel also recommends that the university encourage the FL student to take the SEC Survey, and analyse the data available every semester to take appropriate measures based on the feedback received.

Recommendation 37: The Review Panel recommends the creation of a unit within the CFL to further staff development in all areas related to FL.

Recommendation 38: The Review Panel recommends that institutional research be considered an important area of activity of the CFL, and that a dedicated team be engaged for gathering analytical data and conducting targeted research in collaboration with teachers from other faculties.
Recommendation 39: The Review Panel recommends that the university adopt an incremental approach as it makes the transition to online delivery so that the enabling structures and capacity are in place to ensure successful implementation.
Summary of Commendations, Affirmations and Recommendations

**Commendation 1**: The Review Panel commends the university’s aspiration to make the transition from good to excellent, and its target-oriented approach to delivering FL for all.

**Commendation 2**: The Review Panel commends the broad conception of FL at USP, with a strong focus on the learner experience in recognition that different students have differing needs, depending on their personal circumstances.

**Commendation 3**: The CFL’s Strategic Plan demonstrates a commitment to the wider university strategy.

**Commendation 4**: The Review Panel commends the Learning and Teaching Fellowship scheme proposed in the strategic plan of the CFL, seeing it as an important initiative to create champions for FL in the USP faculties and schools.

**Commendation 5**: The Review Panel commends the commitment of staff to draw upon and use OER and open learning design to increase efficiency and participation in global directions.

**Commendation 6**: The Review Panel commends the university for its flexi-schools.

**Commendation 7**: The Review Panel commends the Vice Chancellor for initiating the use of OER in the university.

**Commendation 8**: The Review Panel commends the peer mentor programme and the opportunities provided to students for personal growth and development.

**Commendation 9**: The Review Panel commends the availability of the Success@USP programme in the university.

**Commendation 10**: The Review Panel commends the development of the EWS for Moodle by the FSTE to support student success.

**Commendation 11**: The Review Panel commends the Law School for offering a full law programme online using Moodle and for ensuring that good instructional design principles underpin the courses. The Law School has examples of good practices for online delivery that need to be emulated by others within the institution.

**Commendation 12**: The Review Panel commends the professional and talented staff of the Learning Systems Team for their service and exemplary dedication to providing effective services to stakeholders.

**Commendation 13**: The Review Panel commends the university for providing free Internet facilities to the learners at its campuses.

**Commendation 14**: The Review Panel commends the university for its commitment to quality, as reflected in the Strategic Plan 2013–2018 and its activities around quality reviews within the university.
**Affirmation 1:** The Review Panel affirms the intent to revise the Teaching and Learning Policy to align with the new Strategic Plan, as this should provide a stronger framework to help guide future decisions about the nature of FL.

**Affirmation 2:** The Review Panel affirms the financial commitment of the university to implement the Strategic Plan and to deliver results within specified time frames.

**Affirmation 3:** We affirm the complexity and importance of the course-team approach to programme development and the proactive approach that CFL staff members have adopted to develop collaborative partnerships to serve the internal stakeholders.

**Affirmation 4:** The Review Panel affirms the need to accept the CFL as a central service of USP that provides central leadership in FL across the university, ensures quality and equity of student learning experience across campuses, provides course design and development templates and standards, and works collaboratively with faculties to empower their staff in FL.

**Affirmation 5:** The Review Panel affirms the work currently underway to develop a flexi-school policy, which should help to clarify the procedures, expectations and resourcing requirements associated with this method of course design and delivery.

**Affirmation 6:** The Review Panel affirms the commitment to a programme-based approach to course development in order to transform USP’s pedagogy and curriculum.

**Affirmation 7:** The Review Panel affirms the availability of a robust QA process for curriculum for flexible delivery.

**Affirmation 8:** The Review Panel affirms that the three-year review of programmes is a good practice to keep the teaching and learning in the flexible mode relevant and up-to-date.

**Affirmation 9:** The Review Panel affirms the concerns and commitment of the regional/campus directors to provide better learner support services to the FL students.

**Affirmation 10:** The Review Panel affirms the university’s concern for increasing the success rate of FL students and appreciates the current efforts to do more analysis of available data.

**Affirmation 11:** The Review Panel affirms the concern of the university’s senior management to provide high-speed Internet access to the learners at the regional campuses.

**Recommendation 1:** The Review Panel recommends that, following a consultation process engaging staff and students on all campuses, an explicit policy statement be developed about what FL means at USP.

**Recommendation 2:** The Review Panel strongly recommends that USP undertake advocacy at the middle management level of heads of schools and at the disciplinary level to better understand the changes required to achieve the FL aspirations, and that teachers begin to offer FL simultaneously with F2F courses. The senior management needs to work with academic staff to develop a common understanding of the direction and mechanisms to achieve this change.

**Recommendation 3:** The Review Panel recommends that a Programme Innovation Award be developed to recognise teams of staff who commit to curriculum redesign on a large scale and who make innovative use of FL throughout the student experience.
Recommendation 4: The Review Panel recommends that some form of distributed research network be established, building on the proposed Learning and Teaching Fellowship scheme, to connect those staff members who have an interest in innovation and research in the area of FL.

Recommendation 5: The Review Panel recommends that a number of small grants be made available to the above Fellows to support research by faculty staff in the area of FL, and that the findings should be shared widely across and beyond the USP community.

Recommendation 6: The Review Panel strongly recommends early recruitment for the senior staff positions of the CFL to provide direction in order to further implement FL in the university. The Review Panel strongly feels the need for strengthening the lead position at a sufficient level in the university hierarchy to empower the CFL to play a leadership role in promoting the integration of FL within the institution.

Recommendation 7: The Review Panel also recommends that the CFL align staff training and professional development activities with the ‘Flexible Learning Programme Design and Development Quality Assurance Framework’, especially in areas that need capacity building, and that USP promote the value and importance of meeting the guidelines (Appendix 2 of the QA Framework) as evidence of effective teaching.

Recommendation 8: While the Review Panel believes that the continuing vacancies in the senior positions in the CFL is not conducive to the overall health of the unit and the adoption of FL within the university, it recognises the need to reorganise the CFL. The Director position of the CFL should be upgraded to a senior management position at the level of Pro Vice Chancellor or equivalent. The panel’s proposed restructuring of the CFL is given in Annexure 4.

Recommendation 9: The Review Panel strongly recommends that the new DVC (LTSS) develop, implement and monitor a comprehensive change plan for the FL strategy, which defines the offer for the 12 member nations, defines the responsibilities of deans and includes a focus on middle management, amongst other stakeholders.

Recommendation 10: The Review Panel recommends that the current delivery modes be revised to simplify the distinction between F2F teaching and more flexible study options, and to clarify the confusion between modes of delivery and methods of packaging study materials.

Recommendation 11: The Review Panel recommends that courses with flexible modes of delivery and F2F instruction be offered simultaneously. It is recommended that a programme development timeline be adopted at the faculty level, with the CFL co-ordinating the actual development of the courses along with the faculty.

Recommendation 12: The Review Panel recommends the institutionalisation of the QA process by integrating QA into the course development procedure, as approved by the senate.

Recommendation 13: The Review Panel recommends that the university review the faculty workload for FL courses and develop appropriate incentives to encourage the adoption of FL.

Recommendation 14: The Review Panel recommends that the proposed Centre for OER be treated as part of the Design and Development Team and placed within the CFL, part of the university’s initiative to strengthen the CFL. The university needs to develop an institution-wide OER policy to enable effective implementation of OER development, adoption and reuse.
**Recommendation 15:** The Review Panel strongly recommends that the university clarify the level of support to be provided to the FL students and develop a clear policy with respect to the hours of contact, the technology to be used for support, the procedures for engaging teaching assistants, the payment norms, etc. Students should, at their time of admission, receive a clear statement of what to expect.

**Recommendation 16:** The Review Panel recommends that the appointment of teaching assistants be delegated to the campus directors, and that faculty provide the norms for appointment and regularly review such appointments. Accordingly, the budget for organising tutorials may also be delegated from the faculties to the campuses.

**Recommendation 17:** The Review Panel recommends that the university develop norms for faculty workload based on student enrolment.

**Recommendation 18:** The Review Panel recommends the appointment of a “Co-ordinator” or “Head of Student Support and Engagement” to oversee the activities of student support across the headquarters and regional campuses. This position would coordinate the “student support journey,” ensuring that flexible learners are appropriately catered to and that both physical and virtual resources are planned for and championed. The co-ordination of the student support system should include campus life, first-year experience coordinators, the library, SLSs, student administration, and potentially course co-ordinators of large initial courses such as UU114 (English for Academic Purposes).

**Recommendation 19:** The Review Panel recommends that USP develop a student support lifecycle to inform the development of a set of minimum expectations for all students.

**Recommendation 20:** The Review Panel recommends that Success@USP be mainstreamed throughout the university and made mandatory for all students at the beginning of their study at USP. This could be one of the responsibilities of CFL.

**Recommendation 21:** The Review Panel recommends that teaching assistants, SLS staff and regional campus staff be provided with access to key Moodle data to monitor and provide effective learner support.

**Recommendation 22:** The Review Panel recommends that the university review its study material delivery approach and consider setting up DTP units at the regional campuses to facilitate timely access to books and study materials.

**Recommendation 23:** The Review Panel recommends that students be encouraged to submit assignments using the Moodle Turnitin interface. It may be useful for the university to make this a requirement, as reasonable computer time and Internet access are increasingly provided by the university to prepare assignments.

**Recommendation 24:** The Review Panel recommends that the following Australian Council of Open and Distance Education Benchmarks be reviewed and addressed as a matter of urgency:

*Student training for the effective use of technology enhanced learning*

- Student training is aligned with the technologies and teaching approaches in use at the institution.
- Student training for technology enhanced learning is adequately resourced.
- There are procedures in place to regularly evaluate the training and training resources provided for students.
• Coordination occurs between those areas providing training for students.
• Student training programmes are delivered flexibly and address differing skill levels.
• Student training promotes an ethical approach to the use of social media and the technology enhanced learning services provided by the institution.
• Evaluation data is used to inform the planning for continuous improvement of student development processes.
• There are clearly defined pathways for students to access the training they require.

**Student support for the use of technology enhanced learning**

• The provision of support for students is aligned with the technology enhanced learning services used by the institution.
• Student technology enhanced learning support services are resourced.
• There are clearly defined pathways for students to access support services and these are promoted to the student body.
• Support sites and resources are accessible from commonly used devices and the analytics of student usage are monitored.
• There are procedures in place to ensure that student support services and resources are regularly evaluated.
• There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for students contributes to their continuous improvement.
• Coordination occurs between those areas providing support for students.
• There are procedures in place to ensure there is an alignment between student training and student support.
• Processes are in place to determine the ongoing support requirements of students.
• New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for student support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.

**Staff support for the use of technology enhanced learning**

• Technical and educational support is aligned with the current and emerging learning technologies being deployed by the institution.
• Procedures are in place to identify the support requirements of staff, at individual, team and institutional levels.
• Procedures are in place to regularly evaluate the support services and resources provided for staff.
• Coordination occurs between those areas providing support services for staff across the institution.
• Technology enhanced learning support services are accessible and used by staff.
• Technology enhanced learning support services are adequately resourced.
• Technology enhanced learning support services are promoted to staff.
• New technology enhanced learning services are fully analysed for staff support requirements, prior to and during the adoption process.
• There are procedures in place that ensure that evaluation data on technology enhanced learning support services for staff contributes to their continuous improvement.
**Recommendation 25:** The Review Panel recommends rebranding the Moodle site of USP to reflect the nature of the online learning experience. The panel further recommends that the Moodle site (which may be rebranded as eLearn@USP) include both library and student learning support blocks to widen the concept of online learning.

**Recommendation 26:** The Review Panel recommends that a style guide for Moodle courses be developed based on the already existing work of the Law School, and also that the university provide a set of guidelines or basic expectations for the use of the online learning environment, the role of teaching assistants, the date by which Moodle courses should be made available to students, etc.

**Recommendation 27:** The Review Panel recommends that the EWS be mainstreamed in all the Moodle courses offered by the university.

**Recommendation 28:** The Review Panel recommends that the REACT system be reviewed and compared using appropriate criteria for pedagogical, delivery and efficiency aspects in order to meet international standards for using web-based two-way videoconference systems, to include open source options such as Big Blue Button.

**Recommendation 29:** The Review Panel recommends that the recorded satellite tutorial sessions be posted on a suitable media server for access to all learners via the Internet.

**Recommendation 30:** The Review Panel recommends that the university urgently develop a media integration plan for teaching and learning, covering the use of audio (radio, Web-streaming, CD), video (DVD, YouTube), LMS, videoconferencing and social media.

**Recommendation 31:** The Review Panel recommends that USP consider the use of FM radio for strengthening learner support and tutoring, and suggests the possibility of setting up FM stations across the campuses.

**Recommendation 32:** The Review Panel recommends that the university urgently implement a system to rationalise the use of computers on the regional campuses outside Lautala and install a manual/computerised booking system to provide maximum two-hour slots per day, per student.

**Recommendation 33:** The Review Panel recommends that the university implement a single sign-on system to provide remote access to its library resources, online databases, and Moodle platform.

**Recommendation 34:** The Review Panel recommends that the Multimedia Team at the CFL be charged with the responsibility of strengthening and implementing the multimedia teaching learning strategy to include audio, radio and social media channels.

**Recommendation 35:** The Review Panel recommends that the university consider the creation of a Quality Assurance and Enhancement Team within the CFL to oversee the management and development of the quality of flexible course development and delivery.

**Recommendation 36:** The Review Panel also recommends that the university encourage the FL student to take the SEC Survey, and analyse the data available every semester to take appropriate measures based on the feedback received.

**Recommendation 37:** The Review Panel recommends the creation of a unit within the CFL to further staff development in all areas related to FL.
**Recommendation 38:** The Review Panel recommends that institutional research be considered an important area of activity of the CFL, and that a dedicated team be engaged for gathering analytical data and conducting targeted research in collaboration with teachers from other faculties.

**Recommendation 39:** The Review Panel recommends that the university adopt an incremental approach as it makes the transition to online delivery so that the enabling structures and capacity are in place to ensure successful implementation.
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### Day One: Tuesday, 19 August 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity/Meeting</th>
<th>Interviewee(s) and Post Designation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.30am</td>
<td>Pick up from Holiday Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00–11.00am</td>
<td>Panel meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00–12.00pm</td>
<td>Meeting with the Vice Chancellor and President</td>
<td><strong>Professor Rajesh Chandra, Vice Chancellor and President</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30–1.30pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.00–3.00pm | Meeting with VC and members of Senior Management Team | **Professor Rajesh Chandra, Vice Chancellor and President**  
**Professor John Bythell, Deputy Vice Chancellor Research and International and Acting DVC Learning, Teaching and Student Services**  
**Dr. Diliwar Grewal, Vice President Administration**  
**Dr. Giuliano Paunga, Vice President, Regional Campuses and Property and Facilities**  
**Ms. Heather Stadel, Executive Director HR**  
**Mr. Kolinio Boila, Executive Director Finance**  
**Dr. Akanisi Kedrayate, Dean, Faculty of Arts, Law and Education (FALE)**  
**Dr. Kesaia Seniloli, Acting Dean, Faculty of Business and Economics (FBE)**  
**Dr. Anjeela Jokhan, Dean, Faculty of Science, Technology and Environment (FSTE)** |
| 3.00pm   | Panel discussion                      |                                                                                                       |
| 3.15pm   | Afternoon tea                         |                                                                                                       |
| 3.30–4.15pm | Tour of campus                      |                                                                                                       |
| 6.30pm   | Dinner                                | Hosted by Vice Chancellor and President, **Professor Rajesh Chandra**                                  |

### Day Two: Wednesday, 20 August 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity/Meeting</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.15am</td>
<td>Pick up from Holiday Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8.30–9.45am | Meeting with the 13 Regional Campus Directors; this meeting will be at Novotel Hotel, Lami | **Mr. Roderick Dixon, Cook Islands**  
**Dr. Uentabo Neemia-Mackenzie, Kiribati**  
**Dr. Samuela Bogitini, Labasa, Fiji**  
**Dr. Pramila Devi, Lautoka, Fiji**  
**Ms. Alamanda Lauti, Nauru**  
**Mr. Junior Thomas Aleta, Tokelau Acting CD**  
**Ms. Maryanne Talagi, Niue**  
**Dr. Irene Taaia, Marshall Island**  
**Mr. John Usuramo, Solomon Islands**  
**Dr. ‘Ana Koloto, Tonga**  
**Mr. David Manuella, Tuvalu**  
**Mr. Ruben Markward, Campus Manager, Emalus, Vanuatu**  
**Mrs. Ruby Va’a, Alafua, Samoa** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity/Meeting</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.15am</td>
<td>Panel discussion and morning tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40–11.30am</td>
<td>Acting Director Centre for FL (CFL)</td>
<td><strong>Dr. Theresa Koroivulaono</strong>, Acting Director CFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30am</td>
<td>Panel discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.40am–12.10pm</td>
<td>Heads of Schools</td>
<td><strong>Professor Steven Coombs</strong>, <em>School of Education, FALE</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professor Sudesh Mishra</strong>, <em>School of Language Arts and Media, FALE</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professor Arvin Patel</strong>, <em>School of Accounting and Financial Management, FBE</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professor Vijay Naidu</strong>, <em>School of Government Development and International Affairs, FBE</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professor Stephen Gale</strong>, <em>School of Geography, Earth Science and Environment, FSTE</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Professor Ansgar Fehnker</strong>, <em>School of Computing, Information and Mathematical Sciences, FSTE</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.10pm</td>
<td>Panel discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.20–12.55pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00–1.30pm</td>
<td>Video links with students: Group 1</td>
<td>Kiribat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Labasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lautoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nauru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuvalu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30–2.00pm</td>
<td>Video link with students: Group 2</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Niue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tokelau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td>Panel discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20–2.50pm</td>
<td>Meeting with Centre for FL Managers and Staff</td>
<td><strong>Mr. Dhiraj Bhartu</strong>, <em>Learning Systems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mrs. Rokosiga Morrison</strong>, <em>Instructional Design and Education Technology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mr. Javed Yusuf</strong>, <em>Multimedia Team</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Evan Naqiolevu</strong>, <em>Instructional Designer</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Motoniwesi Ikanivere</strong>, <em>Multimedia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Mr. Varun Rao</strong>, <em>Learning Systems</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Panel discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10pm</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity/Meeting</td>
<td>Interviewees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.30–4.00pm| Meeting with Director ITS and ITS Section Managers   | **Mr. Kisione Finau**, Director ITS  
**Mr. Fereti Atalifo**, Deputy Director  
**Mr. Josese Ravuvu**, Management Information System  
**Mr. Neil Sharma**, Systems and Networks Infrastructure  
**Mr. Peni Sigabalavu**, User Services |

**Day Three: Thursday, 21 August 2014. Venue: ICT Conference Room 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity/Meeting</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.15am</td>
<td>Pick up from Holiday Inn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8.30am     | Panel meeting                                        | **Ms. Joan Yee**, University Librarian  
**Ms. Litia Konusi**, Group Manager Student Academic Services  
**Mr. Glen Pope**, Group Manager Campus Life  
**Mrs. Niseta Buatava**, Student Learning Specialist/FALE  
**Mrs. Afshana Anzeg**, Student Learning Specialist/FSTE  
**Mrs. Roshila Singh**, Student Learning Specialist/FBE  
**Mrs. Riteta Laulala**, Student Learning Specialist/FBE |
| 9.00–9.30am| Meeting with Heads of Support Sections and Student Learning Specialists |                                                                             |
| 9.30am     | Panel discussion                                      | **FALE**                                                                     |
| 9.45–10.15am| Meeting with Course Coordinators of courses offered by FL |  
1. Dr. Rajni Chand – UU114  
2. Dr. Subhas Chandra – ED252  
3. Dr. Yoko Kanemasu – SO301  
**FBE**  
4. Dr. Margaret Mishra – UU200  
5. Ms. Emaline Nakabea – EC202  
6. Mr. Peter Fulcher – AF308  
**FSTE**  
7. Mr. Shavin Singh – UU100  
8. Dr. Kerese Maneli – IS224  
9. Mr. Tolu Muliaina – GE304 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity/Meeting</th>
<th>Interviewees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.25am</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45–</td>
<td>Meeting with Undergraduate Students studying by FL at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Laucala, Fiji</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am</td>
<td>Panel discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30am–</td>
<td>Meeting with Director and staff of College of</td>
<td>Mr. Aidan Thorne, Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>Foundation Studies</td>
<td>Mrs. Susan Sela, Associate Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Sereana Sasau, Subject Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Shivneel Prasad, Subject Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Semi Duaibe, Subject Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ms. Veena Bilimoria, Subject Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00–</td>
<td>Have Moodle access to some DFL courses to be identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00–</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10–</td>
<td>Associate Deans</td>
<td>Dr. Salanieta Bakalevu, L&amp;T, FALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40pm</td>
<td>Learning and Teaching (L&amp;T), Research and</td>
<td>Dr. Frances Koya, RGA, FALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate Affairs (RGA) and Planning and Quality (P&amp;Q)</td>
<td>Dr. Bruce Yeates, P&amp;Q, FALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Manorma Mohanty, L&amp;T, FBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Dawn Gibson, RGA, FBE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Bibhya Sharma, L&amp;T, FSTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Sushil Kumar, RGA, FSTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.40pm</td>
<td>Panel discussion and afternoon tea</td>
<td>Dr. David Rohindra, P&amp;Q, FSTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Emalus Campus, Vanuatu Site Visit Programme

**Monday, 25 August 2014**

**Review Panel Delegation:** Professor Belinda Tyan and Dr. Sanjay Mishra

**Venue:** Campus Management Meeting Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity/Meeting</th>
<th>Interviewee(s) and Post Designation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.15am</td>
<td>Pick up from Melanesian Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.30–9.00am</td>
<td>Panel meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00–9.30am</td>
<td>Meeting with the Group Manager, Emalus Campus</td>
<td><strong>Mr. Ruben Markward, Group Manager Emalus Campus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30–10.00am</td>
<td>Meeting with the Head of School of Law</td>
<td><strong>Professor Eric Colvin, Head of School of Law</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00–10.30am</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30–11.15am</td>
<td>Meeting with Academic Staff (School of Law)</td>
<td><strong>Dr. Katharina Serrano, Senior Lecturer</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Dr. Sheryl Buske, Lecturer</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Dr. Jessie Chella, Lecturer</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Ms. Mele Tupou, Lecturer</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Ms. Sofia Shah, Assistant Lecturer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15am–12.00pm</td>
<td>Meeting with Academic Staff responsible for teaching/coordinating FL courses</td>
<td><strong>Dr. Amton Mwaraksumes, Lecturer in Education</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Mr. Lekima Nalaukai, Assistant Lecturer in Economics</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Ms. Carol Aru, CFS Course Coordinator, DFL</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Dr. Hannah Vari Bogiri, Assistant Lecturer, DFL</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Mr. Satend Prasad, Science Laboratory Assistant, DFL</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Ms. Annette Kausiama, FL Coordinator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00–1.00pm</td>
<td>Undergraduate Students (DFL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00–2.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00–3.00pm</td>
<td>Meeting with Support Section Staff</td>
<td><strong>Ms. Helen Tamtam, Student Learning Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Ms. Nettie Collins, Manager, ITS</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Ms. Naomi Bolenga, Coordinator, Student Administrative Services</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Ms. Julie Reynold, Librarian</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00–3.30pm</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.30–4.30pm</td>
<td>Access to Moodle pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solomon Island Campus Site Visit Programme  
Monday, 25 August 2014  

Review Panel Delegation: Professor Asha Kanwar and Professor Mark Brown  

Venue: Library Reading Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity/Meeting</th>
<th>Interviewee(s) and Post Designation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30am</td>
<td>Pick up from Heritage Park Hotel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00–9.30 am</td>
<td>Panel meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.30–10.30am</td>
<td>Meeting with Campus Director</td>
<td>Dr. Jack Maebuta, Campus Director (Ag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30–10.45am</td>
<td>Morning tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45–11.45am</td>
<td>Meeting with the Academic Staff from</td>
<td>Dr. Luke Mani, Lecturer in Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Solomon Islands Campus</td>
<td>Dr. Jack Maebuta, Lecturer in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Moses Hunui, Assistant Lecturer in Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Vincent Nomae, Assistant Lecturer in Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45am–12.15pm</td>
<td>Meeting with the Undergraduate Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15–1.00pm</td>
<td>Tour of Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00–2.00pm</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00–3.00pm</td>
<td>Meeting with the Campus Staff members</td>
<td>Ms. Doris Pakipota, Student Officer – Assessment (SAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Arvindra Prasad, Science Laboratory Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Joseph Samani, Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Tony Dadalo, Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Laban Honimae, Manager Continuing Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Miss Florence Auma, Coordinator, College of Foundation Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mrs. Irene Anigafutu, Coordinator, Student Administrative Services (SAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Edmund Losi, Computer Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00pm</td>
<td>Afternoon tea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15–4.00pm</td>
<td>Access Moodle pages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexure 2: List of Stakeholders Consulted

FL Review Attendance List: Laucala Campus

**Day One: Tuesday, 19 August 2014**

1. Professor Rajesh Chandra, Vice Chancellor and President
2. Professor John Bythell, Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research and International) and Acting DVC (Learning, Teaching and Student Services)
3. Dr. Dilawar Grewal, Vice President (Administration)
4. Ms. Heather Stadel, Executive Director HR
5. Mr. Kolinio Boila, Executive Director Finance
6. Dr. Akanisi Kedrayate, Dean, Faculty of Arts, Law and Education (FALE)
7. Dr. Kesaia Seniloli, Acting Dean, Faculty of Business and Economics (FBE)
8. Associate Professor Anjeela Jokhan, Dean, Faculty of Science, Technology and Environment (FSTE)

**Day Two: Wednesday, 20 August 2014**

1. Mr. Roderick Dixon, Campus Director, Cook Islands
2. Dr. Uentoabo Neemia-Mackenzie, Campus Director, Kiribati
3. Dr. Samuela Bogitini, Campus Director, Labasa – Fiji
4. Dr. Pramil Devi, Campus Director, Lautoka – Fiji
5. Ms. Alamanda Lautu, Campus Director, Nauru
6. Mr. Junior Thoma Aleta, Acting Campus Director, Tokelau
7. Ms. Maryanne Talagi, Campus Director, Niue
8. Dr. Irene Taafaki, Campus Director, Marshall Islands
9. Mr. John Usuramo, Campus Director, Solomon Islands
10. Dr. ‘Ana Koloto, Campus Director, Tonga
11. Mr. David Manuella, Campus Director, Tuvalu
12. Mr. Ruben Markward, Campus Manager, Vanuatu
13. Mrs. Ruby Va’a, Campus Director, Samoa
14. Dr. Theresa Koroivulaono, Acting Director, CFL
15. Professor Sudesh Mishra, HOSchool of Language, Arts and Media, FALE
16. Professor Stephen Gale, HOSchool of Geography, Earth Science and Environment, FSTE
17. Professor Ansgar Fehnker, HOSchool of Computing, Information and Mathematical Sciences, FSTE
18. Mr. Dhiraj Bhartu, Learning Systems Manager
19. Mrs. Rokosiga Morrison, Instructional Designer/Acting SID
20. Mr. Javed Yusuf, Multimedia Team Manager
22. Mr. Motoniwesi Ikanivere, Multimedia Team
23. Mr. Varunesh Rao, Learning Systems Administrator
24. Mr. Kisione Finau, Director ITS
25. Mr. Fereti Atalifo, Deputy Director ITS
26. Mr. Josese Ravuvu, Management Information System
27. Mr. Neil Sharma, Enterprise Systems and Networks Infrastructure
28. Mr. Peni Sigabalavu, User Services

**Day Three: Thursday, 21 August**

1. Ms. Joan Yee, University Librarian
2. Ms. Litia Konusi, Group Manager, Student Administrative Services
3. Mr. Glenn Pope, Group Manager, Campus Life
4. Ms. Siniva Laupepa, Student Learning Specialist, FALE
5. Ms. Afshana Anzeg, Student Learning Specialist, FSTE
6. Ms. Roshila Singh, Student Learning Specialist, FBE
7. Ms. Riteta Laulala, Student Learning Specialist, FBE
8. Dr. Rajni Chand, Course Coordinator–UU114, FALE
9. Associate Professor Subhash Chandra, Course Coordinator–SO301, FALE
10. Dr. Ledua Waqailiti, Programme Coordinator BEd (Primary), FALE
11. Dr. Margaret Mishra, Course Coordinator–UU200, FBE
12. Mr. Peter Fulcher, Course Coordinator–AF308, FBE
13. Dr. Kerese Manueli, Course Coordinator–IS224, FSTE
14. Mr. Tolu Mulaina, Course Coordinator–GE304, FSTE
15. Ms. Swasti Narayan, 300-level student, FSTE
16. Mr. Nikhil Chand, 200-level student, FALE
17. Mr. Immanuel Sami, 200-level student, FSTE
18. Mr. Aidan Thorne, Director
19. Mrs. Susan Sela, Associate Director
20. Mrs. Sereana Sasau, Subject Coordinator (English)
21. Mr. Shivneel Prasad, Subject Coordinator (Physics)
22. Mr. Semi Duaiibe, Subject Coordinator (Geography)
23. Mr. Nilesh Kumar, Subject Coordinator (Economics)
24. Dr. Salanieta Bakalevu, ADL&T, FALE
25. Dr. Bruce Yeates, ADP&Q, FALE
26. Associate Professor Manoranjan Mohanty, ADL&T, FBE
27. Dr. Frances Koya, ADRGA, FALE
28. Associate Professor Sushil Kumar, ADRGA, FSTE
29. Dr. David Rohindra, ADP&Q, FSTE
Day Four: Monday, 25 August – Emalus Campus
1. Mr. Ruben Markward, Group Manager Emalus Campus
2. Professor Eric Colvin, Head of School of Law
3. Mr. Anthony Austin, Lecturer, LW202 (online)
4. Ms. Mele Tupou, Lecturer, LW309 (online)
5. Ms. Sofia Shah, Assistant Lecturer, LW204
6. Dr. Amton Mwarakumes, Lecturer in Education
7. Mr. Lekima Nalaukai, Assistant Lecturer Economics
8. Ms. Carol Aru, CFS Course Coordinator, DFL
9. Mr. Satend Prasad, Science Laboratory Assistant, DFL
10. Ms. Annette Kausiama, Flexible Learning Coordinator
11. Mr. Pita Tuisawau, Instructional Designer, CFL
12. Ben (JNR) Yawa, Student: CS111
13. Noah Iaruel, Student: CS111
14. William Kadi, Student: LL202, LL305
15. Roger Rongo, Student: LW330
16. John Louis, Student: IS221
17. Donna-Marie Pune-Narai, Student: LW330
18. Ms. Sylvie Tapasei-Garae, Library Assistant
19. Ms. Annette Kausiama, FL Coordinator
20. Ms. Nettie Collins, Manager, ITS

Day Five: Monday, 25 August – Solomon Islands Campus
1. Dr. Jack Maebuta, Campus Director
2. Dr. Luke Mani, Lecturer in Chemistry
3. Mr. Moses Hunui, Assistant Lecturer in Information Systems
4. Mr. Vincent Nomae, Assistant Lecturer in Economics
5. Ms. Doris Pakipota, Student Officer, Assessment (SAS)
6. Mr. Arvindra Prasad, Science Laboratory Technician
7. Mr. Joseph Samani, Accountant
8. Mr. Tony Dadalo, Librarian
9. Mr. Laban Honimae, Manager Continuing Education
10. Miss Florence Auma, Coordinator, College of Foundation Studies
11. Mrs. Irene Anigafutu, Coordinator, Student Administrative Services (SAS)
12. Mr. Edmund Losi, Computer Technician
# Annexure 3: List of Staff Members of the CFL

## CENTRE FOR FL STAFF MEMBERS: 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Staff Member’s Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CFL Director</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Theresa Koroivulaono</td>
<td>CFL Acting Director/Instructional Designer</td>
<td>BA, MA, PhD (English), University of Auckland, New Zealand, Cert TESL, USP, Graduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kitiana Molikula</td>
<td>Accounts Clerk (AC)</td>
<td>Certificate Secretarial Studies, Fiji National University, FNU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Koroata O’Brien</td>
<td>Communications Assistant (CA)</td>
<td>BA, USP, in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nitendra Gounder</td>
<td>Communications Assistant (CA)</td>
<td>Trade Cert Electronics, TPAF (Fiji), BCom, USP (IS), in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sanita Dau</td>
<td>Cleaner (Casual)</td>
<td>Certificate Professional Housekeeping Services, ServicePro (Fiji)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sarome Seeto</td>
<td>Personal Secretary (Temporary attachment from DVCLT&amp;SS Office)</td>
<td>Dip Business Office Administration, FNU, in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Evonne Inia-Taufaga</td>
<td>Personal Secretary (Temporary attachment to DVCLT&amp;SS Office)</td>
<td>Cert. Desktop Publishing, FNU, Cert Mngt &amp; Public Admin, USP, in progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROGRAMME DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT TEAM (PDD – 20 STAFF MEMBERS)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
<th>Education/Qualifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rokosiga Morrison</td>
<td>Acting Senior Instructional Designer/</td>
<td>MEd, Argosy University, PGDip, BA, USP, Cert Designing and Facilitating eLearning, Open Polytechnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Designer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Makarita Erasito</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Certificate Computing, DATEC (Fiji) Ltd, SPEC, BA (Tourism &amp; Hospitality), USP, in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alanieta Lesuma-Fatiaki</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (ID)</td>
<td>MIDT (Instructional Design &amp; Technology), Open University of Malaysia, in progress, BA, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neelam Narayan</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (ID)</td>
<td>PhD Ed, USP, in progress, MA (online Education), PGCert, USQ, BEd, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Irene Yee Chief</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (ID)</td>
<td>PhD, New Mexico, Med., South Australia, BA (Special Education), Monash, BEd, DipEd USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jane Kanas</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (ID)</td>
<td>BA, PGDip, MA, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Evan Naqiolevu</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (ID)</td>
<td>MSc (Instructional Design), Kumamoto, PGDip, BA, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pita Tuisawau</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (ID CFL – based in Emalus Campus)</td>
<td>BA, GCTT, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Katarina Foliaki</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (ID CFS – based in Tonga Campus)</td>
<td>Cert (Facilitating and Designing eLearning), Open Polytechnic, NZ, BA, USP, PGCert, USQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (vacant)</td>
<td>USP moratorium in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mojito Jione</td>
<td>Educational Technologist (ET)</td>
<td>BSc, GCTT, PGDip, USP, in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tomasi Cabebula</td>
<td>Educational Technologist (ET)</td>
<td>Cert. (Systems Analysis), Open Polytechnic, Dip (Business Computing), FNU, GCTT, BCom, MCom, PGDip, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Flora Bentley</td>
<td>Educational Technologist (ET)</td>
<td>BA, PGDip, USP, Certificate eLearning (online), Open Polytechnic, NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Alena Meo</td>
<td>Educational Technologist (ET)</td>
<td>Dip Ed, FNU, BCom, PGDip, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Viola Lesi</td>
<td>Educational Technologist (ET)</td>
<td>BSc, MSc, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Eroni Racule</td>
<td>Educational Technologist (ET)</td>
<td>BEd, PGDip, MA, USP, in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tevita Jitoko</td>
<td>Educational Technologist (ET)</td>
<td>BSc, MBA, GCTT, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pranil Prabhakar</td>
<td>Educational Technologist (ET)</td>
<td>Dip Ed, FNU, BEd, USP, PGDip, in progress, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Deepak Prasad</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (ID): PhD scholarship at Kumamoto University, in progress</td>
<td>Dip TT, FNU, BA, BTech, USP, MA Ed Tech, USQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Education/Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Valentine Hazelman</td>
<td>Instructional Designer (ID): PhD scholarship</td>
<td>BA, PGCert Education Technology, Master of Education Technology, USQ Certificate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at Wollongong University, in progress</td>
<td>(Multimedia Production for Education &amp; Instructional Systems), Okinawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Centre &amp; Kansai University, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LEARNING SYSTEMS TEAM (LST – 3 STAFF MEMBERS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dhiraj Bhartu</td>
<td>Learning Systems Manager (LSM)</td>
<td>MCIS, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Varunesh Rao</td>
<td>Learning Systems Administrator (LSA)</td>
<td>MCIS, PGDip, BSc, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rajneel Totaram</td>
<td>Learning Systems Developer (LSD)</td>
<td>MCIS, PGDip, BSc, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MULTIMEDIA TEAM (MMT – 17 TEAM MEMBERS)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Javed Yusuf</td>
<td>Manager Multimedia</td>
<td>MEd Tech, PGCert Ed Tech, USQ, BSc, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eni Ramere</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Certificate Secretarial Studies, Fiji National University, FNU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maraia Lesuma</td>
<td>Senior Sound Technician (SST)</td>
<td>Certificate (Journalism), PGCert HRM, PGDip GM, MBA, USP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sereima Raimua</td>
<td>Graphic Illustrator (GI)</td>
<td>Trade Cert Graphic Design, FNU, Diploma (Management), USP, in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lasarusa Donuvakayanuyanu</td>
<td>Graphic Illustrator (GI)</td>
<td>Trade Cert Graphic Design, FNU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Navitalai Halofaki</td>
<td>Audio Video Production Assistant (AVPA)</td>
<td>Dip Electrical Engineering (Electronic), FNU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dovi Ikanivere</td>
<td>Multimedia Production Assistant (MMPA)</td>
<td>Certificate (Video Editing), Certificate (Basic Electronics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gavidi Draunidalo</td>
<td>Multimedia Production Assistant Web &amp; Animation (MMPAW&amp;A)</td>
<td>BSc, Pune University, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Maxine Valentine</td>
<td>Senior Electronic Publisher (SEP)</td>
<td>Certificate Graphic Design, Desktop Publishing, FNU, PGDip USP, MBA, USP, in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Letila Fong</td>
<td>Electronic Publisher (EP)</td>
<td>Dip Electrical Engineering, FNU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ronald Philitoga</td>
<td>Electronic Publisher (EP)</td>
<td>Trade Cert Graphic Design, FNU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Miliakere Koro</td>
<td>Electronic Publisher (EP)</td>
<td>Certificate Computing, Fiji Centre (USP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Ethel Varea</td>
<td>Electronic Publisher (EP-CFS)</td>
<td>BCom, USP, in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Joshua Handyside</td>
<td>Electronic Publisher (EP-CFS)</td>
<td>Certificate Web Design, FNU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexure 4: Proposed Organisational Structure of the CFL

We propose that the Centre for Flexible Learning (CFL) be strengthened through a reorganisation of its role and functions; this would emphasise a more co-ordinating role for the Centre, to streamline and lead the FL activities of the university so as to achieve the targets set in the Strategic Plan 2013–2018 and meet the regional aspirations of the members countries by providing quality tertiary education.

**Director:** The Director position may be at the level of a Pro Vice Chancellor reporting to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (LTSS). This person should be a leader in the field of FL, with significant experience in technology-enabled learning. The role will cover overall management of the CFL and co-ordination with the deans of the faculties and associate deans for teaching and learning in the faculties. The Director should also advise the DVC (LTSS) and Vice Chancellor on all aspects related to FL, including technology, research, staff development and QA. This position should be filled by an externally recruited individual.

**Deputy Director:** This is an administrative position to assist the Director of CFL in performing his/her duties. This could be a position on secondment from any other units of the university. The Deputy Director will largely co-ordinate with the faculties for course development, apart from managing CFL administration.

There are five support teams, in addition to the administration team, which will be headed by the Deputy Director. Each of the teams may be headed by an assistant director reporting to the Deputy Director. The roles and functions of each of the support teams are described below.

**Design and Development Team:** This team is the same as the current team in the CFL. To be headed by an Assistant Director/Senior Instructional Designer, this team will work with the Deputy Director to co-ordinate course and programme development with the faculties. Major responsibilities will be to provide instructional design and material development support to individuals. This team will also provide OER support and guidance to faculty members developing courses.
Learning Systems Team: The role of this team will also be the same as that of the current team. Members will primarily manage the learning management systems and other web-based technologies for teaching and learning. This unit will have a line relationship with the central ITS and Multimedia Team.

Multimedia Team: This team will focus on the development of audio, video and multimedia materials, as is currently being done. However, considering the new roles envisaged in this report, the multimedia team will also work on FM radio and related technologies if the university decides to merge the radio station with the CFL. This team will also manage any new FM station and work with the Learning Systems Team to provide e-resource support for flexible courses.

Learner Support Co-ordination Team: This team will co-ordinate the activities of the SLS located in the faculties. Thus, it is envisaged that the SLS staff will continue to work from the faculties but will be co-ordinated by this team to provide effective support services to the learners. This team will co-ordinate tutorial supports at the regional campuses and also offer the Success@USP module to all FL students through F2F and online workshops.

Academic Professional Development Team: This team will be responsible for regularly organising staff development programmes on topics of interests. The team will also engage in proactively assisting faculty members in their professional development and will manage the fellowship programme of the CFL. The team members of this unit of the CFL should be given advanced training to perform the role of trainers. This team will innovate to provide new ways of staff development.

Knowledge Generation and Innovation Team: This team will focus on research, evaluation and innovation for FL within the university. This team will manage the QA process for FL course design, development and delivery and will undertake student satisfaction surveys. Institutional research will also be the responsibility of this unit. The team will also work with the ITS to undertake projects on innovative technological solutions for learning.

While we are not recommending the staff strengths, we strongly recommend that the above units/teams have sufficient human resources to co-ordinate and undertake activities in collaboration with other faculty members of USP.

We also encourage the CFL to create an informal network environment to engage faculty members in any of the above units/teams.

We also recommend that the CFL have an international advisory board, which should meet virtually at least twice a year. This should be a consultative group on issues of importance for the CFL. The Director may use this group to develop policies for the CFL.
Annexure 5: Excerpts from Law School Policies for Online Programmes

1. The responsibilities of the online lecturer are:

1.1. To develop interactive online activities for all students.
1.2. To provide tutorials via videoconference or other means for online students, as agreed.
1.3. To mark online students assignments and exams.
1.4. To provide final marks for the online students to the exam board.
1.5. To deal with student issues including late assignments, plagiarism and dishonest practice for online students.
1.6. To monitor all student activities that take place online (whether activities are undertaken by online or on campus students), to provide feedback to students, and to bring any relevant issues to the attention of the other course lecturer(s).
1.7. To mark any assessments being done by students online (whether students are online or face to face).

***

Policy on minimum requirements for face to face, blended and online teaching

Approved, BoS April 2013

Note on copyright

Regardless of mode of teaching all courses must comply with USP copyright regulations. More information on these requirements are on the School of Law space on Moodle.

The School of Law offers courses in 3 modes:

- Face to face
- Blended
- Online

Face to face

In face to face courses students have a minimum of 2 hours of lectures plus 1 hour of tutorials each week.

All School of Law courses, even if only offered face to face, also have a Moodle page. As a minimum it is expected that the Moodle page will contain:

- The course guide, prepared in accordance with the School of Law course guide requirements;
- A news forum for the lecturer to post notices to students;
- Portals for submitting assignments, so that they can be checked by Turnitin for plagiarism in accordance with USP policy;
- A Moodle gradebook for recording students’ continuous assessment results;
• Topic outlines for each topic (preferably provided in Word so that students can easily use them to make their own topic notes) which contain:
  o Learning outcomes that state
    ■ What a student will be able to do by the end of the unit
    ■ How the topic objectives help to achieve the course learning objectives
    ■ How the topic objectives contribute to successful completion of assessment activities
  o A brief outline of the topic
  o A list of readings, with links to readings if relevant
  o Questions for each reading, to help students to focus their reading
  o Study tasks and/or review questions
• Uploads of PowerPoints used in class;
• Recordings of lectures.

Most face to face courses provide more material on Moodle than the minimum, and the Moodle material appears more like a blended or online course.

Face to face courses must comply with the USP tutorial attendance policy. This requires:

Students attend 60% of tutorials. Lecturer must take records of attendance. Students who do not meet attendance requirements fail the course.

Blended

The USP policy on modes of delivery says that a blended course is:

one that blends online and F2F delivery. Furthermore, a blended course is one where a substantial proportion of the content, that is, 30-79% is delivered online, typically uses online discussions, and typically has some F2F interaction between student and lecturer or tutor.

Blended learning is often used at the School of Law where there are some students on campus and others studying online around the region.

In order to ensure that students around the region get some F2F interaction blended courses may consider some or all of the following:

• Use video conferences for seminars or interactive lectures
• Use "real-time" or synchronous web features – such as weekly live tutorials via online chat room
• Do some assessments via videoconference or teleconference (which works quite well with low numbers of online students)
• Make a visit to another campus (which can work if you have the majority of your distance students at one other campus)

School of Law blended courses must provide the following, as a minimum, on Moodle:

• The course guide, prepared in accordance with the School of Law course guide requirements;
• A news forum for the lecturer to post notices to students;
• Portals for submitting assignments, so that they can be checked by Turnitin in accordance with USP policy;
• A Moodle gradebook for recording students’ continuous assessment results;
• Topic outlines for each topic (preferably provided in Word so that students can easily use them to make their own topic notes) which contain:
  o Learning outcomes that state
    ■ What a student will be able to do by the end of the unit
    ■ How the topic objectives help to achieve the course learning objectives
    ■ How the topic objectives contribute to successful completion of assessment activities
  o A brief outline of the topic
  o A list of readings, with links to readings if relevant
  o Questions for each reading, to help students to focus their reading
  o Study tasks and/or review questions

*An example of a minimum topic outline is provided at the end of this document. More content can, of course, be added.*

• Podcasts of lectures (depending on the level of detail in the topic outlines, online activities and PowerPoints the podcasts may be brief introductions or full lectures. If lectures are being given to students studying on campus podcasts of these lectures must be provided.)
• Topic PowerPoints (depending on the level of detail in the topic outlines, online activities and podcasts the PowerPoints may be brief introductions or full lectures. If lectures are being given to students studying on campus it is expected that PowerPoints used in class will be uploaded.)
• A “lecturer led” discussion forum that, as a minimum, involves the lecturer posting 1 tutorial type question and then providing feedback on student comments on that question each week. This discussion forum does not have to be assessed, but lecturers can choose to use it as an assessment.
• A forum for administrative questions that, as a minimum, is monitored by the lecturer once a week

Most courses also contain various topic resources, such as readings that are loaded onto Moodle.

**Online**

USP defines an online course as “one where most or all of the content is delivered online and typically has no F2F meetings.”

Many SoL courses are offered in two modes – face to face and online.

School of Law online courses must provide the following, as a minimum, on Moodle:

• The course guide, prepared in accordance with the School of Law course guide requirements;
A news forum for the lecturer to post notices to students;

- Portals for submitting assignments, so that they can be checked by Turnitin in accordance with USP policy;
- A Moodle gradebook for recording students’ continuous assessment results;
- Topic outlines for each topic (preferably provided in Word so that students can easily use them to make their own topic notes) which contain, at a minimum:
  - Learning outcomes that state
    - What a student will be able to do by the end of the unit
    - How the topic objectives help to achieve the course learning objectives
    - How the topic objectives contribute to successful completion of assessment activities
  - A list of readings, with links to readings if relevant
  - Questions for each reading, to help students to focus their reading
  - Study tasks and/or review questions

An example of a minimum topic outline is provided at the end of this document. More content can, of course, be added.

- Podcasts of each topic (depending on the level of detail in the topic outlines, online activities and PowerPoints the podcasts may be brief introductions or full lectures)
- Topic PowerPoints (depending on the level of detail in the topic outlines, online activities and podcasts the PowerPoints may be brief introductions or full lectures)
- A “lecturer led” discussion forum that, as a minimum, involves the lecturer posting 1 tutorial type question and then providing feedback on student comments on that question each week. This discussion forum does not have to be assessed, but lecturers can choose to use it as an assessment.
- A forum for administrative questions that, as a minimum, is monitored by the lecturer once a week.

Most courses also contain various topic resources, such as readings that are loaded onto Moodle.

Most online courses also provide:

- More detailed topic outlines
- More interactive online activities
- More online assessment activities

Some online courses also provide video conference classes as support.

***

EXAMPLE MINIMUM TOPIC OUTLINE

Comments: This has been “cut down” from a longer topic outline used in LW 305. Until a template for topic outlines is created there is no set format, but you should make sure headings are clear.
One thing you can notice is that each heading in the notes aligns to one of the learning outcomes of the topic. This alignment helps to develop conscious design.

---

**TOPIC 2: THE PLACE OF LAW IN PACIFIC SOCIETY**

**Learning Outcomes**

By the end of this topic you should be able to:

**Develop** an opinion on what role law should, ideally, play in modern democratic society in your country;

► **Identify** some of the reasons why the formal legal system may not fulfil its role in modern Pacific societies;

► **List** the minimum standards for the operation of a legal system;

► **Use** the concept of minimum standards to begin analysing a particular issue.

This topic contributes to achieving the course learning outcomes by:

3. **Debate** how key issues including modernization, the relationship between State law and custom and lack of legitimacy of the introduced legal system present challenges for your country
   
   ● Providing you with background to debates on key issues (which occur in topics 4 – 7) by getting you to think about the ideal role of law and broad reasons why this role is not being fulfilled in your country

4. **Analyse** why particular laws are not performing as well as they should be
   
   ● Providing you with a framework that can be applied to analysis of the operation of individual laws

Achieving the topic learning outcomes will contribute to your successful completion of the following assessments:

1. Law reform activity, presentation 1 and 2
   
   ● Presentation 1 is based directly on the material in this topic and provides the background material for presentation 2

2. Lawwatch
   
   ● The content of this topic may be useful in analyzing current legal and social developments

3. Government of Pacifica
   
   ● The content of this topic may provide background material to help you analyse government of Pacific debates

4. Final exam
   
   ● You can expect an exam question that relates to this topic

**The ideal role of law in modern democratic society**

What do you think the role of law should, ideally, be in your country?
To help answer this question below are some readings and questions that will help you to think about this, but it is important to also use your imagination about what you would like your society to be like, and what role law should play in this ideally imagined society:


1. What do you think Cooray means when he uses the word liberal?
2. What does Cooray think is the role of the Constitution?
3. What things do you think define Cooray’s concept of justice?
4. Why does Cooray prefer common law to statute law as a law-making mechanism?
5. Do you agree with Cooray’s concept of justice?
6. Do you agree that common law should be the primary law-making mechanism?

Reading 2.2 Excerpts from Amitai Etzioni, “Law in Civil Society, Good Society and the Prescriptive State” (2000) 75(2) Chicago Kent Law Review 355-377. (in the notes – the full article is available through Hein Online)

1. Etzioni identifies 3 types of society: good society, civil society and the prescriptive State. What are the characteristics of these societies?
2. What sort of society/(ies) do you want law to reflect?
3. What difficulties do you see with law being able to fulfil what you think is its ideal role?

Difficulties with state law in the Pacific

Whilst we may be able to say what it is that law should ideally do, we all know that formal legal systems throughout the Pacific islands do not always operate effectively, or act as ideal legal systems. Why is this? Part of the explanation may come from the fact that legal systems have been adopted from outside, rather than developed autochthonously. This adoption may mean that the formal (or state) legal system is not widely understood, or seen as relevant or appropriate. This alone cannot provide the whole answer — even in England the formal legal system does not always operate effectively — but it certainly is important in the Pacific context. So too are issues of resources and geographic considerations, which may hinder access to the legal system.

Reading 2.2 continued

Go back to the Etzioni reading and consider the following questions:

1. Which type of society does your “traditional society” most reflect?
2. Which type of society does your contemporary society most reflect?
3. Which type of society does your legal/political system most reflect?
4. What, if anything, does lack of consistency in types of society in these 3 areas tell you about difficulties in successful functioning of law?

Reading 2.3 “Compensation in PNG” ASAONet discussion list, 24/1/05.

1. Can you think of similar examples of inappropriate legislation being passed in your country?
2. Take one example of inappropriate legislation. What particular things made it inappropriate or unworkable?
3. Having thought about this, reevaluate Mark Cooray’s comments on the role of the legislature (from the previous study task). What do you think the role of the legislature should be in your country?

4. What things do you think legislatures need to bear in mind when making laws?


1. What inconsistencies or incompatibilities between the introduced law and court system and society does Powles identify?

2. Do you think all of these apply to your society? Identify examples that illustrate each incompatibility.

3. Do these things prevent the law from playing the role that you think it should ideally fulfil?

4. Are there other things which stop law from fulfilling its role in your society that you think should be added to the list? What are they?

**Minimum standards for an effective legal system**

You should have developed your concept of an ideal legal system, and seen that it will vary depending on both your own view of society and the social reality in which the legal system is operating. We have also seen that there are various tensions between Pacific society and the formal legal system that prevent the formal legal system from operating effectively, or ideally.

To develop a legal system that can attain the ideal it may help to identify various things that this legal system should do. Powles, in his chapter, above, calls these things minimum standards.

**Reading 2.4 continued**

1. What are the minimum standards for a legal system that Powles identifies?

2. Do you agree with all of them?

3. Are there any additional minimum standards that should be added?

4. Do you think that these standards are being met in your country? Why/why not? (think of concrete examples)

**Applying the minimum standards to analyse laws**

The PowerPoint and lecture demonstrate how to apply the minimum standards to analyse laws. Read the PowerPoint, listen to the podcast and then attempt the following study task.

**STUDY TASK**

- Identify one statute that is not working well.

- Use the Guy Powles minimum standards framework to begin your analysis of the law. You should identify questions for further research.

- This study task is the same as your law reform presentation 1 assessment.

**Conclusion**

The issues we have considered in topic are not new – Powles’ article was written almost 20 years ago. However, they continue to create large challenges for law makers everywhere. The
Etizoni article deserves to be read and reread as there is a lot of a philosophical material in there about the nature of different societies and their legal systems and how this reflects basic differences in values and beliefs about human nature.

Whether or not these big issues have a particular solution, we have also gained something very concrete and practical from this unit: a theoretical framework of minimum standards which we can apply to help us begin to analyse laws and legal issues.

**Review questions**

1. What role(s) do you think law should, ideally, play in your society?
2. What are some of the reasons why the law currently fails to fulfill its roles?
3. What are the Guy Powles’ minimum standards?
4. How can you use these standards to help your analysis of particular legal issues?
5. Why is it useful to use these standards to help your analysis of particular legal issues?