



COMMONWEALTH *of* LEARNING

Baseline Study on Technology-Enabled Learning at the Mahatma Gandhi Institute



Baseline Study on Technology-Enabled Learning at the Mahatma Gandhi Institute



COMMONWEALTH *of* LEARNING

The Commonwealth of Learning (COL) is an intergovernmental organisation created by Commonwealth Heads of Government to promote the development and sharing of open learning and distance education knowledge, resources and technologies.

© 2023 by Commonwealth of Learning and Higher Education Commission



Baseline Study on Technology-Enabled Learning at the Mahatma Gandhi Institute is made available under a Creative Commons Attribution — ShareAlike4.0 Licence (international): <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0>.

For the avoidance of doubt, by applying this licence, the Commonwealth of Learning does not waive any privileges or immunities from claims that they may be entitled to assert, nor does the Commonwealth of Learning submit itself to the jurisdiction, courts, legal processes or laws of any jurisdiction.

This report was prepared by Mrs R. D. Rampersad and Mr T. K. Chadeea on behalf of the Higher Education Commission, under the guidance of Dr S. Mishra, Director: Education, Commonwealth of Learning, Canada.

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the valuable contributions of Professor R. Mohee (Commissioner, Higher Education Commission), Dr A. Durbarry (Higher Education Commission), R. Rampertab, Director General (Mahatma Gandhi Institute), Dr (Mrs) V. Koonjal, Director (Mahatma Gandhi Institute), Mr Gulshan Sooklall (Mahatma Gandhi Institute) and Mr Boomesh Beedasy (Mahatma Gandhi Institute).

Published by:

Commonwealth of Learning
4710 Kingsway, Suite 2500
Burnaby, British Columbia
Canada V5H 4M2
Telephone: + 1 604 775 8200
Fax: + 1 604 775 8210
Web: www.col.org
Email: info@col.org

Table of Contents

List of Tables	4
List of Abbreviations	5
Executive Summary	6
Recommendations	7
Chapter 1: Introduction	8
1.1 Context	8
1.2 About the Mahatma Gandhi Institute	8
1.3 Objectives of the Study	9
1.4 Methodology	9
Chapter 2: Policy Review and Infrastructure Analysis	10
2.1 Profile of the MGI	10
2.2 Technology and Services	11
2.2.1 Devices.....	11
2.2.2 Internet access at the MGI.....	11
2.2.3 Restrictions on access to social media and downloads.....	11
2.3 Use of OER and MOOCs	11
2.4 The MGI's TEL Preparedness	11
Chapter 3: Academic Staff's Use of Technologies for Teaching, Learning and Research	15
3.1. Profile of Academic Staff	15
3.1.1 Age and gender.....	15
3.1.2 Qualifications and designations.....	15
3.1.3 Teaching experience	16
3.1.4 Discipline	16
3.2 Access to and Use of ICT	16
3.2.1 Ownership of and access to devices.....	16
3.2.2 Internet access: Location.....	17
3.2.3 Internet access: Devices used.....	17
3.3 Use of ICT for Teaching and Learning	18
3.3.1 Comfort level with computer-related activities	18
3.3.2 Use of social media	19
3.3.3 Memberships in mailing lists or discussion forums	20
3.3.4 TEL environment and experience.....	20
3.4 Use of ICT for Research and Scholarship	24
3.5 Perceptions about the Use of TEL	25
3.5.1 Attitudes towards TEL.....	25
3.5.2 Motivators to use TEL	26
3.5.3 Barriers to using TEL.....	27
3.6 Open-Ended Questions	29
Chapter 4: Students' Use of Technology for Learning	30
4.1 Profile of Students	30
4.1.1 Age, gender and discipline	30

4.1.2 Level of study	30
4.1.3 Year-wise distribution per discipline.....	31
4.1.4 Students with disabilities	32
4.2. Access to and Use of ICT	32
4.2.1 Students' ownership of and access to digital devices	32
4.2.2 Internet access: Location	32
4.2.3 Time spent on the Internet	32
4.2.4 Internet access on campus: Location	33
4.2.5 Students' digital skills and competency	33
4.3 Perceptions about Technology in Learning	37
4.3.1 Blended learning at the MGI.....	37
4.3.2 Perception about technology for learning	37
4.3.3 Students' perception about technology use in their studies.....	39
4.4 Open-Ended Responses	39
<i>Chapter 5: Key Findings, Conclusion and Recommendations</i>	<i>41</i>
5.1 Profile of Academic Staff and Students	41
5.2 Access to and Ownership of Devices	41
5.3 Use of ICT for Teaching and Learning	42
5.3.1 Faculty survey.....	42
5.3.2 Learner survey	43
5.3.3 Training in TEL.....	43
5.3.4 The MGI's TEL score.....	43
5.4 Conclusion	44
5.5 Recommendations.....	44
<i>References</i>	<i>45</i>

List of Tables

Table 1: Survey response rate: Academic staff and students.....	9
Table 2: TEL preparedness at the MGI.....	12
Table 3: Age and gender profile of academics (n = 65)	15
Table 4: Qualifications and designations of academic staff (n = 51)	15
Table 5: Academic staff's years of teaching experience (n = 65).....	16
Table 6: Disciplines in which the academic staff work (n = 62)	16
Table 7: Academic staff's ownership of devices	17
Table 8: Academic staff's access to digital devices.....	17
Table 9: Academic staff's Internet access: Location (n = 65)	17
Table 10: Academic staff's Internet access: Devices (n = 65).....	17
Table 11: Academic staff's ability level with computer-related activities	19
Table 12: Academic staff's use of social media (n = 67)	20
Table 13: Mode of delivery (n = 62)*	20
Table 14: Academic staff's use of tools and apps.....	21
Table 15: Academic staff's use of digital resources	22
Table 16: Creation and sharing of teaching and learning resources	23
Table 17: Academic staff's skills in integrating technology in teaching and learning.....	24
Table 18: Academic staff's use of OER	25
Table 19: Academic staff's attitudes towards TEL.....	26
Table 20: Motivators to use TEL	27
Table 21: Barriers to using TEL	28
Table 22: Age and gender profile of students.....	30
Table 23: Students' level of study (n = 248)	30
Table 24: Year-wise distribution of students per discipline (n = 254)	31
Table 25: Students' ownership of and access to digital devices*	32
Table 26: Students' Internet access: Location (n = 250)	32
Table 27: Time spent by students on the Internet (n = 231)	33
Table 28: Students' Internet access on campus: Location	33
Table 29: Students' digital competency.....	34
Table 30: Average time spent by students on social media (n = 238).....	35
Table 31: Frequency of status updates by students (n = 238).....	35
Table 32: Students' experience with resources.....	36
Table 33: Students' participation in online courses (n = 236).....	37
Table 34: Students' participation in MOOCs (n = 196)	37
Table 35: Students' perceptions about technology use for learning	38
Table 36: Students' perceptions about technology use in their studies	39

List of Abbreviations

COL	Commonwealth of Learning
EDLP	Early Digital Learning Programme
HEC	Higher Education Commission
HEI	Higher Education Institution
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
LCCS	Learning Centred Credit System
LMS	Learning management system
LRC	Language Resource Centre
MGI	Mahatma Gandhi Institute
MIE	Mauritius Institute of Education
MOOC	Massive Open Online Course
ODL	Open and Distance Learning
OER	Open Educational Resources
OUM	Open University, Mauritius
RTI	Rabindranath Tagore Institute
TEL	Technology-Enabled Learning
UdM	Université des Mascareignes
UoM	University of Mauritius
UTM	University of Technology, Mauritius

Executive Summary

The Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Mauritius conducted a baseline survey at the Mahatma Gandhi Institute (MGI), Mauritius, in collaboration with the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) in March 2023 to establish technology-enabled learning (TEL) preparedness at the institution and subsequently develop and implement a TEL policy. The survey comprised three separate surveys — institutional, faculty member and learner — and asked about a variety of technology-related topics, including governance, policies, facilities and devices available, access to the Internet and use of technology. This report uses the data collected to examine both the results of the surveys to assess how prepared instructors and students are to embrace the use of technology for teaching and learning and also the findings of a self-review of the institutional facilities related to technology and policies.

The MGI stands out from the other higher education institutes (HEIs) of Mauritius as it was set up by an act of Parliament, passed on 23 December 1970, as a joint initiative of the governments of India and Mauritius and inaugurated on 9 October 1976. It has 67 faculty members and 465 students and offers programmes in regionally unique and exclusive areas of expertise (e.g., Asian languages, performing arts). It also has a responsibility to promote Asian languages at a national level and has been producing content for primary schools to support the Early Digital Learning Project, an initiative of the Ministry of Education.

The university comprises five schools: School of Performing Arts, School of Mauritian and Area Studies, School of Indian Studies, School of Fine Arts and School of Indological Studies. Programmes are offered at certificate, diploma and degree levels. Degree-level programmes (undergraduate and postgraduate) are offered through the University of Mauritius (UoM) and the Mauritius Institute of Education (MIE).

Prior to the Covid-19 lockdown, programmes were mostly delivered using face-to-face teaching. The exceptions to this were programmes run with the MIE and UoM, which had to offer some modules via blended/online learning in accordance with the Learner Centred Credit System (LCCS) requirements in place in these institutions. During the Covid-19 national lockdown, the MGI was able to ensure continuity in the delivery of programmes and conducting of examinations by using Google Classroom. In 2023, most of the modules are being run face-to-face. Academic staff at the MGI are proficient at using more conservative tools and apps, being mostly users rather than producers of content at a tertiary level. Innovations such as simulations and open educational resources (OER) are therefore not yet part of their culture and practice.

During a Visioning Workshop in April 2023, the academic staff pointed to the lack of adequate support such as a specialised e-learning unit and trained technical staff as a major hurdle to their ability to transform their existing pedagogical practices and adopt TEL. The possibility of inter-institutional collaboration to share expertise was raised. The responses to the open-ended questions in the survey reflected the opinions expressed at the workshop. Overall, academics at the MGI seem to have a positive mindset with regards to TEL, based on their responses to questions about the motivators for and barriers to the use of technology. The findings from the survey will be crucial when drafting the MGI TEL policy. Exposure to this HEC/COL project has been an enlightening experience for the MGI's academic community: they were exposed to concepts such as OER, learning design and micro-credentials. One faculty member has already launched a training programme using COL OER in order to train the MGI's academic community.

Students were also using mostly conservative tools and apps. They would benefit from induction sessions to explore the resources available at the MGI in a more effective manner. Students are aware of the benefits of TEL and how skills developed in a TEL environment will hone their skills for the future and the world of work. The presence and active participation of the director-general and the director of the MGI at the Visioning Workshop bodes well for the MGI's TEL transformation.

Based on the findings from the three surveys — institutional, faculty and learner — the TEL score for MGI is 82 (“Limited Preparedness”): the MGI does not have a TEL policy yet. Its strategic plan sees information and communication technologies (ICT) as an enabler but it does not have measurable goals and outcomes. Similarly, it does not have an ICT policy in place. The MGI has neither instructional designers nor a centre dedicated to blended/online learning. The Language Resource Centre has played a pivotal role in the production of videos, but these videos were mostly meant for primary/secondary education levels.

Recommendations

1. Under the guidance of the HEC, the MGI should prepare a TEL policy that is aligned to its strategic plan and goals. The TEL policy will acknowledge the five pillars identified by the Guidelines for Developing Institutional Technology-Enabled Learning Policy:
 - Strategic Pillar 1: Strengthening the Governance Structure for TEL
 - Strategic Pillar 2: Consolidating Technology and Infrastructure
 - Strategic Pillar 3: Expanding Teaching, Learning and Assessment Using Technology
 - Strategic Pillar 4: Building Professional Development and Growth
 - Strategic Pillar 5: Leveraging on a Dynamic Ecosystem of Collaboration
2. The MGI should organise capacity-building workshops in TEL for both students (through induction sessions) and faculty members. Existing OER (e.g., from COL) could be used and existing collaborations with partner institutions could be drawn on.
3. The MGI offers a unique variety of programmes, and it could emerge as a leader by developing OER and other related resources in these areas. Training staff to develop OER would empower them to move in that direction.

Though in terms of ICT resources and training of staff the MGI shows limited preparedness, there is an openness to TEL among students and faculty members. They appear to recognise that technology has permeated the education sector. Having a TEL policy is seen as critical to ensuring that the MGI can successfully embrace TEL for the benefit of all.

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Context

Technology-enabled learning (TEL) is a term used to describe “the application of some form of digital technology to teaching and/or learning in an educational context to support and facilitate student learning” (Commonwealth of Learning [COL], 2020) — that is, how technology facilitates learning, including making learning accessible to people whose circumstances (e.g., working students, students with disabilities) would otherwise have impeded their access to learning.

As a result of Covid-19, technology has become part of the classroom. It is safe to say that its adoption by educational institutions can be considered to be on a spectrum, from fully online, to blended to emergency remote teaching.

It should be noted that in the context of Mauritius, the terms blended learning, hybrid learning and emergency remote teaching are often used interchangeably.

In 2022, the Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Mauritius conducted a survey of the University of Mauritius (UoM), Open University, Mauritius (OUM), University of Technology, Mauritius (UTM) and Université des Mascareignes (UdM) to gauge their TEL preparedness. Based on the findings, each institution had to either revise or develop their institutional TEL policy.

This report explores the situation at the Mahatma Gandhi Institute (MGI), another higher education institution (HEI) in Mauritius.

1.2 About the Mahatma Gandhi Institute

The Mahatma Gandhi Institute was set up by an act of Parliament, passed on 23 December 1970 as a joint initiative of the governments of India and Mauritius, and inaugurated on 9 October 1976.

The *Mahatma Gandhi Institute Act 1982*, *Mahatma Gandhi Institute (Amendment) Act 2002* and *Rabindranath Tagore Institute Act 2002* have provided for the MGI and the Rabindranath Tagore Institute (RTI) to function under one council and one director-general. By broadening its scope, the MGI is well settled on its path to cater for the growing educational, academic and cultural demands of the country and to contribute to the regional role of Mauritius.

The MGI is viewed as a meeting ground for different cultures. The philosophy underlying its vision and mission draws on Gandhian thought, which is rich in educational and social values.

The MGI’s objective is to:

- establish, as a tribute to Mahatma Gandhi, a Centre of Studies for Indian Culture and Traditions, and
- promote education and culture generally.

The MGI comprises the following schools and centres:

- School of Performing Arts
- School of Mauritian and Area Studies
- School of Indian Studies
- School of Fine Arts

- School of Indological Studies
- Centre for Quality Assurance
- Centre for Research

The MGI has 67 faculty members and 465 students. Certain degree programmes are run exclusively at the MGI (e.g., Hindi, Tamil) because it is only the only HEI with the required expertise. However, since the MGI is not an awarding body for degree programmes, these programmes are run under either the UoM or the Mauritius Institute of Education (MIE). Certificates and diplomas are awarded by the MGI.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The main objective of this current report is to gauge the MGI’s technology preparedness and whether it merits TEL implementation.

1.4 Methodology

Three questionnaires were administered at the MGI in February 2023. The questionnaires were designed by the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) and reviewed by the HEC. Once approved by COL, the surveys were conducted using LimeSurvey.

Academic staff and students from both the MGI and RTI were invited to complete the questionnaires.

The primary aim of each survey was as follows:

1. **The MGI’s policy questionnaire:** The primary aim of this questionnaire was to assess the TEL environment and enabling policies at the MGI. The questionnaire was completed by a responsible officer at the MGI.
2. **Faculty questionnaire:** The primary aim of this questionnaire was to assess the TEL environment and enabling policies, including understanding instructors’ access to and use of media and technology; instructors’ perceptions and beliefs about the use of technology for teaching and learning; and the use of digital resources, including open educational resources (OER), for teaching, learning and research in an educational institution. The full-time faculty members of the MGI were invited to complete the questionnaire.
3. **Learner questionnaire:** The primary aim of this questionnaire was to assess the TEL environment and enabling policies, including students’ access to and use of media and technology, and their preferences for adopting technologies for learning in schools. The questionnaire was completed by a randomly selected stratified sample of students in the university/institute.

Table 1 shows the response rates to invitations to participate in the survey.

Table 1: Survey response rate: Academic staff and students

Number of academic staff (n = 68)	Response rate: Academic staff (%)	Number of students (n = 465)	Response rate: Students (%)
67	98.5	250	53.8

In all, 53.8% of the students completed the survey. The sample size is adequate for representativeness and validity of the responses.

Chapter 2: Policy Review and Infrastructure Analysis

2.1 Profile of the MGI

As per the MGI's Strategic Plan 2022–2026 (Mahatma Gandhi Institute [MGI], 2022), ICT provides for the possibility of:

adapt[ing] existing programmes of studies to online/blended/directed learning modes... [while] optimiz[ing] the use of technology... develop[ing] and implement[ing] ... a Management Information System, strengthening the IT infrastructure to sustain Internet connectivity with appropriate strength, [and] training of staff in e-technologies. (p. 24)

In terms of IT infrastructure, the MGI is well equipped and has specialised equipment for graphic designers and 12 e-classrooms, including a studio for recording purposes. The MGI has also been strengthening its e-library.

Academic staff are provided with the required software to conduct their activities — for example, MS 365 and Google Workspace (formerly G Suite). Google Classroom is used by academics for posting lecture notes and by students for uploading assignments, especially for those modules/programmes that are run with the UoM and MIE (e.g., BEd) and offered on the Learner Centred Credit System (LCCS). LCCS involves a new pedagogy — self-directed learning, student-centredness and blended learning.

During the national Covid-19 lockdown in 2020, the MGI maintained its activities and conducted classes and examinations online. Other activities such as artistic and cultural activities were also conducted online to ensure continuity of learning.

The MGI also assists the Ministry of Education, Tertiary Education, Science and Technology through the production of multimedia material for five grades in all six Asian languages within the context of the Early Digital Learning Programme (EDLP). It has produced more than 2,000 educational videos for primary school students since the Covid-19 national lockdown in 2020.

In terms of Asian language education in Mauritius, the MGI has a national reach. And in terms of training, there are a number of TEL initiatives at the MGI and through the UoM:

- Twenty-three MGI academics were trained at the Central Institute of Indian Languages in Mysore in the production of multimedia educational resources.
- Three MGI staff completed the African Union–sponsored African Leadership in ICT course.
- All academics were trained in the use of Google Classroom and platforms such as Moodle.
- In November 2018, MGI faculty members were trained together with all institutions affiliated with the UoM on the Learner Centred Credit System (LCCS) and its implications for teaching and learning.

Despite its specialisation in Asian languages, where its contribution at the national level is unique, the MGI has a number of shortcomings to address. According to its director-general, capacity building in TEL, dedicated staff and champions for TEL, more advanced infrastructure and a more holistic approach to integrate TEL in teaching and learning are essential in order to integrate TEL in a more structured way and for the MGI to move to the next stage (Rampertab, 2023).

2.2 Technology and Services

2.2.1 Devices

The MGI has 90 desktops and 215 laptops connected to the Internet.

Academics are provided with desktop computers in their office. Laptops are provided to each department and to the Language Resource Centre. Academics at the associate professor-level and heads of school are provided with laptops; other academics must purchase their own. Students have to buy all their own devices.

2.2.2 Internet access at the MGI

The bandwidth at the MGI is < 1 Gbps, through a government-sponsored Internet provider. The campus has Wi-Fi, but students complained about poor connections and coverage.

2.2.3 Restrictions on access to social media and downloads

The MGI restricts access to Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Instagram and video channels (e.g., YouTube, Vimeo and adult content). There is no restriction on access to online content and downloads, WhatsApp, Viber, Skype, audio channels, massive downloading of videos, audio, reference books, software and emails. Some academic staff have complained about the restriction on YouTube as these resources are useful for some disciplines (e.g., dance classes).

2.3 Use of OER and MOOCs

According to the institutional survey, the MGI has 133 online/MOOC courses and 128 learners. It has not offered any MOOCs yet. It should be noted that there may have been some confusion over the use of the term “courses” in this question. Courses can refer to either programmes or modules. In this case, it is more likely that it refers to modules, as the MGI does not offer 133 programmes of study.

2.4 The MGI’s TEL Preparedness

The MGI’s TEL score is 82, which indicates “limited preparedness.” That means that “the institution has addressed some aspects of the technology-enabled learning system, policies and infrastructure, but they need further development.” The MGI does not have a TEL policy yet. Its strategic plan sees ICT as an enabler but it does not have measurable goals and outcomes. Similarly, it has neither an ICT policy in place nor instructional designers or a centre dedicated to blended/online learning. The Language Resource Centre has played a pivotal role in the production of videos, but these videos were mostly meant for primary or secondary levels. Based on the information collected through the survey and from the Visioning Workshop on the Development of a Technology-Enabled Learning Policy at the MGI on 13 April 2023, senior management are supportive of and academic staff are committed to developing TEL, but there is a crucial need for training, IT support and staff dedicated to TEL, such as instructional designers, for this to happen.

The TEL score (see Table 2 for more details) was discussed with the MGI’s senior management and academic community at the Visioning Workshop.

Table 2: TEL preparedness at the MGI

Domain and statements			Total score
Policy	1.1 There is a well-documented technology-enabled policy.	2	
	1.2 The vision and mission of the technology-enabled learning policy are aligned with the mission of the organisation.	2	
	1.3 The vision and mission of the technology-enabled learning are well understood across the organisation.	2	
	1.4 There is a commitment on the part of institutional leaders to use technology to achieve strategic academic goals.	2	
	Category score		8/20
Strategic plan	2.1 There is a strategic plan for the implementation of technology-enabled learning.	2	
	2.2 The strategic plan for technology-enabled learning has measurable goals and outcomes.	1	
	2.3 The strategic plan for technology-enabled learning is approved by senior management of the organisation and is supported by adequate financial provisions.	1	
	Category score		4/15
IT Support Department	3.1 The organisation has an IT department that handles procurement, installation and maintenance of technologies for teaching and learning.	3	
	3.2 There is an ICT policy in place, which is implemented by a high-powered committee in the organisation.	1	
	3.3 The head of the IT support department reports to senior management and is responsible for overall functioning of the technology in the organisation.	3	
	3.4 The head of the IT support department is well qualified and up to date in order to manage the technological requirements in the organisation.	4	
	Category score		11/20
Technology	4.1 There is adequate hardware infrastructure for teaching and learning (e.g., access to computers for students and learners).	3	
	4.2 There are adequate applications and software for teaching and learning (e.g., access to appropriate software, intranet, learning management system, etc.).	3	
	4.3 There is adequate networking infrastructure in the organisation (e.g., access to adequate bandwidth).	3	
	4.4 There are adequate policies and procedures in place to protect privacy and organisational data.	3	
	Category score		12/20
Content	5.1 There is support available for the creation of digital multimedia content in the organisation (e.g., production of e-courses, audio and video materials, animation, etc.).	3	
	5.2 There are instructional designers in the organisation or	1	

	faculty members are trained to organise learning content appropriately.		
	5.3 Teachers have adequate access to the online systems to develop courses for technology-enabled learning.	3	
	Category score		7/15
Documentation	6.1 There is a variety of help available to support teachers and students in using technology effectively.	3	
	6.2 Lessons learned in the implementation of technology-enabled learning are stored and shared within the organisation for others to access and learn from.	1	
	6.3 The workflow processes and responsibilities to implement technology-enabled learning are well documented in the organisation.	1	
	Category score		5/15
Organisational culture	7.1 Faculty and staff members are willing to learn about new technology in the organisation.	4	
	7.2 Faculty and staff members support each other easily.	2	
	7.3 There is a culture of knowledge creation and sharing in the organisation.	2	
	Category score		8/15
Leadership	8.1 Leaders in the organisation are involved in the implementation of technology-enabled learning.	3	
	8.2 Senior management in the organisation regularly review, monitor and evaluate the progress of technology-enabled learning.	2	
	8.3 The top leadership of the organisation is supportive of technology-enabled learning and provides encouragement and motivation to the faculty and staff to achieve the academic goals.	3	
	Category score		8/15
Human resources and training	9.1 Faculty members are qualified and trained to use technology for teaching and learning.	1	
	9.2 Faculty and staff members receive regular training to update them in the use of technology-enabled learning.	2	
	9.3 There are adequate staff to support technology-enabled learning.	2	
	9.4 The organisation has a structure in place to create teams for content development and delivery of technology-enabled learning.	1	
	9.5 Faculty members trust the support received from instructional designers and technology support staff while developing and delivering the courses. Note: The MGI does not have instructional designers	0	
	9.6 The IT staff members are highly skilled and trained to provide the needed support.	3	
	Category score		9/30

TEL champions	10.1 There are early adopters of technology-enabled learning in the organisation.	3	
	10.2 There are TEL champions in the organisation who support and care about pedagogic innovations.	3	
	10.3 There are faculty members who can take leadership roles in developing appropriate policies and a technology-enabled learning strategy for the organisation.	2	
	10.4 There are TEL champions to research and disseminate good practices in technology-enabled learning.	2	
	Category score		10/20
	Overall score		82/185

Score:

1 = Strongly disagree or does not exist

2 = Disagree or only marginally demonstrates existence

3 = Neither agree nor disagree or existence or otherwise is difficult to explain

4 = Agree or it does exist

5 = Strongly agree or it definitely exists and is well established

Interpretation of overall score:

- Score below 55: Negligible preparedness. There is no comprehensive technology-enabled learning system or infrastructure, and policies are incomplete. The structures in place need immediate attention.
- Score 55–94: Limited preparedness. The institution has addressed some aspects of the technology-enabled learning system, policies and infrastructure, but they need further development.
- Score 95–129: Developing preparedness. The institution has put in place some of the aspects of a technology-enabled learning system, policies and infrastructure, and is in the process of developing a robust system.
- Score 130–164. Established preparedness. The institution has an established technology-enabled learning system as well as policies, infrastructure and practices in place.
- Score 165 and above. Exceptional preparedness. The institution has successfully implemented a technology-enabled learning system and its effect can be easily observed.

Chapter 3: Academic Staff’s Use of Technologies for Teaching, Learning and Research

3.1. Profile of Academic Staff

3.1.1 Age and gender

Table 3 shows the distribution of faculty by age and gender. As the data show, the majority of respondents were female. The majority of the female respondents were from the 36–40 years age group and the majority of male respondents from the 41–45 years age group.

Table 3: Age and gender profile of academics (n = 65)

Age group	Female academics		Male academics	
	Number	%	Number	%
21–25	6	9.0%	—	—
26–30	5	7.5%	—	—
31–35	4	6.0%	—	—
36–40	11	16.4%	—	—
41–45	9	13.4%	6	9.0%
46–50	2	3.0%	4	6.0%
51–55	1	1.5%	2	3.0%
56–60	6	9.0%	2	3.0%
61–65	5	7.5%	2	3.0%
Total	49	73.1%	16	23.9%

3.1.2 Qualifications and designations

Table 4 shows the qualifications and designations (professor, associate professor, senior lecturer and lecturer) of the academic respondents. It can be noted that:

- the majority of the respondents were at lecturer’s level and possessed a degree at master’s level,
- 16 faculty members are at lecturer’s level and hold a PhD, and
- 25 (49%) of the respondents hold a PhD.

Table 4: Qualifications and designations of academic staff (n = 51)

Position	Master’s (n = 26)		PhD (n = 25)	
	Number	%	Number	%
Assistant professor	4	15.4%	5	20.0%
Associate professor	—	—	4	16.0%
Lecturer	21	80.8%	16	64.0%
Professor	1	3.8%	—	—

3.1.3 Teaching experience

Table 5 gives an overview of the faculty members' years of teaching experience. The majority (27.1%) of the respondents have 16–20 years of teaching experience, and 18.6% have 11–15 years' teaching experience.

Table 5: Academic staff's years of teaching experience (n = 65)

Years of teaching experience	Number	%
≤5 years	8	11.9%
6–10 years	7	10.2%
11–15 years	12	18.6%
16–20 years	18	27.1%
21–25 years	4	6.8%
26–30 years	10	15.2%
31–35 years	3	5.1%
36–40 years	3	5.1%

3.1.4 Discipline

Table 6 shows which discipline the respondents work in. The majority (34%) of the respondents teach Indian Studies. The MGI has a niche in Indian Studies and Performing Arts, being the only HEI in Mauritius offering these disciplines at tertiary level.

Table 6: Disciplines in which the academic staff work (n = 62)

Faculty discipline	Number	%
Fine Arts	5	8%
Humanities	9	15%
Indian Studies	21	34%
Mauritian and Area Studies	2	3%
Other	9	15%
Performing Arts	14	23%
Social Sciences	2	3%

3.2 Access to and Use of ICT

3.2.1 Ownership of and access to devices

According to the data in Tables 7 and 8, the majority of the respondents own a smartphone (98.4%), a laptop (96.8%) and/or a desktop PC (78.3%).

The MGI provides a desktop PC to 76.7% of the respondents; 36.2% are provided with a laptop. Associate professors and heads of school are provided with laptops.

Table 7: Academic staff's ownership of devices

Do you own any of these devices?	Desktop (n = 60)		Laptop (n = 62)		Smartphone (n = 62)		Tablet device (e.g., iPad) (n = 47)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No, and I do not plan to buy one in the next 12 months	12	20	2	3.2	1	1.6	25	53.2
No, but I plan to buy one in the next 12 months	1	1.7	—	—	—	—	2	4.3
Yes	47	78.3	60	96.8	61	98.4	20	42.6

Table 8: Academic staff's access to digital devices

Do you have access to any of these devices at your university?	Desktop (n = 60)		Laptop (n = 58)		Smartphone (n = 55)		Tablet device (e.g., iPad) (n=32)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No, my university does not allow me to use these	2	3.3%	1	1.7%	2	3.6%	13	40.6%
Yes, I use my personal device in the university	12	20.0%	36	62.1%	48	87.3%	15	46.9%
Yes, provided by the university	46	76.7%	21	36.2%	5	9.1%	4	12.5%

3.2.2 Internet access: Location

Respondents accessed the Internet from home (91%) and from the office (79%) (see Table 9). The qualitative data showed that the academic staff have complained about the slow connection on campus.

Table 9: Academic staff's Internet access: Location (n = 65)

Place of Internet Access	No		Yes	
	N	%	N	%
Home	6	9%	59	91%
Office	14	21%	51	79%

3.2.3 Internet access: Devices used

Most respondents access the Internet via smartphone, with a laptop being the second-most commonly used device for this purpose. (See Table 10.)

Table 10: Academic staff's Internet access: Devices (n = 65)

Which device do you use more frequently to access the Internet?	N	%
Desktop computer	13	21%
Laptop	21	32%
Smartphone	31	48%

3.3 Use of ICT for Teaching and Learning

In this section, we describe the faculty members' use of ICT for activities related to teaching and learning. It is important to understand the context in which these surveys were carried out at the MGI in 2023, when all restrictions related to Covid-19 had been lifted at the national level.

3.3.1 *Comfort level with computer-related activities*

Faculty members were more comfortable at advanced and intermediate user levels in activities directly related to their duties as academics (administrative tasks; online meetings and remote teaching; liaising with staff, colleagues and students; preparing notes and slides). Hence, they were comfortable with:

- Communication platforms: Most rated themselves at an intermediate user level. The mean score was 2.06.
- Email: Most rated themselves at an advanced user level. The mean score was 2.78.
- Presentations: Most rated themselves at an advanced level. The mean score was 2.44.
- Word processors: Most rated themselves at an intermediate level. The mean score was 2.49.

In other areas — for example, digital audio, video editing and multimedia authoring — their skills were at basic and even non-user levels.

However, the MGI offers programmes at degree level in advertising and graphic design, animation, game design, digital video production, web and multimedia and film production. Some faculty members therefore have an advanced/expert level of skills in these areas. The survey results can be explained by the fact that the majority of the academics who participated in the survey teach Indian Studies.

The MGI produced approximately 4,000 videos in all Asian languages (Hindi, Marathi, Telegu, Tamil, modern Chinese and Urdu) in-house for primary-level students during the Covid-19 lockdown period. These videos are hosted on the Language Resource Centre (LRC) channel on YouTube. The LRC is the focal point for the production of these videos and the academic staff do not necessarily need to develop technical skills for the production of these videos: they act as content providers/creators.

It is worth noting that 32 academic staff who responded to the survey rated their competencies at a non-user level and basic user level for learning management systems (LMSs) when in fact they use Google Classroom. This discrepancy could be explained by the fact that they were not aware that the platform is an LMS. Note that not all 67 academics responded to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore ranged from 58 to 64. (See Table 11.)

Table 11: Academic staff's ability level with computer-related activities

Please rate your comfort level with the following computer-related activities	Non-user level (0)	Basic level (1)	Intermediate level (2)	Advanced level (3)	Expert level (4)	Mean score
Communications platform (e.g., MS Teams)	3	16	21	18	4	2.06
Databases	16	15	19	11	—	1.41
Digital audio	15	25	9	7	4	1.33
Email	—	5	18	27	14	2.78
Graphic editing	22	22	8	3	5	1.12
Learning management system (e.g., Moodle)	16	16	11	15	2	1.52
Multimedia authoring	19	18	12	12	1	1.32
Presentations (e.g., Microsoft PowerPoint)	1	9	22	25	7	2.44
Spreadsheets (e.g., Microsoft Excel)	2	23	28	7	2	1.74
Video editing	22	23	6	3	4	1.03
Web 2.0 tools (wikis, blogs, social networking)	12	16	18	14	2	1.65
Web page design	37	10	6	5	1	0.69
Word processor (e.g., Microsoft Word)	—	5	28	24	6	2.49

3.3.2 Use of social media

Overall, the faculty members were equally active (73.13%) on Facebook, photo-sharing sites, research-sharing sites, SlideShare and social bookmarking sites. The majority were not active on blogs, Goodreads.com or Twitter. (See Table 12.)

Table 12: Academic staff's use of social media (n = 67)

Which social media platforms do you use?	No		Yes	
	N	%	N	%
Blog (using Blogger or WordPress or within institutional website/CMs)	61	91.0%	6	9.0%
Facebook	18	26.9%	49	73.1%
Goodreads.com (for connecting with authors and readers) or similar	55	82.1%	12	17.9%
Photo-sharing (Instagram/Flickr/Picasaweb, etc.)	18	26.9%	49	73.1%
Research-sharing site (Academic.edu, Researchgate.net, etc.)	18	26.9%	49	73.1%
SlideShare or similar presentation platform	18	26.9%	49	73.1%
Social bookmarking sites (Delicious, Scoop.it, Pinterest, etc.)	18	26.9%	49	73.1%
Twitter	58	86.6%	9	13.4%

3.3.3 Memberships in mailing lists or discussion forums

At the MGI, only 53% of the respondents said that they are part of a discussion group or belong to a mailing list. However, given that they are staff at the MGI, they should automatically be on MGI mailing lists.

3.3.4 TEL environment and experience

Mode of delivery

The mode of delivery for teaching was identified as predominantly blended learning (70.5%) although just over half of the academic staff (55.7%) still used traditional face-to-face teaching. (See Table 13.) This could be explained by the following:

- Restrictions on face-to-face contact had been lifted by the government.
- The nature of the disciplines (performing arts, fine arts) taught by many respondents requires a face-to-face mode of delivery.

Table 13: Mode of delivery (n = 62)*

Nature of class	No		Yes	
	N	%	N	%
Blended, where some components of the study are done online	18	29.5%	43	70.5%
Completely online	57	93.4%	4	6.6%
Distance education	58	95.1%	3	4.9%
Traditional face-to-face	27	44.3%	34	55.7%

*Multiple responses were permitted

Use of tools and apps

In terms of the faculty's experience in using tools and apps to enhance their teaching:

- Although they use Google Classroom, eight academics rated their ability with LMSs as poor. The mean score of 2.59 shows that the majority were using an LMS.
- They rated themselves fairly highly for emails (mean score = 3.62), computer labs (mean score = 2.66) and downloading and using free and open-source software (mean score = 2.53).
- Given the disciplines on offer at the MGI, the faculty members were not used to using software like MATLAB graphics software or image analysis (mean score = 1.91). The results could be explained by the fact that the majority of the respondents taught Indian Studies and, given the nature of the discipline, have no reason to use these resources.

Note that not all 67 academics responded to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore ranged from 58 to 64. (See Table 14.)

Table 14: Academic staff's use of tools and apps

Please rate your experience with the following resources/services/spaces provided by your institution	Not available (0)	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Neutral (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Mean score
Email services (institutional)	1	—	13	6	31	12	3.62
Support for maintenance and repair of ICTs	2	12	13	7	25	1	2.73
Computer labs (for practical and Internet access)	7	9	10	11	20	4	2.66
Learning management system (e.g., Moodle, etc.)	7	8	13	9	18	4	2.59
Network bandwidth/speed of Internet (download and upload)	1	14	15	13	15	3	2.59
Download and use of free and open-source software for teaching and learning	4	12	13	12	12	5	2.53
Wi-Fi access	1	19	15	9	16	3	2.46
Online or virtual technologies (e.g., network or cloud-based file storage system, Web portals, etc.)	5	11	16	10	16	2	2.45
eClassroom facilities (e.g., computers, projection systems, lecture capture systems, SMART boards, etc.)	7	15	17	11	10	4	2.22
Access to software (e.g., MATLAB, GIS applications, statistical software, qualitative data analysis, graphics software, textual or image analysis program, etc.)	11	16	10	11	8	2	1.91
e-Portfolio	14	12	12	13	4	2	1.77

Use of digital resources

Faculty members seem to be more accustomed to using the following digital resources: audio recordings, digital films, images, open textbooks, PowerPoint, Word files and open access research papers. Blogs, micro-blogging and simulations and 2D/3D animation were used to a lesser extent.

The academics also mentioned in the survey that given the nature of the programmes offered at the MGI, audio recordings (for language learning) and digital films (e.g., for performing arts) are used in teaching and learning. Note that not all 67 academics responded to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore ranged from 50 to 55. (See Table 15.)

Table 15: Academic staff's use of digital resources

Please indicate how often you use the following digital resources/platforms in your teaching	Never (0)	Rarely (1)	Sometimes (2)	Often (3)	Always (4)	Mean score
Word files (activity sheets/handouts/notes)	4	3	9	21	17	2.81
Presentations (e.g., PowerPoint, including from the online sources)	3	3	15	21	13	2.69
Images (pictures, photographs, including from the Web)	2	4	17	23	9	2.60
Open access research papers	2	10	15	14	11	2.42
Digital films/video (e.g., YouTube)	6	7	13	22	7	2.31
Open textbooks	5	14	9	14	11	2.23
Audio recordings	5	10	19	15	5	2.09
Learning management system	13	12	8	10	9	1.81
Micro-blogging (Twitter, Facebook, etc.)	20	12	12	4	2	1.12
Social bookmarking	21	14	9	4	3	1.10
Simulations and 2D/3D animation/printing	23	14	5	8	1	1.02
Blogs	21	17	10	2	1	0.92

Creation and sharing of teaching and learning resources

The survey revealed that the academic staff create traditional resources like Word files, PowerPoint presentations and images, but these are not necessarily shared with others. Given the nature of the programmes offered (e.g., languages, fine arts and digital media), audio recordings and PowerPoint presentations were created and shared. Simulations and blogs are not commonly created and shared by the academic staff at the MGI. (See Table 15.)

Table 16: Creation and sharing of teaching and learning resources

Have you created and shared the following teaching and learning materials?	Never		Yes, and shared through an open licence		Yes, but not shared with others	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Audio recordings	20	39.2%	16	31.4%	15	29.4%
Blogs	42	80.0%	4	8.0%	6	12.0%
Course packs	32	62.0%	6	12.0%	14	26.0%
Digital films/video (e.g., YouTube)	24	46.2%	17	32.7%	11	21.2%
Images (pictures, photographs, including from the Web)	20	38.9%	13	25.9%	18	35.2%
Learning management system	30	58.0%	14	26.0%	8	16.0%
Presentations (e.g., PowerPoint, including from the online sources)	10	19.2%	21	40.4%	21	40.4%
Simulations and 2D/3D animation	42	80.4%	3	5.9%	7	13.7%
Word files (activity sheets/handouts/notes)	8	15.7%	27	51.0%	17	33.3%

Use of ICT in learning and teaching

Faculty members were more at ease with integrating the following tools:

- Online videos: The academic staff noted that these online videos are useful resources for their programmes (performing arts, language training)
- Communication platforms
- e-Books/e-Textbooks
- Online collaboration tools
- Learner management systems

The majority of the academic staff who responded (mean score = 0.73) do not use accessible tools. Note that not all 67 academics responded to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore ranged from 48 to 53. (See Table 17.)

Table 17: Academic staff’s skills in integrating technology in teaching and learning

Please rate your skills in integrating the following in teaching and learning	I can’t use it (0)	I can use it to a small extent (1)	I can use it satisfactorily (2)	I can use it well (3)	I can use it very well (4)	Mean score
Online video/audio	1	9	17	15	11	2.49
Communications platform (e.g., MS Teams)	4	8	23	10	7	2.15
e-books/e-textbooks	3	13	19	8	8	2.10
Online collaboration tools (e.g., Adobe Connect, Google Docs)	6	13	13	15	6	2.04
Learning management system (e.g., Moodle)	7	10	21	9	5	1.90
Social media (blogs, wikis, etc.)	9	11	18	8	5	1.78
Educational games/simulations	10	11	15	12	3	1.75
Lecture capture tools	15	11	12	8	3	1.45
e-portfolio	14	20	11	6	—	1.18
Accessible tools (for people with disabilities)	29	7	8	4	—	0.73

3.4 Use of ICT for Research and Scholarship

As indicated in Table 12, the majority of the academic staff at the MGI use research-sharing sites. The information in Table 18 shows that the majority rarely use the different OER databases.

Of the resources mentioned in the survey, the academic staff used the following to some extent (sometimes, often, always):

- Directory of Open Access Journals (mean score = 1.73)
- OER Commons (mean score = 1.55)
- WikiEducator (mean score = 1.54)

Given the nature of the disciplines offered by the MGI (e.g., Asian languages such as Hindi, Urdu, Tamil and Telegu), relevant MOOCs and OER databases may not be available.

One strength of the MGI is its uniqueness in terms of the disciplines it offers. Training on OER can empower staff to contribute towards releasing content already produced as OER and to produce more such content in the future. Note that not all 67 academics responded to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore varies.

Table 18: Academic staff’s use of OER

How often do you use the following OER platforms for your teaching and learning?	Rarely (1)	Sometimes (2)	Often (3)	Always (4)	Mean score
Directory of Open Access Journals	20	8	8	1	1.73
OER Commons	27	6	5	2	1.55
WikiEducator	24	7	5	1	1.54
NPTEL, India	25	4	4	1	1.44
CollegeOpenTextbooks	28	1	6	—	1.37
BCCampus Open Textbooks	28	2	2	2	1.35
OpenLearn, UK	28	4	2	—	1.24
MIT Open Courseware	30	2	2	—	1.18
Saylor Academy	33	1	2	—	1.14
OpenStax College	32	2	1	—	1.11

3.5 Perceptions about the Use of TEL

3.5.1 Attitudes towards TEL

According to Heggart (2015), 21st-century teachers and instructors need to be open to innovation and growth and to have an adaptable mindset in order to meet new needs of students and stay abreast of emerging trends.

Based on the data in Table 19, with mean scores ranging from 3.77 to 4.23, the academic staff who responded to the survey seem to demonstrate an openness to TEL. The qualitative data also suggest a positive attitude towards TEL. Note that not all 67 academics responded to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore varies.

Table 19: Academic staff’s attitudes towards TEL

Please rate the following attitude statements	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly Agree (5)	Mean Score
Technology-enabled learning increases access to education and training	—	—	2	36	14	4.23
Technology-enabled learning increases the flexibility of teaching and learning	—	1	5	28	19	4.23
Technology-enabled learning increases the quality of teaching and learning because it integrates all forms of media: print, audio, video and animation	—	—	6	32	15	4.17
Technology-enabled learning saves time and effort for both teachers and students	—	—	6	33	13	4.13
Technology-enabled learning will bring new opportunities for organising teaching and learning	—	1	6	32	15	4.13
Technology-enabled learning enables collaborative learning	—	—	9	31	12	4.06
Technology-enabled learning increases my efficiency in teaching	—	—	11	29	11	4
Technology-enabled learning can solve many of our educational problems	—	3	7	33	12	3.98
Technology-enabled learning improves communication between students and teachers	1	2	7	30	13	3.98
Technology-enabled learning can engage learners more than other forms of learning	—	2	15	29	7	3.77

3.5.2 Motivators to use TEL

Gauging what motivates MGI academic staff is crucial because the results can aid the MGI in the preparation of its TEL policy. Based on the responses, overall, motivators for using TEL can be ranked as follows (highest to lowest mean score) (see Table 20):

1. Improved infrastructure (hardware and software) deployment/Personal interest in using technology
2. Better Internet bandwidth at workplace
3. Intellectual challenge
4. Training on technology-enabled learning
5. Self-gratification

6. Technical support
7. Professional incentives to use technology-enabled learning
8. Credit towards promotion/Peer recognition prestige and status

Note that not all 67 academics responded to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore varies.

Table 20: Motivators to use TEL

Please rate the following motivator for you to use technology-enabled learning	Very weak motivator (1)	Weak motivator (2)	Average motivator (3)	Strong motivator (4)	Very strong motivator (5)	Mean score
Improved infrastructure (hardware and software) deployment	2	1	7	20	18	4.06
Personal interest in using technology	—	—	14	23	17	4.06
Better Internet bandwidth at workplace	1	2	11	17	19	4.02
Intellectual challenge	—	1	10	27	12	4.00
Training on technology-enabled learning	—	—	15	21	14	3.98
Self-gratification	—	1	13	27	8	3.86
Technical support	2	3	9	21	13	3.83
Professional incentives to use technology-enabled learning	1	3	12	22	12	3.82
Credit towards promotion	4	1	16	15	13	3.65
Peer recognition, prestige and status	1	4	15	19	9	3.65

3.5.3 Barriers to using TEL

An analysis of what MGI academic staff identify as barriers to using TEL can also aid the MGI in the preparation of its TEL policy. Note that not all 67 academics responded to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore varies.

Table 21: Barriers to using TEL

	Very weak barrier (1)	Weak barrier (2)	Average barrier (3)	Strong barrier (4)	Very strong barrier (5)	Mean score
Lack of instructional design support for technology-enabled learning	1	1	14	13	19	4.00
Lack of institutional policy for technology-enabled learning	1	3	14	17	13	3.79
Lack of time to develop e-courses	2	1	15	16	13	3.79
Poor Internet access and networking in the university	2	4	12	15	15	3.77
Lack of training on technology-enabled learning	-	3	17	20	10	3.74
Lack of technical support in the university	1	—	22	16	11	3.72
Inadequate availability of hardware and software	-	6	12	19	10	3.70
Lack of incentives to use technology-enabled learning	1	2	17	18	9	3.68
No role models to follow	4	3	17	11	13	3.54
Lack of credit towards promotion	2	3	22	9	11	3.51
Concern about faculty workload	2	-	24	18	5	3.49
Concern about students' access to technology	2	4	16	20	5	3.47
Concern about the quality of e-courses	3	3	19	15	7	3.43
Concern about security issues on the Internet	2	6	18	14	7	3.38
Lack of professional prestige	3	5	19	13	7	3.34
Intimidated by technology	6	9	19	10	4	2.94

3.6 Open-Ended Questions

Academics' responses to the open-ended questions are presented below, organised by theme.

<p>TEL policy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One respondent made the following comment: "Given that our Strategic Plan 2022–2026 does make mention of the use of ICT in teaching and learning, there is a dire need to develop a TEL policy and strategy at institutional level. There are misunderstanding and misperceptions regarding online teaching and distance education, etc. as well as lack of incentives and investments in TEL." • It was felt that having a TEL policy "will guide academics about the smooth implementation and proper use of technology in teaching and learning" and "strategy will help overcome the challenges of online teaching and help consolidate actual instruction models." • A TEL policy or guidelines will help to consolidate TEL to ensure better learning, more so given the current context and trends. • Post Covid-19, such a policy is seen as crucial but "provided that academics are given appropriate training, support and conducive environment to master and materialize TEL."
<p>HR and infrastructure</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lecturers recommended a reinforcement of the IT department, in terms of staff, equipment and Internet connection so as to pave the way for TEL at the MGI. • A request was also made for resource persons and technical staff to be trained. • Given the specificity of the MGI's programming (practical, performing arts, film making, fine arts), a request was made for appropriate software to enable practical projects to be viewed. • Software for plagiarism detection was also requested. • One respondent commented on the lengthy procedures involved with purchasing equipment. • Access to equipment for students must be improved.
<p>Mindset and training</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was felt that the MGI "need to move towards innovating ideas to improve our visibility and attract more students." • Because the MGI is involved in the teaching of Asian, foreign and heritage languages, a blended approach might be more appropriate as opposed to fully online. • One respondent remarked that they have a preference for face-to-face lecturers. In order to shift to TEL, appropriate training in TEL is required. • Restrictions on accessing YouTube were seen as a hindrance as given the nature of the programmes at the MGI, videos and music downloads are important teaching resources. • Since technology is now an "integral part of the Education System," a TEL policy will facilitate the transition to TEL and ensure that faculty members are less resistant to change. The policy will have to include incentives, such as promotion, or other forms of recognition. • The support of senior management, in terms of developing relevant policies, purchasing equipment such as laptops for staff, regularly updating software and providing training is crucial to ensure the successful implementation of TEL.
<p>Cost implication/Budget</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cost implication of implementing TEL is seen as critical. According to one respondent, "When the institution is going for cost reduction across the board, it is difficult to undertake such massive investment in training and infrastructure, specifically in the field of performing arts."

Chapter 4: Students' Use of Technology for Learning

4.1 Profile of Students

In all, 250 students (53.8% of the total number of students) completed the survey from the MGI, which is adequate for representativeness and validity of the responses.

4.1.1 Age, gender and discipline

The students were predominantly in the 21–25 years age group and female. (See Table 22.)

Table 22: Age and gender profile of students

Age group	Female		Male		Total number
	Number	%	Number	%	
≤20	4	1.6%	—	—	4
21–25	144	57.6%	23	9.2%	167
26–30	15	6%	3	1.2%	18
31–35	6	2.4%	2	0.8%	8
36–40	2	0.8%	2	0.8%	4
≥41	10	4%	22	8.8%	32

4.1.2 Level of study

The majority of the respondents are studying at undergraduate level. (See Table 23.) Given the nature of the programmes, some students were enrolled in certificate-level and diploma-level programmes, with the possibility of eventually re-enrolling for higher qualifications.

Table 23: Students' level of study (n = 248)

Level of study	Number	Percentage
Certificate	27	10.8%
Diploma	54	21.6%
Graduate	128	51.2%
Postgraduate	39	15.6%

Some of the programmes offered at certificate and diploma levels are Vocal Hindustani Music, Vocal Carnatic Music, Tabla, Mridangam, Sitar, Violin — Hindustani, Violin — Carnatic, Veena, Bharata Natyam, Kathak, Kuchipudi, Introductory Course in Business Chinese and Modern Chinese.¹

¹ See <https://www.mgirt.ac.mu/index.php/tertiary/courses/undergraduate-programmes> and <https://www.mgirt.ac.mu/index.php/certificate-courses>

4.1.3 Year-wise distribution per discipline

The majority of the respondents are enrolled in Indian Studies, with Performing Arts being the next-most popular course of study. The MGI is not an awarding body for degree-level programmes, so these programmes are run jointly with either the University of Mauritius or the Mauritius Institute of Education. For example, for the academic year 2023–2024, the degree programmes run through the University of Mauritius are as follows:

Full-Time

- BA (Hons) Media Arts
- BA (Hons) Visual Arts
- BA (Hons) Hindi
- BA (Hons) Urdu
- BA (Hons) Marathi
- BA (Hons) Tamil
- BA (Hons) Telegu
- BA (Hons) Indian Philosophy
- BA (Hons) Mauritian Studies
- BA (Hons) Film Production
- BA (Hons) Fine Arts

Part Time

- BA (Hons) Performing Arts (Vocal Hindustani)
- BA (Hons) Performing Arts (Tabla)
- BA (Hons) Performing Arts (Sitar)
- BA (Hons) Performing Arts (Kathak)
- BA (Hons) Performing Arts (Kuchipudi)
- BA (Hons) Sanskrit
- BA (Hons) Vocal Carnatic
- MA Marathi
- MA Hindi
- MA Sitar
- MA Vocal Hindustani Music

Table 24 shows the number of students per discipline and their year of study.

Table 24: Year-wise distribution of students per discipline (n = 254)

Faculty/Discipline	Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fine Arts	3	12.0%	10	40.0%	12	48.0%	—	—
Health and Medical Services	1	100.0%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Humanities	1	4.2%	12	50.0%	11	45.8%	—	—
Indian Studies	7	8.4%	34	41.0%	42	50.6%	—	—
Mauritian and Area Studies	2	18.2%	8	72.7%	1	9.1%	—	—
Natural Sciences	2	100.0%	—	—	—	—	—	—
Performing Arts	14	30.4%	29	63.0%	2	4.3%	1	2.2%
Social Sciences	1	5.3%	6	31.6%	11	57.9%	1	5.3%
Other — Media Arts	1	—	7	87.5%	1	12.5%	—	—
Other — Indological Studies	5	20.0%	1	20.0%	3	60.0%	—	—
Other — Indian Philosophy	—	—	2	66.7%	1	33.3%	—	—
Other	5	22.7%	7	31.8%	8	36.4%	2	9.1%

4.1.4 Students with disabilities

Four students reported having some disabilities, but there was no survey question to ask if their disabilities were professionally assessed.

4.2. Access to and Use of ICT

4.2.1 Students' ownership of and access to digital devices

The data in Table 25 show that the majority of the students owned smartphones (98.3%), followed by laptops (88.5%) and desktops (41.1%).

Table 25: Students' ownership of and access to digital devices*

Do you own any of these devices?	No, and I do not plan to buy one in the next 12 months		No, but I plan to buy one in the next 12 months		Yes	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Desktop	123	56.2%	6	2.7%	90	41.1%
Laptop	15	6.2%	13	5.3%	215	88.5%
Smartphones	4	1.7%	—	—	237	98.3%
Tablet device (e.g., iPad)	156	71.6%	13	6.0%	49	22.5%

*Multiple responses were permitted.

4.2.2 Internet access: Location

The majority (98%) of the students accessed the Internet from home. (See Table 26.) In 2023, all classes have resumed face-to-face sessions, so students would mostly access the Internet from home to work on assignments, etc.

The qualitative data reveal that many students have complained about slow Internet and Wi-Fi connections and poor coverage.

Table 26: Students' Internet access: Location (n = 250)

Where do you access the Internet?	No		Yes	
	Number	%	Number	%
Do not access	249	99.6%	1	0.4%
Home	5	2%	245	98%
School	126	50.4%	124	49.6%

4.2.3 Time spent on the Internet

The data in Table 27 indicate that female students spend more time on the Internet on a daily basis than their male counterparts.

Table 27: Time spent by students on the Internet (n = 231)

Internet access time: Daily	Female students (n = 179)		Male students (n = 52)		Total N	Total %
	Number	%	Number	%		
< 1 hour	13	7.3%	6	11.5%	19	8%
> 5 hours	57	31.8%	7	13.5%	64	28%
1–2 hours	47	26.3%	25	48.1%	72	31%
3–5 hours	60	33.5%	12	23.1%	72	31%
Do not use daily	2	1.1%	2	3.8%	4	2%

4.2.4 Internet access on campus: Location

The majority of the students access broadband on campus from the library (48.8%), followed by classrooms (44.8%). They also access the Wi-Fi available on the campus (54.4%). Note that some students did not respond to the question about Wi-Fi. (See Table 28.)

Table 28: Students’ Internet access on campus: Location

Access location	No		Yes	
	Number	%	Number	%
Classrooms	138	55.2%	112	44.8%
Faculty rooms	236	94.4%	14	5.6%
Laboratories	235	94 %	15	6%
Library	128	51.2%	122	48.8%
Open areas	196	78.4%	54	21.6%
Reception lounge	233	93.2%	17	6.8%
Seminar halls	229	91.6%	21	8.4%
Students’ common rooms	236	94.4%	14	5.6%
Wi-Fi on campus	107	42.8%	136	54.4%

4.2.5 Students’ digital skills and competency

Students’ digital competency

According to the mean scores, the students appeared to be proficient in the use of emails, communication platforms, word processors, presentations, search engines and Web 2.0 tools. These are tools and apps that are directly linked to their needs as learners.

Despite the fact that the students use Google Classroom, many did not rate themselves high in their competency with learning management systems (mean score = 1.16), possibly because only Canvas and Moodle were given as examples in the survey. Those examples may have misled the learners. Note that some students did not respond to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore ranged from 242 to 248.

Table 29: Students' digital competency

Students skills in computer-related activities	I can't use it (0)	I can use it to a small extent (1)	I can use it satisfactorily (2)	I can use it well (3)	I can use it very well (4)	Mean score
Email	3	16	23	106	99	3.14
Communications platform (e.g., Google Meet/Classroom, MS Teams)	4	21	42	74	106	3.04
Word processor (e.g., Microsoft Word)	8	15	46	95	84	2.94
Presentation (e.g., Microsoft PowerPoint)	10	32	52	81	71	2.70
Search engine	16	37	43	69	77	2.64
Spreadsheets (e.g., Microsoft Excel)	22	56	71	64	33	2.12
Web 2.0 tools (Wikis, blogs, social networking)	48	62	56	41	37	1.82
Databases	46	62	59	50	25	1.78
Digital audio	53	79	49	41	22	1.59
Multimedia authoring	55	69	59	40	20	1.59
Video editing	62	65	56	42	20	1.56
Graphic editing	76	68	45	33	21	1.40
Learning management system (e.g., Moodle, Canvas)	102	61	38	25	18	1.16
Web page design	117	60	38	18	12	0.97

Membership in mailing lists and discussion forums

Most students (68.4%) responded that they did not belong to any mailing lists or discussion forums. However, as University of Mauritius/MGI students, they are automatically included on student mailing lists, as all correspondence, communiqués, notices, etc. are sent out via email to students.

Students' use of social media

The majority of the students had a social media account and were quite active in terms of hours spent on social media and frequency of status updates. (See Tables 30 and 31.)

Table 30: Average time spent by students on social media (n = 238)

Time spent on social media	Do not use daily (0)	< 1 hour (1)	1–2 hours (2)	3–5 hours (3)	> 5 hours (4)	Mean score
	13	50	86	69	20	2.14

Table 31: Frequency of status updates by students (n = 238)

Frequency of updating social media account	Not at all (0)	Not very frequently (1)	Once a fortnight (2)	Once a week (3)	Once a day (4)	Several times a day (5)	Mean score
	25	117	14	32	19	31	1.98

Students' use of resources/services/spaces

The students were used to emails, communications platforms and e-classrooms, e-books, e-journals and plagiarism detection software. (See Table 32.) The MGI could consider having induction sessions to ensure that students make optimum use of the different resources that support teaching and learning.

The students mentioned via the qualitative questions that not all dissertations were available online. This was an issue for students who were also working and could not access these materials from home. Some students did not respond to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore ranged from 192 to 237.

Table 32: Students' experience with resources

Student experience with resources	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Neutral (3)	Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Mean score
Email services (institutional)	13	48	52	93	26	3.31
Communications platform (e.g., MS Teams)	23	30	69	68	19	3.14
eClassroom facilities (e.g. computers, projection systems, lecture capture systems, SMART boards, etc.)	29	44	55	82	27	3.14
e-Books	24	37	70	55	17	3.02
e-Journals	26	37	62	57	16	3
Plagiarism detection software	21	38	84	42	18	2.99
e-Theses and dissertations	24	34	77	51	13	2.97
e-Newspapers	23	35	81	51	10	2.95
Bibliographic databases	24	36	80	46	9	2.9
Citation databases	23	36	79	45	9	2.9
Learning management system (e.g., Moodle, etc.)	24	38	83	45	10	2.9
Institutional repository for sharing of research	25	37	88	42	11	2.89
Online or virtual technologies (e.g., network or cloud-based file storage system, Web portals, etc.)	27	50	69	61	10	2.89
Download and use of free and open-source software for teaching and learning	29	42	71	54	9	2.86
e-Portfolio	26	45	74	45	9	2.83
e-Proceedings of conferences	24	31	87	30	9	2.83
Statistical databases	23	35	82	33	8	2.82
Support for maintenance and repair of ICT	29	39	87	45	7	2.82
Access to data storage	29	41	81	40	9	2.8
Citation/reference management software	32	40	83	35	12	2.78
Patent databases	27	30	94	24	8	2.76
Computer labs (for practical and Internet access)	40	38	63	51	8	2.75
Access to software (e.g., MATLAB, GIS applications, statistical software, qualitative data analysis, graphics software, textual or image analysis program, etc.)	37	40	64	47	8	2.74

Data visualisation software	31	41	77	38	7	2.74
Wi-Fi access	48	61	53	48	10	2.6
Network bandwidth/speed of Internet (download and upload)	47	55	63	43	9	2.59

Students' participation in online courses and MOOCs

Most students (64.4%) said they had taken online courses (see Table 33), but almost half (49.5%) do not know what MOOCs are (see Table 34).

Table 33: Students' participation in online courses (n = 236)

Have you taken an online course?	Number	%
No	84	35.6%
Yes	152	64.4%

Table 34: Students' participation in MOOCs (n = 196)

Have you taken a MOOC?	Number	%
No, and I do not know what a MOOC is	97	49.5%
No, but I do know what a MOOC is	46	23.5%
Yes, and I completed it	41	20.9%
Yes, but I didn't complete it	12	6.1%

4.3 Perceptions about Technology in Learning

4.3.1 Blended learning at the MGI

The survey results showed that 70.2% of the students chose a blended mode of study at the MGI and 27.8% chose a traditional face-to-face mode.

This has to be seen in the context of the Covid-19 national lockdown, when the whole education system pivoted to some form of remote teaching and blended learning. Afterwards, instructors continued to integrate some blended learning and remote teaching via Zoom, Google Meet and Teams.

The MGI uses Google Classroom. Notes are posted by instructors and assignments are uploaded by students.

4.3.2 Perception about technology for learning

The data in Table 35 show that, in terms of perceptions about technology for learning, students seem to be aware of issues related to Internet security, safety and privacy. The majority prefer to keep their academic and social life separate on social media and are concerned about cybersecurity.

The majority of the respondents believe technology could enhance the classroom experience and connect them with their friends, instructors and matters related to the MGI.

Students also seem to be open to the use of technology in the classroom while being aware of issues related to security, safety and privacy. Similar to the academic staff, the students seem to have a positive mindset and sound digital literacy, which bodes well for TEL at the MGI.

Note that some students did not respond to each part of the question. The number of responses therefore ranged from 222 to 226.

Table 35: Students' perceptions about technology use for learning

Students' perceptions about technology for learning	Do not know (0)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	Mean score
When it comes to social media (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn), I like to keep my academic life and social life separate	5	1	1	32	111	74	4.08
I am concerned about cybersecurity (password protection and hacking)	4	2	5	25	124	64	4.03
Technology makes me feel connected to teachers	1	3	6	39	130	47	3.92
I get more actively involved in courses that use technology	3	2	7	59	100	54	3.84
Technology makes me feel connected to other participants	4	2	10	41	124	45	3.83
Technology makes me feel connected to what's going on at MGI	3	2	5	56	127	33	3.77
Use of tablets/laptops in class improves my engagement with the content and class	6	1	5	60	120	31	3.7
I wish my teachers in MGI would use and integrate more technology in their teaching	4	2	11	74	93	42	3.66
When I entered MGI, I was adequately prepared to use the technology needed in my courses	7	5	17	59	114	22	3.49
I am concerned that technology advances may increasingly invade my privacy	9	7	28	58	94	28	3.36
Technology interferes with my ability to concentrate and think deeply about subjects I care about	5	16	35	60	86	23	3.22
Multitasking with my technology devices sometimes prevents me from concentrating on or doing the work that is most important	5	10	38	67	90	14	3.2
In-class use of mobile devices is distracting to my teacher	17	4	35	80	61	25	3.08
In-class use of mobile devices is distracting to me	3	16	63	80	50	10	2.85

Students' perceptions about technology for learning	Do not know (0)	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	Mean score
I am more likely to skip classes when materials from course lectures are available online	1	39	87	56	34	8	2.48

4.3.3 Students' perception about technology use in their studies

The high mean scores (4.14–4.27) for responses to the seven statements in Table 36 demonstrate that the students are convinced about the benefits of TEL: how it contributes to their learning, and helps in developing skills that will be useful to them once they join the workforce. Like the academic staff, the students seem to have an open mind about TEL. Note that some students did not respond to all parts of the question. The number of responses therefore ranged from 227 to 230.

Table 36: Students' perceptions about technology use in their studies

Rate the following statements about technology use in your studies	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	Mean score
It will improve my IT/information management skills in general	2	1	18	121	87	4.27
It motivates me to explore many topics I may not have seen before	2	2	17	121	87	4.26
It will improve my career or employment prospects in the long term	3	1	22	115	86	4.23
It makes completing work in my subjects more convenient	1	3	20	128	76	4.21
It allows me to collaborate with others easily, both on and outside of the campus	2	3	22	126	74	4.18
It will help me understand the subject material more deeply	2	3	23	133	69	4.15
It will help me get better results in my subjects	2	3	30	121	74	4.14

4.4 Open-Ended Responses

The students recommended the following:

- Improved Internet and Wi-Fi connection in all classes and across the campus. Because of the slow connection and limited coverage, they cannot do classwork, research work and access Google Classroom for online notes and submit assignments. They could not access e-books or online dissertations from the campus.
- More online resources to be made available, to cater for the needs of working students who follow part-time programmes.

- More advanced and powerful computers where specific software can be installed to enable students to work on campus.
- The TEL environment at the MGI must be improved, as technology is permeating the education sector.
- More up-to-date and appropriate software, depending on the disciplines that are specific to the MGI.
- Maintenance of projectors and air conditioners in the classrooms.
- To have access to content in specific languages to enhance exposure to Asian/foreign/heritage languages, “There should be an online site specifically where we students can get access to different Indian language: e-newspapers, thesis, blogs, research papers and others so that we can enlarge our understanding through our respective courses.”

Chapter 5: Key Findings, Conclusion and Recommendations

This study at the MGI was conducted in 2023, when all Covid-19–related restrictions had been lifted. However, after three years, no institution has been left unaffected by the changes introduced by responses to the pandemic. Some form of blended learning and remote teaching has found its way into all HEIs.

The main objective of this report is to gauge the Mahatma Gandhi Institute’s technology preparedness and whether it merits TEL implementation. The findings of the three questionnaires (institutional, faculty and learner), the qualitative data and the discussion with faculty members during the Visioning Workshop, held at the MGI on 13 April 2023, were used to assess the TEL environment at the MGI.

5.1 Profile of Academic Staff and Students

The findings from the faculty survey show that the majority of the faculty respondents were female. The majority of the female respondents were from the 35–40 years age group and the majority of male respondents from the 41–45 years age group. In terms of the respondents’ grades and qualifications, the majority were at lecturer’s level and possessed a degree at master’s level. Over one-quarter (27.1%) had 16–20 years of teaching experience, and 18.6% had 11–15 years. The highest number of respondents taught Indian Studies (34%).

The findings from the learner survey show that most respondents were in the 21–25 years age group, female and studying at undergraduate level. Given the nature of the programmes on offer, some students were enrolled in certificate-level and diploma-level programmes, with the possibility of eventually re-enrolling for higher qualifications. The majority of the respondents were enrolled in Indian Studies, followed by Performing Arts. In some programmes, there is only one student. These programmes are meant to train students in scarcity areas and are offered as high-priority programmes.

5.2 Access to and Ownership of Devices

The majority (98.4%) of the academics owned a smartphone. Academics are provided with desktops in their office but most have to purchase their own laptops. Academics at associate professor-level, heads of school, the Language Resource Centre and each department are provided with laptops.

Students have to buy their own devices. The campus has Wi-Fi, but students complained about poor connections and coverage. The majority of the learners owned smartphones, followed by laptops and desktops, and access the Internet from home. In 2023, all classes resumed face-to-face sessions, so students would mostly access the Internet from home to work on assignments and conduct other work. Female students seem to spend more time on the Internet on a daily basis. The majority of the students access broadband from the library, followed by classrooms.

During the Visioning Workshop in April 2023, the academics expressed a need for specialised software and equipment to meet the specific requirements of their disciplines (e.g., a sound system to record specific music notes, a camera for 3D sculptures). The need for all staff to be provided with laptops was also discussed.

5.3 Use of ICT for Teaching and Learning

5.3.1 Faculty survey

The academic staff appeared to be at advanced and intermediate user levels in using traditional tools and apps directly related to their academic duties (administrative tasks, online meeting and remote teaching). They were therefore very good with email, presentations (e.g., PowerPoint) and word processing. In other areas — for example, digital audio, video editing, multimedia authoring — their skills were more at basic and even non-user levels. The MGI offers programmes at degree level in advertising and graphic design, animation, game design, digital video production and web and multimedia and film production, so some faculty members have these competencies. However, the majority of the survey respondents from the academic community taught Indian Studies. Moreover, given that the Language Resource Centre is the focal point in terms of technical expertise for the production of videos, the lecturers are more content developers/providers.

The academic staff seem to be relatively used to using audio recordings, digital films, images, open textbooks, PowerPoint, Word files and open access research papers. They used blogs, micro-blogging and simulations and 2D/3D animation to a lesser extent.

Overall, they were equally active (73.1%) on Facebook, photo-sharing sites, research-sharing sites, SlideShare and social bookmarking sites. The majority were not active on blogs, Goodreads.com or Twitter.

In terms of the faculty's experience in using tools and apps to enhance their teaching, although they use Google Classroom, they rated themselves poorly (mean = 1.52) for LMS use. They rated themselves fairly highly for emails (mean = 3.62), computer labs (mean = 2.66), and downloading and using free and open-source software (mean = 2.53). Given the disciplines offered at the MGI, they were not used to using software like MATLAB graphics software or image analysis (mean = 1.91). These results could be explained by the fact that the majority of the academic respondents teach Indian Studies and generally have no reason to use these resources.

The academic staff who responded to the survey create conventional resources like Word files, PowerPoint presentations and images but do not necessarily share them with others. Given the nature of the programmes offered (e.g., second and foreign languages, fine arts and digital media), the academics create and share audio recordings and PowerPoint presentations. Simulations and blogs are not commonly created and shared by academics. They were more at ease in integrating communication platforms, e-books/e-textbooks, learner management systems, online collaboration tools and online videos into their work. Almost 61% responded that they cannot use accessible tools for people with disabilities. The academics resort rarely to OER. They also rarely used OER databases. For example, the mean score for the use of OER Commons was 1.55. Given the nature of the disciplines offered by MGI (e.g., Asian languages such as Hindi, Urdu, Tamil, Telegu, etc.), relevant MOOCs and OER databases may not be available.

One strength of the MGI is its uniqueness in terms of the disciplines it offers. Training in OER could give staff the skills and confidence to contribute towards creating and releasing OER and producing more such content in the future.

Overall, the academics seem to have a positive mindset with regards to TEL, based on their responses to the motivators for and barriers to the use of technology. However, they tend to be quite conservative in terms of the tools and apps they use. Training in how to develop

videos, repurpose videos, integrate OER and emerge as contributors to OER will help them to use other resources to integrate TEL in their classrooms.

5.3.2 Learner survey

According to the findings of the learner survey, the students are proficient with emails, communication platforms, word processors, presentation software, search engines and Web 2.0 tools. These are tools and apps that are directly linked to their specific needs as learners. Despite the fact that the students use Google Classroom, many did not rate themselves high for their ability to use learner management systems (mean score = 1.16). This was possibly because only Canvas and Moodle were given as examples in the survey, which may have misled the students.

The majority of the students said they did not belong to mailing lists or discussion forums. However, as University of Mauritius/MGI students, they are automatically on student mailing lists as all correspondence, communiqués, notices, etc. are issued via students' official email addresses. The majority of the students had social media accounts and were quite active users.

The students were used to emails, communications platforms, e-classrooms, e-books, e-journals and plagiarism detection software. One recommendation would be for the MGI to consider having induction sessions to ensure that students make optimum use of the different resources that support teaching and learning — for example, citation databases, citation/reference management software and data visualisation software.

Most students (64.4%) said they had taken online courses but 49.5% did not know what a MOOC is.

As far as the students' digital literacy is concerned, the survey results indicated that the students were aware of issues related to Internet safety and privacy.

The majority of the students agree that TEL is beneficial in terms of how it contributes to their learning and helps in developing skills that will be useful to them once they join the workforce.

5.3.3 Training in TEL

Based on the qualitative data and the information collected at the Visioning Workshop held at the MGI on 13 April 2023, it appears that staff feel that training in TEL would help them adopt technology in the classroom in a more effective manner. Having a dedicated unit/centre for online/blended learning would also help to support TEL initiatives at the MGI.

5.3.4 The MGI's TEL score

Based on the above findings, the TEL score for the MGI is 82, indicating “limited preparedness.” That translates as “the institution has addressed some aspects of the technology-enabled learning system, policies and infrastructure, but they need further development.”

The MGI does not yet have a TEL policy. Its strategic plan sees ICT as an enabler but it does not have measurable goals and outcomes, and there is no ICT policy in place. The MGI does not have instructional designers or a centre dedicated to blended/online learning. The Language Resource Centre has played a pivotal role in the production of videos but these videos were mostly meant for primary or secondary levels. The results of the surveys and the outcomes of the Visioning Workshop on the Development of a Technology-Enabled Learning Policy at the MGI on 13 April 2023 indicate that senior management is supportive

of and academics are committed to the implementation of TEL. However, training, IT support and staff dedicated to TEL, such as instructional designers, are crucial for embracing TEL.

5.4 Conclusion

Although in terms of ICT resources and training of staff the MGI exhibits limited preparedness, there is an openness to TEL among both learners and faculty members. There is recognition that technology has permeated the education sector. Having a TEL policy is seen as critical to ensure that the MGI can successfully embrace TEL on its campus.

Leadership will be key to ensuring the adoption of TEL. The presence and active participation of the director-general and the director of the MGI at the Visioning Workshop bodes well in that respect.

5.5 Recommendations

1. The MGI, under the guidance of the HEC, should prepare a TEL policy for its institution that is aligned to its strategic plan and goals. The TEL policy will acknowledge the five pillars identified by the Guidelines for Developing Institutional Technology-Enabled Learning Policy:
 - Strategic Pillar 1: Strengthening the Governance Structure for TEL
 - Strategic Pillar 2: Consolidating Technology and Infrastructure
 - Strategic Pillar 3: Expanding Teaching, Learning and Assessment Using Technology
 - Strategic Pillar 4: Building Professional Development and Growth
 - Strategic Pillar 5: Leveraging on a Dynamic Ecosystem of Collaboration
2. Capacity-building workshops in TEL should be organised for both students (through induction sessions) and faculty members. Existing OER (e.g., from COL) could be used and existing collaborations with partner institutions could be drawn on.
3. The MGI should develop a model of blended learning that is responsive to its specific needs — for example, what TEL model would be best suited for performing arts, sculpture or vocal training; and what type of equipment is required to record sound or photograph sculptures, etc.? The MGI is unique in terms of the disciplines it offers and it could emerge as a leader by developing OER and other related resources in these areas. Training in the development of OER would empower MGI staff to emerge as content providers in these areas.

References

- Commonwealth of Learning. (2020). *Open and distance learning: Key terms and definitions*. <https://oasis.col.org/items/7dc20f7c-4901-433a-90f1-6274f5ce53dd>
- Heggart, K. (2015, February 4). Developing a growth mindset in teachers and staff. *Edutopia*. <https://www.edutopia.org/discussion/developing-growth-mindset-teachers-and-staff>.
- Mahatma Gandhi Institute. (2022). *Mahatma Gandhi Institute Strategic Plan 2022–2026*. <https://www.mgirti.ac.mu/index.php/strategic-plan>
- Mahatma Gandhi Institute. (2023). Home page. <https://www.mgirti.ac.mu/>.
- Rampertab, R., (2023, 09 March). *Leveraging technology for enhanced teaching and learning at MGI: Achievements, aspirations and hurdles* [Speech]. Launching of Technology Enabled Learning — Phase 2, organised by the Higher Education Commission and Commonwealth of Learning, Mauritius.



4710 Kingsway, Suite 2500
Burnaby, BC V5H 4M2
Canada
Tel: +1 604 775 8200
Fax: +1 604 775 8210
E-mail: info@col.org
Web: www.col.org

June 2023