



IDEA GROUP PUBLISHING

1331 E. Chocolate Avenue, Hershey PA 17033-1117, USA
Tel: 717/533-8845; Fax 717/533-8661; URL-<http://www.idea-group.com>

Policy Processes for Technological Change

Richard Smith, Brian Lewis and Christine Massey
Simon Fraser University

INTRODUCTION

Universities, among the oldest social institutions, are facing enormous pressures to change. There have always been debates about the university, its purpose, its pedagogical program, and its relationship to other social and political structures. Today, these debates have been given renewed vigor and urgency by the availability of advanced information and communication technologies for teaching and learning. These include computers and computer networks, along with the software and telecommunications networks that link them together. When these technologies are used to connect learners at a distance, they are called “telelearning technologies.” When referring to their use more generally, to include local as well as remote teaching innovations, they are sometimes called “technology mediated learning” (TML).

Despite much media attention and recent academic criticism, pressures on universities are facilitated, but not caused, by telelearning technologies. Change in universities is not simply a result of forces acting upon universities, but is the result of a complex interaction of internal and external drivers. The use of telelearning technologies intersects with a host of social, political, and economic factors currently influencing university reform. Technology, in this context, has become the catalyst for change, reacting with other elements in a system to spark a reaction and a change in form and structure.

This chapter examines policy processes for the introduction of technology-mediated learning at universities and colleges. It is based on the results of a two-year research project to investigate policy issues that arise with the implementation of telelearning technology in universities and colleges. The focus was on Canadian institutions of higher learning, but the issues raised are common to higher educational institutions in other countries. The study scanned a large number of institutions, reviewed documents, and interviewed key actors including government and institutional administrators, faculty, and students, to discover the range of issues raised by the implementation of telelearning technologies. This chapter discusses these issues and findings.

CASE QUESTIONS

- What policies or processes are in place to guide change in colleges and universities? Who knows about these policies and participates in them?

- What are the forces behind technological change in higher education organizations? Are they external or internal?
- Can technology be used as a tool for achieving meaningful and positive change or is it an end to itself?
- In what ways can technology be used to increase access to education?

DOING THE RIGHT THING AND DOING THINGS RIGHT

Organizations implementing telelearning technologies often find themselves facing a variety of new issues not encountered when delivering courses in traditional formats. For example, telelearning technologies can provide access to courses for a broad range of new users. What kind of new or different support services will these new students require? On the flip side of the access issue, students are often concerned about who will have access to files that have stored their electronic discussions, how their identities are safeguarded, and how long these files will be stored. These concerns regarding the implementation of telelearning technologies can be broadly classified as concerns on how to implement these technologies, or “doing things right.”

These micro issues of implementation, however, quickly raise questions about “doing the right things,” the larger, often politically charged questions that form the policy environment for telelearning technologies. These issues are about why telelearning technologies are used and often evoke preconceived notions of economy, society, and education. These issues are concerned with power relations and the very nature of educational institutions. Examples of these issues would be the purpose of education, the role of professors/trainers, and the goals of business-education partnerships — not only “how” a subject is taught, but what, when, why, by whom, and for what purpose. These broad policy debates, while easily becoming polarized, can help to define an institution’s goals so that choices about implementing telelearning technologies become clearer.

Clearly, the two aspects of telelearning policy, “doing things right” and “doing the right things,” are linked and both must be dealt with in organizational policies and practices. The importance of sound policy processes that can deal effectively with both aspects cannot be overstated.

One could argue that universities already have well-established mechanisms in place to make these kinds of decisions. After all, universities have long traditions of collegial decision-making. But it is a peculiar feature of decisions about technology that these well-worn processes are seldom respected, as the wisdom of how and why to use technology is expected to be apparent to all.

The issues raised by telelearning technologies suggest a need for a systematic approach that honors collegiality while ensuring that the difficult questions can be dealt with in ways that do not overwhelm the process but serve to facilitate choices about implementation. One danger is that policy processes focus solely on “doing things right,” trying to avoid controversy with broader political questions. The decisions that result from such processes risk being dismissed by those affected as ill considered and will not be supported. Another danger is that “doing the right thing” questions can overwhelm all discussion, with no progress made on making any decisions for the institution. In the end, decisions are often made anyway, but without consultation, behind the scenes, and as surreptitiously as possible, to avoid getting caught up in an endless and unproductive process.

7 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/policy-processes-technological-change/6340

Related Content

Feeling Like a First Year Teacher: Toward Becoming a Successful Online Instructor

Lloyd P. Rieber, Gregory M. Francomand Lucas John Jensen (2011). *Technology Integration in Higher Education: Social and Organizational Aspects* (pp. 42-57).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/feeling-like-first-year-teacher/51448

Instructional Technical and Pedagogical Design: Teaching Future Teachers Educational Technology

Anne T. Ottenbreit-Leftwich, Mark O. Millardand Peter van Leusen (2012). *Informed Design of Educational Technologies in Higher Education: Enhanced Learning and Teaching* (pp. 452-473).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/instructional-technical-pedagogical-design/58399

The Impact of Instructional Simulation Use on Teaching and Learning: A Case Study

Michael C. Johnson, Charles R. Grahamand Su-Ling Hsueh (2012). *Informed Design of Educational Technologies in Higher Education: Enhanced Learning and Teaching* (pp. 193-211).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/impact-instructional-simulation-use-teaching/58387

The Single Most Consequential Thing We Do in Universities: A Case Study in Teaching Assessment to New Academics

Grant Campbell (2013). *Cases on Quality Teaching Practices in Higher Education* (pp. 304-329).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/single-most-consequential-thing-universities/75504

The University of Hawai'i at Manoa Sustainability Courtyard as a Center for Campus Engagement

John Cusick (2013). *Cases on Higher Education Spaces: Innovation, Collaboration, and Technology* (pp. 107-120).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/university-hawai-manoa-sustainability-courtyard/72673