



Erasmus+ Programme (ERASMUS)

GOT

Building Capacity for Online Tuition in Ghana

Type of Action: Capacity Building in the field of Higher Education: Strand 2 - Partnerships for transformation in higher education.

Topic: ERASMUS-EDU-2022-CBHE-STRAND-2

Grant Agreement no: 101082794

Website: <https://projects.tuni.fi/got>

Risk Management Plan Report (Deliverable D9.2)

Authors: Christopher Yarkwah

Reviewer(s): Benjamin Ghansah

July 2024

Start date of the project: January 1, 2023. Duration: Three years

Revision: 1.0

Project funded by the European Commission within the Erasmus-2022 Capacity Building in the field of Higher Education: Strand 2 - Partnerships for transformation in higher education.

Dissemination Level

PU: Public

Project consortium

- Tampere Research Center for Information and Media, Tampere University (TAU), Finland.
- Center of Excellence in Educational Innovation, Tallinn University (TLU), Estonia.
- Information and Communication Technology Education, University of Education, Winneba (UEW) Ghana.
- Mathematics and ICT Education, University of Cape Coast (UCC), Cape Coast, Ghana.

Notices

For information, please contact Christopher Yarkwah (cyarkwah@ucc.edu.gh). This document is intended to fulfil the contractual obligations of the GOT project concerning deliverable D9.1 described in contract 101082794.

© Copyright GOT 2024. All rights reserved.

Author, Beneficiary

- Tampere University (TAU)-Coordinator
- Tallinn University (TLU)-Partner
- University of Education, Winneba (UEW) -Partner
- University of Cape Coast (UCC) - Partner

Executive Summary

The GOT project's objective is to transition the delivery of digital education lessons at the University of Cape Coast (UCC) and the University of Education, Winneba (UEW) to data-driven and evidence-based approaches. Additionally, the project strives to reorient the mindset of researchers, educators, and digital solutions suppliers in the area of online teaching and learning. As a result, UCC and UEW have been implementing extensive digital education initiatives to improve teaching and learning experiences. This report aims to identify and evaluate the risks associated with digital literacy for higher education instructors who have received training on various digital tools, referred to as Mobility Champions. It focuses on the ability of mobility champions to retain knowledge and implement risk mitigation strategies to sustain digital literacy over time. The report emphasises the necessity of continuous support and structured strategies to ensure that digital literacy is maintained, thereby enhancing the educational experience for students.

Both the University of Education, Winneba (UEW) and the University of Cape Coast (UCC) have used a range of digital tools to enhance their digital education activities. Both UCC and UEW employ learning management systems (LMS) such as Moodle to facilitate course

delivery, manage material, and enhance student participation. Both the University of Cape Coast (UCC) and the University of Education, Winneba (UEW) enhance their learning management systems (LMS) by incorporating video conferencing platforms such as Zoom, Microsoft Teams, and Google Meet. We use these platforms to conduct virtual classes and meetings. We utilise online assessment platforms such as Google Classroom and Quiz in Moodle to administer quizzes, examinations, and assignments for distant learners. Although there are difficulties, faculty members at UEW and UCC are employing these tools in diverse ways. These include uploading course materials, lecture notes, and assignments on LMS platforms, conducting virtual lectures and tutorials using video conferencing tools, incorporating multimedia content (videos, simulations, and interactive quizzes) into lessons, involving students in online discussions, forums, and collaborative projects, and evaluating student progress and performance through online assessments.

1.0 Risk Assessment

1.1 Knowledge retention risks

Champions/Instructors may forget or fail to apply the digital skills they have learned. This situation has the propensity to affect the quality of digital tool usage over time, reducing the effectiveness of teaching methods. Based on this assessment, we set the risk level at medium.

1.2 Technical Risks

Potential issues under this risk could include both hardware and software.

There have been malfunctions, cybersecurity breaches, and data privacy concerns. It must be noted that this risk factors can significantly disrupt teaching activities and compromise sensitive information, and reduce trust in digital tools. The risk level of this assessment would be quite high

1.3 Pedagogical Risks

It is highly imperative to note that pedagogical risks may include the ineffective use of digital tools, insufficient training or support, and an overreliance on technology. This risk has the potential to impede the learning process, foster a reliance on technology, and constrain the instructors' pedagogical flexibility. The level of risk associated with pedagogy is anticipated to be medium.

1.4 Human Factors and Risks

These risks encompass resistance to change, lack of motivation or interest, and insufficient digital literacy skills among champions and instructors. Such factors can lead to reluctance to adopt new technologies, reducing the overall effectiveness of digital literacy initiatives, and the risk level is anticipated to be medium.

1.5 Ethical Risks

Ethical concerns include bias in AI-assessed teaching and learning, as well as unintended consequences of using AI. These can lead to unfair assessment practices, which can harm the educational process and student outcomes.

Experts perceive the risk level as moderate.

1.6 Risk Mitigation Strategies

Having identified the aforementioned risks, it is critical that we, as universities, put forward a mitigation strategy. Below are the risk mitigation strategies that would be engineered by UCC and UEW.

2.0 Knowledge retention risks

Regarding this risk, both UCC and UEW plan to organize regular refresher training sessions. This would be done by periodically updating and reinforcing the digital skills of the champions and instructors. Again, both universities would be encouraging peer-to-peer knowledge sharing. This, in a way, would facilitate communities where champions and instructors can share experiences and solutions. For the knowledge to be retained, both universities would reward champions and instructors for effectively integrating digital tools into their teaching.

2.1 Technical Risks

We will regularly update and maintain all digital tools and systems to ensure their up-to-date functionality. Also, cybersecurity training and awareness programmes would be organised to educate instructors on best practices for cybersecurity to prevent breaches. Both universities would ensure data encryption and access controls so as to protect sensitive information through robust encryption and strict access controls.

2.2 Pedagogical Risks

In this context, both universities would provide continuous professional development opportunities for their members. There would also be a collaborative learning community for sharing best practices. Here, both universities would establish platforms for champions and instructors to exchange ideas and strategies. Regular assessments and feedback will be conducted on the effectiveness of digital tools. What this means is that we shall continuously evaluate the impact of digital tools on teaching and learning in the university community.

2.3 Human Factors and Risks

With this risk in mind, both universities intend to personalize support and coaching for struggling champions and instructors. What this means is that we would offer tailored assistance to those who find digital tools challenging. Celebrating successes and sharing stories of effective digital tool use would be promoted and recognised so as to motivate others. There would also be incentives for adopting digital tools. This means both universities would provide rewards for champions and instructors who proactively integrate digital literacy into their pedagogy.

2.4 Ethical Risks

Both universities will develop guidelines for using AI in teaching and learning. Here, we would create clear policies to ensure the ethical use of AI. Regular monitoring and evaluation of AI-assessed teaching and learning would be carried out. We shall continuously assess AI applications to identify and mitigate any biases.

3.0 Knowledge retention and maintenance

We will implement the following measures to ensure the champions retain and maintain the knowledge they have acquired:

1. Regular training and updates on acquired knowledge will take place. Both universities would schedule frequent training sessions to keep champions and instructors current with the latest digital tools and techniques.
2. At our respective universities, there will be a community of practice for peer-to-peer knowledge sharing. Here, both universities would facilitate forums where champions and instructors could collaborate and exchange insights.
3. Again, both universities intend to recognize and reward students or instructors for applying digital skills. We shall implement a reward system for those who demonstrate effective use of digital tools.

4. Both universities would personalise support and coaching. This means that we will provide individualized assistance to address the specific challenges faced by champions and instructors.
5. In addition, we shall celebrate successes and share best practices. We shall highlight and share successful implementation stories to inspire and educate others.

4.0 Recommendations

We will adhere to the following recommendations to improve digital literacy in both institutions.

1. For instructors and champions, we will create a framework for digital literacy. Our objective is to create a thorough manual that specifies the essential digital skills for champions and instructors to adhere to.
2. Offer continuous training and assistance to the champions and faculty. The purpose of this is to guarantee the availability of ongoing professional development opportunities for the champions and instructors.
3. Promote collaboration and the exchange of knowledge among champions, professors, and other faculty members both within and outside the university community. We aim to cultivate a collaborative culture among champions and educators in order to improve overall digital literacy.
4. Establish protocols for the utilisation of artificial intelligence in educational instruction and acquisition. Both universities establish regulations to regulate the ethical utilisation of AI within our institutions.
5. Regularly analyse and appraise the efficacy of digital tools in our institutions. We will establish a method to continuously assess digital tools to ensure they align with educational objectives.
6. Allocate funds and the necessary facilities to effectively incorporate digital literacy into our institutions. We will dedicate ample resources to the maintenance and enhancement of digital infrastructure.
7. Create a thorough plan for implementing digital literacy in a way that is effective and encompasses all aspects of digital literacy. We will develop a comprehensive and strategic plan that covers all areas of digital literacy and is in line with the objectives of our institutions.

5.0 Conclusion

By recognising and mitigating the different risks connected with digital literacy for these champions, both institutions may improve the retention and practical use of digital skills. Implementing this proactive strategy will guarantee that digital literacy efforts have a beneficial impact on faculty effectiveness and student learning results.