

From: Brigette McConkey <bridgettem@athabascau.ca>
To: seugnet.blignaut@nwu.ac.za
Date: 2012/10/01 01:11 PM
Subject: [IRRODL] Submission Acknowledgement

Seugnet Blignaut:

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "Looking out and looking in: Exploring a case of faculty perceptions during e-learning staff development" to The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning URL:
<http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl>
Username: seugnet

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Brigette McConkey
The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning

The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning
IRRODL

--

This communication is intended for the use of the recipient to whom it is addressed, and may contain confidential, personal, and or privileged information. Please contact us immediately if you are not the intended recipient of this communication, and do not copy, distribute, or take action relying on it. Any communications received in error, or subsequent reply, should be deleted or destroyed.

From: "Prof. Terry Anderson" <terrya@athabascau.ca>
To: Seugnet Blignaut <seugnet.blignaut@nwu.ac.za>
CC: Hendrik Daniël Esterhuizen<hennie.esterhuizen@nwu.ac.za>, Suria Ellis <s...>
Date: 2012/12/03 11:00 PM
Subject: [IRRODL] IRRODL Editor Decision

Dear Seugnet Blignaut:

We have reached a decision regarding your submission to The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, "Looking out and looking in: Exploring a case of faculty perceptions during e-learning staff development".

Congratulations, I am pleased to inform you that your article has been accepted for publication in IRRODL, but on the condition that you respond appropriately to the reviewers' comments (see below and attached).

Please revise the documents in response to the reviewers' concerns and use Word 'marked changes' (or equivalent) in order that we can easily see these changes. Please also email to us a 'clean copy' with all changes accepted. Finally, could you provide a short document, in point form, noting how you addressed the reviewers' concerns – or a rationale for not having done so.

Thanks again and congratulations, we hope you will be prompt with these revisions, so that we can publish your work in the next issue.

Please send your revised copies to Terry Anderson at terrya@athabascau.ca and Brigette McConkey at bridgettem@athabascau.ca.

Sincerely,

Prof. Terry Anderson
Athabasca University
terrya@athabascau.ca
Editor,
International Review of Research in Open and Distance learning

Reviewer B:

1. Complete, clear, and well-organized presentation:
Unsatisfactory

Comments:

In general the manuscript is well organized. There are some lapses in the writing that warrant careful proofreading. (For example, both "center" and "centre" are used in the same sentence to describe the same thing).

2. Significance of the problem:
Satisfactory

Comments:

The problem is well-articulated. However, one thing that impeded my understanding was the role of the e-Learning Manager was not clear. On the surface it appears the person in this role is responsible for technology training and support to the faculty, but the extensive discussion of leadership and the comparison of the e-Learning Manager's perceptions with those of faculty suggest that they are in a more formal leadership position and directs the work of faculty to so degree. It may help to have

the role of the e-Learning Manager described more explicitly.

3. Applicability and interest to the field (relevance beyond case presented):
Satisfactory

Comments:
This is an area that would be interest of readers.

4. Original contribution to open and distance learning:
Satisfactory

Comments:
I think the model provided here extends our understanding of faculty adaption of TEL.

5. Description of the problem within a theoretical framework (where appropriate):
Unsatisfactory

Comments:
I think the literature review could be re-written to better surface the theoretical framework that informs this research.

6. Literature review demonstrates a clear relationship between problem and ODL and other relevant literature:
Satisfactory

Comments:
The literature review provides a good framework for this study. I would recommend perhaps making it more targeted. Some of the literature seemed irrelevant to the study, such as the extended discussion of leadership, when as far as I can tell the discussion centers on faculty attitudes toward e-learning technologies and how they differ from that of the e-learning manager.

7. Appropriateness of research design and method:
Satisfactory

Comments:
The research design is strong. I think it may be important to make more apparent why this design was chosen.

8. Accurate and useful interpretation:
Satisfactory

Comments:
I think the interpretation of finding is useful to practitioners.

9. Sound argument and analysis:
Satisfactory

Comments:
The analysis is sound.

10. Conclusion describes implications for distance education theory, research and/or practice:
Satisfactory

Comments:

The recommendation section could be extended to give more specific examples of application of the findings.

Additional comments:

Reviewer E:

- 1. Complete, clear, and well-organized presentation:
Satisfactory

Comments:

- 2. Significance of the problem:
Excellent

Comments:

Faculty attitudes toward technology-enhanced learning is a common problem; therefore, it should not be assumed or overlooked.

- 3. Applicability and interest to the field (relevance beyond case presented):
Excellent

Comments:

The article is definitely of importance to the ODL field, and the recommendations can be applied to various situations.

- 4. Original contribution to open and distance learning:
Satisfactory

Comments:

- 5. Description of the problem within a theoretical framework (where appropriate):
Satisfactory

Comments:

- 6. Literature review demonstrates a clear relationship between problem and ODL and other relevant literature:
Excellent

Comments:

The references cited in this section are relevant, and most of them are relatively recent.

- 7. Appropriateness of research design and method:
Satisfactory

Comments:

- 8. Accurate and useful interpretation:

Satisfactory

Comments:

9. Sound argument and analysis:
Satisfactory

Comments:

10. Conclusion describes implications for distance education theory,
research and/or practice:
Excellent

Comments:

The authors' conclusions set the stage for further research and practice
in this area.

Additional comments:

Please refer to the "1358-10481-2-RV (Suggested Edits - Richard Butler)"
document for additional comments.

The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning
IRRODL

--

This communication is intended for the use of the recipient to whom it
is addressed, and may contain confidential, personal, and or privileged
information. Please contact us immediately if you are not the intended
recipient of this communication, and do not copy, distribute, or take
action relying on it. Any communications received in error, or
subsequent reply, should be deleted or destroyed.



Survey regarding integrating e-learning technologies in open distance learning at the School for Continuing Teacher Education, NWU

The purpose with the survey is to determine staff opinions regarding usefulness and limitations regarding integrating e-learning technologies in the context of open distance learning at the School for Continuing Teacher Education, NWU. Your participation in the survey is voluntary. All information will be treated confidentially. Your feedback will be helpful in improving distance education initiatives. Please sign the consent form and deposit the completed questionnaire and the consent form separately.

(U is welkom om Afrikaans te gebruik indien u verkies)

Please fill in the required responses into the spaces below:

(If you require additional writing space, use reverse side of the page please)

Section A: e-Learning technologies

Statement	I Definitely Commit	I Commit	I am Neutral	I do not Commit	I Definitely do Not Commit
[A1] I commit myself to implementing e-learning at the School for Continuing Teacher Education (Mark with X)	[5]	[4]	[3]	[2]	[1]
[A2] Please elaborate on your response in [A1] above:					
[A3] I consider the following as examples of e-learning technologies:					
[A4] I consider it essential to increase the use of e-learning technologies in open distance learning initiatives:	Yes [1]		No [0]		
[A5] If you answered yes in [A4], which e-learning technologies are the most important in the context of open distance learning at the School for Continuing Teacher Education, NWU?					
[A6] Please elaborate on your response in [A5] above:					

Section B: Enablers and barriers to learning technology integration

[B1] I consider the following existing initiatives helpful (enablers) in terms of promoting learning technology integration at the School for Continuing Teacher Education, NWU:

[B2] I consider the following as concerns/barriers/obstacles in relation to e-learning technology integration:

[B3] I consider the following future initiatives essential in terms of promoting learning technology integration at the School for Continuing Teacher Education, NWU:

Thank you very much for your time and contribution!