Lived Experience of Developing a Blended Learning Academic Programme in a Traditionally Presential University

Paul Birevu Muyinda, Samuel Ndeda Siminyu, Jessica Norah Aguti, Godfrey Mayende, Dianah Nampijja, Richard Kajumbula, Jamiah Mayanja, Dorothy Kyagaba Ssebbowa, Harriet Nabushawo, David Kabugo, Michael Walimbwa, Julius Shopi Mbulankende, Nazarius Turyakira, Ghislain Maurice Nobert Isabwe

ABSTRACT

Information and communication technologies (ICTs) are presenting pedagogical affordances that are not only being embraced by open distance learning universities but also traditional presential universities. Presential universities are adopting blended learning and teaching approaches in their provisions albeit with some resistance from some staff. This paper shares the experiences and lessons learned from developing the Master of Instructional Design and Technology (MIDT) blended learning curriculum in a traditional presential university. The lessons are drawn from three (3) research questions, namely: 1) What process steps are traditional presential universities taking in the design and development of blended learning curriculum? 2) What is compelling presential universities to adopt blended learning? 3) How are presential universities metamorphosing into blended learning? The paper takes a case study approach employing in-depth document analysis and personal experience explications from staff at the heart of developing curriculum. Findings indicate that contemporary realities such as globalization, increased emphasis on learner-centeredness, increased proliferation of ICTs and others are disrupting the ivory tower traditions and practices of presential universities. These universities are being compelled to open up their gates to non-traditional learners through blended learning, but with a lot more caution. The caution is evidenced by the great amount of rigor invoked in the process of approving blended learning curricula as compared to traditional face-to-face curricula. As such champions of blended learning curricula in presential universities should be prepared to spend more time, energy and resources to have blended learning curricula approved. Putting in place policies and strategies for spurring blended learning; sensitizing staff on the affordances of blended learning and training faculty on how to employ blended pedagogy should take centre stage. Further, the top management of these universities need to be involved at all levels of blended learning curriculum development.

KEYWORDS

Blended Learning, Curriculum Development, Distance Learning, Makerere University, Open Distance and eLearning, Online Learning, Presential University

INTRODUCTION

The need to transform educational institutions from ‘teaching’ to ‘learning’ institutions is more apparent than ever before. This is evident in the World Bank Report 2018, where emphasis is placed on “learning” as the key “to realise education’s promise” (World Bank, 2018). This places a call to curriculum developers to shift from teacher-centred to learner-centred curricula design. In its 2008/09 – 2018/19 Strategic Plan, Makerere University set out to transform its pedagogy from teacher-centred to learner-centred (Makerere University, 2008, p.9). Further, it also set out to introduce open, distance and eLearning (ODeL) programmes in at least six of its colleges (p.15). This effort resulted in the development of a policy on ODeL (Makerere University, 2015). The policy aims at mainstreaming ODeL approaches in conventional pedagogy effectively requiring

Makerere University to become a blended learning university offering learner-centeredness, technology enhanced programmes. In 2013, with support from NORAD and the University of Agder, Makerere University embarked on leapfrogging its first-generation distance education programmes into fourth and fifth generation distance education programmes. The project led to the development of two first ever blended/online learning programmes at Makerere University, a predominantly traditional presential university. This paper chronicles the development process of the blended/online learning Masters of Instructional Design and Technology (MIDT) programme while drawing lessons that could inform the development of similar programmes in predominantly presential universities.

Blended Learning

B*lended learning (*sometimes called *hybrid* or *mixed-mode learning*) is the use of traditional classroom teaching methods together with the use of online learning for the same learners studying the same content in the same course. It is a "thoughtful fusion of face-to-face and online learning experiences" (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008, p.5). Blending may occur at activity, course, programme or institutional levels (Graham, 2006). At each of these levels, classroom instruction time may be augmented by online learning experiences. Online learning can include varying degrees of interaction or independent study. However, in a quality blended learning experience, the content and activities of both in-person and online learning are integrated with one another. The various learning experiences are synthesised, complement each other, and are planned or orchestrated to run in parallel (AlKhaleel, 2019). A learner can therefore study online but also meet their facilitators in occasional face-to-face sessions. The World Bank emphasises the need to measure learning as a way of gauging the transformational impact of education (World Bank, 2018). It is much easier to implement e-portfolio systems for measure learning in blended learning approaches.

The increasing proliferation of ICTs in education is providing a fertile ground for the adoption of blended learning in presential universities. These universities have setup-up learning management systems (LMS) - like the open source Moodle, and have put in place specialised units responsible for pedagogical support. The support units have as one of their roles, the function of developing, nurturing and supporting blended learning in their respective universities. At Makerere University, such a unit is called the Institute of Open, Distance and eLearning (IODeL).

Presential University

Presential universities are those where learners receive their tuition face-to-face in brick-and-mortar lecture rooms/theatres, laboratories, libraries, conference rooms or offices. Learners and their teachers must physically appear in the lecture space at prescribed times on the timetable. In presential universities, learners reside in or around the universities. Presential universities have been critiqued for not being inclusive. Their modus operandi does not permit working learners to study as they work. The brick-and-mortar infrastructure in which they operate does not permit increased access to all deserving candidates. They are also very protective of their traditions and practices and are not so fast at incubating and adopting innovations. Often, they tend to lean more on teacher-centred than learner-centred pedagogies.

Presential University and Blended Learning

Globalization is leading to the liberalization of education. Liberalization of education means increased number of education providers, increasing access to education, flexible ways of delivering education and internationalization (Singh, Shivam & Yaduvanshi, 2016). For any entity to survive in a liberalized economy, it must provide high quality services/products that meet clients' needs. The products/services offered should be on high demand and easily accessible. Traditional presential universities are adopting blended learning to enable them cope with the demands of liberalization. With blended learning, universities can accommodate more student numbers and reach out to persons that would ordinarily not be able to partake of a fulltime education at the university campuses.

Blended learning presents enormous benefits to presential universities (AlKhaleel, 2019). Through blended learning, learners' soft (21st Century) skills can be boosted. For instance, blended learning can motivate learners to become better time manager since e-tivities therein have strict deadlines (Salmon, 2013). Further, blended learning has the potential to spur increased learning skills, greater access to information and improved satisfaction and learning outcomes. It offers opportunities of learning in a community of practice. The e-tivities therein improve learner engagement and can help them achieve higher and more meaningful levels of learning. Learners and teachers become virtual citizens as they practice to project themselves socially and academically in an online community of inquiry.

Blended Learning at Makerere University

The history of blended learning at Makerere University can be traced back in 1991 with the commencement of the External Degree Programmes (Aguti & Fraser, 2006; Bbuye & Mango, 2005). The Bachelor of Education (External) and the Bachelor of Commerce (External) were the two undergraduate programmes that kick-started the scheme. These programmes encompassed a fusion of limited face-to-face teaching at the main campus and study centres with independent study abetted by print-based distance learning study materials (Aguti & Fraser, 2006). In 2001, the student support system received a boost when the Blackboard Virtual Learning Environment was introduced (Gwamba, Mayende, Isabwe & Muyinda, 2017). Thereafter, the mobile learning (m-learning) started proliferating the distance learning support arena (Kajumbula, 2006). Infact, in 2008, the Mobile Research Supervision Initiative (MRSI) was born (Muyinda, Lubega & Lynch, 2010). Thereafter, the MRSI, the Mobile Learning Systems (MLS) with components to support cooperative and collaborative learning also came on-board (Muyinda, Mayende & Kizito, 2015). Throughout these developments, Makerere University maintained a blended learning distance education dispensation where technology was fused with face-to-face tutorials and print materials. The cost of maintaining face-to-face and print distance learning materials shot through the roof creating a need to increase on non-face-to-face support and reduce the cost of print study materials. In other words, the need to upgrade from the predominantly first-generation distance education to the fourth- and fifth-generation distance education arose. Fourth and fifth generations distance education employs mainly online pedagogy (Taylor, 2001). This in turn birthed the Distance Education Leapfrogging Project (DELP).

The DELP Project

The DELP project was aimed at increasing access to flexible quality education at Makerere University by increasing capacity to integrate ICTs into pedagogical processes through leapfrogging the then first generation distance education provision into fourth and fifth generation

distance education provisions. DELP, a five-year Norad funded project, commenced in July 2013. It had four (4) work packages, namely: i) Education (Bachelors and Masters); ii) PhD and Research; iii) Institutional Development; and iv) Project Management. Guided by an online learning needs assessment (Mayende, Muyinda, Prinz, Isabwe & Nampijja, 2015), under the Education work package, two blended learning programmes were developed. At undergraduate level, the project upgraded the Commonwealth Youth in Development Diploma Programme (CYP) into a Bachelor of Youth Development Work programme because of its international stature. At graduate level, the study pointed to the need for a programme that would develop capacity for blended/online/distance learning provision in Uganda, the region and beyond, hence the birth of the Master of Instructional Design and Technology (MIDT) programme. In this paper we recount the process of developing the MIDT programme and draw lessons for similar future endeavours.

The MIDT Programme

The online learning needs assessment recognized that teaching and learning in the 21st Century was changing from that where the teacher was the sage-on-the-stage in a walled classroom with learners seated in rows and columns, to teaching and learning anywhere, anytime with the support of real-time educational technologies (Mayende, *et al.*, 2015). This realization orchestrated the need to change the way education was designed and delivered in the wake of: i) digital natives that were increasingly joining the education system; ii) emergence of digital tools with pedagogical affordances; and iii) the emergence of the global knowledge economy. Though the need existed, there was a dearth in human resource to develop and support technology-mediated education.

In the absence of adequate numbers of competent human resource to steer the development of technology-mediated education, Uganda and indeed other similar developing economies are significantly disadvantaged in the Information Age. Individuals, institutions, communities and organisations are curtailed in their ability to participate in global educational discourse when they lack experts to inspire, guide, and monitor their efforts. The MIDT programme therefore came in to respond to the demand for educators, trainers, administrators, managers, and researchers in the field of technology-mediated education; persons who had the knowledge and skills to assume leadership roles in online programme design, development, and evaluation. The programme is delivered using the same method it espouses – blended learning. The emphasis of this programme is on leading practices in learning (i.e. learning processes, planning for learning, designing for learning, facilitating learning and assessing learning), which takes place in technology-mediated environments. This paper draws lessons from a lived experience of developing the MIDT programme at Makerere University, a predominantly presential university with a history of 100 years. These lessons are important for transforming other programmes into blended learning programmes.

Research Questions

The lessons are drawn by answering the following questions:

a) What process steps are traditional presential universities taking in the design and development of blended learning curriculum?
b) What is compelling presential universities to adopt blended learning?
c) How are presential universities metamorphosing into blended learning?

METHODS

Since we concentrated on eking out our lived experiences of developing a blended learning academic programme in a predominantly presential university, we adopted a case study approach. To answer the research questions, data was collected using in-depth document analysis and personal reflections from DELP project team members who were at the heart of MIDT curriculum development process. Documents related to the MIDT curriculum development and approval were analysed to establish vital insights into the process steps of curriculum development at Makerere University. By having the entire development team author this paper, the data herein was inherently validated. The data however, may have some limitations because the case was only limited to blended learning curriculum development at Makerere University. But universities with similar academic governance structures can have a lot to share in the findings.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Process steps for designing and developing blended learning curriculum in presential universities

Standard capacity indicators for online/blended learning curricula are non-existent in Uganda and at Makerere University. Approving a blended/online learning curriculum is not devoid of the process steps required by the university and the accreditation body.

In Uganda, the body responsible for accrediting academic programmes is the National Council for Higher Education (NCHE). By the time of accrediting the MIDT programme in December 2017, there were no capacity indicators for accrediting blended learning curricula. The programme was accredited using conventional face-to-face curricula capacity indicators. The programme had to meet Makerere University academic programmes quality assurance capacitor indicators as well.

The overarching capacity indicator for any academic programme is whether the programme is vital for socio-economic development. The necessity for the MIDT programme was revealed by undertaking a needs assessment survey as the first step (Mayende, *et. al.*, 2015). The study recommended the need to fast track the development of the MIDT programme so as to establish a human resource base for educational technologists and virtual or blended learning developers, academicians, researchers and practitioners.

In the second step, various stakeholders (subject matter experts, continuing and former students, senior educationists, researchers and representatives from line ministries, universities and corporate organisations, etc.) were involved in identifying the programme-level learning outcomes from the findings of the online learning needs assessment and benchmarks with similar programmes from South Africa, Malaysia, Canada, USA and UK. Having identified the desired learning outcomes, a team consisting of curriculum specialists and subject matter experts was constituted to draft the curriculum. The draft was then discussed and amendments made at a stakeholders' meeting; and departmental, school and college academic boards. From the college academic board, the draft curriculum was presented, discussed and further amendments made at the Research and Graduate Board, a committee of Senate, and then Senate itself. Following subsequent amendments, the curriculum was presented to the University Council Quality

Assurance, Gender and ICT Committee for more quality assurance before approval at the University Council and accreditation by NCHE.

Needs Assessment: An online learning needs assessment survey was carried out in universities, government and non-government agencies, banks and other organisations in Uganda and South Sudan (Mayende *et al.*, 2015). Among other findings, the survey established the need for virtual and blended learning. It revealed a critical shortage of human resource that could spur the development and implementation of virtual education. Extant literature indicated that few institutions offered academic programmes for online/blended learning developers. In Africa UCT was running a Masters in Educational Technology. Similar programmes were to be found in Canada and Malaysia and were variously named, for example: Master of Learning Design and Technology, Master of ICT in Education, and so on. The survey recommended fast tracking the development of the MIDT programme so as to establish a human resource base for educational technologists and virtual/blended learning developers, academicians, researchers and practitioners.

Drafting the Proposed Curriculum: Having identified the programmes-level learning outcomes, a seven-member committee was setup to analyse the needs assessment report and literature on similar programmes elsewhere and then draft proposed curriculum. In a series of meetings, retreats and consultations, the committee crafted the first draft of the curriculum consisting of the preamble, rationale, justification, description, duration, target group, competencies, aim, learning outcomes, resources and infrastructure, gender mainstreaming and proposed courses/modules. Twenty (20) courses/modules were proposed. Of these 12 were to run as cores while eight (8) would run as electives. The programme would produce graduates specializing either in instructional design or instructional technology. Each specialization would have twelve (12) cores and four (4) electives courses. These would be delivered in six (6) semesters. To draft the detailed course outlines for the proposed modules, the Committee co-opted specific subject matter experts. The Committee, in a series of meetings produced draft zero of the MIDT draft curriculum proposal.

Stakeholders Involvement: The MIDT draft curriculum was subjected to stakeholder validations. A renown educational technology professor and convener of the Master of Education Technology Programme at the University of Cape Town (UCT) was invited to Makerere University to present to the Committee on the topic "*The Lived Experience of Developing an Educational Technology Masters Programme*". From his presentation and interactions, the committee was able to make critical adjustments the proposed curriculum. Thereafter, the committee organized a half-day conversation with a wider stakeholder group. The group included representatives from the Ministry of Education and Sports, Ministry of ICT and National Guidance, the National Council for Higher Education, the National Curriculum Development Centre, National Information and Technology Authority, universities and schools. The group also consisted of graduate and undergraduate students, teachers of ICT, e-learning enthusiasts and experts from the University of Agder. The conversation emphasized the need to have a catchy programme title; cross-cutting courses, such as, Gender and ICT; credit transfer mechanisms; reasonable programme duration, multiple exit and entry avenues and flexible assessment criteria. These were incorporated to get Curriculum Proposal Draft 1.

School and College Level Approval: Draft 1 of the proposed curriculum was then subjected to Academic Boards of the School of Distance and Lifelong Learning (SoDLL) and the College of

Education and External Studies (CEES) on 16th June 2015 and 12th November 2015 respectively. The SoDLL Academic Board recommended that the duration of the programme be reduced from two and half (2½) years to two (2) years and that the programme be forwarded to the CEES Academic Board. The CEES Academic Board recommended to retain the programme duration at two and half (2½) years to permit flexible learner pacing. The Board also introduced multiple exits - Plan C (research only) and recommended the inclusion of all missing components like the budget, staff list and meeting minutes and reports before forwarding the proposal to Senate's Research and Graduate Board for further discussion.

Moratorium on Approval of New Programmes: The approval journey for the MIDT curriculum proposal faced a set-back when a moratorium to stay approval of all new academic programmes was slapped on the University until a Senate Committee setup to review and rationalize academic programmes in the University had completed its report. This exercise took over one year to complete. When the moratorium was finally lifted, the proposed MIDT curriculum was discussed by the Research and Graduate Studies Board.

Approval by Research and Graduate Board: After a one year's wait, the Research and Graduate Board of Studies discussed the proposal on 9th June 2016. The Board recommended to name semesters as per NCHE naming convention, i.e. as Year One Semester 1, Semester II; Year Two Semester I, Semester II instead of Semester 1, Semester 2, Semester 3, Semester 4, etc.; set minimum semester load to nine (9) credit units instead of eight (8); have a budget that takes into consideration the unit cost of training a graduate student; indicate the present teaching load of the proposed staff and include a sustainability plan. These recommendations were effected on 16th June 2016 and proposal submitted to Director, Directorate of Research and Graduate Training (DRGT) for onward transmission to Senate.

Senate Approval: On 15th July 2016, the DRGT presented the proposed curriculum to Senate, the supreme academic body of the University. Chaired by the Vice Chancellor, Senate is composed of two Deputy Vice Chancellors, the University Secretary, all Principals of Colleges, Directors of Institutes and Directorates, School Deans, one representative from each School, one student guild representative, heads of administrative departments and Ministry of Education representative. Senate observed that Plan C had been misrepresented in the proposal. They guided that as per Makerere University Prospectus, Plan C is where a student completes the programme with 85% coursework, 15% seminar series and comprehensive examination while Plan D is where a student completes the programme by undertaking research and dissertation. Senate thus recommended the deletion of Plan C in favour of Plan D. Senate also recommended the removal of the Postgraduate Certificate in Instructional Design and Technology which had been included as one of the channels for multiple exits. Senate further advised the team to seek for curriculum endorsements from line ministries. The proposed changes were effected and a compliance report submitted to the Academic Registrar on 1st September 2016. Line ministries' endorsements were sought on 4th February, 2017.

Line Ministries' Endorsement: The Curriculum proposal was submitted to the Ministry of Education and Sports and Ministry of ICT and National Guidance for endorsement before presentation to the Makerere University Council Quality Assurance, Gender and ICT Committee.

Only the Ministry of ICT and National Guidance returned a written endorsement on 14th February 2017. The Ministry stated,

> "*We are in agreement with you that there is a need to address the knowledge, skills and competency gaps within the country to design, conduct, and assess open, distance and e-learning programmes using ICTs. … the Ministry immediately endorses the proposed course*"
>
> (Ministry of ICT and National Guidance, 2017, p.1).

Though we did not secure a written endorsement from the Ministry of Education, the curriculum team visited the Commissioner of Higher Education who expressed high demand for the programme especially at PhD level. The written and verbal endorsements gave a lease of life to the proposal to be submitted to the University Council Quality Assurance, Gender and ICT Committee for final quality assurance checks.

University Council Quality Assurance, Gender and ICT Committee Approval: On 12th May 2017, the Curriculum proposal was discussed at the Council Quality Assurance, Gender and ICT Committee. This Committee's major concern was on the name of the programme. The Committee searched in the taxonomy of academic programmes and did not find any programme named 'Master of Instructional Design and Technology'. The Committee considered naming the programme with an MA or MSc prefix. However, a further search on the Internet found a similar programme at the University of Malaysia that had been launched less than 2 years ago. This prompted this Committee to leave the name as proposed. Other issues raised concerned programme duration, the infrastructure capacity of the College, the need to raise tuition fees and programme sustainability. The comments were addressed through a letter of due diligence to the Director, Directorate of Quality Assurance on 24th May 2017 before submitting the curriculum proposal to Makerere University Council for approval

University Council Approval: The University Council is the supreme governing body of the University. It makes all policies governing the University. A curriculum is the policy document that governs the running of a given academic programme. The University Council approved the MIDT curricula on 24th August 2017. This provided a passport for the curriculum to proceed to the NCHE for accreditation.

National Council for Higher Education (NCHE): On 12th October 2017, Makerere University submitted the MIDT curriculum to NCHE for accreditation. The programme was accredited on 30th November 2017. With the accreditation letter, the University was now ready to advertise and implement the programme.

Programme 'Onlinisation': Having approved the curriculum document, the next step was to implement the different modules in the institutional learning management system. From this process, the curriculum team coined the noun '*onlinisatio*n' from the verb '*onlinise*'. We defined '*onlinisation*' as the *process of programming instructionally designed course/module study guides in an institution's learning management system for activity-based interactive blended learning*. The onlinisation process involved training lecturers in e-courseware development and e-moderation. Successful onlinisation was accomplished after signing contracts with each course/module developer in which staff time compensation was effected to ensure timely completion of the onlinisation process.

Programme Promotion and Student Admission: The University advertised the programme in the print and electronic media calling upon qualifying candidates to apply for admission. Being a new programme with a new method of delivery, in 2017/18 academic year, the programme attracted only 20 applicants, half the number anticipated. In 2018/19, the programme admitted 15 candidates out of the expected 40. In 2019/20 the programme admitted 30 out of 40, indicating the need for extensive marketing of the programme in and outside the country.

Programme Implementation: The first cohort (2017/18 intake) of learners were admitted and started studies in February 2018. Whereas the MIDT programme could be implemented fully as an online programme, the context demanded that the programme be implemented as a blended learning programme taking on one (1) week of face-to-face and 14 weeks of activity-based online learning. The face-to-face period is used for increasing socialization amongst the learners, between learners and their tutors; getting learners acclimatized to the virtual learning environment and setting up a learning plan for the 14 weeks of online learning as is envisaged in Gilly Salmon's Five Stage Model (Salmon, 2013). In the online period, the different modules were designed with various e-tivities to spur activity based interactive learning and assessment.

Lessons: The life cycle of academic programmes development through to implementation has numerous approval stages. Owing to the infancy of the blended learning delivery mode in presential universities, there are more stringent checks and balances placed on the development and implementation of its curriculum than that placed on conventional face-to-face curricula. At each of the numerous approval stages, the curriculum faces scholars who are in most cases new to blended/online learning and with limited appreciation of the mode. Most of these scholars have a negative bias towards the mode. They think that online/blended learning provisions are of low quality than traditional classroom provisions (Muyinda, Mayende, Maiga & Oyo, 2019). With this type of mind-set, blended/online learning curriculum conveners require resilience and high levels of lobbying skills to convince their counterparts. They should be prepared to spend more time, energy and resources in the development and approval processes of blended learning programmes.

Further, the pessimism and low-quality claims around online/blended learning programmes are in themselves a blessing in disguise for the programmes because their developer invoke the highest rigour and quality checks during their development and implementation processes (Mabed & Koehler, 2012). The activity-based instructional design adopted in the programmes and the many watchful quality assurance eyes focused on the programmes during their implementation give them unrivalled quality.

Factors compelling presential universities to adopt blended learning

In a globalized world, liberalization is becoming the order of the day. Traditional presential universities are no longer a preserve of a few elites. Liberalization calls for opening up gates of these universities to a wider access that brings in even non-traditional learners. It calls for the adoption of methods of delivery that are flexible enough for a wide audience of learners from within and without the country. It calls for adoption of learner-centred pedagogy. It calls for competency and activity based-learning. It calls for internationalization and ISO certification of academic programmes. These liberalization calls can be answered by well-designed blended/online learning provisions.

World over, there are more than 900 universities offering high quality online degree programmes and learners are increasingly embracing these programmes (Makerere University, 2019). In five or more years to come, the majority of academic programmes in the World will be implemented as either blended or online learning programmes (Alexander, Ashford-Rowe, Barajas-Murphy, Dobbin, *et al.,* 2019). Further, the ever changing job market is demanding for new learning, unlearning and re-learning hence placing a call for lifelong learning which cannot be met through inflexible pedagogical practices prevalent in conventional presential universities. Through blended learning these universities are transforming themselves to meet the changing demand for knowledge and professional skills.

Lesson: With globalisation, presential universities can no longer operate as single mode universities but rather as dual mode universities.

How are presential universities metamorphosing into blended learning?

These universities are now developing policies that propel blended learning. The policies take cognizance of the unique needs of blended learning and try to set a conducive environment for the co-existence of online with face-to-face classroom learning. The policies are establishing units responsible for planning and nurturing the seed of online/blended learning in universities. The policies are resulting in strategic plans directing all their units to adopt blended and e-learning (Makerere University, 2019). They are developing their infrastructural and human resources capacity to spur blended learning and above all, they are seeking collaborations with universities that have implemented blended learning to guide in the process.

Lesson: Presential universities should be receptive of transformative teaching and learning approaches for increased flexibility in their provisions

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proliferation of ICTs in teaching and learning will continue to grow as more ICTs with pedagogical affordance emerge. Presential educational institutions are increasingly adopting these ICTs in management and academic functions. The learners joining presential universities are of the generation 'Y' whose affinity to use ICTs in every process of their life is significantly big. Presential universities can no longer base on the chalk-and-talk classroom approach to education. In just a few years to come blended/online learning shall be a must adopt delivery method. As such, there is need to put in place policies, standard indicators, and strategies for spurring blended learning. There is also need to sensitize staff on the affordances of blended learning and training faculty on how to employ the blended/online pedagogy in addition to setting up requisite infrastructure. In all this the role of university top management should be a supportive one. Our next study will be on undertaking an evaluation of the blended learning dispensation.

REFERENCES

AlKhaleel, A. (2019). The Advantages of Using Blended Learning in Studying English as a Foreign Language at the University of Tabuk. Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods. Vol. 9, No. 2. DOI: 10.26655/mjltm.2019.2.5

Bbuye, J. & Mango, M. J. (2005). Origin and Trend of Distance Education in Uganda. *Journal of Social Sciences.* Vol 1, No. 3, pp. 166-171.

Aguti, N. J., & Fraser, J. W. (2006). Integration of Information Communication Technologies (IICTs) in The Distance Education Bachelor of Education Programme, Makerere University, Uganda. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education -TOJDE, 7*(3), Article: 7.

Alexander B., Ashford-Rowe, K., Barajas-Murphy, N., Dobbin, G., Knott, J., McCormack, M., Pomerantz, J. Seilhamer, R. & Weber, N. (2019). *EDUCAUSE Horizon Report: 2019 Higher Education Edition*. EDUCAUSE: Louisville

Garrison, D. R., & Vaughan, N. D. (2008). Blended learning in higher education: Framework, principles, and guidelines: John Wiley & Sons.

Graham, C. R. (2006). Blended learning systems: Definitions, current trends, and future directions. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), *Handbook of blended learning: Global Perspectives, local designs* (pp. 1-32). San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer Publishing.

Gwamba, G., Mayende, G., Isabwe, G. M. N., & Muyinda, P. B. (2017). Conceptualising Design of Learning Management Systems to address Institutional Realities. Paper presented at the International Conference on Interactive Collaborative Learning.

Kajumbula, R. (2006). The effectiveness of mobile short messaging service (SMS) technologies in the support of selected distance education students of Makerere University, Uganda.

Mabed, M. & Koehler, T. (2012). An Instructional Design For Developing An Effective Blended Learning Environment. Proceedings of EDULEARN12 Conference. 2nd-4th July 2012, Barcelona, Spain.

Makerere University (2019). Makerere University Strategic Plan 2019/20 -2029/30. Makerere University, Kampala.

Makerere University (2015). Makerere University Policy on Open Distance and eLearning. Makerere University, Kampala

Makerere University (2008). Makerere University Strategic Plan 2008/09 – 2018/19. Makerere University, Kampala.

Mayende, G., Muyinda, B. P., Prinz, A., Isabwe, G. M. N., & Nampijja, D. (2015). Online Learning Needs Assessment in Uganda. In F. D. Conway, S. Hillen, Landis, M., Schlegelmilch, T.M. & Wolcott, P. (Eds.). *Digital media in teaching and its added value.* Munster: Waxmann Publishers. ISBN: 978-3-8309-3287-1, 236 pages.

Ministry of ICT and National Guidance (2017). *Letter of Endorsement for the Master of Instructional Design and Technology at Makerere University*. Kampala, Uganda

Muyinda B. P., Mayende, G., Maiga, G. & Oyo, B. (2019). Widely acclaimed but lowly utilized. Congruencing ODL utilization with its wide acclaim. *Universal Journal of Education and Research*. 7(2), p.400-412.

Muyinda, B. P., Lubega, J., Lynch, K. (2010). Unleashing mobile phones for research supervision support at Makerere University, Uganda: the lessons learned. *International Journal of Innovation and Learning (IJIL),* Vol. 7, No 1, pp 14-34. Available at http://www.inderscience.com/search/index.php?action=record&rec_id=29471&prevQuery=&ps=10&m=or

Muyinda, B. P., Mayende, G. & Kizito, J. (2015). Requirements for a Seamless Collaborative and Cooperative MLearning System. In L- H. Wong, M. Milrad &, M. Specht Eds. Seamless Learning in the Age of Mobile Connectivity ©Springer Science + Business Media Singapore 2015. Publisher – Springer Singapore. Chapter 11. DOI 10.1007/978-981-287-113-8_11, pp 201-222

Salmon, G. (2013). *E-tivities: The key to active online learning*. Routledge.

Singh, S., Shivam, R. & Yaduvanshi, S. (2016) Effectiveness of blended learning in economics classroom. International Journal of Academic Research and Development. Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 13-15.

Taylor, J. C. (2001). Fifth generation distance education. *Instructional Science and Technology*, 4 (1). pp. 1-14.

World Bank (2018). *World Development Report 2018: Learning to Realise Education's Promise.* World Bank: Washington DC