



# Scoping Document: Staff Development



Lecture capture has seen rapid global expansion, particularly in the US, Australia and now in the UK. The growth rate can be explained by a combination of three critical features: it leverages learning benefit from the predominant classroom delivery method (the lecture); it is relatively invisible to the lecturer and therefore requires little or no technical training; student feedback is overwhelmingly and consistently positive. This latter factor is a major benefit for institutions when student satisfaction and retention have become key concerns. However, the negligible technical training required combined with the established practice of lecturing tends to mask the staff development needs of this new technology. These needs have now become apparent in institutions where lecture capture has been introduced. It is clear that there are a number of professional, personal and contractual issues which require both policy formulation and informed consent. Thus, appropriate staff development is sensible not only for academic staff but also for managers.

This document seeks to outline some of the target issues, highlighting how they can be addressed through staff development. It is supplemented by other resources available from the ELTAC Lecture Capture Support website.

Each section begins with an overview, followed by a ranked list of the most commonly encountered issues identified by representatives from six UK institutions, based on their practical experience of using lecture capture and running staff development events.

## Provenance

This document is based on the research of instructional designers at Coventry University during the ELTAC project. It is supplemented by the collective experience of representatives of six UK universities who collaborated in an assembly on staff development for lecture capture held at Coventry University in March 2010, funded by the JISC.

**Lead authors:** Juliet Hinrichsen, Coventry University

**Contributors:** John Couperthwaite (University of Birmingham)  
Gameel Nasser (University of Birmingham)  
Amanda Hardy (Coventry University)  
Kris Roger (London School of Economics and Political Science)  
Charles Shields (Loughborough University)  
Phil Bradley (Newcastle University)  
Carol Summerside (Newcastle University)  
John Davies (University of Sussex)  
Paul Bailey (JISC)  
Jenny Mackness (JISC)

## Topic: Engagement of academic staff

There may be understandable reluctance by academic staff to engage with lecture capture. There may be suspicion of the motives of management (replacing staff with technology, surveillance of teaching) or more philosophical objection to the reinforcement of a teaching method which is seen as outmoded and teacher-centric. Both of these are legitimate concerns and are thus important areas to unpack, discuss and clarify. The communication to staff about the introduction to lecture capture needs to take account of such perceptions, but the greatest impact will be achieved through appropriate staff development. We argue this not as a strategy to 'overcome' resistance or even to persuade as an end in itself. The real value is twofold. Firstly, as an exercise to clarify the institution's own answers to these questions with reference to strategy, policy and practice. By using staff development interventions as both a testing ground for those answers and as a consultative process to inform policy and practice a serious dialogue can take place with academics. This is more likely to result in 'engagement' than mere acceptance. The second important role of staff development is to leverage the reflective process on pedagogy which can accompany the introduction of lecture capture if appropriately supported (see Lecture Pedagogy).

### Common issues

- Idea that LC doesn't "fit" their teaching
- Fear that recordings will replace the lecturer? (efficiency rather than quality drive)
- Students think its fantastic – some lecturers definitely do not. Potential for problems?
- Tutors may not be able to use it immediately – timetable constraints
- Lecturers want informed practice: they have many questions
- (Some) students are suspicious – also related to perception of lowering contact time

## Topic: IPR Copyright - Ownership

Although contractual arrangements do vary across the sector in most cases teaching materials produced by lecturers belong to their institution. Whilst this has been problematised somewhat with the advent of e-learning, lecture capture raises more focussed and new questions which require clarification. For example, 'materials' implies textual or document type artefacts produced to support teaching. The lecture is actual teaching and is performed live to an audience, perhaps bringing it into the realm of performance rights? One's own image has special protection in the law and thus video capture requires the right to use that image, going beyond the provision of materials. Another issue which has been identified since the VLE became established is the extent to which full and compliant copyright practices are adhered to. Whilst material may be shown (with acknowledgement) in a classroom setting, once stored or distributed in another medium there may be inadvertent infringement. What is the position if there is an recording of an image which was legitimately used in a classroom setting? Complications extend to questions of re-use, visiting lecturers permissions (and their status with their own institutions) and ad-hoc capture of students (eg asking a question). These issues need both legal and pragmatic clarification. However, this is not just a question of policy, but also of the informed consent of academic staff. Staff development can provide an opportunity both to explore these issues and to communicate policy and contribute to it. Further, by considering cases and scenarios the complexities can be elucidated in a way which is more meaningful and contextualised to practice than formal documentation. Staff development on the IPR and copyright issues may be considered a duty of care of the institution and a key factor in mitigating risk.

### Common issues

- Who 'owns' the lecture?
- Copyright over lecturers image?
- Routine use of non-copyright-cleared imagines in Powerpoint
- Student IP – if they ask a question?
- Clinicians reluctant to have lectures containing clinical/ sensitive material recorded
- Balance between IP and performance rights
- Strong complaint when scheduling error leads to recording of lecturer who hadn't opted in
- Visiting lecturers – especially re-use consents

## Topic: Attendance

The fear that attendance at lectures will fall because students have access to a verbatim alternative is probably the most common question raised by academics. This is not surprising given the current context in which many students have working or domestic lives which militate against full attendance. The perception that technology contributes to this, both in terms of specific provision such as PowerPoint slides and Word documents and through the development of distance and flexible delivery modes such as the VLE and web-based access, is not unreasonable. Whilst lecturers may appreciate the potential benefit to students as learners, it may be seen to be at cost to their own professional and occupational security. It is therefore very important to tackle these questions, and indeed to take seriously the possibility that attendance could fall. Staff development offers a way to do this which is non-threatening in that it is non-managerial, it can be exploratory, allowing fears and concerns to surface, and it can be productive by maximising the opportunity to reflect and improve on pedagogic practice. In cases where there are entrenched attendance problems which are likely to be exacerbated by lecture capture there is potential to redesign the curriculum to make more effective use of the combination of support resource and contact time.

The evidence from literature on attendance is mixed and inconclusive (see bibliography on the ELTAC Lecture Capture Support Site) but what seems clear is that it is unlikely to be lecture capture per se which is the reason for non-attendance. There is a complex interaction with other factors such as motivation and learning style as well as the role of the lecture in the course and the nature of the content.

### Common issues

- Not an issue for students
- Major issue for staff
- Used as a 'smokescreen' reason by academics who just don't fancy the idea of being recorded
- Highlights variation in style of lecture and role of lecture in a module
- No reduction, anecdotal – change in behaviour in class more talking!

## Topic: Lecture pedagogy

Our investigations show that most lecturers do not intend to make changes to their practice when they begin capturing their lectures. In fact many of the early adopters are those who are confident about their lecturing style and its popularity with students. However, once they begin capturing they become aware of particular issues such as the range of movement captured by the camera or the level of interaction with the audience. They then need to make decisions about whether to modify their style to improve the integrity of the recording or to have a 'warts and all' approach. This decision should depend on the purpose of the recording, and thus an early opportunity to consider this is helpful. As they become used to capturing and start to get feedback from students it is quite common for tutors to begin to extend their use of lecture capture, for example with ad-hoc or desktop captures.

There are thus two different kinds of staff development intervention: an early stage 'thinking through' which prepares participants for the realities of lecture capture at a practical level whilst anticipating some of the conceptual questions they may need to ask themselves; and a later stage reflective planning intervention once a level of appreciation of the potential uses and further development offered by lecture capture has been reached.

There are four key areas of pedagogy highlighted by lecture capture:

1. The delivery, style and format of the lecture
2. The content and structure of the material
3. How students learn from the lecture and from the recording
4. Maximising benefit from the recording as a learning resource

Staff development which addresses these areas can have an impact on the quality of both the live lecture and the resultant recording. It can also be an important curriculum development activity, with pedagogical review of the way in which content is delivered and in which learning occurs from a whole course perspective.

### Common issues

- Physical movement of lecturer is constrained
- Desire to go beyond recording as passive resource
- Need for creative models of using recordings
- Evidence base
- Increased student engagement at live lecture event because not worrying as much about getting everything written down – can add to notes later
- The impact on lecturing style
- Passive watching of lectures could be detrimental to learning