EDITORIAL

Gemma Witton | Educational Developer

College of Learning and Teaching, University of Wolverhampton

Originally a developer of web solutions for industry, I began working in education fourteen years ago with the development of eLearning resources to support secondary-level education. I moved into the higher education sector after successfully completing a MA in Online and Distance Education with the Open University Institute of Educational Technology. I subsequently gained Certified Membership of the Association for Learning Technology, completed a Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice in Higher Education and was awarded Senior Fellowship of the Higher Education Academy.

My main area of interest is multimedia-supported learning and I lead the University of Wolverhampton's Capture Technologies (Panopto) Project. I design and run staff development activities in the use of Panopto and engage in pedagogic research on the impact of capture technologies on student experience, attainment, retention and progression. I believe the term 'lecture capture' is misrepresentative of the potential applications for such a versatile technology, and that its purposeful use could be transformative for learning and teaching diverse groups of students.

EDITORIAL

When I started working in my current role in 2013, I was given a leading role on what was then known as the 'Lecture Capture Project'. When I was told of my new area of responsibility I struggled to hide my disappointment. With a background in the design and development of educational multimedia, the concept of 'lecture capture' went against everything that I believed created a great educational experience for learners. What I could not have predicted was that this would become something of an all-consuming and career-defining project for me.

Later that year, colleagues from IT Services, the Faculty of Science and Engineering and I were puzzling over the design and implementation of a video capture and broadcast system to facilitate learning in a state-of-the-art space for the teaching and learning of practical science. Now known as the Rosalind Franklin building, the science centre was designed without any traditional teaching spaces such as classrooms or lecture theatres, and no "front of the class" teachers desk, lectern or projectors. This was a 'Flipped Building' and the project challenged many of our

> I find myself asking what our measures of success should really look like

existing practices: our notions of accepted pedagogy for an entire subject area; the introduction of a cloud-hosted system, contrary to the existing IT infrastructure; and our models for technical support. Our response to these challenges set a precedent for many of the digital transformation projects that were to come at the University of Wolverhampton, and the Rosalind Franklin project set the foundations for our institutional philosophy for using Capture Technologies. The 'Lecture Capture Project' had become so much more than making a video replica of a live lecture. Suddenly, it had become a lot more interesting!

The pilot study took place during the 2015–16 academic year and the findings are reported in Witton (2017). The output of the report was a model that considers the value of different approaches to using capture technology. The model recommends a shift in focus away from conventional use of the technology for capturing lectures toward the purposeful use of capture technologies to create content that adds value to student learning and engagement (such as assessment unpacking, supplementary materials and flipped classroom materials) and which may ultimately lead to a more positive impact on student attainment.

Two years on from that initial pilot, Panopto is installed in over 70 teaching rooms across the University. Unlike a growing number of institutions, we continue to operate an opt-in policy for capturing lectures and we currently only have automated scheduling in our largest lecture theatre (and recording is scheduled on request). The project is trying to promote thoughtful capture of teaching and learning activities that will enhance the student experience rather than duplicate it. Of course, there is a reasonable amount of traditional lecture capture taking place and we expect that this will increase as Panopto becomes available in more learning spaces; however, as a project team we are trying to focus on creative installations of Panopto in discipline-specific spaces where it will enhance the learning experience and add real value. We are advocates for 'Personal Capture'; with academics choosing what they want to record, when they choose to record it, and what device they wish to use for the recording. The resulting innovation and impact on student learning within engaged subject areas is impressive. The work of colleagues that I have observed leads me to believe that the long term success of capture technologies requires us to retain a level of academic autonomy in its use. Even with our opt-in policy we have still encountered pockets of resistance. There is, however, increasing pressure on the project to deliver a blanket capture-all policy, despite the conflicting pedagogical evidence on the impact of lecture capture availability (Bos et al., 2015; Marchand et al., 2014; Powers & Carrol, 2016) and the potential negative fallout from some of our academic colleagues. Still, in an increasingly competitive

GEMMA WITTON

higher education market where the mass capture of lectures is happening all across the sector, do we have any choice but to do the same?

I am a regular attendee at many of the conferences and events with a focus on the use of capture technologies in education. I am struck by the frequency that the discussion topic focuses on how we can encourage reluctant members of staff to agree to a capture-all approach. *"Maybe if we make the recording and distribution of sessions an automated and passive activity so that it will happen without them really noticing?" "Maybe if we only record audio and slides so that they don't have to worry about what they look like on camera?" "Is there some other way that we can encourage the recording of more and more sessions so that we can report a percentage increase back to senior management this year?"* In the current political climate, which places academics under intense scrutiny through the National Student Survey (NSS) and the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF), is it any wonder that some members of academic staff are suspicious of the motives for recording all their classes when the pedagogical evidence has yet to provide real evidence for the enhancement of students' learning experiences and improvements in attainment and progression? (Franklin et al, 2011; Hadgu et al, 2016; Johnston et al, 2013; Leadbeater et al, 2013)

It is when we think about capture technologies in relation to some of these externally-driven measures of success, that our approach to using Panopto becomes a little muddied. For example, despite having little or no positive effect on attainment or degree classification traditional lecture capture can provide a big win on the NSS for student satisfaction within the 'Teaching on my course' section.

If we also consider the TEF, one of the ways that this measures teaching excellence is the HESA student continuation data. At the University of Wolverhampton our student demographic is such that, relative to the sector, a large proportion of our students are mature, have caring responsibilities and/or are a contributor to their household income. Given the other factors at play for this type of student, the quality of teaching is unlikely to be the deciding factor in the continuation of their studies. A capture-all policy for lectures may potentially have a positive impact on progression rates for these groups by increasing the amount of flexibility in their programme of study and helping them fit their studies around their other commitments. For me, this is perhaps the most convincing argument for adopting a capture-all approach; nevertheless, I would also argue that it would not make our teaching any more or less excellent.

There has been plenty of discourse, particularly around the TEF, that the importance given to particular metrics might actually be detrimental to the quality of teaching. Academics who feel that they cannot experiment or take risks in an attempt to improve the quality of their courses for fear of a backlash in their NSS score or the loss of the gold logo on their prospectus will almost certainly stifle innovation. It doesn't seem conducive to an environment where teaching staff are satisfied and motivated to provide anything other than vanilla-flavoured courses for mass consumption.

On top of this, we have the ongoing reduction in the Disabled Students' Allowances (DSA) to consider. It becomes particularly hard to promote an agenda of academic autonomy and purposeful capture of meaningful educational media on the one hand, if you also find yourself needing to provide a technological alternative to note takers on an institution-wide scale on the other hand.

So, as our project matures and the operational and technical aspects of the project become business-as-usual, I find myself asking what our measures of success should really look like. If the University was an institution with an opt-out policy and a capture-all approach then this would be simple: the percentage of capture-enabled teaching rooms; the total number of modules engaged; the quantity of hours recorded and viewed are all easy data to gather; however, if we want to continue to justify our current philosophy we need our metrics to offer more than that and we need to demonstrate positive impacts on the students' learning experiences. We cannot place undue importance on the data that are easy to gather, but we do need to have something to demonstrate progress and ongoing value. If we are promoting purposeful use of capture, then shouldn't our measures of success reflect that ideology too?

References

Bos, N., Groeneveld, C., van Bruggen, J., & Brand-Gruwel, S. (2015). The use of recorded lectures in education and the impact on lecture attendance and exam performance. British Journal of Educational Technology. DOI: 10.1111/bjet.12300.

Franklin, D., Gibson, J., Samuel, J., Teeter, W., & Clarkson, C. (2011). Use of lecture recordings in medical education. Medical Science Educator, 21(1), 21.

Hadgu, R.M., Huynh, S. & Gopalan, C. (2016) The Use of Lecture Capture and Student Performance in Physiology. Journal of Curriculum and Teaching 5(1). DOI: 10.5430/jct.v5n1p11

Johnston, A., Massa, H., & Burne, T. (2013). Digital lecture recording: a cautionary tale. Nurse Education in Practice, 13(1), 40–47.

Leadbeater, W., Shuttleworth, T., Couperthwaite, J., & Nightingale, K. (2013). Evaluating the use and impact of lecture recording in undergraduates: evidence for distinct approaches for different groups of students. Computers & Education, 61, 185–192.

GEMMA WITTON

Marchand, J., Pearson, M., & Albon, S. (2014). Student and faculty member perspectives on lecture capture in pharmacy education. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 78(4), 74.

Powers, C.A. and Carrol, M.A. (2016) Student Attendance at Pharmacology Lectures and Its Relation to Exam Performance: A Two Year Observational Analysis. The FASEB Journal, 31:810.4

Witton, G. (2017) The value of capture: taking an alternative approach to using lecture capture technologies for increased impact on student learning and engagement. British Journal of Educational Technology, 48: 1010–1019. DOI: 10.1111/bjet.12470the same?

HIGHLIGHT #1

I became a Teaching Fellow in September 2016 and it was recommended that I undertake the Teaching and Learning in Higher Education programme (TLHEP). I wasn't completely new to university teaching; I had been a Graduate Teaching Assistant for three years while researching my PhD, with positive feedback from students and peer review from colleagues. I confess to having been somewhat sceptical as to what the TLHEP could offer me, and wary of the additional workload on top of a new job with a busy timetable. However, as the course progressed, I appreciated having dedicated time to reflect critically on my teaching, and I discovered how theories of learning and teaching could help me make more informed choices about how I teach. This is what Brookfield means by the 'deeper benefit' of critical reflection in addition to mere 'procedural utility', because critical reflection leads us to 'know why we believe what we believe'.[1]

This discussion on 'What makes good teaching?' is from my first TLHEP assignment. Like any student looking back on work she wrote last year, I am very aware how much I have learnt since then and I am therefore a little shy of sharing it! I hope readers will find it interesting nevertheless.

What makes good teaching?

It can be difficult to define what makes good teaching, not least because teaching is 'a complex act, influenced by subtle conditions and swift teacher-student interactions'.[2] I have strong memories of certain teachers throughout my life: for example, the primary school teacher who encouraged me to read Orwell; the high school physics teacher whose vivid explanation of force remains with me 35 years later; the university lecturer who managed to make contract law interesting through his use of entertaining stories; and the master's lecturer whose eccentricities of dress and personality complemented his ability to make us question our assumptions. Students remember good teachers for a variety of reasons, but there are several factors that contribute towards what is generally understood to be good teaching. This discussion draws on both the academic literature and on personal reflection from my own teaching experience so far.

The overarching aim of successful teaching, for me, is to provide a collaborative and enriching learning experience which enables students to achieve their goals. An important ingredient in this

1. Stephen Brookfield, 'The Getting of Wisdom: What Critically Reflective Teaching is and Why It's Important,' in Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher (1995): 1-28, 25.
2. Allan C Ornstein, 'The New Paradigm in Research on Teaching,' The Educational Forum 59.2 (1995): 124.

established and experienced HE researchers as mentors throughout the *entire* process of engagement with pedagogic research, in essence desiring support from "real" educational researchers (their words!), which to my eyes shows that many might not identify as "real" researchers despite that being a core part of their roles and professional expectations. Clearly there is a discussion required to offer support for those who feel this disconnect in their professional identity as educational scholars and it's something the THiNK network is going to closely look at in the coming year.

There you have it! A little money, a lot more time and a new(ish) mind-set are needed to better support higher education research based on the THiNK survey and I'm sure future iterations of this instrument will uncover additional needs and drivers. It is an exciting time in the HE sector and with REF and TEF now firmly in our lives, the versatile academic scholar will need to further develop those "plate spinning" skills in order to excel.

The next edition of JADE is a milestone for us, being the 10th edition and will be a special "inclusive practice" themed edition, so if you want to submit to that please do get in touch and let's make the 10th edition our best one yet. As always, thank to you all for reading and contributing to JADE.

Dr. Russell Crawford
Managing Editor

r.crawford@keele.ac.uk