University of Huddersfield Repository

Bennett, Elizabeth and Folley, Susan

D4 Strategic Project:Developing Staff Digital Literacies.Internal Scoping Report

Original Citation

Bennett, Elizabeth and Folley, Susan (2015) D4 Strategic Project:Developing Staff Digital Literacies.Internal Scoping Report. Project Report. University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield, UK. (Unpublished)

This version is available at http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/id/eprint/26266/

D4 Strategic Project:
Developing Staff Digital Literacies.

Internal Scoping Report

TALI Strategic Project

Report by Liz Bennett (SEPD) and Sue Folley (CLS)

Aug 2015.

Contents

Glossary

ADA	(School of) Art Design and Architecture
AS	(School of) Applied Sciences
BS	(The) Business School
C&E	(School of) Computing and Engineering
CLS	Computing and Library Services
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
DL	Digital Literacy
DLS (Grid)	Digital Literacy for Staff (Grid)
EAM	Electronic Assessment Management
eBEAM	Evaluating the Benefits of Electronic Assessment Management project
EPD	(School of) Education and Professional Development
HEA	Higher Education Academy
HEI	Higher Education Institutions
HHS	(School of) Human and Health Sciences
Jisc	Joint information services committee
LTA	Learning Technology Advisor
LTDG	Learning Technology Development Group
MHM	(School of) Music, Humanities and Media
NSS	National Student Survey
NTF	National Teaching Fellow
PGCHE	Post Graduate Certificate in Higher Education
PLE	Personal Learning Environment
PVC	Pro Vice Chancellor
REF	Research Excellence Framework
QAA	Quality Assurance Agency
QSAG	Quality and Standards Advisory Group
SD	Staff Development
SDG	Staff Development Group
TALI	Teaching and Learning Institute (at the University of Huddersfield)
TEEE	Technology Enhanced Education and ELearning group
TEL	Technology Enhanced Learning
UNIAC	A shared internal audit and assurance service for universities
UTF	University Teaching Fellow
VLE	Virtual Learning Environment (UniLearn/Blackboard)
VLESG	Virtual Learning Environment Steering Group

Introduction

This report is the second stage of the 2014-2015 TALI Strategic Project exploring Developing Staff Digital Literacies. The first stage was the external scoping report which identified a range of approaches taken by other HEIs alongside guidance from sector bodies such as Jisc and the HEA. This report focusses on the University of Huddersfield context by outlining and critically analysing how the issue has developed at the University.

The report is discussing the methodology, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The finding section starts by discussion of the local context at University of Huddersfield then is structured around same sections as were used in the external scoping report. The categories are curriculum design, academic champions, centralised staff development courses, localised staff development courses, accredited courses, informal approaches, on-demand resources, specific events, student champions and institutional strategies. Relevant past projects that have a digital literacy focus, are then identified.

This has enabled comparison between the rest of the sector and the provision at University of Huddersfield and has enabled us to identify strengths and omissions.

The report concludes by making recommendations, and in particular identifies how the D4 project might develop. This next stage of the project involves undertaking a intervention with colleagues who have not traditionally engaged in digital practices, to help them to developing their digital capability.

Methodology

The study is based on document analysis from a range of project reports that have been carried out at the University. The sources reviewed were TALI funded innovation projects carried out over the last 5 years, a nationally funded JISC projects carried out at the University, an instutional review into the University's computer systems by UNIAC and reports into individual School's response to staff digital literacies.

In addition a small scale study was undertaken to gather data particularly for this project. This survey was carried out by email with the LTA from across all the Schools (Appendix A). Sue's insider knowledge as the person who co-ordinates much of the centralised initiatives has informed our investigation. We compiled the report based on these findings and then organised a dissemination event to which we invited the LTAs and TALI's researchers. The aim of the event was to critically review its contents and to highlight possible ways forward. By gaining feedback from key stakeholders within the digital literacy agenda, the LTAs and TALI, we aimed to gain critical feedback at a formative time for the project as well as to build 'buy in' amongst this critical group.

Findings

Local Context at University of Huddersfield

As the external scoping report found (see for example Czerniewicz and Brown, 2009; Sharpe, Benfield and Francis, 2006) developing staff digital fluency takes place within a particular localised context and understanding the setting is critical to being able to make change in this area. In particular localised culture includes the institutional priorities and values, the level of devolution of responsibility and accountability in relation to staff development, experience of other forms of change and innovation with IT systems etc. Huddersfield's context is characterised by a number of features:

- A high degree of understanding of the University Strategy;
- Strategy that has a number of competing and demanding outcomes for academic staff in terms of high degree of student satisfaction (NSS score), doctorates, research outputs, research income alongside staff digital literacy.
- Recent experience of the expectation of mandatory HEA fellowship (Thornton 2014);
- High level of devolution of funding and autonomy to Schools;
- Smaller central Teaching and Learning Development Unit and/or Learning Technology Unit than many other HEIs;
- A national profile is in relation to electronic management of assessment with the recent Jisc funded eBeam report (Ellis and Reynolds, 2013).

Institutional Strategies for Developing Academic Staff's Digital Literacy

It seems to be unclear where the responsibility for the development of digital literacy should lie. On the one hand it could be argued to be the responsibility of the individual, as part of their ongoing personal and professional development practices, whilst on the other it could be argued to be the responsibility of the Institution. The institution perspective on this therefore shapes the approach to any institutional strategy relating developing digital literacies. In reality it is often a combination of individuals being responsible for their development (in terms of agency and autonomy of academic staff) and line managers making sure that staff are developing their role as is expected of them (audit part of appraisals).

Some centralised and localised support for developing aspects of staff Digital Literacies are provided by the University. The roles listed in Appendix B incorporate some responsibility (to varying degrees) of making support available in the area of digital literacy.

Curriculum Design

We do not provide any centralised resource (staff) to assist with the (re) design of modules or courses. Any curriculum/course/module design is carried out at a local level, that is within schools or course teams.

Academic Champions

Academic Champions are not officially recognised within the University or by Schools in a formal way. Instead informally early adopters/technological evangelists may want to "spread the word" and share practice/experience. Staff who assume the role, usually do it as an additional task. The exception to this is Stephen White in HHS, who is currently seconded for two years to support staff in that School with distance and online teaching.

Centralised Staff Development Courses

At the University of Huddersfield we have a comprehensive staff development programme of short courses focussing on specific tools and technologies, IT skills including Microsoft packages, and other systems training. Although skills based, the learning technology courses involve thinking about the tools in a pedagogical context alongside teaching the practical hands-on skills of how to use and manage them. As they are centralised, they are not discipline specific, but do have the advantage of enabling staff to network from different Schools who are interested in the same tools/technologies. A full list of Centralised Staff Development courses offered in relation to Learning Technologies/digital literacies is included in Appendix C.

Localised Staff Development Courses

The LTAs provide a few technology-enhanced learning staff development sessions both formally and informally, but no usually on a regular basis, with a wide variety of approaches across the Schools (see the table in Appendix D). These tend to driven by the School's priorities e.g. electronic submission and marking; MyReading; use of iPads; electronic voting devices etc.

Accredited Courses:

There is a mandatory Post Graduate Certificate in Higher Education Practice that all academic staff new to the University are expected to complete. Successful completion provides staff with Fellow of the Higher Education Academy This course has several sessions which focus on embedding digital practices into teaching and learning, and one of the requirements for HEA fellowship is that a lecturer must evidence their understanding of "The use and value of appropriate learning technologies" (HEA 2011 p.3).

The MSc Technology Enhanced Learning provides a route for those wishing to focus particularly on digital practices to extend their knowledge. Take up for this course has included a small number of academic staff and the scope for growing the number is limited by other competing priorities such as requirement for staff to gain doctorates and for those with decorates to secure REF outputs.

Informal Approaches e.g. Coffee Clubs

Learning Bytes sessions: The Academic Development Advisor coordinates these sessions which run monthly at lunchtime for an hour. Each session is about a different tool, technology or approach and that topic is explained, academics across the University share good and bad experiences, and there is

general advice and discussion. Previous topics have included: GradeMark, UniConnect, 10 ways to improve your UniLearn site, Introducing the Blackboard App. Tea and coffee are provided and staff are encouraged to share their experiences in an informal way. A list of previous Learning Bytes topics and dates can be found in Appendix E.

TALI's iPad (and other tablets) Coffee Club: This is run by a member of staff in TALI. It is informal and a number of iPad apps are discussed each session. The emphasis is on sharing experiences and tips for useful apps. Appendix F for list of these events

Other TALI Sessions: TALI also offer other sessions, with some of the topics covering TEL topics. For example ShareMeet sessions where staff are encouraged to share and discuss innovative and creative teaching practices. TALI also host sessions where UTF or NTF holders share elements of "good practice".

Learning Technology Drop-in Sessions: The Academic Development Advisor offers monthly drop-in session for staff to drop-in informally to ask for help and advice on any learning technology and to provide space and time for staff to work on their UniLearn modules in a supported and distraction-free environment. These are promoted at the end of every training course and Learning Bytes session as a way to follow up on any of the discussion/training, as well as listed on the ipark website (see below) and on posters around the University. These always seem to be well received when staff are told about them but very poorly attended in practice.

On-Demand Resources

The University of Huddersfield's ipark website (http://ipark.hud.ac.uk) is an on-demand resource for staff, containing various different offers of help and support including:

- A list of tools staff may want to use in teaching and learning including a page about each one with more information, case studies, good practice, useful related journal articles and further links to help/resources.
- A comprehensive list of how-to guides for using the various features of the University's VLE, and other supported learning technologies.
- Screencasts (video tutorials) for using the various features of the University's VLE and other supported learning technologies.
- A list of staff development courses on offer.
- Links to details about the Learning Bytes session and Drop-in sessions.

The ipark website has recently undergone a re-launch to raise the profile and awareness amongst staff. It has been updated in look and feel, and been added as a tab to UniLearn for easy access as well as being linked from the University's staff home page, the Staff Hub, the TALI web pages and the Staff Development web pages.

The LTAs, VLE Support Assistants and Academic Development Advisor also offer on-demand one-to-one support.

Specific Events

One off or occasional events are held at the University to share and promote the use of technology in teaching and learning. Examples include:

- The annual Teaching and Learning conference, which aims to develop all aspects of teaching and learning, so many of the sessions have been about using technology in teaching and learning.
- The TEEE Festival – which was first held in Sept 2014, and is a week-long series of workshops and sessions aims to give people a chance to try out technologies, discuss experience and good practice with others. This was set up by the Technology Enhanced Education and ELearning (TEEE) group in HHS, together with TALI, and another is planned for Sept 2015.
- The Inspire Conference, organised by the SEPD for staff enrolled on the PGCHE course, who all had to do some experimental teaching and present on it. Many of these were innovative use of technology.
- Various School and Departmental away-days have involved discussing how technologies can be used in Teaching and Learning. For example Sue Folley has run a Technology and Social Media Session three times over the last twelve months in the Business School.
- TALI organised events such as iPad (and other tablets) Coffee Club and Sharemeet sessions particularly the ones on Digital Identity and Scholarship

Student Champions

The notion of working with students in ways that go beyond the traditional teacher student relationship and position students as active co-creators in the exchange have been used at other institutions. At University of Huddersfield we trialled a Students as Pedagogic Consultants model for two years, and this approached which was not limited to digital tools, was innovative and valued by staff. However due to the significant administrative load in organising the project was not sustained.

Institution-wide Strategies

Meeting and Reporting Structure:

The following meetings/reporting structures for digital-literacy related strategies and decisions:

- the VLE Steering Group (VLESG), which is a strategic group, chaired by the PVC Teaching and Learning (Tim Thornton) with academic representatives from every School, managers from CLS, the Academic Development Advisor and a representative from the Students Union. This group makes top level and strategic decisions and reports to Quality and Standards Advisory Group (QSAG).
- The Learning Technology Development Group (LTDG) which is a more operational group, chaired by the Head of Corporate Systems in CLS (Allen Sluggett) and made up of the LTA from each School, as well as members of the Learning Technology technical team in CLS, the Academic Development Advisor, and a member of Academic Staff on a rotating basis (currently Liz Bennett – EPD). The LTDG reports to the VLESG, and decisions made at the VLESG are fed back to the LTDG.

The Digital Literacy Grid

The main University-wide strategy relating to digital literacies is the Digital Literacy for Staff (DLS) Grid (see Appendix G). The DLS Grid was developed in 2013 with a number of objectives in mind:

- To measure and reinforce the minimum standards and consistency of use of the VLE across modules;
- To provide a way of measuring progression and development in this area;
- To be flexible enough to be suitable for use across different disciplines;
- To find a way to meet QAA requirements for online teaching;
- Developing s tool which was not too simplistic or overly complicated;
- Attempting to avoid a tick-box or compliance exercise.

The DLS Grid is based on a number of levels, with two columns, one representing example uses of technologies that may fall into that level, and one about professional development in the area of learning technologies within in the last 12 months. The aim is that everyone is either at or working towards the minimum level, and that progression is discussed individually at appraisals taking individual and contextual circumstances into consideration.

The DLS Grid was approved by the VLESG and has Senior Management buy-in as well as linked to the University Teaching and Learning Strategy – under the Professional Development of Colleagues Strand:

TD3 – Achievement of Relevant Level of Digital Literacy Skills

In most Schools, the DLS Grid is used mainly at appraisals, but in the Business School, they recorded how many staff in each Department were at each level. This information was then used to target individual members of staff to provide support and training as well as raise awareness of all the resources and support on offer.

Past Projects Relating to Digital Literacy/Fluency

JISC EBEAM Project: The Evaluating the Benefits of Electronic Assessment Management (EBEAM) project was funded jointly by JISC and the University of Huddersfield. It was conducted in partnership with iParadigms who offered technical support and sponsorship to present early findings at several conferences. It ran from October 2011 through to March 2013. It offered an opportunity to evaluate an aspect of Higher Education assessment policy and practice.
Its findings offered an understanding of the challenges of achieving wide scale adoption of a particular technology (electronic marking) and in particular focussed on the need to allow academic staff choice about how they approach the task. This allowed those that were less keen on using technology to have a sense of their own agency. They argued that this approach was likely to lead to widespread adoption as there was evidence that "even those with strong initial reservations tend to be won over by the benefits of EAM and this suggests that a significant proportion of academic staff will work at least comfortably (if not always enthusiastically) with electronic marking." (Ellis & Reynolds, 2013 p.19).

Technology Enhanced Learning in the Creative Arts and Humanities (Power et al, 2013): This project sought to identify the issues surrounding academic staff and their in digital literacy within creative arts and humanities, through a survey followed up with interviews and focus groups. The responses revealed that a large majority of staff see the VLE as a technical solution rather than pedagogical innovation (repository - not an interactive learning resource). Further to this a large percentage of staff commented that the VLE should be standardised across the institution, yet there was also a contradicting view that academic staff wanted space to be creative.
Staff commented that there was no/little incentive to improve digital literacy skills and that conducting audits does not necessarily improve learning or contribute to the enhancement or improvement of Teaching and Learning strategy rather it is a compliance exercise.

It was found that some staff had misconceived perceptions about using interactive tools (perhaps preventing them from moving from basic usage to more advanced). It was interesting that staff skill was not identified as an issue (this was clearly evident from the discussions around what can and ca not be done in the VLE – yet when training is offered both centrally and at School level there is limited take-up).

One of the barriers identified for lack of use was that staff found the VLE, "clunky, clumsy and difficult to navigate". It was found that most staff aspire to use social learning, webinars and Personal Learning Environments (PLEs) in the future, however it was acknowledged that training would be required to integrate this into practice. This may present institutional challenges since nearly 65% of respondents used word of mouth or self-study to keep abreast of technology. The survey also revealed a lack of buy-in from a minority of individuals indicating that a change of culture is required.

C-Ment (McDowell, Raistrick and Merrington 2013): This project was to recognise the work of the LTAs within Teaching and Learning projects and activities, by enabling them to gain professional accreditation as Chartered Member Association of Learning Technology , CMALT.

ReVERiFy (McDowell and Catterall, 2014): This project was funded by a TALI innovation bid and with the aim of effecting sustainable and efficient institution-wide change through video-enhancement of assessment and feedback practices. The project ran for a year and had some impact at a local level, (i.e. use of video feedback by some staff on some courses) but limited wider impact.

iPads for Academic Practices Project (Aiyegbayo 2014): This research project evaluated the academics' use of iPads for academic practices (teaching, research and administration) at the University of Huddersfield. The project employed a combination of quantitative (2 online surveys) and qualitative methodologies (22 semi-structured interviews) to gather the research data. 84 academics completed the first survey while 56 academics completed the second survey. The findings show that iPads are used by about half the sample teaching and 90% for administrative purposes. The study found that whilst many academic staff stated that they did not require additional institutional support to help them maximise the use of their iPads for academic purposes, many reported that they did not know how to use the device fully. The study concludes that "formal pedagogical support is essential if academics are to use these devices effectively for teaching purposes" (Aiyegbayo 2014, p.2). Thus there is a contradiction on the one hand staff say they do not need additional institutional support whilst on the other it is apparent that they do need additional

help in particular in relation to using the iPads in teaching. This contradiction may be a critical barrier to developing staff digital fluency.

Other Past Projects relating to developing staff digital literacies include: the TALI funded Epiguem project, ran by Cath Ellis, Liz Bennett and Sue Folley in 2011, which provided a supported structure for 30 staff who enrolled on a course on Learning Technologies; and the CPD Framework project ran by Cath Ellis and Sue Folley in 2010, which assisted 'Champions' from each School develop a flexibly delivered module to be included in the CPD Framework.

Measuring Digital Literacies/Fluencies

This section of the report considers how digital literacies/fluencies are evaluated and measured at the University of Huddersfield. Three approaches are considered: base-lining, appraisals, audits.

Base-lining Strategies

Base line is carried out through the use of appraisals and audits at individual School level as discussed below.

Appraisals

Each member of staff at the University has an annual appraisal with their line manager. The Digital Literacy for Staff Grid (explained above) is used across the University at these appraisals to provide a vehicle for discussion about present levels of digital literacy and plans for future development in this area.

Audits

In the past there have been various audits carried out within Schools by the LTAs on use of the VLE. These vary quite considerable in terms of how often the audits have taken place and what is included. It is difficult to strike a balance between just reporting on use (e.g. where content or tools are present) and *effective* use – e.g. establishing if tools are used and managed effectively. Automated reports are easy to produce on the former of these, but checking each module for effective use is extremely time-consuming, and would have to be done on an individual module basis.

At University level, reports run to ensure some of the minimum standards are being adhered to. The minimum standards in terms of VLE use for each module is included in Appendix H. Monthly reports are automated, so only measure whether certain information is present or missing. This can therefore measure missing information fairly accurately, but where information is present, it cannot measure the quality of that information. These minimum standards reports are go to the QSAG.

The Uniac Report on the VLE

The Uniac Review of the Virtual Learning Environment was completed in July 2014. The report aimed to assess the management of the VLE, to provide assurance that the processes in place identify any areas that need improvement and that these processes are implemented in a timely manner. The report rated the University as a 1 (the highest score – out of 4) for Risk Management, and a 2 for both effectiveness and efficiency. It concluded that the management of the VLE was effective and efficient. The recommendations for improvement included: further development of the use of the

Digital Literacy for Staff Grid; that VLE Content within individual modules is reviewed, as it was not always very recent or meaningful, and that they observed that training is underutilised by staff.

Discussion and Conclusions

The development of staff digital literacies is a complex area, and is difficult to define, therefore has the potential for everyone to feel that it is someone else's responsibility. Although all HEIs provide a range of development opportunities, individuals need to take some responsibility for their own development. In addition this is an aspect of professional practice that is more than just about learning new skills, as it extends to involve application of skills to teaching and research practices. Recognising that it is more to do with attitudes and practices than skills may help the University (and indeed other institutions) develop on more effective approaches to developing in this area.

The devolved nature of the University of Huddersfield has led to a wide variation in the approaches taken within each School. This has some strength in terms of provision of localised support for staff and affords the LTAs a great deal of autonomy, so that they can therefore provide tailored support which is knowledgeable and sensitive to the school and discipline context. However there are wide variations related to the role role/reporting structure/ time/resource/pedagogic skills of the School LTAs. In particular some of them find it particularly challenging to manage the demands made on them to contribute to the University's central provision (eg leading central staff development, contributing to testing of the VLE etc). Their role in relation to the staff development of academics is varied (and some are responsible for student inductions in the VLE and others not so much). Some reported that they felt a lack of confidence in relation judging of academics' work (for example reviewing their VLE content).

In terms of the University of Huddersfield's approach to development of staff digital literacies there are some things that we do well and some that we might develop. We appear to do well at the auditing, appraisals and more 'stick' approaches (eg DLS grid, audits and the reports on minimum requirements). However, these audit approaches are seen as compliance exercises by some staff (Power et al, 2013), and we need to make sure that there are additional approaches to this in place, which encourage staff to be more driven by internal motivations. Top-down approaches may achieve more consistency but may not get the buy-in from some individuals: for example Power et al. (2013) found that contradictions exist between staff recognising the need for a standardised approach to the use of VLE and wanting to retain control and creativity.

The University also does well at the provision of both formal staff development courses and the on-demand help. However there are contradictions between what staff say and what they need (Power et al, 2013; Aiyegbayo, 2014). In addition the uptake of formal staff development courses is low and in addition it is not generally the best method for supporting development in this area. As Littlejohn et al (2012) notes digital "literacies are acquired through continue development in different contexts, not through one off instruction" (p.550). Similarly Power et al (2013) suggest a preference for word of mouth support rather than one-off formal training courses, which indicates the value of on-demand point-of-need individualised support, and also the power of learning within a community of practice where norms of operating are present.

As a University, we tend do less well at approaches which attempt to win hearts and minds, aimed at getting people to be internally motivated to *want* to change their teaching practices. The eBEAM report (Ellis and Reynolds, 2013) argued that allowing academic staff freedom (agency) in relation to adoption of technology is likely to be more successful than enforcement. However they suggest that this needs to take place alongside the uptake by the others so that technology use becomes normal (Ellis and Reynolds, 2013) - winning people around by stealth.

There is a tension between giving academics freedom and choice in relation to adoption of technology and more institutional strategic approaches which dictate the way that things should be. It is more likely that winning hearts and minds will be more sustainable and empowering for staff, although this will not win over everybody. Perhaps the answer is a combination approach which insists on compliance to certain minimum standards, together with 'hearts and minds' approaches to more continued and sustained development. Rogers' (2003) diffusion of innovation theory suggests that once the critical mass adopt certain technologies, that many of the rest follow.

Conclusion and recommendation for the Intervention Stage of the D4 Project

Based on the conclusions from the external and internal reports, we consider the best way forward for this project is to trial an intervention that gives staff ownership and agency over changes in teaching practice. This is an attempt to win the hearts and minds of the group of staff who perhaps would not volunteer to attend more formal training courses in connection with developing their digital literacies. We recommend piloting a curriculum design approach, which we identified in this report as a missing element from our current range of institutional strategies in relation to supporting the development of staff digital literacies. The focus on the curriculum ensures a more holistic approach, with the emphasis on the students rather than on the staff. This view is supported by Jisc:

> *Context is key, so focusing on the subject specialism is the best way to engage teaching, support staff and students in conversations about what it means to be digitally literate in a particular discipline. Aligned with that is the curriculum design process. Learning design workshops and curriculum approval processes should help ensure that digital literacies are developed through appropriate tasks and articulated in learning outcomes* (Jisc, 2014, para 2).

We recommend basing the intervention on an Appreciative Inquiry methodology is an approach to change management which frames change in a positive way. It does so by firstly placing an emphasis on what works well in a particular context, and how this can be built on and developed, rather than taking a more negative problem-focussed, or deficit approach to change.

Thus the report recommends that the project adopts a curriculum design intervention using Appreciative Inquiry methodology, to work with two or three course teams whose modules are due for (re)validation in the near future, and focussing on how digital skills can be designed into the curriculum.

References and Links

Aiyegbayo, O. (2014). How and why academics do and do not use iPads for academic teaching? *British Journal of Educational Technology*, n/a-n/a. doi: 10.1111/bjet.12202.

Czerniewicz, L., & Brown, C. (2009). A study of the relationship between institutional policy, organisational culture and e-learning use in four South African universities. *Computers & Education, 53*(1), 121-131.

Ellis, C., & Reynolds, C. (2013). Final Report EBeam Project Evaluating the Benefits of Electronic Assessment Management: Huddersfield.

HEA (2011). The UK Professional Standards Framework for teaching and supporting learning in higher education, HEA, York.

Jisc (2014). Jisc Info Net, Digital Literacies – Supporting Staff: https://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/developing-digital-literacies/supporting-staff [accessed Aug 2015]

Littlejohn, A., Beetham, H., & McGill, L. (2012). Learning at the digital frontier: a review of digital literacies in theory and practice. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 28*(6), 547-556.

McDowell, J., Raistrick, A. and Merrington, J. (2013). *Enhancing institutional practice through CMALT accreditation.* In: ALT-C 2013 - Building new cultures of learning, 10th - 12th September 2013, University of Nottingham, UK.

McDowell , J. and Catterall, S. (2014). *Using Asynchronous Video to Enhance Engagement with Learning, Assessment and Feedback for Learners Affected by Dyslexia*. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Use of New Technologies for Inclusive Learning. York.

Power, J., Ellis, C., Kannara, V., Fisher, B. and Marsh , J. (2013) *An exploration of institutional blockages in relation to the use and development of the VLE.* In: 20th annual conference of the Association for Learning Technology., 10-12 September 2013, University of Nottingham, UK.

Sharpe, R., Benfield, G., & Francis, R. (2006). Implementing a university e-learning strategy: levers for change within academic schools. *ALT-J, 14*(2), 135-151.

Thornton, T. (2014). Professional recognition: promoting recognition through the Higher Education Academy in a UK higher education institution. *Tertiary Education and Management, 20*(3), 225-238.

Links

eBeam blog: https://library3.hud.ac.uk/blogs/ebeam/
Learning Bytes Sessions: http://ipark.hud.ac.uk/content/learning-bytes
Learning Technology Drop-in Sessions: http://ipark.hud.ac.uk/content/drop-in-sessions
iPad Coffee Club: http://www.hud.ac.uk/tali/prof_dev/ipad/
iPark website: http://ipark.hud.ac.uk/

Staff Development Courses on Learning Technologies: http://ipark.hud.ac.uk/content/staff-development-courses

TEEE Festival 2014: http://hhs.hud.ac.uk/teee/2014.htm

TEEE Festival 2015: http://hhs.hud.ac.uk/teee/index.htm

Appendix A - Research Instrument

Email to LTAs:

Dear All,

Please could you answer a few questions to help Liz and I with a report on digital literacy of staff that we are compiling for a TALI Project. Part of the project is just to document what support we offer to staff in relation to digital literacies:

1)   Is your LTA role 100% of your role? If not – what percent of your role (approx) is for LTA duties?

2)   Do you have any support for your LTA role (e.g. VLE Support Assistants, placement students etc) –If so how many staff (and are they full time, placements students, permanent etc)

3)   Do you run any organised training courses within your School as part of your LTA role? If so please state and approx. how many sessions you have approximately run over the last year?
(This doesn't include any one-to-one help for staff which we know you all do – or any ad hoc sessions – just ones that are organised as part of a programme and advertised to people in your School.)

4)   Do you contribute to any centralised staff development activities? If so – which ones?

5)   Do you have any staff in your School that act as Academic Champion either formally or informally for specific technologies etc – if so who are they and which tools/technologies do they champion?

6)   In your own opinion, from your dealing with Academic Staff, what is the most effective way of motivating staff *to want to* know more about using technologies in teaching and learning? (i.e. so the motivation is from them not from being forced or coerced into doing things in a particular way).

Thanks very much - could you respond by the end of next week (Friday 19th Dec) please, thanks.

Sue

Dr Sue Folley BSc(Hons) MSc PGCE FHEA EdD
Academic Development Advisor

Appendix B- Staff Supporting Digital Literacies

Academic Development Advisor (Sue Folley) – based centrally in CLS with a remit to promote and co-ordinate the use of technologies in teaching and learning across the University. The focus is on the pedagogical use of tools rather than technological.

Senior Computing Officer (Andy Raistrick) – with a role partially to assist the Academic Development Advisor with the pedagogical support of using TEL.

Learning Technologies Support Assistant (x 1) – a placement student based in CLS to support the Academic Development Advisor with running training courses, keeping the ipark resource up-to-date, and assisting with on-demand staff support.

Learning Technology Advisors (x 7) – one based in each School to help staff and students with the VLE. These roles widely vary across the Schools but they offer one-to-one support, technical help, VLE administration duties, testing, and assist with some centralised training courses. The individual LTA roles are more fully explained by a table in Appendix D.

VLE Support Assistants (x 7 approx - varies each year) – These are placement students based in the Schools to assist the LTAs. Some Schools have two, some just one, and some none (see table in Appendix D). These also have varied roles, so not necessarily dedicated LTA support.

TALI – the Teaching and Learning Institute (3 full time staff plus admin support) – with a remit for the development of inspiring and innovative teaching and learning across the University, so some of their work will cross over with the development of digital literacies in teaching.

Staff Development Group (2 full time members of staff plus admin support) – responsible for the organisation and some delivery of all training courses across the University, so some of these will help with digital literacy skills.

IT Training (2 members of staff, one full-time, one part-time) – with a remit to train staff and students on technologies not classed as learning technologies such as Microsoft Office products, SharePoint etc.

Librarians (3 Academic Librarians) with a remit for developing information literacy in staff and students.

Appendix C – List of Centralised Staff Development Courses

..in connection with Learning Technologies/Digital Literacies

- UniLearn - The Basics
- UniLearn - Beyond the Basics
- Using Blogs and wikis within UniLearn
- Introduction to online quizzes and surveys in UniLearn
- Using UniLearn to Create an e-portfolio
- Introduction to UniConnect - the University's Webinar Tool for Teaching and Learning
- Advanced UniConnect
- An Introduction to Interactive Whiteboards and SmartPodium Interactive Displays
- Introduction to using GradeMark
- Preventing/ Detecting Plagiarism using Turnitin UK Plagiarism detection software
- Introduction to Video Streaming
- MyReading Software
- Using Camtasia to Build Screencasts
- Building High Quality Screencast Lectures
- Facilitating Online

Appendix D – Roles of the School based Learning Technology Advisors

School	Current LTA (Jan 2015)	% of their job that is LTA support	Any VLE Support Assistants?	School Support Provided	Provides for Central Training Courses
ADA	Vidya Kannara	100%	1 recruited for a specific TEL project but not ongoing.	UniLearn administration; one-to-one support; 3 Turnitin workshops recently.	MyReading
AS	Steve Bentley	50%	1 but not 100% LTA support	UniLearn administration; one-to-one support; training courses as and when demand – 10 in the last year due to staff getting ipads.	Introduction to GradeMark. Contributes to some Learning Bytes sessions; ran a TALI funded session on Safe, Secure and Challenging Environment.
BS	Abdul Jabbar	60%	2	UniLearn administration; one-to-one support; Sessions at Department away-days.	None
C&E	Jane Merrington	30-40% depending on time of year.	1 but not 100% LTA support	UniLearn administration; one-to-one support; ad hoc training due to demand.	UniLearn Basics
EPD	Jebar Ahmed	100%	No	UniLearn administration; one-to-one support; Some organised training courses on Turnitin, Induction, motivating learners and mobile apps.	None.
HHS	Paul Dagg	90%	2 but not 100% LTA support	UniLearn administration; One-to-one support; and online support and resources	UniLearn the Basics; Contributes to some Learning Bytes sessions.
MHM	Ben Fisher	60%	No	UniLearn administration; one-to-one support; mini 15 mins sessions have just started to be offered on various LT tools.	UniLearn Beyond the Basics;

Appendix E - List of Learning Bytes Topics and Dates

- Mar 2010 - How can I mark more efficiently and give feedback to students more quickly?
- Apr 2010 - How can I connect better with students and communicate more efficiently with them? -
- May 2010 - What is an e-portfolio? How can I use them in teaching and learning?
- Jun 2010 - How can I automatically mark in class quizzes? (Using voting pads)
- Jul 2010 - How can I use synchronous communication to engage with students?
- Oct 2010 - How can we get students to reflect more effectively on their learning?
- Nov 2010 - How can I use Blackboard to make my course more interactive/collaborative?
- Dec 2010 - Ten tips on how to instantly make my Blackboard module better
- Jan 2011 - Introduction to Blackboard v9.1 followed by an open questions on
- Feb 2011 - Making the most of your iphone/ipad
- Mar 2011 - Demo of UniTube: the University's Video Streaming software
- April 2011 - Demo of Student Response System for use with mobile devices
- May 2011 - The use of Screencasting in Teaching and Learning
- Jun 2011 - Making the most of Grademark for electronic submission and marking
- Sep 2011 - E-Portfolios using Campus Pack Tools
- Oct 2011 - Using Blogs and Wikis in Teaching and Learning
- Nov 2011 - Use of Facebook and Twitter in Teaching and Learning
- Dec 2011 - Using Webinars in Teaching and Learning including a demo of Elluminate
- Jan 2012 - The use of Video in Teaching and Learning and using UniTube:
- Feb 2012 - Electronic submission and marking with Turnitin's Grademark
- Mar 2012 - All you have ever wanted to know about Summon
- April 2012 - Making the most of your ipad/iphone
- May 2012 - Using mobile devices in teaching and learning
- June 2012 - The use of quizzes and surveys in teaching and learning
- July 2012 - Using audio feedback
- Sep 2012 - E-Portfolios in UniLearn using the Campus Pack Tools
- Oct 2012 - Introduction to Twitter as a tool for personal development and for use in teaching and learning
- Nov 2012 - Introduction to screencasting
- Jan 2013 - Webinar Tool: Using Adobe Connect
- Feb 2013 - Top 10 UniLearn tips
- Mar 2013 - Social Reading
- Apr 2013 - Referencing Software - Reference management software
- May 2013 - Yammer
- Jun 2013 - UniTube - UniTube Presentation
- Jul 2013 - The Flipped Classroom - Flipped Classroom – what's not to like?
- Sep 2013 - Adobe Bridge
- Oct 2013 - Summon
- Nov 2013 - Using Google Sites for eportfolios
- Dec 2013 - Introducing the Blackboard (Unilearn) Mobile App
- Jan 2014 – The Turnitin App
- Feb 2014 - Screencasting and Lecture Capture
- Mar 2014 - Collaborative Tools
- Apr 2014 - Managing Learning
- May 2014 - Assessment Tools
- Jun 2014 - Tools & Tips for Teaching Distance Learning
- July 2014 - Make your UniLearn Module more Visually Appealing
- Sep 2014 - Holistic View of Learning Technologies at Huddersfield
- Oct 2014 - Introduction to UniConnect
- Nov 2014 - UniTube and Video Sharing
- Dec 2014 - UniLearn's 12 Days of Christmas

Appendix F - List of TALI Organised Events and Dates

- Sept 2012 - If content is king, what is attention?
- Oct 2012 - Digital Scholarship: Leveraging digital tools in the 21st century
- Sept 2013 - iPad Sharemeet
- Nov 2013 - iPad (and other tablets) Coffee Club
- Feb 2014 - iPad (and other tablets) Coffee Club
- May 2014 - iPad (and other tablets) Coffee Club
- Nov 2014 - iPad (and other tablets) Coffee Club
- Jan 2015 - iPad (and other tablets) Coffee Club
- Jan 2015 - Exploring Digital Scholarship
- Mar 2015 - iPad (and other tablets) Coffee Club
- Apr 2015 - Exploring Digital Identity and Scholarship

Appendix G – The Digital Literacy Grid

LEVEL	APPLICATION	ANNUAL PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
Not yet at Technology-supported level	Very limited or no use of technologies in teaching, learning & assessment.	Minimal or no self-development activity within the last 12 months relating to use of technology in teaching, learning & assessment.
Technology-supported level (where face-to-face delivery is supported by the use of technology)	Frequent and appropriate use of UniLearn: • Uploading documents to modules. • Use of Announcements. • Staff information up-to-date and informative. • MyReading list maintained • Turnitin used for relevant assessments Together with: • Another example of a tool being used within UniLearn; examples are (but are not restricted to) discussion boards, blogs, and wikis – or an equivalent tool being used outside of UniLearn.	Participating in self-development and personal learning relating to the use of technology in teaching, learning & assessment, relevant to this level of application. Examples could be (but not restricted to): • *Staff development courses.* • *Learning Bytes sessions or TALI session.* • *Pedagogic conferences.* • *Other professional development activities such as external workshops or taught modules.*
Technology-enhanced level (where technology is integrated into the delivery)	Enhanced use of UniLearn: • Demonstration of continued application at the ***Technology-supported Level***. Further customisation of modules in UniLearn, e.g. • Re-order the content area of the menu to follow how the module is taught • Changing the styling of the module and adding a banner. • Appropriate use/upload of multimedia items to UniLearn e.g. video, audio, images. Together with: • Examples of more advanced UniLearn features and/or other technologies being used (in addition to those used in previous levels). Examples are (but are not restricted to) quizzes, group functionality, synchronous interactions, eportfolios, and social media.	Participating in professional development activities relating to the use of technology in teaching, learning & assessment, relevant to this level of application, reflecting on how they could be incorporated into practice and taking some positive steps towards this. Examples could be (but not restricted to): • *Staff development courses.* • *Learning Bytes sessions or TALI session.* • *Pedagogic conferences.* • *Other professional development activities such as external workshops or taught modules.*

	To __deliver__ wholly online modules and to meet the QAA Requirements for this, you also need: • To apply the criteria for the technology-enhanced level (above) to an online learning context, • Plus achieve the E-tutoring module DMZ2330 (or equivalent), through completion of the module, or by building an APEL claim against the learning outcomes (see supporting document).	
Technology-dependent level **(where technology is central to delivery)**	Extended use of learning technologies: • Demonstration of continued application at the *Technology-enhanced Level*. • Practice is rethought and redesigned, to harness the affordances of technologies. This can include, but is not restricted to: • Expanded application of technologies used in previous levels. • Using screencasts instead of lectures and using the class time to engage students in other learning activities. • Using technology to produce creative assessment methods. • Using technology to facilitate student-created content. • Redesigning a module to become blended delivery e.g. when a significant proportion of the face-to-face delivery is replaced by online activities.	High-level involvement in professional development activities relating to the use of technology in teaching, learning & assessment, relevant to this level of application. Examples could be (but not restricted to): • *Presenting at conferences or invited events.* • *Contributing to the delivery of staff development sessions, Learning Bytes sessions, TALI events.* • *Engaging with an online learning network, using reflection to review and improve your professional practice.* • *Writing a journal article or book chapter.* • *Mentoring colleagues.* • *Completing a professional or taught course.*
	To __design and deliver__ wholly online modules and to meet the QAA Requirements for this, you also need: *Essential:* • To apply the criteria for the *technology-dependent level* (above) to the design and delivery of a wholly online module/course. • Plus achieve the E-tutoring module DMZ2330 (or equivalent), through completion of the module, or by building an APEL claim against the learning outcomes (see supporting document). *Desirable:* • Achieve the Understanding e-learning module DMZ1330 (or equivalent), through completion of the module, or by building an APEL claim against the learning outcomes (see supporting document).	

Appendix H – The Minimum Standards for Modules on the VLE:

Consistent UniLearn menus

University of HUDDERSFIELD
Inspiring tomorrow's professionals

Announcements

This cannot be empty or renamed and will be the default entry point for all UniLearn sites.
Button must contain: A banner and/or a permanent announcement welcoming students. These should clearly identify the UniLearn site and the module.

Module Information

This cannot be empty or renamed.
Button must contain:
Module specification document or handbook (if it contains the module specification document within it).
Any specific attendance requirements in excess of the University's usual Attendance Monitoring Policy (e.g. involvement in group work)

Staff Information

This cannot be empty or renamed.
Button must contain:
* Name, photograph and contact details (including phone number and email address) of the Module Leader, as well as office hours and office location.
* Where appropriate, name, photograph and contact details of other staff (teaching and/or technical) involved in the delivery of the module.

Assessment

This cannot be empty or renamed.
Button must contain:
* The assessment strategy which should be reproduced exactly as it appears in the validated module specification and in the handbook. This includes the weighting attached to each element of assessment (e.g. 3,000 word essay: 60%, and 3 hour unseen examination: 40%). This should state which elements of the assessment strategy are available for Tutor Reassessment
* The assessment brief: this should be the same as that supplied in the handbook or a date given as to when it will be available during the course of the year. The assessment criteria as they apply to that specific assessment should be included as part of the brief – with a clear breakdown of how marks will be allocated to each criterion
* Assessment deadlines: listing when their assessments are due for submission and how the submission should be made (e.g. location of the drop box/pigeonhole or arrangements for submission by Turnitin). It should be clear that the student must keep a copy of the work and whether or not any receipt is issued for the submission.
* Information on the penalties for late submission.
* Formative assessment: opportunities for students to benefit from formative assessment should be stated
* Feedback arrangements: students should be clear on when and how they can expect to access feedback on their summative assessments
NB care must be taken to not contradict information provided elsewhere (such as in the module handbook)

Consistent UniLearn menus

Learning Resources

This can be renamed but cannot be empty.

Should contain (as appropriate):

- Delivery schedule that gives students a clear understanding about how the module will be delivered across the course of the year, particularly in terms of contact with tutors. For example (where appropriate): a lecture/seminar breakdown with an indication of topics covered each week; scheduling of tutorials in support of the completion of a dissertation or contact during a work placement. Total contact hours should match the validated module specification taking account of any reading (or other) weeks when there is no formal class contact
- Directed study guidelines: where the module specification indicates that a portion of the student's overall effort is allocated to 'Supervised or Directed Activity' (in addition to the specified class contact), an indication of the nature of this activity should be included and the extent to which supervision or direction is provided or can be expected. For example (where appropriate) this may take the form of a directed reading schedule, a reflective journal exercise, a self-evaluation exercise.
- Class preparation: wherever appropriate a list of topics (for example seminar discussion topics) and required reading/preparation should be provided.
- Each module should show some 'enriched' use of UniLearn, that are appropriate to the learning outcomes of the module. These could include:
  - an asynchronous or synchronous group discussion space (a group blog, discussion board, scheduled revision webinars, a twitter or Facebook feed)
  - a space for reflection (a personal learning journal blog or private wiki)
  - self-paced resources (such as screencasts, podcasts, films, documentaries)
  - self-evaluation or self-test opportunities (automatically marked quizzes, short answer tests)
  - peer evaluation opportunities (PeerMark exercises).

Reading List

This cannot be empty or renamed

Must include:

- All readings students require for the module as well as additional readings which the student would be expected to access in excess of the usual seminar/assessment preparation. This reading list should be compiled via the library My Reading List software and should be checked and updated regularly.

If you need any further information about what is required for your UniLearn module, please contact your School's Learning Technology Advisor. A copy of this document can be found on this page: http://ipark.hud.ac.uk/content/unilearn and further how-to guides and support materials can be found on the ipark website: http://ipark.hud.ac.uk.