

Presentation Script for

But what do you REALLY think? An OER collaborator perception survey

Presented at OEGlobal 2023, Edmonton, AB, Canada - October 17, 2023 <https://sched.co/1S7lj>

© Anita Walz, Heather Blicher, and Kindred Grey. Released under a CC BY 4.0 international license
Slides, script, and survey instrument available at: <http://hdl.handle.net/10919/116412>

[SLIDE 1]

As people come in

Anita

Welcome! We're so glad you're here! Please take a moment to access the mentimeter question we want to [know what you hope to learn in this session]

I'm Anita and I am an Assoc Prof and Asst dir of open ed and scholcomm librarian at VT

Heather

I'm Heather Blicher and I'm an Open Education librarian on the team.

Kindred

I'm Kindred and I focus on graphic design and production for our team's open resources.

Heather

So, now let's pull up our mentimeter to see what you had to say!

<https://www.menti.com/alazc5z7fdwt> (if we can share results with audience)

[SLIDE 2]

1 minute

Anita

Our team of three comprises the Open Education Initiative -- a program of the Scholarly Communication office at the University Libraries at Virginia Tech.

Virginia Tech is a Research 1 university and land-grant institution with around 37,000 undergraduate and graduate students. We strongly identify with and are motivated by our land-grant mission and university motto *Ut Prosim* -- "That I May Serve."

Within the context of Virginia Tech, the Open Education Initiative aims to improve student learning and make faculty teaching materials more affordable, accessible to all students, of high quality, flexible/adaptable, engaging, and innovative. Everything that we work on is freely-and-publicly available under open licenses that allow adaptation - with the exception of some assessment materials which are restricted to faculty. We've published over 25 large-scale open educational resources. We provide consultations, project management, grant support, graphic design, production support, student and external review coordination, and expertise on copyright and Creative Commons.

[SLIDE 3]

1 minute

Anita

The presentation highlights our efforts at evaluation of our program from the perspective of current and past collaborators

We'll:

- 1) Briefly discuss our program, research scope, the types of questions we asked, and WHY we asked them
- 2) Our intent in conducting this research -- including what we thought it would deliver and what it actually delivered
- 3) And, we'll talk about what's next -- changes we've made or are making to our program

We'd plan to leave some substantive time for discussion at the end. We'd really love to hear

- 1) Your perspectives on program evaluation if you've done or considered something like this
- 2) How we might have better gotten to the information sought
- 3) And we'd ESPECIALLY like to know what about your programmatic approaches for attracting, onboarding, and supporting faculty and new projects

Two notes:

- This is not an in-depth presentation with lots of statistical analysis. While one of us DOES has a statistics degree, we're looking for themes and insights that lead to actionable changes ... so you won't see any anovas or p-values in this presentation.
- This is also not a "slick and shiny" presentation. It reflects our "in the weeds" learning. We don't have everything figured out ... and we invite you to learn alongside us.

Heather will now tell you a bit about the survey and survey population.

[SLIDE 4]

1 minute

Heather

- 1) We built the survey collaboratively and in consultation from a Social Science Research consultant
- 2) Our online survey ran for about 3 weeks in Spring 2023. Of the 33 invited members of the population, 72% started the survey and 48% completed it.
- 3) Our survey population included collaborators who created, adapted, or were in the process of creating or adapting OER in the many disciplines as you see on this slide, including medicine, engineering, business, music and many more we didn't have the space to include.

[SLIDE 5]

1 minute

Heather

We aimed to identify program strengths and weaknesses and to find actionable areas for improvement. Some of our research questions are summarized here:

Specifically, we sought information to help us understand aspects of:

- Motivation or the Why....We sought to uncover why they chose to become involved in the work
- Support....what support do they identify as needed **prior to** and **when starting** a new project? -- and in what modalities?

- Satisfaction...How satisfied were they with the support we currently offer
- Topics, we sought feedback on the many topic areas we coach them on with future plans in mind to build asynchronous onboarding and ongoing support in some areas
- Improvement...And how can we improve

[SLIDE 6]

1 minute

Heather

The survey instrument is a three part instrument with sections on: Program awareness and participant motivation, importance and satisfaction of existing OEI consultations and services, and reflection on project impacts.

It includes multiple choice questions, importance/satisfaction rankings, and free-text questions. For example: the 6th question on the survey asks participants to rate the level of importance, then satisfaction for 7 services offered by our group.

If you'd like to see the entire survey instrument, you can scan the QR code or use the link. We have a few print copies we can also share with you.

[SLIDE 7]

1 minute

Anita

We chose to conduct this research **because we want improve our onboarding and faculty-support strategies**. We'd really like to put more responsibility on faculty and less on ourselves -- and still have faculty finish their projects.

- While all of our projects are a bit different, we find that we are spending a great deal of time in onboarding meetings and hand-holding throughout projects.
- We're found that keeping in close touch seems to improve program participant retention and completion ... so we're concerned that instructors still complete their work -- but we too have limits on our time and bandwidth.
- Every institution is a bit different. So, knowing why faculty are motivated to do this work and how they prefer to learn can also help us better connect with their values
- Ultimately, we want to be able to support more changes in practice and as well as simultaneous projects -- and have a larger impact.

[SLIDE 8]

2 minutes

Anita

Before adding additional members (Kindred about three years ago, and Heather this past January) to the team, realizing that I was having bandwidth issues supporting the many projects, I experimented with multiple ways to multiply my capacity in ways that provided some efficiencies.

I did this because I found that: Collaborators are busy, we repeated ourselves during onboarding and throughout project meetings -- and there were some serious overwork-issues going on. My colleagues and I were ALSO finding that the messages were providing did not clearly relay exactly how much work OER creations take. Collaborators told us over the over "I didn't realize how much this would take." Something was not getting through...

Some of these past attempts included:

a. Past attempts:

- i. Offloading faculty development by partnering with the Rebus Community Textbook Success Program
- ii. Developing a two-hour onboarding workshop with agenda and detailed checklists
- iii. Ignore the problem -- and writing grant proposals WITH people as a way to onboard them
- iv. Just-in-time lots of checkins in early part of projects and check ins more spread out in the middle with more at the end of a project

[SLIDE 9]

Anita

From the survey there were a number of things we expected to find . . . and other things we actually found . . .

[SLIDE 10]

30 seconds

Kindred

Whenever you conduct a survey, you always have a narrative in your mind about what the feedback might be.

In our case, we *expected* people to give really critical feedback, specifically on extraneous services that we offer and how we might refine them.

We spend a lot of one-on-one time coaching our collaborators on how to publish open resources, so we expected them to give us some ideas on how we could take more of a back seat and give them more short, directive instruction.

[SLIDE 11]

30 seconds

Kindred

Instead, we found that the general feedback from our survey was really positive, and participants didn't have much constructive feedback.

This is kind of a double edged sword.

On one hand, it's nice to see that the work we do is being received well and has a positive impact.

But on the other hand, we didn't get any constructive feedback on how to *improve* our onboarding efficiencies or what we can change to *better support* our authors while they are creating their open resources.

[SLIDE 12]

2 minutes

Anita

In the survey, we asked a couple of different questions to better understand what pre-project, onboarding, and coaching subjects our authors valued, and which ones they didn't value as much.

Anita

Topics we listed included: Funding availability, Pressbooks training, orientation to Creative Commons licenses, incorporating third-party materials into one's own work, finding and using images in my work, accessibility, features that support Universal Design for Learning. Respondents also had an opportunity to "fill in the blank".

Respondents expressed the most interest in: information about funding, Pressbooks, accessibility, and finding images they can use.

This was a helpful affirmation that we're on a good path.

[SLIDE 13]

2 minutes

Heather

We also wanted to know why our collaborators are choosing to do this work.

Heather

We found that the answers were equally distributed with the top three being:

- A desire to reduce costs for students
- A desire to contribute to their discipline
- And a desire to offer more accessible course materials for students

After the fact, we realized we should have been more specific in using the term "**accessible**"- we're not sure if they meant they were concerned with students having access to the textbook **or** if they were concerned with work meeting accessibility standards, for example using alt text and long descriptions for images.

[SLIDE 14]

2 minutes

Anita

Another motivation for this survey was to find out exactly what support authors need to be successful.

Anita

We provide a number of support services including project management, graphic design, copyediting, coordination of student and peer review processes, grant/grant-writing collaboration, and coaching on best practices. We asked on a four-point likert scale 1) the importance of these services to them, and 2) their level of satisfaction with them. We also offered checkboxes for "I didn't know about this resource" and "I didn't need this resource"

Nothing rated below a 3.7 on the importance scale or 3.9 on satisfaction scale and the differences between each of the support services offered were so narrow as to be negligible.

The comments after this section were especially helpful -- but not for reasons we anticipated [read comments]

While these services are valuable, they are **not necessarily major selling points** for people

that DON'T KNOW they need something. . . and they might not be appreciated at the early stages of a project when authors don't know they need them. But, they are recognized AT and AFTER the point of need.

[SLIDE 15]

2 minutes

Heather

Our team was curious about the format that our collaborators preferred to learn from.

Heather

And we didn't get much feedback on this. Respondents' said they appreciated what we offer but didn't provide additional input. This has slowed our work in identifying asynchronous onboarding resources we could develop so that we could step back from doing some things and put more responsibility on authors -- with the hopes that they will still complete the work... and on time. This would allow us more time to be strategic with existing labor and time resources.

[SLIDE 16]

2 minutes

Heather

Lastly, we wanted feedback on areas that we could improve.

Heather

We didn't get any real suggestions. People don't know what they don't know. Perhaps we can offer examples of what **we think** we're missing. Or we find a way to express that we really **do** want their ideas and opinions. We want their perspectives to make the program stronger. For a future survey, we're discussing ways to get more substantial feedback by implementing different research methodologies, for example having someone outside of our team conduct the research to avoid respondent's self-censoring.

[SLIDE 17]

1 minute

Anita

We found an overwhelming level of satisfaction in that a high percentage of collaborators reported that they would do this work again. (Outside the survey, we have multiple-repeat authors and collaborators -- and they aren't just coming for the money, which is encouraging.)

Two notable quotes:

- This was the easiest and most productive collaboration I've had as an academic:
- One collaborator status "without [the support available throughout the process] -- no way [that I would go through it again]"

[SLIDE 18]

1 minute

Anita

We were delighted to see that some respondents were broadening acceptance for open projects in their departments

- One by encouraging involvement by graduate students
- And another who reported WIDE recognition of their project as "scholarly" and that others are since attempting the publication process

[SLIDE 19]

1 minute

Anita

Several reported impacts on their pedagogy -- including

- Better continuity of material within their curriculum and implementation of universal design
- And shifting use more OER materials

[SLIDE 20]

1 minute

Anita

So, the big questions are “what are we doing next?” Frankly, I am not completely sure...our institution so greatly values academic freedom plus people are constantly overcommitted -- these challenges efforts toward coordination and other things as you might imagine...

- We've already started informing collaborators that our meetings with them will be shorter and I am being a bit more dogmatic about meeting agendas too
- Team members are at a place where they are more comfortable meeting solo with authors -- it takes a while to learn how to do this work and to get into these working relationships -- some have started taking the lead and having one-on-one meetings with authors.
- We're continuing our discussions of how to put more LEARNING responsibility on authors
 - We have a long list of artifacts of “how other open initiatives” handle onboarding and training that we're going through

[SLIDE 21]

1 minute

Anita

- We'll be adopting, adapting, and creating new materials to form what will likely be an asynchronous training program for faculty and staff who teach
 - Some of these will include:
 - Orientation to project workflow and variations on
 - More delineation of onboarding processes for: consulting projects vs. hands-on-collaborative projects
 - More detailed information on what makes a project successful, our approach, and how to pitch us a project
 - Past author testimonials on particular topics (especially what you wish you knew before you started)
- I am not yet sure what we'll do with on-going support and hand holding. I enjoy that process a lot so I guess we'll see.
- After realizing that we don't just need MORE marketing, we need THE RIGHT marketing, I am starting to think through what that looks like
 - At minimum, this includes changes to our web presence. It also includes more communication of “WHY” rather than “WHAT”

- And overall we need to better define and communicate changing roles and expectations
- There are challenges ahead, but we're excited to meet them and to continue to meet the charge of engaging with faculty and staff to contribute high-quality open resources that can be used by students and adopted and adapted at other institutions

[SLIDE 22]

Heather (moderator)

[All presenters feel free to chime in]

Here are a few questions to get us started.

And also come talk to us- we'd love to hear how you've gotten to the more critical content... What suggestions do you have for more efficiently conveying to ENGAGE and ONBOARD interested faculty -- and when do you this?

[SLIDE 23]

Thank you

[SLIDE 24]

Credits