RIGHTS & REWARDS

In Blended
Institutional Repositories

Designing a rewards and support scheme for a repository of teaching and learning materials

August 2006

Sue Manuel, Charles Oppenheim

JISC The Joint Information Systems Committee

Loughborough University

Contents

1.0 Introduction

This report outlines the factors taken into consideration when designing a scheme to reward and support staff for depositing materials into a repository for teaching and learning materials at Loughborough. It details preferences for rewarding staff identified by the Rights and Rewards project survey (Bates *et al.*, 2005) and the options considered for the scheme. These are set against the practicalities for possible institutional adoption. It is important to bear in mind that financial rewards represent a small part of the scheme and there are funding and sustainability implications to consider. Also, this is a research and development project and there may be a danger of raising expectations for the repository service that may not be met. Elements of the scheme may be phased in over time as the repository service is developed.

2.0 Repository reward and support scheme

The project's reward and support scheme is based on the premise that staff should be acknowledged in their efforts, and that excellence and innovation in teaching and learning need to be encouraged. The experience and expertise of the engCETL (one of the project partners) in this area has played a vital part in the designing of the reward scheme. The engCETL has an excellent record in encouraging academics to engage with projects that enhance teaching and learning, and of delivering appropriate rewards for their involvement. A repository service provides an ideal mechanism for wider dissemination of examples of good teaching materials and practice. The reward and support scheme for the project's demonstrator repository is designed to reward good citizens and to encourage the sharing of resources.

A range of awards have been devised to reflect the diverse nature of teaching and activities to support teaching. It has been designed to encompass new starters in the teaching profession and experienced staff; materials created from team working activities; technical support personnel; and administration staff.

When designing the rewards and support scheme particular attention was paid to the outcomes of sections of the project survey which reference experience of repository use, rewards and rights (Bates *et al.*, 2005). These are summarised below.

1. Experience of the use of existing repositories was generally favourable with no real problems encountered with access, broken links or the use of materials downloaded from the repository. This is encouraging but the project will aim to ensure that its repository system is user friendly for depositors and end-users. The quality of material was thought to be good and could be used with the individual style of the teacher. Peer-reviewed material was considered to be useful (51.6% '*strongly agreed*' or '*agreed*').
2. The main reasons for using a repository were 'to improve my teaching'; 'to increase student motivation'; 'to make sure materials are preserved'; 'it's linked to my institutions VLE'; or 'it's related to my research'. Other more personal themes were to enhance student learning, to improve access to resources, and altruistic motives.
3. Popular features of an 'ideal' repository service would be: Open Access (OA), password access for certain user groups, comment, rating systems and reviews. An indication of the quality of an item was also regarded as desirable.
4. Contribution to a repository was much more likely where:
    a. Support was in place,

b. Maintenance of links was not expected,
c. Institutional backing was given – compulsory deposit, included in pay or promotional awards and recognition,
d. Resources were preserved,
e. It was connected to research as well as teaching.
5. A combination of financial and non-financial rewards would encourage contribution:
a. **Financial** – personal financial rewards in the form of nomination for salary increment or lump sum award, budget allocation for a teaching and learning project, budget for office equipment, royalties on downloads, or gifts in the form of book vouchers.
b. **Non-financial** – satisfaction of contributing, or a period of secondment to professional development.

The criteria for receipt of rewards under the scheme depend on the nature of the award. The project would recommend that the scheme should be incorporated into existing schemes for rewarding staff at Loughborough. For example, we will recommend that the wording of existing reward review documents be altered to reflect contribution to the repository, similar to those for promotions, and lump sum payments. Other awards in the repository scheme, such as those sponsored by individuals or departments may have specific criteria attached. These criteria will be devised in consultation with the awarding body, and will be outlined in the application documentation.

2.1 Reward matrices

The project aims to develop a repository system that will reward users in a number of ways, financial and non-financial. Some of the rewards suggested here are 'universal' rewards that will equally apply to a variety of different Job Families and staff grades. Other rewards are more suitable for a specific Job Family. Attempts have been made to make the rewards scheme as fair as possible to all; where rewards are targeted at a particular Job Family an attempt has been made to offer an alternative reward in other cases. These are set out in the rewards matrices in Appendix A and include:

System rewards

- Backed up
- Electronic review process / Quality control
- Feedback mechanisms
- Good search functionality – keyword, browsing
- Informal and formal spaces
- Personal profile page – listing teaching and research outputs held in the repository
- Preservation of materials
- Well designed IT systems - reliable and user friendly
- Well-managed

Job related

Non-financial rewards

- Altruistic

- Benefits to be gained from sharing teaching research and experience with others
- Best practice guidelines
- Build time to contribute to repository into the departments Workload Model
- Esteem
- Feedback / conversational spaces
- Increase student motivation
- Inter-disciplinary resources and contacts
- Pool of resources (textual and image)
- Quality control
- Shared workspace
- Showcase for work (Academic, Learning specialists and support staff)
- Teaching and research outputs accessed from a one place e.g. a portal
- Time allocation for preparation and deposit of materials
- Usage / download counts
- User comments and ratings

Financial rewards
- Budget allocation – project funding or equipment
- Cash prize
- Evidence for promotion or salary increment– portfolio of good quality teaching examples, case studies, reports and evidence of engagement with colleagues and the wider community
- Lump sum award
- Sponsored subject award - engCETL

Support
- Faculty / department support
- Mediated deposit
- Named primary contact
- Online guides
- Templates for case studies and reports
- User friendly guides for preparation of materials and deposit to repository

General
- Opportunity to write up and publish case studies etc
- Review process for quality assurance

Some of these rewards are discussed in greater detail below, as are the benefits to selected staff groups.

System rewards
Well-designed systems are rewarding for users, IT support and development staff. Rewards may vary for each staff group but time saving benefits apply to all when systems are designed with efficiency and end-users in mind.

Quality control

The issue of quality control was raised in the Rights and Rewards survey, and 51.6% of respondents took the view that peer-reviewed materials were more useful (Bates *et al.*, 2005). We will look more closely at mechanisms for quality control and review in the demonstrator repository. One repository system we will investigate, DSpace, will allow items to be deposited and held before being accepted or rejected into the repository. The task of reviewing an item could be allocated to the Department's teaching coordinator, who could then check the quality and accept or reject the submission. Once an item is accepted into the repository, others can access it. Thus, it is feasible to maintain a system of peer review so long as a suitable review board can be assembled.

Royalties

Royalties on certain categories of content could be implemented. This could be achieved in several ways:

- By restricting use of pdf files to read only; users wanting to print or save could be asked to pay a fee.
- Image files could be provided royalty free as thumbnails or with royalties to high quality versions to pay for use.
- Resources could be made available for subscribers only.

These methods are not ideal solutions for an OA repository and the administrative overheads of such schemes may detract from any benefits.

Feedback

Getting feedback on resources submitted to a repository was one of the positive aspects that has, or would, encourage contribution to a repository (Bates *et al.*, 2005). DSpace does not currently feature a feedback mechanism. However, a Portuguese project Papadocs[1] has been investigating review features in DSpace. This includes an element of student commentary on the resources academics make available. The technical possibilities of incorporating this feature require into the projects demonstrator repository require further investigations.

Book Sales

Amazon run a service whereby a percentage of the revenue generated by the sales of books and other items accessed via a web link to Amazon is returned to subscribers to the service. The University Library currently operates this service via an SFX button. One of the links in the SFX menu invites users to "Read the review or buy this book at Amazon.co.uk". This service is in operation in Loughborough University's Institutional Repository (IR). As the University Library already has the scheme in place, funds would ultimately be returned to them. The monies are used to buy additional books for the benefit of all students, researchers and academics at this institution. Although not a personal reward, this does represent a clear benefit to all. It is however unlikely that teaching materials on the repository would generate significant book sales.

---

[1] Papadocs project:
http://dspace-dev.dsi.uminho.pt:8080/en/dspaceUM_papadocs.jsp.

Shared work space

The repository service may evolve to offer shared work space for a range of staff, for example project teams may find this useful and individuals across departments might use this space to share thoughts and documents on teaching. Admin and IT support staff could be given permissions to access materials in shared spaces in order to deposit them into the formal repository space; i.e., to publish to a wider audience.

Preservation and backup services

Preservation and backup services have the potential to ease workloads associated with the location of lost files, satisfying requests for files from colleagues and others. This time saving applies to teachers as well as administrative and support staff who may be asked to locate items. Repository managers and associated staff also benefit from knowing that materials are regularly backed up and preserved for future use.

Resource maintenance

Consideration needs to be given to the maintenance of resources within the repository. Certain resources, e.g., images, will not require any maintenance activity beyond preservation. Other items will require greater management effort, materials that are out of date or misleading will fall into this category.

University managers

Managers could expect to see the benefits associated with the full range of system rewards, either directly or indirectly. These benefits might include: the repository system and its content can be demonstrated to others; use of the repository can be cited as evidence of good practice in teaching and research; sharing between practitioners can be highlighted; collaborative working across departments and work with industry partners can be seen in action. Additionally, the quality of the resources can be ensured, their preservation and therefore availability for the long-term can be achieved, and mechanisms for actively encouraging feedback and comments can be developed.

Teaching staff

Teaching staff can benefit from having access to: shared resources for use in teaching, exemplars and case studies. It is envisaged that a personal profile page for staff will be created that is automatically populated with details of their teaching and research outputs that are housed in the repository. This page could also list materials in the university's publications database.

Professional development

Probationary lecturers could be directed to examples of good practice, lecture presentations, tests, examples of different teaching and learning styles, and information literacy materials. Shared space for this group could be used as a support channel either formally, informally, or both. Probationary lecturers might like to work on the creation of teaching materials together, and feedback could then be supplied by their department, professional development and peers.

2.2 Scenarios for rewarding and supporting repository contribution

To illustrate how the reward and support scheme might benefit a variety of staff at Loughborough, a number of use case scenarios have been drawn up. These describe an activity associated with teaching, the scenarios outline how the repository might extend this activity and reward staff in their efforts.

1. Harry has been a teacher for more that 15 years. He has created a body of teaching materials and primary resources that he would like to share with other practitioners. His primary motivations are altruistic.

In this use case, Harry would not expect to be financially rewarded for contributing his items to the repository. The system can make the process easier for him, and it provides the added benefits of managing and preserving his items. The availability of support is another way to reward and encourage his contribution.

2. Rebecca is actively involved in motivating students to maximise their learning opportunities at university. She encourages service providers to liaise with one another, delivers training sessions for staff and student. She also motivates her own staff to explore new ways of creating training materials, delivering lectures and engaging with students. Her additional efforts have been recognised by her university and she has been awarded a lump sum prize. As a recipient of the prize she is expected to disseminate her good practice to others.

Depositing best practice guidelines into an open access repository is an ideal way to disseminate information and would help her to achieve the university's objective in this area. As in scenario number one she would benefit from an easy to use system with suitable support in place.

3. A team involved in a learning and teaching project would like to write a case study to share their methodologies and findings with a wide audience. The project is no longer funded; therefore, the team need to secure time and additional funding.

The team could apply for funding via a sponsored award that encourages the dissemination of learning and teaching project research findings. If the preparation of materials for contribution to the repository is recognised in their department's workload model, time can then be allocated to writing the case studies.

4. As a learning technologist, Fay is aware of many of the needs of the academic staff she supports. She is keen to encourage academics to make greater use of ITC and interactive learning in their teaching. Her initiatives and approaches to individuals in her department have begun to pay off. With her support, academics have now created some good quality interactive learning materials. She has encouraged and assisted academics to put good examples into the repository and she uses these exemplars to encourage more teachers to adopt greater use of such materials in their teaching.

Fay's work in fostering the sharing of good teaching examples into the repository, and in assisting teachers to do so has led to her Head of Department recommending that she receive a repository Supporting prize. (See below).

2.3 Repository awards

The level of the repository awards should be set in relation to the Loughborough University's Awards and Rewards scheme. In this way they can be blended at a later date if the university adopts the repository reward and support scheme. Three categories of financial awards are proposed:

To be provided as part of the university's Awards and Rewards Scheme
- Repository teaching material prizes and awards
  - Three **prizes** (one prize per faculty) - for the most active academic contributor to the repository, and
  - Three **project awards** – to an academic for undertaking a project as outlined below.
- Repository **supporting prizes** - offered to individuals who support the creation of teaching materials or deposit into the repository.

To be provided by the project and engCETL
- Sponsored prizes and awards – e.g. from the engCETL (including allocation of engCETL staff time for engCETL departments), the project's Steering Committee and industry.

The **prizes** will be given for the quantity of resources placed in the repository, this will encourage sharing and help to achieve a critical mass of repository content.

The **project awards** will operate in the same way as the university's Mini Project Awards and will provide exemplars for repository content and how this material may be re-used in teaching and learning. Academics will be encouraged to work thought their departments Online Learning Development Officer (OLDO) when, creating / preparing digital materials, and when placing them in the repository. The award will be offered to academics under the criteria that they provide documentation that includes evaluation of: the resources they deposit, accessibility issues, the process of depositing into the repository, how the resources may be transferred to different disciplines and guidelines for re-use. The submissions will be judged by the same panel convened for the Mini Project Award.

The **supporting prize** will be offered for individuals who support the creation of materials, create materials, and deposit these into the repository. This will be implemented when the demonstrator repository is more established and true pictures of supporting excellence can be established.

The **sponsored awards** might include contributions from the engCETL, the project Steering Committee and industry.

3. Managing and administering the awards

Nominations for awards and individual applications may come from a range of sources. In some instances the Head of Department may be called on to propose suitable recipients. Awarding bodies may select recipients of the sponsored awards. Therefore, it is feasible that input will come from a variety of sources. If a central body administered the award application process it would ensure that the process was transparent and fair. The project will propose that Professional Development be approached to co-ordinate the management and administration of awards.

The creation of a pool of resources for use in teaching, and exemplars with supporting documentation for teachers to refer to will be of benefit to this institution and the wider community. The repository service may also have a positive impact on staff motivation and may facilitate greater communication amongst staff groups and across departments. In the long run the repository may be a service that helps to save staff time. Applicable resources could be easy to locate; collaboration will facilitate knowledge sharing; and materials and exemplars could be provided for probationary teachers.

Award criteria

The proposed awards will apply to individuals from any of the job families listed in Section 3.1 below. The main criteria for application and receipt of an award are that:

- A significant quantity of resources, or exemplars with supporting documentation have been shared via the repository, or
- A significant effort has been made to encourage or support the creation or deposit of materials to the repository.

Application process

If the scheme runs along side the university's existing scheme then the application for project awards will be based on their application requirements. Details for submissions will be drawn up; a degree of flexibility should be built in to this process so that relevant information can be collected without requiring too much textual input from applicants. The prizes will be based on the quantity of items submitted by individuals. Supporting prizes application process will be devised and implemented at a later date.

If the university accepts this scheme then the timing of applications will be aligned with its existing Awards and Rewards scheme. If not then it may be advisable to adjust the timing so that it does not conflict with this scheme. Professional Development will notify recipients of a prize or award and the publicising of award allocations may vary. The project would encourage a high level of publicity, both internally and externally, but the recipient's views on this may need to be considered.

The process for selection and receipt of sponsored awards will be devised in conjunction with sponsors.

3.1 Eligibility

Following a recent job evaluation scheme Loughborough has now adopted the HAY scheme and jobs are accordingly placed into 'Job Families'. The following represent the seven families introduced at Loughborough:

- Teaching and Scholarship.
- Research and Teaching.
- Research.
- Management and Specialist.
- Administrative Services.
- Technical Services.
- Operational Services.

The university defines a job family as "a group of roles that are similar in character, where the role holders are engaged in broadly similar work, or have broadly similar objectives." (The Draft Agreement on the implementation of the Job Evaluation Scheme 2005). The reward and support scheme covers all of the relevant job families that may be actively involved in sustaining a repository of teaching and learning materials.

3.2 The university's Workload Model

The Workload Model is an agreement between Loughborough University and the Loughborough Association of University Teachers (AUT) on the workload of teaching staff. It sets out guidelines for the allocation of work to this staff group. Heads of Department produce an annual departmental model based on the particular requirements for the department, but each must cover the following:

- Research, teaching and administration workloads for each member of teaching staff.
- The model must be discussed and reviewed annually.
- It must be accessible and available to all staff in the department.
- Department teachers must broadly agree with the model.
- Workload duties should be allocated fairly.
- The model should be submitted to the Deputy Vice Chancellor.

The project will recommend that Heads of Department factor in activities associated with the deposit of items into the repository into their workload model.

3.3 Financial implications

The desire for financial rewards for supporting the creation and deposit of items into a repository has to take into account the fairness of the scheme and the sustainability of the awards. For this reason, it is desirable for the project to align itself with existing mechanisms for rewarding staff at Loughborough. However, the project would also like to introduce some new initiatives in this area and will therefore seek funding for a number of sponsored prizes and awards. The project will endeavour to ensure a commitment to fund these initiatives for a number of years.

4.0 Marketing the scheme

Marketing the scheme will involve a range of activities from presentations, leaflets, posters and word-of-mouth. Different material will be created for different audiences, in this way the most suitable benefits of becoming involved with the repository can be highlighted.

5.0 Evaluating the scheme

The scheme will be piloted across the university and the outcomes documented. Feedback will be examined to see if the scheme can be extended to include additional awards, rewards and support. The scheme will be measured by usage of the repository, recording enquiries about the service, monitoring feedback from repository contributors and award recipients. A brief survey could be conducted if more detailed analysis is required.

6.0 Summary

The reward and support scheme for the Rights and Rewards project repository of teaching and learning materials is designed to make the process of contributing materials as easy as possible. It recognises that staff time is valuable and that the additional efforts that individuals make to create their teaching and learning materials and to make them available to others and to support others in this activity should be celebrated and encouraged. A combination of system rewards, support rewards, financial and non-financial rewards has been identified as the most appropriate way to achieve this goal. Institutional recognition and adoption of the scheme would add backing and authority to the projects aims and would send a valuable message to staff at Loughborough that teaching and learning are highly valued activities.

6.1 Recommendations

We recommend the following:
1. Heads of Department should incorporate the time for preparation and deposit of materials into the repository in their Workload Model.
2. Criteria for promotions, salary increments, discretionary points and lump sum payments should take into consideration repository activities. This applies to staff involved with submission, creation of materials and in supporting roles. A change of wording to the criteria for promotion is recommended.
3. All staff at Loughborough involved with the creation and deposit of items into the repository should be eligible to apply or be nominated for an award from the repository award and support scheme.
4. Professional Development should administer the repository awards scheme.
5. The judging panel for the Mini Project Awards should also undertake selection of the repository project awards.

7.0 Acknowledgements

Bibliography

Agreement on the operation and control of workload: An Agreement between Loughborough University and Loughborough Association of University Teachers on Workload. Available online at:
http://www.lboro.ac.uk/admin/personnel/geninfo/workload.htm.

Bates, M., Loddington, S., Manuel, S., and Oppenheim, C., (2005). *Rights and rewards project academic survey: final report*. Available online at:
http://rightsandrewards.lboro.ac.uk/index.php?section=21.

The Draft Agreement on the implementation of the Job Evaluation Scheme (2005), Available online at: http://www.lboro.ac.uk/admin/personnel/JEScheme/index.htm.

HEFCE: Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF) (2006). Available online at:
http://www.hefce.ac.uk/learning/enhance/tqef.asp.

Human Resources Strategy [Round 2] 2004/06: Rewarding and Developing Staff (2004). Available online at:
http://www.lboro.ac.uk/admin/personnel/hrstrategy-may2004.doc.

Appendix A: Reward matrices

These award matrices show at a glance the potential rewards that staff in a range of roles might gain from being actively involved with a repository of teaching and learning materials at Loughborough University.

	User friendly	Backed up	Shared work space	Feedback	Quality control	Good search	Preservation	Persistent URL	Personal profile page
Teaching academic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Repository manager	✓	✓					✓	✓	
Teaching and learning specialist	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Admin	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Departmental IT support	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Central IT support	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
Senior management	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Professional development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
End-user	v	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	

Job related
Non-financial

	Central teaching and research store	Showcase	Altruistic	Professional development	Contacts	Pool of resources	User comments and ratings	Feedback / discussions
Teaching academic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Repository manager	✓	✓						
Teaching and learning specialist	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Admin	✓					✓		
Department IT support	✓					✓	✓	
Central IT support	✓	✓	✓	✓				
Senior management	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Professional development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
End-user						✓	✓	

Job related
Non-financial

	Usage / download stats	Time allocation to prepare material	Quality control	Shared workspace	Best practice guidelines	Recognition in Workload Model
Teaching academic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Repository manager	✓					
Teaching and learning specialist	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Admin	✓			✓		
Department IT support	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Central IT support	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Senior management	✓		✓	✓	✓	
Professional development	✓		✓	✓	✓	
End-user			✓		✓	

Financial

	Lump sum award	Cash prize	Sponsored award	Evidence for promotion	Budget allocation	Review Reward Application
Teaching academic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Repository manager	✓	✓				✓
Teaching and learning specialist	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Admin	✓	✓				✓
Department IT support	✓	✓				✓
Central IT support	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓
Senior management	✓	✓				✓
Professional development	✓	✓				✓

Support

	User friendly help guides	Templates for case studies / reports	Online guides	Named primary contact	Faculty / department support	Mediated deposit	Training
Teaching academic	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Repository manager	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Teaching and learning specialist	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Admin	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Department IT support	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Central IT support	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Senior management	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Professional development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
End-user	✓						