Feedback on draft <u>Recording of Taught Content Policy and Procedures</u> in May, 2023

Feedback topic	Detailed comments on draft document (version 2023-04-13). These are anonymised, and in some cases summarised.	Advice on how the comments are addressed in the final policy update (December version)
Impact on in-class engagement	Objection to recordings and their impact on students' attendance in class: "Fundamentally the policy misses its target in that it really does not address the major key issue for the success of the university as a business in the long run which is that in reality, we all know that about 50% of students or more are now using recordings for distance learning."	These are objections to recordings in general, and so in effect opposes the current policy as well as the update. For this reason no changes were made to the updated policy.
Academic freedom	"Lecture theatre recording is a major cooler on academic freedom of speech and on the basis of first principles is undesirable in a democracy."	
Live-streamed classes and captions	Query over live-captioning in Zoom – can we include this? She noted that some courses use live-streaming Zoom for classes and the real-time, live captions can be a problem and cannot be edited. They are also prone to error and can be really tricky for students to follow a live-zoom class.	The Policy and Procedures (the "Policy") were generally edited to remove reference to specific tools and apps, except where this was relevant, and to be 'generic' in respect to the technology. The second bullet point in item 2 refers to recordings of non-lecture classes in order to bring these into scope, and the first bullet point in item 27 refers to live-streamed classes specifically, as an example of 'manual recording' (which is included in Definitions). The third bullet point of item 36 warns of the use of automated captions for live-streamed classes.
	Observed that Teams is being used for classes, as well - and so live-streaming, recording, and captions are being created on Teams, as well.	
Workload burden from editing captions	Making teaching staff responsible for captions is an additional and unannounced workload burden.	The central concern of these submissions is the additional workload burden for teachers in having to edit captions. The policy acknowledges that teachers are best-placed to determine whether editing is required and whether it is an unreasonable burden (item 5) and that this burden may be justifiable grounds for an exemption (second bullet point of item 20). Item 46 specifically identifies that exemptions for captions may be granted where corrections are not feasible.
	Workload burden from editing: places yet further administrative burden on academic staff that amounts to invisible work to accommodate under-performing systems. This burden-shifting is unsustainable and untenable.	
	Workload burden from editing captions: "creates a substantial burden on teaching staff, especially considered in light of the requirement for lecture recording to be released to students within 24 hours of the end of the lecture timeslot"	
	Workload burden from editing captions: "With most lectures taking at least an hour, this is at least an additional hour of work (most likely much more) for the lecturer to spend reviewing the recording after the lecture. I do not believe that this is feasible with current workloads"	
	Concerned about workload burden on teaching staff: "This level of manual correction will be a challenge for staff members who are already stretched for time with their existing teaching and research responsibilities."	

Feedback on draft <u>Recording of Taught Content Policy and Procedures</u> in May, 2023

Feedback topic	Detailed comments on draft document (version 2023-04-13). These are anonymised, and in some cases summarised.	Advice on how the comments are addressed in the final policy update (December version)
	Workload burden from having to edit captions: "I use Māori language frequently in my lectures and have no intention of checking or correcting the transcription quality (I expect it is poor). The elements of the policy that expect the lecturer to check any captions (para 7 and para 20) are unreasonable. "	
	Section 36 implies that we must read through the transcripts of our teaching sessions to see if the automated transcriptions have created offensive translations. Very few folks are going to do that. Could we frame it so that this is a requirement we fix it if someone reports it to us?	
	Procedures: Editing and release: para 36 appears to require teaching staff to edit recordings and transcripts to correct gross inaccuracies and all inaccurate transcripts of te reo; see also para 20. I strongly suggest that this is not sustainable: this is an academic staff workload issue that will impact on wellbeing. If transcripts are considered so important that editing is to be required, then that needs to be resourced, by providing and designating staff other than lecturers to do this.	
	Workload burden from editing captions: If this is intended to change, that would impose a very significant additional work load on teaching staff. I do not think that can be supported unless additional resourcing is provided.	
Equity of workload burden of editing captions - and in particular, those who use te reo Māori in classes	Equity of workload – since the extra work will fall on some staff more than others	The third bullet point of item 20 and item 46 provide for the potential inequity of editing falling on teachers who use te reo Māori in classes.
	Colleagues who actively seek to embrace the te reo policy will effectively be required to multiply the time they spend ...for no recognition of those additional workload hours.	
	"The correcting of te reo Māori in automated transcripts can be very time consuming."	
	Panopto ASR is "discrimatory AI for te reo Māori". He provides a lengthy paper to present the argument.	

Feedback on draft <u>Recording of Taught Content Policy and Procedures</u> in May, 2023

Feedback topic	Detailed comments on draft document (version 2023-04-13). These are anonymised, and in some cases summarised.	Advice on how the comments are addressed in the final policy update (December version)
Workload equity for teachers who non-native English speakers	It also creates potential for inequity as it is likely to disproportionately affect those who speak English in a non-standard dialect or with an accent that Panopto is not good at transcribing	Item 20 acknowledges that the policy may contravene the Equity Policy, and notes that this will be affected by the state of technology; and item 46 provides for exemptions to acknowledge this.
Disincentivising the use of te reo Māori	The fact that the university has contracted a system that fails to recognise te reo kupu, while at the same time promoting the increased use of te reo, is problematic.	The combination of items 17, 20 and 46 are intended to mitigate the potential to disincentivise the use of te reo Māori in classes, by acknowledging the potentially inequitable workload burden.
	...as well as potentially disincentivizing the use of te reo Māori in the classroom (the opposite of the University's goals)	
	"Having an expectation to check recordings or even explain to students that transcriptions do not work for the Māori language is putting a barrier in place to its use and will not achieve the stated principle of respecting te reo Māori."	
	Ongoing challenge capturing te reo kupu	
	Panopto ASR is "discrimatory AI for te reo Māori". He provides a lengthy paper to present the argument.	
Automatic speech recognition as 'discriminatory AI'	Panopto automatic speech recognition (ASR) is "discrimatory AI for te reo Māori". He provides a lengthy argument on this.	The first bullet point in item 20 specifically acknowledges the discriminatory nature of ASR.
Advising students on quality of captions	Rather than requiring staff to edit captions that "the university provide an auto-generated disclaimer at the start of all lecture recordings that 'subtitles are auto-generated and may incorrectly capture spoken content'"	We can add a disclaimer to the copyright message in the recordings warning students of inaccuracies in captions. Item 39 of the policy refers to this. Teachers may (and should) advise students in their courses as well - since they will be best-placed to judge the accuracy of captions in their recordings.
	Giving students advice (and choice): "We would like to propose an alternative approach. Instead of requiring staff to manually correct captions, we suggest that staff indicate at the start of each term whether or not they will edit the captions. This would allow students to make an informed decision about whether they want to display the auto-captions, or watch the lectures without them."	

Feedback on draft <u>Recording of Taught Content Policy and Procedures</u> in May, 2023

Feedback topic	Detailed comments on draft document (version 2023-04-13). These are anonymised, and in some cases summarised.	Advice on how the comments are addressed in the final policy update (December version)
	A suggestion re captions: the sections on Responsibilities and on Procedures should require the university to issue a statement on each course Canvas page cautioning students against reliance on captions, given their frequent inaccuracies. Since lecturers have long been advised to post such a statement, it seems preferable to standardise this and relieve lecturers of this task.	
	Miscaptioning is rife!	
Exemptions/opting-out	"I've read the proposed changes and recording lectures should not be a matter of choice for lecturers to make and the lecture recording policy should stay as it is right now. Also with international students returning to New Zealand universities, some will need to revisit material as English is not their first language and recorded lectures would aid their study. Giving lecturers a choice to record lectures where they might be able to do so and choose not to will deprive international students of vital study material. Lastly, lectures are a vital source of material, and if a student is sick for more than a day or two, that student will be severely disadvantaged compared to their classmates because they missed material that they would not be able to get because the lectures are not recorded."	The submitter appears to have misunderstood the updated policy and feels that it provides easier 'opting-out' for teachers. This is not the case although the grounds for exemption requests are being expanded to acknowledge different teaching modes.
	"The AS-67 Form not only requires the approval of the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching but also must be approved by the Course Director.20 It may only be filled out by the Course Coordinator or the Course Director. The Teaching Staff are defined in the policy Definitions section a way such that those who lecture the relevant content may be neither the Course Coordinator nor the Course Director."	The updated policy provides for individual teachers to request exemptions for their classes, and so acknowledges that the circumstances and teaching modes may vary within courses. The policy also removes any specific reference to the length of time that exemptions can be awarded. This is to provide flexibility to ADLTs to grant long-term exemptions if appropriate. This would benefit teaching staff by removing an administrative burden and would provide certainty for students.
	Exemptions from the addition of captions are provided in para 42, but it is not clear whether this is for individual sessions or for a course as a whole, and how the criteria would apply to a course as a whole.	

Feedback on draft <u>Recording of Taught Content Policy and Procedures</u> in May, 2023

Feedback topic	Detailed comments on draft document (version 2023-04-13). These are anonymised, and in some cases summarised.	Advice on how the comments are addressed in the final policy update (December version)
	Cl 44 states that approved exemptions for courses will roll over for each academic term that the course is offered and be reviewed every five years. Five years seems like an awfully long period. Courses change hands and structure in this time. It is our view that this should be reviewed a lot more regularly - perhaps every year or two.	
Guest lecturers	Guest lecturers – shift to an 'opt-out' policy for them. Suggests: Course Coordinators will ensure that guest lecturers or other non-University employees who are active participants in a teaching session are informed that, unless they specifically withhold permission, their contributions will be recorded and released to students. Where permission is withheld the recording must be stopped in class or edited as appropriate	Item 24 states that guest lecturers would need to opt out if they do not wish their contributions to be recorded. The default setting is 'opt-in' but Course Coordinators have an obligation to advise guest lecturers on this.
Sharing of recordings beyond the course	Privacy: "the policy should spell out and require the current practice of prefacing recordings with statements to students that lecture recordings are purely for their own educational use and must not be shared outside the class."	Item 14 identifies that students are responsible for using recordings for their personal use only, and item 50 reinforces this.
	Panopto allows access to courses that students are not enrolled in.	This is not generally the case but can happen only when a teacher puts a recording in their personal Panopto folder instead of the course folder. Teachers may do this unwittingly or may do it deliberately, but the policy and technology does not do this automatically.
Students' own copies	Clarify policies around students keeping and making their own recording, eg personal video/photos	Item 23 requires students to seek permission of the teacher before making their own recordings.
Students with disabilities	Under point 4 'Recording of teaching overview', add as highlighted: teaching staff are "encouraged to be aware of the value of recordings in equitable access and inclusivity for students' learning, particularly for students with disabilities"	The suggested text has been added to item 4.
	Under point 9 that refers to teaching activities which aren't automatically recorded, can we again encourage teaching staff to permit student recording, particularly where it is being recommended for a student with disabilities to improve their access to courses? The student will then be able to use appropriate and existing assistive technology to enhance their learning	Item 8 encourages teachers to be supportive of students with disabilities.

Feedback on draft <u>Recording of Taught Content Policy and Procedures</u> in May, 2023

Feedback topic	Detailed comments on draft document (version 2023-04-13). These are anonymised, and in some cases summarised.	Advice on how the comments are addressed in the final policy update (December version)
Student equity	Equity students: I suggest the policy should include express recognition that equity students are especially vulnerable to using recordings to regularly replace in-person attendance and as a result getting an inferior learning experience. I suggest that the university should work on providing additional support to equity students. This could include eg helping equity students to work out how to manage attendance as often as possible, prompting those who use recordings in lieu of attendance to stay up to date, and providing opportunities for interaction for those who use recordings.	The first and second bullet points of item 8 encourage teachers to be supportive of students with disabilities, and there is specific reference to those under the care of Student Disability Services.
	The policy allows courses to be exempted from lecture capture and release. It does not mention that such courses should/may be expected to have special provision on hardship/equity grounds for students who need recordings in classes where a lecture recording exemption has been granted. It would be great to see a streamlined process and/or procedures for this. Currently it is at the lecturer's discretion to decide when to release lecture recordings if their class has an exemption. This places extra admin on the individual lecturer and means whether individuals are granted access to recordings will be very class/lecturer-dependent. Some lecturers are requiring students to "prove" the need for hardship which poses logistical and privacy concerns and creates further inequities. It is our view that students should not be required to divulge personal details or evidence such as employment contracts or medical information to gain access to recordings.	
Non-English speakers	Non-English speakers have problems with understanding the recorded words. [this was stated as affirmation of the value of captions]	Captions help with this - but only if they are accurate. Item 4 encourages teachers to be mindful of the value of recordings to students' learning and specifically mentions 'inclusivity' in this regard.

Feedback on draft <u>Recording of Taught Content Policy and Procedures</u> in May, 2023

Feedback topic	Detailed comments on draft document (version 2023-04-13). These are anonymised, and in some cases summarised.	Advice on how the comments are addressed in the final policy update (December version)
Re-use of recordings	"My concerns relate to what seems to be a lack of clear languaging and clarity re 15: Intellectual Created by Staff and Students. I am assuming that our lecture recordings as 'instructional materials' will not be used in any way, unless agreed to explicitly, other than offering recorded lectures for a course in the semester in which it is taught. This is the passage (below) that did not clearly articulate this. In its current reading, it seems to suggest that our lecture recordings can be used more widely. It would be very good to have this clearly clarified."	The University's licence to use recordings is covered by §3.4 of the **Intellectual Property Created by Staff and Students Policy**. It does not need the explicit or specific permission of teachers and item 22 speaks to this.
	Are old recordings being re-used in place of current ones? These feels like a poor option	Item 6 notes that recordings are a "supplementary learning resource" for courses with in-person classes. Item 22 notes that the University has a licence to re-use archived recordings, and item 42 states that recordings may be used in an emergency situation in order to provide teaching continuity.
Value of online teaching	The submission calls for more online course options, since students cannot always schedule the courses they want/need and/or have clashes.	Item 6 includes the observation that some students may need to reply upon recordings because they are not able to attend in-person lectures - for a variety of reasons, many legitimate and understandable.
Technology	"Document camera is sometimes used in the lecture but not recorded" (comment from group discussion)	The one (single) projector video input can be limiting, and teachers may overlook the use of the document camera if it is displayed on the non-recording projector. This is a technical matter and will be addressed in Guidelines to teachers.

Feedback on draft <u>Recording of Taught Content Policy and Procedures</u> in May, 2023

Feedback topic	Detailed comments on draft document (version 2023-04-13). These are anonymised, and in some cases summarised.	Advice on how the comments are addressed in the final policy update (December version)
Posting of recordings	"I just wanted to express my opinion on point 38 in the Recording of Teaching Policy page. 24 hour turnaround time is grossly insufficient. It states that the posting of a recording should not disadvantage a student. I would argue that 24 hours typically means a student is not able to attend the following day's lecture in time and from personal experience, means offsetting the entire week's lectures which immediately affects projects, assignments, and quizzes. In my personal opinion lectures should be automatically published immediately, however if a time requirement is really necessary, I would like to suggest from the students perspective that 6 hours would be more appropriate."	This is a particular problem for courses with lectures scheduled on consecutive days AND where the learning is scaffolded such that students need to have followed the first lecture before making sense of the subsequent one. Item 9 provides a general expectation that recordings will be released promptly. Item 15 puts a responsibility on Course Directors to ensure that recordings are released in appropriately. Item 40 specifically addresses the concerns of this submitter and states that recordings may need to be released earlier (within 24 hours).
	24 hours turnaround is good. But even 24 hour uploads can disadvantage students who missed a lecture - if there is a following lecture the next day	
	Release time should not be dropped from 24 hours from 48 owing to extra workload from editing captions: "Also we should not drop the 48 hour release policy down to 24 hours. We have busy schedules of commitments and we need the usual 48 hours to ensure we can edit out anything unintentionally included or offensive in the lecture or requiring editing out for copyright reasons."	Teaching and Learning Quality Committee chose to retain 24 hours as the default setting. Teachers may request a later release - up to 72 hours - but must comply with policy.
Monitoring and applying policy	"What are steps if teachers fail to follow policy?" (query from student forum)	Item 17 specifies that the responsibilities of Associate Deans Learning and Teaching is to ensure that courses adhere to the policy. Item 8 notes that students may use the formal complaints process if they believe that a course is not following this policy.
Supplementary status of recordings	It is good and important that the draft explicitly states: that staff are not expected to adjust teaching style (para 4). that recordings are provided as a supplementary learning resource and are not intended to substitute for in-person attendance (para 5). That is important because reliance on recordings to substitute for in-person attendance results in a greatly inferior learning experience	Items 4 and 6 reaffirm the current policy that teachers are not required to change their teaching and that recordings are considered to be supplementary learning resources, by default.
Reference to specific technologies	"We suggest that references to Panopto be removed; the choice of this piece of software is not relevant at a policy level."	The general point that the 'policy' should be neutral in respect to technologies and apps is well-take; however, the references to 'Panopto' are in the Procedures part only and so are relevant in those items. Nonetheless, the Definition of Panopto has been altered to provide for any future replacement of the app.

Feedback on draft <u>Recording of Taught Content Policy and Procedures</u> in May, 2023

Feedback topic	Detailed comments on draft document (version 2023-04-13). These are anonymised, and in some cases summarised.	Advice on how the comments are addressed in the final policy update (December version)
Typographical error	"There is a typo in paragraph 4 of the policy,..."	This was corrected.
Speaker on video	"The new policy indicates an expectation to have both slides, sound and a video capture of the speaker."	The submitter appears to misunderstand policy and believe that a camera will be on the teacher. This is not the case, and not technically feasible in most recording-enabled rooms.
	Camera on the lecturer - this would be valuable for students if they could see the speakers' facial expressions and body language.	Student reps (at the Student Consultative Group) observed that it would be valuable if the teacher appeared in the video - since this supports students' understanding of their language, and especially any nuances in this. Being able to read lips and facial expressions would be helpful. This is not technically possible currently, and is not provided for in this policy; however it may be something for consideration in the future.
Quality of the technology	Complains about experiences of poor quality recordings owing to equipment and different set-ups in different rooms.	This is not really a policy matter although item 13 identifies that University's responsibility to provide the recording facilities, and item 5 makes teachers responsible for exercising judgement on the quality of recordings in general, and item 18 makes the Lecture Environment Support Unit responsible for technical support.