FACILITATORS GUIDE

Using intervention development approaches to supporting OA

Intervention approaches teach us that to make real changes, approaches need to address the underlying problems. This involves understanding what the difficulties are (from the user perspective), what type of change is needed, and what solution will be most useful. The aim is to work *with* the users to acknowledge how they may engage with something, and strategically help overcome barriers.

The following simplified approach draws on intervention development techniques to give research support staff tools to better understand the areas they are needing to change. By breaking down the topic into its component elements, you can determine the solutions available and choose the most appropriate means to address them. This process supports you to think through:

- What the **problems** are
- What a better situation would look like (**goal**)
- What (and whose) **knowledge, attitudes and processes** would help achieve the goals
- What **activities**/approaches will most effectively produce the changes

The framework is not restrictive, but seeks to help you structure your approach. Intervention development is iterative and focuses on making the clearest sense of the context and how people engage. Use the framework as a support tool not a prescription

Steps

1) Problem setting: List down the problems!

2) Convert the first problem into a positive goal. What would a good situation look like?

3) Consider what changes are needed to achieve this goal. Again, what would a good situation look like?

    a. Knowledge: What needs to be known/understood by who to achieve the goal?
    b. Attitude: What beliefs, values and opinions need to be held by who to achieve the goal?
    c. System: What non-person elements (eg. technical solutions, practical factors) need to be in place to achieve the goal?

4) Consider solutions: what approaches, techniques or strategies can target the particular problem? Remember to look at methods which address the particular problem not just the overall goal

Notes:

- You may not have something for each column change goal column, don’t worry! They may not all be relevant for all problems.
- Keep thinking – you can change, add, break down problems more, add more ideas….
- By the end you should have a clearer strategy for where you want to get to and how. Then go do ☺

NOTES FOR FACILITATORS

Overall: this diagram is a very simplified version of part of an intervention mapping process. The aim is not to shoehorn views into the boxes, but to focus on the process of tackling things that can be changed. Take a problem, break it down into its component parts and work out what a 'change state' looks like (ie. if you did it right, what would it look like!). Undoubtedly participants will jump around the grid, remembering new problems, breaking single problems into multiple components and broadening the map. This is great! The aim is to challenge and openly articulate all the difficulties so you can effectively tackle these. If something really is unchangeable (eg you can't magically produce funds!), then focus on what can be addressed to help resolve the system. You're also focusing on WHO needs to effect change. All of us can only influence in certain directions and so we need to draw on those people who are well placed to play a role. The end result of this process should be a better understanding of how we convert problems into solutions, smartly using processes not just delivering more and bigger training.
.

The only 'rules' are:

a. The only negatively phrased column is 'Problem'
b. When converting the problem to a goal, feel free to challenge it! For instance if one of the cited problems is 'No funding available for OA'. It's unlikely that your solution can be 'Have funding for OA!'. So think about what the goal needs to be. Eg. 'academics to understand that OA does not need funds'
c. All other columns are phrased positively as goals. If people come up with negative things (eg. 'well academics just don't understand…..'), just convert it into the positive version (e.g. acadaemics
d. Actions (methods etc) are decided as a result of understanding the goals. They are not picked and then goals matched!

Facilitative questions:

You can help direct the discussion with questions such as:

- If that's the problem, what does a better version look like?
- What kind of problem is it?
- Are they the most appropriate person
- Who can do that?
- How does that method fit the goal?
- Are there multiple changes needed?
- Are there different levels of change (eg. individual, disciplines, departments, seniorities….?)
- How can we convert that difficulty into a goal?
- What is the change we want to see? *(as separate from)* What is the way to make the change?
- Does that method make the change you want it to?
- Who do you need to endorse this?
- Do you need to need to target messages at more specific groups?

Workshop version

I suggest this is done with post its and flipchart paper / across tables… the steps are followed as above but instead of writing, people can scribble on post its, move them, group them etc….new ideas come on new post its. You get the idea!!

EXAMPLE MAPPING GRID

Problem	Goal (positive phrase)	GOALS OF CHANGE *Knowledge*	*Attitude*	*System / process*	ACTIONS
Academics don't deposit article on acceptance	Academics to self-deposit articles within 3 months of acceptance	Academics know about the HEFCE 3 month ruling for REF eligibility	Academics view depositing within 3 months as the norm	Institutional repository has clear deposit process	Info provision: all staff email, deposit guide, training Changing norm: clear institutional message from leadership and through faculty leads on OA as default System: add new button to dashboard 'deposit here'
Academics unknowingly choose a journal which does not comply with REF embargo periods	Academics to choose a journal which complies with REF panel embargo periods	Academics to know the relevant embargo period and be able to find the embargo information on publisher's websites	Academics to feel it is their role to find embargo information	Embargo checking service available via staff information pages	Add in embargo checking service Clarify roles for checking etc and communicate via training and staff communiques
Lack of translation of library based OA activities to academic community	Library to effectively communicate expertise, services and processes to academic community	Library staff to know what processes/information are needed by academics Library staff to be able to translate material in academically-friendly messages	Library staff to feel it is their role to translate and communicate across the institution Library staff to feel able to engage the academic community	Strong library presence on staff pages to raise awareness and convey expertise	Engage researchers to help translate materials / messages
No funding available for OA	Academics to comply with OA through a mix of Gold and Green routes	Academics to understand Gold vs. Green routes Academics to understand Green is still REF compliant	Academics to understand OA does not always require funding Academics to view Green as acceptable	Clear decision process for obtaining limited institutional Gold funds	University leads to establish clear process to obtain Gold fees when appropriate Comms strategy: Institutional message from leads on OA funding position