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Executive summary

This project was first conceptualised in early 2010 and commenced November 2010 after receiving funding from the former Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC), now the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT).

Since this project began there has been an evolution in the Open Educational Resource (OER) movement. From its early foundations in 2001 with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), the OER movement has evolved from being mainly focused on increasing access to digital educational resources, to being focused on supporting educational practices and promoting quality and innovation in teaching and learning through Open Educational Practices (OEP). Many other developments in higher education have occurred during the lifecycle of this project. Some developments have been closely related to the increased popularity of OER and OEP, such as the formation of several universities’ consortia worldwide to offer free online learning resources (either with paid accredited assessment or not) to an ever diverse and large number of learners (e.g. Massive Open Online Courses – MOOCs).

To date, many universities around the globe have launched Open Educational Resource (OER) projects. Wiley and Gurrell (2009) claim that millions of learners have benefited from learning through OER materials, and many educational institutions, mostly distance education providers, have obtained significant rewards in terms of enhancing their reputations, increasing student enrolment and developing innovative ways to produce distance learning materials. The movement supporting OER and OEP continues to gain momentum at a substantial rate. The rapid global expansion in the availability of quality OER and the development and trialling of a range of OEP is set to change the landscape of higher education globally. New conceptions of delivery, curriculum development, pedagogy and sustainable business have already begun to challenge institutions to quickly consider the implications or run the risk of losing competitive advantage. The philosophy behind the OER movement is “that of making educational materials a common or public good from which all, in theory, can benefit, but most especially those who receive the least benefit from current systems of educational provision, whether publicly or privately funded” (Lane, 2008, p. 149).

Objectives

The major objectives of this project were to:

- raise awareness of OER use and adoption across the higher education sector in Australia;
- undertake an extensive sector survey to uncover the state of play of OER and OEP;
- seek and incorporate feedback of Australian higher education institutions at the National Symposium to inform the development of a Feasibility Protocol; and
- make recommendations to inform and assist the adoption of OER and OEP within higher education in Australia (Feasibility Protocol).

Outputs

The project produced the following:

1. an annotated bibliography, which is a compilation of the 100 most relevant resources for this project (www.zotero.org/groups/oer_in_australia/items);

---

1 This paragraph is derived from Bossu, C., Brown, M., & Bull, D. (2011). Playing catch-up: Investigating public and institutional policies for OER practices in Australia. The Journal of Open, Flexible and Distance Learning, 15(2), 41 – 54. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 License.
2. project findings that uncovered the state of play of OER and the extent to which they have been used or considered for adoption by higher education institutions in Australia;
3. four examples of best practices in OEP;
4. Intellectual Property and Copyright Policy Analysis of higher education institutions in Australia;
5. OER National Symposium; and
6. Feasibility Protocol, which is an instrument to assist and inform institutional decision makers on the adoption of OER and OEP.

The above project outputs can be found, either as stand-alone documents or as part of the full final report, and are freely available for download. All stakeholder groups within the higher education sector in Australia and internationally are encouraged to access these resources and distribute to their professional networks and interested agencies.

Some Project Findings

Project findings, and the approach used to derive them, should have applicability across the sector. From these findings, individual institutions should be able to adapt the resources developed according to their own contexts.

We found that:
• most participants have been aware of the movement and have good knowledge of OER and of the Creative Commons licenses;
• however, the majority of participants have rarely or never used OER;
• interestingly, the majority of them indicated that they would like to get involved in OER activities, and
• the poor use of OER could be due to the fact that OER practices and initiatives have not been included in the current strategic plans of most participating institutions.

OER can be beneficial to individuals and their institutions because:
• they can increase collaboration institutionally and internationally;
• they are aligned with academic traditions of the sharing of knowledge;
• they can save time and avoid duplication of effort;
• they can improve the quality of educational materials;
• they can lead to new pedagogical practices, and
• they can increase access to education and wider participation in higher education across Australia.

However, many challenges still remain due to:
• a lack of interest in creating, but mostly in adopting OER;
• the poor quality of OER resources available;
• insufficient institutional support to encourage and promote the adoption of OER and OEP; and
• copyright and intellectual property policies issues, which were considered by many participants as one of the biggest challenges of OEP and OEP adoption.

Through this project a Feasibility Protocol was developed. This is a valuable instrument aimed at assisting senior executives to make decisions regarding the adoption of OER and OEP, including the issues to consider regarding the opportunities, challenges and strategic directions involving OER. The Feasibility Protocol also prompts questions on the practical issues related to institutional intellectual property and copyright policies while adopting OER. Nevertheless, we would like to highlight that the Feasibility Protocol is not a rigid instrument and can be adapted and further developed to meet individual university needs.
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Part One - Project Overview

Despite the changes and transitions that the OER movement has experienced in the last couple of years, the project’s core structure, including design, objectives and deliverables remained the same. However, the project team identified the need to adapt certain aspects of the project to meet current developments in the field. These adjustments have been greatly beneficial to the project, as the shift from OER to OEP emerged in the project findings. We believe that a narrow focus on OER per se may not be enough for educational institutions to fundamentally embrace and establish effective open pedagogical practices.

Part one of this report presents an outline of the project, including its significance to the higher education sector in Australia, its objectives and deliverables, and the methods and design applied.

Significance of the project

This project was developed to increase understanding and awareness about OER across the higher education sector in Australia and to enable the development of a sector framework for OEP (Feasibility Protocol). The team believes that the findings from this project have the potential to assist institutions to make decisions on the adoption of OER and OEP.

Definitions

We begin our discussion of the research with some definitional matters. What is OER? Since its inception by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in 2002, the term “open educational resources” (UNESCO, 2002) has been re-defined several times to meet the fast evolving pace of the movement and to fit into the diverse range of contexts that it has been applied.

The OER definition that frames this study is the one developed by the OER Foundation:

“Open Educational Resources (OER), are educational materials which are licensed in ways that provide permissions for individuals and institutions to reuse, adapt and modify the materials for their own use. OER can, and do include full courses, textbooks, streaming videos, exams, software, and any other materials or techniques supporting learning” (OER Foundation, 2011).

More specifically, OER might also include the following types of resources:

- **Learning Content**: full courses, courseware, content modules, learning objects, collections and journals;
- **Tools**: software to support the development, use, re-use and delivery of learning content including searching and organisation of content, content and learning management systems, content development tools and on-line learning communities; and
- **Implementation Resources**: these include intellectual property licenses to promote open publishing of materials, design principles of best practice and localisation of content (OECD, 2007, p. 30).

Another important concept to be defined in this study is Open Educational Practices (OEP). According to the Open Educational Quality Initiative (OPAL), “OEP are defined as practices which support the (re)use and production of OER through institutional policies, promote innovative pedagogical models, and respect and empower learners as co-producers on their lifelong learning path” (OPAL, 2011, p. 12).
Research Questions

In order to assist the project team to meet the objectives of this study, three research questions were conceptualised:

- What is the current state of play regarding the adoption of OER in Australian higher education?
- What are the benefits and barriers involved with the adoption of OER and OEP in Australian higher education?
- What are the supporting national and institutional policies available that could encourage the adoption and use of OER and OEP in Australian higher education?

Methods and Design

The project was designed in two phases.

Phase One

The first stage involved a comprehensive literature analysis, which also included the collection of institutional educational policies related to OER (Brown & Bossu, 2011). One of the challenges with OER, due to its evolving nature, was to develop a systematic, transparent and duplicable process for the literature review. It took several attempts and many fruitful discussions during project team meetings to finalise a reliable approach to conducting the search of relevant resources that suited the requirements of this project (Bossu, Brown, & Bull, 2011).

A thorough approach to the literature review should allow others to assess the quality of the work done and enable future replication (Ridley, 2008). An annotated bibliography was compiled as a result of these discussions. It consisted of recent research from the past ten years. Any work older that that was excluded. Indeed, preference was given to research from the past five years unless it was considered seminal in the field. Resources included peer-reviewed journal articles (open and closed), books, conference papers and reports related to OER and OEP. This annotated bibliography database contained 100 key references. Each annotation was peer reviewed by the project team members (further information on the annotated bibliography methodology, please see Appendix B.1). Subsequently, the resulting annotated bibliography has already proven to be a valuable resource for the team members to consult, interrogate and add references to as we progressed through the project (Bossu et al., 2011).

Data collection also took place in the first phase. Two instruments of data collection were developed to assist the project team to answer the research questions; the first was an online survey, and the second was a series of semi-structured interviews (See Appendix B.2 for the survey and interview instruments).

The survey was developed in Qualtrics, which is online survey software that assists researchers to develop, distribute, analyse and report on qualitative and quantitative data. The survey had a total of 33 questions divided into five sections. Initial questions attempted to uncover the respondents’ knowledge and experience with OER and the extent of their institutions’ current involvement in OER initiatives. Later questions explored issues related to the benefits of and barriers to the adoption of OER and the perceived need for both public and institutional policies to facilitate the adoption of OER (Bull, Bossu, & Brown, 2011).

The survey was followed by a series of interviews conducted amongst a wide range of stakeholders. The interview instrument was designed following a similar framework to the survey. Semi-structured interviews were conducted to generate the data needed to inform this study, as they allowed the use of a more flexible interview guide and develop prompts and probes while interviews evolved (B. Johnson & Turner, 2003; Minichiello, Aroni, & Hays, 2003; Turner, Minichiello, Aroni & Hays, 2003).
The interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed. The identity and personal and professional information provided by participants were protected at all times during this study. Participants were chosen via purposive sampling, which assisted the project team to gather richer insights through critical and in-depth information to the investigation (Minichiello et al., 2008). The Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) of the University of New England has approved this project and the methods of data collection and analysis (See Appendix B.3 for the HREC approval).

A mixed-method approach, predominantly qualitative, but supported by quantitative data, was adopted for data collection and analysis (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). Data analysis was an ongoing process. Thematic analysis was used to support and confirm themes and concepts identified in the literature, as well as those that emerged during data collection. Thematic analysis assisted the project team to identify patterns and to reduce and refine the data into themes in order to facilitate interpretation “as an inductive inquiry” (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 5). A preliminary data analysis summary was sent to the project’s reference group, which was a group of four “critical friends” experts in the field of OER. This process built upon the validation and trustworthiness of the data, as well as adopting powerful instruments for community and team collaboration.

Phase Two

In phase two, the findings of stage one provided the basis of a National Symposium, which was a one-day event held in Sydney on 31 August 2012. Forty-one participants attended the Symposium. They represented 21 different national and international institutions, including higher educational institutions, TAFE, and government bodies. The Symposium was not only a key dissemination point for this project, but it was also an opportunity for gathering insights and feedback from a diverse range of stakeholders across the higher education sector in Australia on the draft of the Feasibility Protocol.

There were several activities organised for the one-day Symposium; one of the most important ones was the group discussion (See Appendix B.4 for the full program).

The participants were randomly allocated to four groups and each group was responsible for discussing one aspect of the Feasibility Protocol. The different aspects of the Feasibility Protocol were:

- opportunities in OER;
- challenges;
- strategic directions; and
- policy analysis

The goal of this activity was to provide specific feedback on the relevant aspect of the draft protocol on the following three issues:

- characteristics that were viewed positively but could be further developed or strengthened;
- characteristics that were not viewed positively, or where there were errors or inappropriate statements or questions, which ought be revised; and
- relevant issues that have not been addressed and which could be useful additions to the text.

Each group had a facilitator, who was responsible for providing motivation, support and encouragement to the group in addressing the above issues and to note the responses of the group. Feedback collected during the group discussions and other activities of the Symposium were incorporated in the final version of the Feasibility Protocol, which will be discussed in detail in Part four.
Examples of Best Practice

One of the project deliverables was to develop four Examples of Best Practices in OER and OEP. The Examples of Best Practices are OpenLearn Initiative (Open University – UK), Otago Polytechnic (New Zealand), Catalonia Open University (Spain), and Athabasca University (Canada). A rationale for choosing these examples was that these were successful cases of OEP adoption at the time of this project. Also, the project team believed that these institutions represented a diverse range of educational providers located in different countries and continents. Thus they also represented different cultures and issues in relation to the adoption of OEP.

The Examples of Best Practice were uncovered through desktop research and were a direct result of the availability of open access to various websites and documents on the web. Hence we discovered that there is a direct relation between what each institution aimed to do and the possibility of producing open resources.

‘Openness’ was conceived in terms of freely available resources that enabled this research. It was an indication of what could be done within an educational research environment that is committed to collaboration and dissemination of information and insight (the Examples of Best Practice are available in Appendix B.5).

Intellectual Property and Copyright Policy Analysis

The Intellectual Property and Copyright Policy Analysis was also a deliverable of this project. A summary of the outputs and findings resulting from this analysis are presented in Part Four of this report, where we present and discuss the Feasibility Protocol. The significant contributions of this analysis to this study can be found in the “Policies Analysis” aspect of the Feasibility Protocol.

The full report of the policy analysis is available in Appendix B.6. This provides an overview of the key intellectual property rights and licensing considerations in OER. In preparing this document, the online, available intellectual property policies of Australian universities were reviewed to assess how these documents currently address the ownership of content created and developed by university employees.

This policy analysis offers recommendations to assist decision makers and managers at Australian universities to develop policies and processes, which support university and individual engagement in OER.

The project team would like to emphasise that this policy analysis is an informative document and does not provide legal advice to readers. Desktop research was also conducted to gather the publicly available policies used in this analysis. Feedback and validation of this resource was sought through a peer review process. Further suggestions from stakeholders were also collated at the OER National Symposium held in Sydney in August 2012 and implemented.

Linkages

In addition to publications, conference presentations and attendances, linkages with the following national and international organisations were maintained. Some of these organisations were project partners, others were members of the reference group and other linkages were developed as the project progressed.

- Athabasca University (Canada)
- Commonwealth of Learning (Canada)
- Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (Spain)
• University of Leicester (UK)
• Otago Polytechnic (New Zealand)
• OER Foundation (New Zealand)
• Massey University (New Zealand)
• Southern Queensland University
• University of Tasmania
• University of Canberra
• WikiEducator, OER, OERU - Discussion Forums
Part Two – Reflecting on the Literature

This section highlights some of the most relevant issues and developments in the OER movement since its birth in 2001.

OER represents an emerging movement that is re-shaping learning and teaching in higher education worldwide. The growth of the open educational trend “is a response to the rising costs of education, the desire for accessing learning in areas where such access is difficult, and an expression of student choice about when and how to learn” (L. Johnson, Levine, Smith, & Stone, 2010, p. 6). Also, OER has the potential to meet the growing demand for higher education worldwide, and to close the gap between formal, non-formal and informal education (Kanwar, Kodhandaraman, & Umar, 2010; Pereira, 2007). The OER movement “is a technology-empowered effort to create and share educational content on a global level” (Caswell, Henson, Jensen, & Wiley, 2008, p. 2).

Currently, many universities around the globe have launched OER projects. Many learners from all walks of life have benefited from learning through OER materials, and many educational institutions, including distance education providers, have obtained significant rewards in terms of enhancing their reputations, increasing student enrolment and developing innovative ways to produce distance learning materials (Wiley & Gurrell, 2009).

However, the OER movement still faces many challenges. Part two highlights some the first OER initiatives and then explores the wide range of OER available to learners currently. After that, we will discuss the transition that the OER moment has undergone will be discussed and some of the policy development that has taken place globally and in Australia will be presented. This section will finish by exploring some of the benefits and challenges of the OER movement.

OER in Perspective

Tracing History

The early work of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in establishing the OpenCourseWare Consortium (OCWC) in 2001 has produced perhaps the most widely recognised open content repository. Another important development was the OpenLearn initiative, launched in 2006 by the Open University (OU). This initiative aimed to engage and support learners through the adoption of Web 2.0 technologies (Bossu & Tynan, 2011). The OpenLearn together with the development in the Media-wiki platforms enabled users worldwide to build their learning communities, develop a wide range of new learning resources through co-authoring and also through adapting and sharing old ones. Learners and institutions can re-contextualised and repackage learning resources according to learners’ specific needs (Bossu et al., 2011). The rapid advance of technologies, including Web 2.0 technologies, and the increased access to the Internet worldwide in the last decade, provided an optimal environment for OER to prosper.

Scratching the Surface

Currently, there is a whole range of OER initiatives, projects and repositories available². From openly licensed videos (YouTube), photographs (Flickr) and open textbooks (Open Textbook Catalog, Flatworld Knowledge), to Learning Management Systems (Xerte), full courses (Khan Academy, P2PU) and lectures (Lecturefox), authoring and sharing applications (LeMill), to repositories of academic and government publications (OER Knowledge Cloud, Zotero) and Open Access Journals (DOAJ), and much more. There are also major OER

² See Part Six for the web links of the OER initiatives presented in this paragraph.
initiatives in every single continent in the world:\(^3\):

- **Africa:** Teacher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa (TESSA) program, OER@AVU, OER Africa
- **Europe:** JISC/HEA OER Programme, JorumOpen, The Open Educational Quality Initiative (OPAL), OpenEd
- **America:** Open Course Library (OCL), MERLOT, Connections
- **Oceania:** OERNZ and OER university
- **Asia:** OER Asia, Fullbright Economic Teaching Program OCW (Vietnam), Japan OCW, China OCW.

OER initiatives have not only increased in numbers, they have also evolved theoretically and ideologically. One example of this evolution is the Open Educational Practice programs discussed below.

**Towards Open Practice**

The growing diversity of OER initiatives coupled with better understanding of the limitations of open content, without open practices, has given rise to an important shift in thinking in the field. An early example of this shift was the Open Educational Quality Initiative (OPAL), an international network to support and promote Open Educational Practices (OEP). The project concluded that OEP have potential to lead to more open pedagogical practices and innovative cultures. In other words, a narrow focus on OER per se may not be enough for educational institutions to fundamentally embrace and establish effective open pedagogical practices.

The principles that underpin OEP developed by OPAL and adapted to this study are as follows (OPAL, 2011, p. 12):

- OEP are based on OER;
- OEP embraces open learning strategies;
- learning and teaching quality improvement;
- change of educational cultures; and
- OER as a value proposition for institutions.

The above principles, combined with the other important concepts of the study, form the basis of discussions in this report.

Despite the growing consensus that resources alone might not be enough to provide learners with a full learning experience, and might not be robust enough for institutional OER initiatives to prosper, most OER initiatives still remain predominately repositories of content. Also, while some initiatives, such as the OCWC, compile annual statistics on the number of hits on particular OER, there is a lack of solid and publically available data on the extent of the impact of these resources on learning. However, OER have continued to evolve and been morphed into other developments in education, particularly in higher education.

**Some recent developments**

The change from open content to open practices has not been the only shift that has occurred recently in the OER landscape. In the last couple of years we have also seen an increase in popularity of the Prior Learning Assessment Recognition (PLAR) and assessment for accredited learning through the use of OER, so students can demonstrate to employers

---

\(^3\) See Part Six for web links of the OER initiatives presented in the paragraph above.
that they have completed the studies and acquired the skills needed to perform a certain job or task. In most cases, students have access to free online resources, but pay a small fee to undertake the assessment.

Another recent development in OER and OEP, and which is impacting dramatically on the higher education landscape globally as we write this report, is the Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and its derivatives cMOOCs and xMOOCs (Daniel, 2012). “MOOCs are courses available for free and online from some of the world’s best known universities” (Wappett, 2012). MOOCs have attracted thousands of students from all over the world wanting to experience and learn from these leading universities. Universities worldwide have then realised the potential of MOOCs to attract students, to showcase their courses and to profit from it through coupling MOOCS with assessing learning (Caudill, 2012). As a result:

MOOCs herald a new era in online provision of education. Several of the world’s leading universities have forged alliances: edX is an alliance between MIT, Harvard and UC Berkley; while Coursera, established by Stanford University, has partnered with 33 other universities to offer MOOCs to mass audiences... Here in Australia, in rapid response to these developments, there have been recent announcements by both the University of Queensland, who see their MOOCs initiative as an integral component of their blueprint for technology enhanced learning, and Melbourne University, who has entered into a partnership agreement with Coursera, to commence the offering of MOOCs (Bull, 2012, p. 10).

However, it is important to clarify that the assessments undertaken by MOOCs activities are in their majority certificates of accomplishment, not university credentials. Thus, learners do not receive a Harvard or MIT degree from EdX. Also, Coursera and Udacity, which is another popular consortium of this kind, are not OER initiatives as per the definition of the project report (please see page 5 and 6). They provide tuition-free learning opportunities, but the course materials cannot be reused, revised, remixed and redistributed. Even so, these initiatives do demonstrate the demand and interest worldwide in free learning opportunities.

Another important OER development of this nature is the OER university (OERu). Supported by the OER Foundation, an independent, not for profit organisation, OERu is rapidly moving to establish a strategic international alliance between institutional members of the Foundation. The philanthropic approach underpinning the OERu collaboration enables the partners’ institution to mix a financial model with radical openness to build new educational value. In other words, OERu has the potential to offer “fee” free learning, combined with open source content and credible degrees⁴. This will generate a new value proposition for publicly-funded higher education institutions. It will shift the question from how to achieve sustainable OER projects to how institutions will remain sustainable without OER?

OER Policies

Some of the well established OER initiatives and projects (like OCWC and OpenLearn) reflect more than a decade of institutional and national investment and policies and guidelines developed by the institutions, countries and funding bodies they originated from. The United States (US), the United Kingdom (UK) and New Zealand are examples of where investment and development have already taken place. These countries already have in place national government frameworks for open access and licensing, which enables the access of government resources for re-using through the Creative Commons licenses, which

⁴ This paragraph is derived from the OER-university discussion forum publically accessible at https://groups.google.com/forum/#!hl=en#!%3Den&fromgroups#!forum/oer-university, posted on 15th Nov 2012, 12:18pm by Wayne Mackintosh.
have become the standard licences for OER (See Appendix B.6 for a comprehensive guideline on Creative Commons licenses). These governments appear to believe that opening up their resources and works for re-use will promote more open and transparent government. They appear to be acknowledging the benefits of leveraging taxpayer funded educational developments for the benefit of a much wider audience (Kanwar et al., 2010).

In addition, it is believed that institutional level OER and OEP initiatives have higher chances of succeeding and expanding in countries where support was provided at the national level (Carey, 2011). Other national policy developments in the US and the UK have the creation of substantial funding to support open access initiatives in the higher education sector, including community colleges (Carey, 2011). This funding is mostly in the form of small and large-scale grants that are awarded to individual institutions upon submission of projects for developing OER, and thus, encouraging the establishment of OEP (Ehlers, 2011). Such investment has resulted in a large number of resources and growing collection of reports, journal articles, case studies, guidelines and frameworks for OER and OEP (JISC, 2011). Some of these resources can also be found at the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) website (e.g. Guidelines for open educational resources (OER) in higher education and the OER Paris Declaration, which recognises the need of a national level framework or regulations for OER).

OER Initiatives in Australia

In Australia, the willingness to share educational resources first started in the Vocational Education and Training (VET) and the school sectors more than a decade ago, as well as in Technical and Further Education (TAFE) institutions (Browne, 2009). As for the higher education sector, some of the most popular OER initiatives that have emerged are:

- The Macquarie E-Learning Centre of Excellence (MELCOE), with Macquarie University, which specialises in developing open source software tools and open standards for e-learning (OECD, 2007);
- The University of Southern Queensland OCWC, which remains the only Australian member of the OpenCourseWare Consortium (Bull et al., 2011);
- USQ, and more recently the University of Wollongong, which are the only two Australian universities members of the OER university initiative (Thompson, 2011);
- The “Learning to Teach Online” Project with the College of Fine Arts (COFA), at The University of New South Wales (UNSW). This project has developed quality video and text resources to assist educators to teach online (COFAonline, 2012);
- The University of Canberra’s “RecentChangesCamp2012”; an annual meeting of interested Open Space. This free gathering has taken place for the third time in Australia and is focused on wikis and online collaborative practices. “The aims of these events are to draw together people interested in worldwide iterative knowledge involvement or wikis, to discuss and share knowledge, and eat and socialise in a friendly face to face setting” (RCC2012, 2012);
- “EducationLinX.com” led by the University of New England, in partnership with seven other Australian universities, is a content management system aiming to provide an online space for users (students and teachers) to plan, develop and share learning resources including assessment strategies and tools and join in the various forums, discussions and conversations in teacher education;
- Another University of New England’s initiative, also in partnership with other Australian universities, is the “Rethinking Law Curriculum” project. Its primary purpose was to develop strategies within the undergraduate law curriculum to prepare lawyers for legal careers in rural and regional areas, namely through the development of a new curriculum which could be undertaken by students to ‘sensitise’ them to the realities of rural and regional legal practice, and to better prepare them to work and live in rural and regional communities; and
The University of Tasmania’s “Adapt Project”, which is focused on the development of a repository of OER “to enhance learning and teaching in Adaptation studies. The project is led by staff from the University of Tasmania, in partnership with Monash University, The University of Queensland and The University of Western Australia” (Adapt, 2012). Also, several Australian universities have released some of their teaching materials through iTunesU. Others have created repositories of learning objects. Unfortunately, some of these repositories can only be accessed by the universities’ staff and students. Even though some of these repositories and the above initiatives support the Creative Commons license, very few allow for redesigning and repurposing of the content, which therefore limits the value of these resources.

OER users should have the opportunity to rework them and produce new OER that can in turn be shared and given back to other users and learners (Wiley, 2009). This is a key point as at a deeper level the OER movement is predicated on the philosophical belief that online materials should be open for repurposing and reuse.

Policy Developments in Australia
In addition to the institutional initiatives mentioned above, there have been programs and policy developments at the governmental level in Australia. For example:

- The Australian Government’s Open Access and Licensing Framework (AusGOAL), which provides a set of guidelines “to government and related sectors to facilitate open access to publicly funded information” (AusGOAL, 2011, para. 1).
- The Australian National Data Service (ANDS), which is a database containing research resources from research institutions in Australia (ANDS, 2011).
- The Guide to Open Source Software for Australian Government Agencies, which is a policy that requires that government agencies first consider open source software options when requesting tenders (Gray, 2011).
- Government 2.0, which is an Australian government initiative focused on the “use of technology to encourage a more open and transparent form of government, where the public has a greater role in forming policy and has improved access to government information” (Australian Government, 2012, para. 1).

Despite the fact that the above Australian government developments are on par with a number of developments in the UK, the US, New Zealand and also in some European countries (Helsper, 2011), they are mostly concentrated on government agencies. However, there have been some promising developments and policy reviews (intellectual property and copyright policies) have taken place in some Australian universities recently (See Appendix B.6 for a full summary of the current state of these policies). But, more needs to be done if the Australian government wishes to take advantage of the benefits of open educational resources and practices, it will need to adopt strategies that take this movement out of the shadows and place it in a more prominent position within the educational mainstream. Such strategies could assist the government to increase participation and access to education to a more diverse student cohort, particularly working adults and those residing in rural and remote locations of Australia (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent, & Scales, 2008). However, despite the potential advantages of OER, many challenges remain. Some benefits and challenges of the OER movement are discussed next.
Advantages and Challenges of OER

Advantages
Research shows that OER brings many benefits to educational institutions, educators and traditional and non-traditional learners. At institutional levels, OER can assist to reduce costs, improve quality and bring innovation to traditional educational material (Caswell et al., 2008), thus, assisting senior managers and educational leaders to lead in the current climate of change across the higher education landscape worldwide. OER can also be used as a marketing tool by making educational resources publically available on the Internet. Other reasons why institutions should consider OER for teaching and learning are:

- they are in line with academic traditions of sharing knowledge and are a good thing to do;
- they enable institutions to give something back to taxpayers by allowing free sharing and reuse of resources;
- it is good for the institution’s public relations to have an OER project as a showcase for attracting new students; and
- open sharing will speed up the development of new learning resources, stimulate internal improvement, innovation and reuse and help the institution to keep good records of materials and their internal and external use (OECD, 2007, p. 11).

Educators in general can also take advantage of OER. They can have access to a growing range of resources that can be built and/or used to update and revise existing learning content (Bossu & Tynan, 2011; Caswell et al., 2008). Most importantly, OER can assist educators to reduce teaching preparation time, avoid duplication and concentrate their efforts on making students’ learning a more rewarding experience (L. Johnson et al., 2010; Willems & Bossu, 2012). Nevertheless, formal and informal learners can gain the most advantage from the adoption and use of OER because they are accessible; provide learners with flexibility to study anywhere and anytime; at no or low costs; and have the potential to contribute to informal, non-formal and formal education (Bossu & Tynan, 2011; Kanwar et al., 2010; Panke, 2011; Schuwer & Mulder, 2009). Other benefits for learners are the interaction with content and the sharing of knowledge with other learners, “following personal learning goals and encountering different points of view” (Panke, 2011, p. 5).

In addition, OER can also be used by a whole range of professionals and their employers across different areas as free resources for professional development (Bossu & Tynan, 2011), as well as by governments to meet their current political agendas (Bossu, Bull, & Brown, 2012).

Even though OER has the potential to benefit a whole range of stakeholders, from institutions to both formal and informal learners, the impact of OER on the higher education sector is not fully understood yet. In fact, research has shown that little is known about how teachers and learners use, repurpose and interact with OER (Panke, 2011). What is known, however, is that both educators and learners appear to have a limited understanding of OER for teaching and learning, whether formal or informal (Conole & Weller, 2008; Panke, 2011).

Challenges
A limited understanding of OER at the level of teaching and learning is not the only challenge that the OER movement faces. Despite the continued growth, success and evident benefits of the OER movement, a range of issues remains unresolved. Some of these issues have existed since the early stages of the movement and are widely discussed in the OER literature. Other issues have emerged recently, as the movement matures and evolves.

Some challenges at an institutional level include copyright and intellectual property policies and a lack of awareness regarding OER. Institutional barriers also include a lack of incentives from institutions for staff and their use and development of OER (Atkins, Brown, &
Hammond, 2007; Bossu & Tynan, 2011; Wiley & Gurrell, 2009). In addition, issues “regarding quality control, whether or not to support translation and localisation of resources, how to facilitate access for students with disabilities, and technical issues” need to be considered when developing an OER initiative. (Bossu & Tynan, 2011, p. 261).

Many, however, believe that the sustainability of OER initiatives is perhaps the most significant issue for educational institution. Despite the fact that several sustainability models have been developed and discussed in the literature to date, there is no evidence yet of their successes. (Dholakai, King, & Baraniuk, 2006; Downes, 2007; Humbert, Rébillard, & Rennard, 2008; Lane, 2008; Schuwer & Mulder, 2009; Smith & Wang, 2007). As Smith and Wang (2007) point out, for an OER initiative to be sustainable in the long term it needs to create value for the host institution.

Some of the key challenges faced by academics in terms of the use and repurposing of OER include an evident lack of understanding regarding copyright and intellectual property issues, and where to find quality and relevant resources (Bossu & Tynan, 2011). For those who are more familiar with the licenses applied to OER, the adoption of OER into traditional educational contexts would still require academics to “pay attention to a layer of their instruction beyond what is simply pedagogically sound” (Caswell et al., 2008, p. 8).

The not-invented-here syndrome is another problem, as some believe that “material developed or chosen by someone else is commonly judged to be inferior” (McGreal, 2010, p. 3).

As for learners, contextual barriers can pose a substantial challenge to the adoption of OER due to different students needs and capabilities (Kanwar et al., 2010; Willems & Bossu, 2012). Additionally, adequate access to Internet connection, computer skills and relevant OER are all challenges faced by many learners worldwide (Willems & Bossu, 2012). For an OER project to be successful the above issues must be taken into account.

In Part two, we have explored the early foundations of the OER movement and then some of the latest initiatives, including the transition from OER to OEP, and more recently MOOCs. We also highlighted that despite the fact that there are advantages in adoption OER, many challenges still need to be overcome. Some of these advantages and challenges are also evident in the Australian higher education, as shown by the project findings, which are discussed next.
Part Three – Findings

This section discusses the project findings, mostly via data gathered through the online survey and interviews.

Sampling

An online survey was distributed to all major higher education organisation mailing lists in the Australasian region. Individual emails with an invitation to answer the survey were also sent to PVCs/DVCs at all Australian universities and to team member professional contacts and networks. The survey resulted in 100 valid responses from across 30 universities (out of the 39 universities) in Australia. Four other tertiary institutions also responded to the survey. The high participation rates across the sector meant that all Australian states and territories were represented in this study. The sample also has a good representation of university stakeholder groups, from senior executives to managers, educators, curriculum designers, professional developers, library professionals and copyright officers. There was also a balanced gender distribution amongst the respondents: 47% male and 52% female. Figure 1 shows all stakeholders who participated in the survey.

![Figure 1: Number of stakeholders who answered the survey](image)

From the 100 survey respondents, 24 offered to be interviewed. The 24 interview participants were from 18 different Australian institutions. The table below shows the stakeholder groups who participated in the interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder groups</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copyright officer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator (teacher, lecturer, tutor or trainer)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technologist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Manager or Administrator</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive (eg. DVC, PVC)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional / curriculum designer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents’ knowledge and adoption of OER

The first questions of the survey and interview instruments sought information regarding participants’ awareness, knowledge, use and their involvement in OER initiatives. Question four asked the respondents how long they have been aware of the Open Educational Resources concept. A reasonable number of survey respondents have been aware of the OER movement for two to five years (42%), while 27% have been aware for five to ten years (please see Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Respondents awareness of Open Educational Resources](image)

Respondents were also asked (question five) to rate their knowledge of OER. As can be seen in Figure 3, most respondents (51%) believe that they have an intermediate knowledge of OER. In the interviews, respondents’ level of understanding of OER group was also high, but it must be taken into account that the sample was obtained from volunteers who were comfortable to be questioned about issues surrounding OER. Thus, this level of understanding was to be expected.

![Figure 3: Respondents’ knowledge of OER](image)

Despite the high levels of awareness and good knowledge of OER shown above, the majority of respondents have rarely or never used, developed and/or re-purposed OER, as presented in Figure 4.
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Figure 4: Frequency in which respondents use, develop and/or re-purpose OER

On the other hand, most interviewees (62%) declared that they have used OER for both personal and professional purposes. It was of interest to note that this usage was not widely adopted in their institutions. Very few interviewees made their resources available, and even fewer specifically created OER. Most respondents were aware of only a handful of colleagues using OER within their institutions. When asked what they thought were the main concerns of those people not using OER, the main responses were potential loss of intellectual property and fear of exposure.

As for those who have adopted OER, learning objects have been the most preferred type of resources applied in teaching and learning (72%), followed by parts of units or modules (28%) available, particularly those focused on the respondents’ teaching subjects. Question 25 asked respondents the extent to which they agree with the following statements regarding their involvement in OER activities and collaboration.

As shown in Figure 5, most respondents declared that they are not involved in collaborative OER initiatives either nationally or internationally. However, they indicated that they would like to be involved in OER activities in the future if the opportunity arises.

Figure 5: Respondents involvement in OER activities and collaboration
The lack of adoption and participants’ involvement in such activities could be due to the fact that OER practices and initiatives were not included in the current strategic plans of most participating institutions, as demonstrated in Figure 7. The following section discusses further issues regarding institutional commitments to OER and projects and initiatives.

Institutional Commitment to OER

Later survey questions sought information on the commitment of participating institutions to the OER movement, the existence of institutional policies and incentives to the adoption of OER. Question nine asked respondents whether their institution has a current OER project or initiative. The answers were fairly balanced as 36% of the respondents declared that their institutions had some form of OER initiative, while 32% of the institutions did not have and 32% of respondents did not know if their institutions had any OER initiative at the time of this study. Respondents were also asked to identify the levels of commitment of their institutions to the OER movement. Only six institutions were very committed. However, 36 institutions were partially committed and 28 respondents were not aware of their institutional commitment to OER. Twenty-six respondents declare that their institutions are not committed at all, as presented in Figure 6.

![Figure 6: Institutional commitment to OER](image)

In terms of institutional strategic directions, only 15% of the respondents declared that their institutions include OER practices and initiatives in to current strategic planning. The majority of respondents (36%), however, mentioned that they did not know, while 30% believed that their institutions did not include any OER activities in to the strategic plans (please see Figure 7).
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Policy support and development

Participants believed that government policies are necessary to regulate the adoption of OER in Australia and that dedicated OER public policies could encourage the growth, development and institutional adoption of open educational resources and practices across the sector in Australia. Please see Figure 8, which presents the answers of question 17, where respondents were asked to rate statements regarding the need of government policies for OER in Australia.

![Figure 8: The need of government policies for OER in Australia](image)

Even though the efforts of some individual OER initiatives have succeeded at the institutional level in Australia, as mentioned in the literature section of this report, the movement has expanded faster and more effectively in countries where support was provided at the national level. Particularly in Australia, this support could come in the form of more flexible policies. According to respondents, the Australian government should also support higher educational institutions through grants or financial awards to encourage the development of OER (Bossu, et al., 2011).
As for institutional policies, they were considered an important factor to promote the effective use and adoption of OER. As shown in Figure 9, respondents believed that educational institutions should develop policies and activities to promote OER awareness and to clarify issues related to intellectual property and quality assurance. Institutions should also promote and recognise OER initiatives. This was also true in studies undertaken in Europe and other parts of the world (OECD, 2007; OPAL, 2011). In fact, many have alerted institutional policy-makers of the existing institutional strategies to the adoption of OER, and that these strategies could be implemented through appropriate internal regulations and guidelines (Atkins, et al., 2007; Downes, 2007; Kanwar, et al., 2010). For more information on intellectual property and copyright policies of Australian universities, please go to Appendix B.6.

Figure 9: Important factors for the effective use of OER at institutional levels
Use of Creative Common Licenses

Question 14 asked respondents whether their institutions make use of Creative Commons (CC) License. As can be seen in Figure 10, the majority of respondents answered “Yes”.

Figure 10: Institutions’ use of Creative Commons Licence

Further questions on licensing asked respondents which open license they have used before. Most respondents declared that they use Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY). This license lets others distribute, remix, tweak, and build upon your work, even commercially, as long as they credit you for the original creation. This is the most accommodating of licenses offered. Recommended for maximum dissemination and use of licensed materials (CC BY 3.0 Australia from http://creativecommons.org/licenses/).

Figure 11: Open licences used by respondents

Likewise, most of interviewees (with the exception of two) were aware of the CC licenses. The findings related to the use of CC licenses were very positive and controversial at the same time, as the majority of Australian universities claim copyright ownership over content. It could be that many university employees from various institutions were using these licenses, but these practices were not formally endorsed, or were not specified within...
Benefits of OER

In terms of the benefits that OER can bring to education and training in Australia, the majority (top five responses) of survey respondents’ views were that:

- OER has the potential to increase collaboration within an institution and internationally;
- OER are well aligned with academic traditions of sharing of knowledge;
- Educators can save time and avoid duplication of effort;
- OER can improve the quality of educational materials; and
- OER helps to enhance quality of teaching and learning in higher education.

Also, respondents believed that OER use is a catalyst for institutional innovation (61) and that the use of OER has the potential to lead to new pedagogical practices (58) within higher education institutions in Australia.

Interview responses reflected similar trends. Interviewees pointed out (62%) that social improvements and “access to education for all” are potential benefits of OER. Other benefits identified by respondents include increasing efficiency in time and/or money (50%) and improvement of the quality of teaching resources (42%). They stated that teaching materials undergoing a review process could only improve in quality. Increasing collaboration was also mentioned by over a third of the respondents as another benefit of OER (37%).

Here are some typical quotes to validate the discussion above:

“It could provide a built-in quality assurance model. I mean people don’t want to put their name to crap, so if they’re going to create it, they’re going to create it to be reviewed by
Their peers, so it’s going to be good.” (Educator)

“I’m excited about the prospect of sharing resources with other academics and other faculties within Australia and overseas. I think that not only encourages better collaboration, encourages a new way of thinking for academics.” (Educator)

“The total would be much greater than the sum of its parts.” (Manager)

Challenges of OER

When asked to indicate the potential barriers to the use of OER survey respondents pointed out that the lack of interest in creating and using OER and poor quality of OER were considered as important factors by the majority of them. Respondents also identified that insufficient institutional support, and the lack of institutional policies to address OER developments, as barriers to the growth of the OER movement, amongst other barriers (please see figure 13).

Similarly, common barriers to OER use, identified by the interview participants, were issues related to intellectual property policies and the lack of a national framework to support OER policy development. Problems surrounding quality and difficulties in changing academic culture were among the other significant barriers identified.
It is interesting to notice that while some participants believed that OER has the potential to improve the quality of educational resources and learning and teaching broadly, other participants were concerned that some OER available are of poor quality. One participant in particular, clarified that this concerned might be a fear of exposure, as described in the following quote:

“One concern is that openness obviously exposes poor practice and you won’t find many people admitting to that concern but I daresay it is a major concern.” (Educator)

When questioned further, participants stated that limited funding and discoverability of OER were considered to be the other major challenges. Several of the respondents suggested that the development of a standardised metadata for OER and/or a national or institutional repository would assist with the discoverability issue. In fact, 70% of the interviewees believed that OER could be more widely used within universities if appropriate support regarding where to find quality OER, and how to use them adequately, were to be provided. Implementing some sort of recognition for those who use/create OER was also identified by 33% as a way to encourage the adoption of OER, followed by the development of policies.

The following quotes illustrate the discussion above and were common amongst those participants:

“So if I knew there was somebody who was the “go-to person” to ask that would be helpful.” (Educator)

“…someone able to tell staff and teach them about licensing and give them options and all the other little things that you would need to do to embed it [OER] and embrace it more fully.” (Director)

Part three discussed the project findings gathered through the online survey and interviews. According to these findings, it is clear there are similarities between related studies undertaken elsewhere and previously explored in Part two of this report. It was of interest to find similar levels of awareness and knowledge regarding OER, OEP and the use of the Creative Common licenses across all stakeholders groups. However, it is evident that much more can be done if government bodies and educational institutions were able to develop the appropriate set of policies and provide the support required for academic staff to make successful use of these free resources through a more open practice.
Part Four – The Feasibility Protocol

This section presents the Feasibility Protocol, which is a set of guiding principles that prompts questions and raises issues that should be considered by universities and tertiary institutions wishing to take advantage of OER and OEP. More specifically the protocol aims to assist senior executive, managers and policy makers to make informed decisions about the adoption of OER and OEP at several levels within their institution. Even though we are aware that the introduction of OER and OEP into mainstream higher education in Australia could have not only a global impact on the sector (e.g. meeting some of the Paris OER Declaration recommendations), but could also impact on small and isolated communities, as well as individuals outside the university sphere, this study is focused primarily on the higher education sector.

The Feasibility Protocol was first conceptualised based on the body of knowledge available in time when the project was developed in early 2010. Figure 14 represents the last version of the Feasibility Protocol, which has been informed by this project’s data analysis, mostly by the interviews with key stakeholders, and current works in the field. The Feasibility Protocol prompts questions on four aspects (please see Figure 14). These aspects are:

- the Opportunities involved with the adoption of OER and OEP;
- factors related to the Challenges associated with the adoption of OER and OEP;
- Strategic Directions that need to be considered for an effective adoption of OER and OEP; and
- intellectual property (IP) Policy Analysis of higher education institutions in Australia.

With the exception of the Policy Analysis, the other aspects of the protocol are subdivided into three levels: the first level is focused on the higher education sector, the second level is related to organisational issues and the third concentrates on individual levels, including staff and students within educational organisations. As for the Policies Analysis, it is focused on organisational, project and individual levels. Next, the aspects of the Feasibility Protocol are discussed in detail.

Figure 14: The Feasibility Protocol
Thinking about the Opportunities

In keeping with previous work, this research shows that OER and OEP bring many opportunities to educational institutions, educators and traditional and non-traditional learners. At an institutional level, OER and OEP can assist to reduce costs, improve quality and bring innovation to traditional educational practices (Caswell et al., 2008; Ehlers, 2011). Here are some questions and issues for stakeholders to consider in order to take full advantage of the opportunities that OER might bring.

For the higher education sector level:
- To what extent could OEP assist to bridge the gap between formal and informal education?
- Would OEP be able to support the diverse student cohort across the higher education sector in Australia (e.g. remote and rural students, adult and distance learners and national, international, refugee, imprisoned etc. students)?
- Would OEP play an important role in positioning the Australian higher education sector in the global stage (e.g. by adopting the 2012 Paris OER Declaration and other related declarations)?

At an organisational level:

Reputation...
- To what extent can OEP be considered a potential vehicle for the institution to market and showcase its educational content, raise the international profile and attract more students?

Collaboration...
- How could OEP provide an opportunity for national and international collaboration with other universities and cooperation with many different stakeholders?

Increase access...
- How does the adoption of OEP align with the institution’s agendas for social inclusion and widening participation?

Innovation...
- How can OEP help to create economies of scale by more efficient content production in terms of time and money (e.g. avoid “reinventing the wheel” and the replication of content)?
- How can OEP help to promote innovations and quality in teaching and learning?

At individual levels:

Academic staff
- Would the adoption of OEP increase collegial and subject level collaboration?
- Could OEP be a vehicle for a “quality agenda [translated into] better teaching”?
- Would OEP add value and enrich my teaching experiences?
- Could OER and OEP create efficiency in content development?
- How could OEP create more opportunities for learning?
- To what extent would the adoption of OEP enhance existing pedagogical approaches to learning and provide the basis for new ones?

As for the Students, the opportunities from the adoption of OEP could be:
- To enhance learning through networked and collaborative learning
- To promote richer learning experiences through the access to learning resources available outside intuitional boundaries
- To meet students’ different needs and learning styles
- To promote and enhance life-long learning
Facing the Challenges

Despite of the wide range of opportunities that can emerge from the adoption of OEP, educational institutions still face many challenges. They still struggle with issues such as resistance to giving away information and knowledge for “free”; at no cost and free to use and re-use. Intellectual propriety and copyright policies for OEP are also matters that remain ambiguous to educational institutions. In a similar fashion, many questions associated with sustainability and quality of OER and OEP continue to be unanswered and under researched. Here are some challenges, questions and issues that the adoption of OEP raise for stakeholders to consider.

For the higher education sector:

- To what extent could OEP be incorporated into other regulatory frameworks, e.g. the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA)?

At an organisational level:

Financial...
- How can business cases be developed and/or adapted to ensure the sustainability of OEP initiatives?
- Are government funds and priorities aligned and available to educational institutions to encourage the adoption of OEP?

Governance...
- Are there policy enablers for OEP in Australia?
- Is there the need to revise internal policies and procedures on content materials to support the adoption of OEP?

Cultural...
- To what extent do traditional academic culture and mindset represent barriers for the adoption of OEP?

At individual levels:

Academic Staff
- Are academics reluctant to make their contents available as OER?
- Are academics concerned about the quality of OER available?
- What are other negative perceptions that academics have towards OER (time-consuming activity, hard to find resources, low quality resources, etc.)?
- What type of skills and knowledge are required by individuals in order to take advantage of OEP?

Some factors that might pose challenges for Students to adopt OER are:
- Poorly contextualised resources
- Inadequate access to the Internet for remote and rural students
- Lack of computer skills could also be a barrier to the successful use of OER.
- OER need to be relevant and meet students’ needs
Strategic directions

Below are some questions and issues for senior management levels to consider, as reflected in the data:

For the higher education sector:
- To what extent could OER assist the revitalisation of the higher education sector in Australia?
- How can government incentives and funding encourage the adoption of OER in the sector?
- How can open policies promote the adoption of OER across the higher education sector in Australia?

At an organisational level:

Resourcing...
- What additional investments (infrastructure, technology and resources) would be required for the implementation of an OER initiative?
- To what extent would additional support (financial, technical and training) to academic staff promote the adoption of OER?

Innovation...
- How the adoption of OER can promote institutional “uniqueness and distinctiveness” amongst other institutions across the sector?
- Could OER be used to meet the expectations of academic staff and students in the use of innovative technologies for learning?
- How can OER be incorporated in the institutional processes for recognition of prior learning?

Planning...
- How should institutional consultation with stakeholder groups be undertaken?
- What is the scope of the OER initiative?
- What is the institutional purpose of having an OER project?

At individual levels:
- Would your institution provide support to academic staff in order to increase awareness and understanding regarding OER?
- Would your institution provide technical support to academic staff, so they can make appropriate use and adoption of OER?
- Would your institution offer financial assistance to academic staff to encourage the adoption of OER?
- Could the above resources (financial, technical and human) a powerful avenue to change academic culture and reluctance towards OER?
- Should your institution recognize and reward those academics that have adopted of OER into their teaching (e.g. in promotion)?
Intellectual property (IP) policies analysis of higher education institutions in Australia

The issues and questions described below were drawn from a longer report on the analysis of the online publically available Intellectual Property policies of Australian universities to determine how these documents address the ownership of course content and educational resources created and developed by their employees. The report evaluates the scope of these policies and assesses the extent to which they currently support universities and university staff to engage in the development and release of Open Educational Resources. Next, we present some questions and issues related to university intellectual property and copyright policies as an attempt to initiate discussions and promote solutions to these issues.

At an organisational level:

Universities wanting to involve employees in developing OER or releasing existing university content under open content licencing.

University considerations:

• Is the university’s encouragement of OER reflected in current university policy?
• Do current employment contracts support the development of content for OER?
• Are there non-exclusive or other arrangements with university employees that will need consideration?
• Are checks required to ensure that university content intended for OER release is not already subject to a university commercialisation or other agreement?
• What authorisations, agreements or waivers may need to be secured before the university embarks on a project intended to develop OER?
• Are there university guidelines about the type of licence under which university developed OER should be released? What are the considerations?
• What university guidelines and processes are necessary to ensure issues of quality and copyright compliance are addressed?
• How does the university intend to brand the resources?
• Does the university intend to host OER or will the resources be included in a public repository of OER?

Risk management

• How will the university manage any dispute which may arise about the ownership of the resources?
• How will the university respond if it identifies that the resources are being used inappropriately?
• Who carries liability for copyright infringement in university-generated OER, the individual or the university?
• What training or resources are necessary to ensure employees developing OER are aware of the IP and copyright considerations?
At a project level
University faculty or project teams engaging in the development of OER

**University considerations:**
- What authorisation will the project need from the university before embarking on a project to develop OER?
- Does the project have the right to release existing university-generated content as OER or is clearance at a higher university level required?
- How will we know if university content we want to include in our OER project is subject to a university commercialisation agreement?
- Is there a university sign-off process to ensure that by developing and releasing OER we are not giving away university IP without authorisation?
- Does the university require to be acknowledged on the OER?
- Are there university guidelines about the type(s) of licence our OER project should use?

**Creators’ rights**
- What agreements or clearances may be required from individuals participating in or developing project OER?
- Are the individuals involved in developing content for the project aware of the open content licence under which the OER will be released?

**Using third party content**
- How can we be confident that third party copyright content included in project OER is licence compatible or has the necessary clearances?
- Do we need to develop a risk approach to using third party copyright content in OER developed by the project?
- What processes should the project put into place in order to keep track of clearances, permissions and licencing conditions that apply to the use of third party content in project OER?

**Training and resources**
What training is necessary to ensure that those involved in developing university OER are aware of their responsibilities relating to:
- university copyright and IPR;
- moral rights; and
- use of third party content.

What resources are available to the project so we can learn about:
- OER;
- creative commons and open content licencing; and
- copyright and IPR responsibilities.

At individual levels
University employees wanting to develop OER

**Consideration for the university as employer**
- Do I have the right to release as an OER, educational resources which I have developed in the course of my employment?
- Can I release as OER, university-generated resources for which I am not sole creator?
- Do I need to acknowledge my connection with the university in some way on the OER?
- Can I develop OER independently of the university and be confident it does not conflict with my employment contract?
**Personal considerations**
- What type of open content licence will I apply to my work?
- Can I be sure that releasing my own work as OER does not conflict with any other agreement I have entered into, such as a publisher agreement?

**Using third party content**
- Will I be using third party content in my OER?
- How can I be confident that any third party copyright content used does not create licencing conflicts by mixing content with different licensing conditions?

**Managing risk**
- What resources are available to me to ensure that I understand the copyright, licencing and IPR considerations in OER?
Part Five – Conclusions and Further Remarks

Presented and discussed in this report are the major issues and aspects of this two-year project funded by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. Part one of the report highlighted the project outline, including some important definitions, the research questions and the methods and design applied in this study. Part two provided reflections on the current body of knowledge and various other resources available regarding OER and OEP. The project findings were explained in Part three and some of the issues related to the adoption of OER in Australia were uncovered. Finally, Part four presented the Feasibility Protocol, which is an instrument to assist universities decision makers in the adoption of OER and OEP.

It can be seen from the discussions in this report that most participants have been aware of the movement and have a sound knowledge of OER. However, the majority of participants have rarely or never used OER. As for those who have adopted OER, learning objects have been the most preferred type of resources applied in teaching and learning. Despite the lack of OER adoption by individuals, the majority indicated that they would like to get involved in OER activities. This poor use of OER could be due to the fact that OER practices and initiatives have not yet been included in the current strategic plans of most participating institutions. These and other findings assisted the project team to answer the first research question and uncovered the current state of play regarding the adoption of OER in Australian higher education.

In this report we have also addressed the second research question (presented in Part one), which examined the benefits and challenges involved with the adoption of OER and OEP in Australian higher education. According to the participants, OER can be advantageous because they have the potential to increase collaboration institutionally and internationally; they are aligned with academic traditions of sharing of knowledge; they can save time and avoid duplication of effort; they can improve the quality of educational materials; they can lead to new pedagogical practices and they can increase access to education and wider participation in higher education across Australia, amongst other benefits. However, many challenges still remain. Many stakeholder groups are still unaware of OER and OEP. There is a lack of interest in creating, but mostly in adopting OER, which could be led by a concern that there are some poor quality OER resources available. Participants have also highlighted that there has been insufficient institutional support to encourage and promote the adoption of OER in their institutions.

Even so, the biggest challenges faced by the OER and OEP movement in the higher education sector in Australia is related to copyright and intellectual property policy issues. Despite the important Australian initiatives and policy developments previously discussed, the lack of explicit educationally oriented government policies appear to be limiting and/or slowing down the process of OER adoption in Australia. To date there have been few policy lever or enablers to support universities and other tertiary providers from pursuing OER initiatives to better support current students, attract new ones and compete against other Australian and international institutions (See Appendix B.6 for more information on copyright and intellectual policies of Australian universities). As a result, the full potential of the use and adoption of OER and OEP is a long way off in Australia compared with other parts of the world such as the UK, US, New Zealand and Europe in general.

We believe that the Feasibility Protocol is a valuable instrument that could encourage the Australian higher education sector to further develop OER and OEP and be on par with developments taking place elsewhere. We also believe that this instrument could assist senior executives to make decisions regarding the adoption of OER and OEP, including the issues and questions that they should consider regarding the opportunities, challenges and strategic directions involving OER. The Feasibility Protocol also prompts questions on the practical issues related to institutional intellectual property and copyright policies while adopting OER. Nevertheless, we would like to highlight that the Feasibility Protocol is not a
rigid instrument and can be adapted, changed and further developed to meet individual university needs, as we are well aware that each one has different structures, cultures and strategic plans for future and current activities. Ultimately, the usefulness of the Feasibility Protocol will depend on individual institutions and the way their senior executives make use of it.

Considering the fast pace of change across the higher education landscape in Australia and globally, one has to wonder if the rush is simply a “fear of being left behind” (Daniel, 2012, p. 4) or a genuine concern about widening participation in education, enhance student learning and experiences through quality resources and good service delivery, and of course a commitment to sharing knowledge and opening up to the world’s learners. As a final recommendation, we strongly argue that attention to the issues mentioned above needs to be addressed/investigated by educational institutions and government bodies in order to appropriately adopt OER in Australia, so they can bring educational benefits to institutions, educators and learners.
Part Six – Additional Resources

Connexions - http://cnx.org/
EducationLinX.com - www.EducationLinX.com
Flickr - http://www.flickr.com/
JISC/HEA OER Programme - http://www.jisc.ac.uk/oer
JorumOpen - http://www.jorum.ac.uk/
Khan Academy - http://www.khanacademy.org/
Learning to Teach Online Project (COFA) - http://online.cofa.unsw.edu.au/learning-to-teach-online/report
Lecturefox - http://lecturefox.com/
LeMill - http://lemill.net/
OER Africa - http://www.oerafrica.org/
OER Knowledge Cloud - https://oerknowledgecloud.org/welcome
OER university - http://wikieducator.org/OER_university/Home
OERNZ - http://wikieducator.org/New_Zealand_Schools_OER_Portal
OPAL - http://www.oer-quality.org/
Open Course Library (OCL) - https://sites.google.com/a/sbctc.edu/opencourselibrary/
Open Textbook Catalog - https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/
OpenEd - http://www.open-ed.eu/
Rethinking Law Curriculum project - http://www.rrlen.net.au/
Teacher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa (TESSA) - http://www.tessafrica.net/ OER@AVU - http://oer.avu.org/
Temoa - http://www.temoa.info/
UNESCO – resources on OER at http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/access-to-knowledge/open-educational-resources/documentary-resources/
Xerte - http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/xerte/
YouTube - http://www.youtube.com/
Zotero - http://www.zotero.org/
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Appendix A – Evaluation Report

Evaluation report
The evaluation section of this report summarises the independent monitoring and evaluation of the project: Adoption, use and management of Open Educational Resources (OER) to enhance teaching and learning in Australia.

The external monitoring and evaluation activities covered both phases of the project for the period November 2010 to December 2012:

- **Phase 1: Investigation** (November 2010 - October 2011). Including the literature survey, online survey, semi-structured interviews, policy inventory and preliminary data analysis.

The monitoring and evaluation activities were directed by the evaluation plan approved by the project team on 14 February 2011.

Based on the monitoring and evaluation evidence, the external evaluation confirms that the project aims were achieved and, in some cases exceeded, within budget and within the approved time frames for the project.

Evaluation methodology and summary of project achievements
The evaluation methodology was based on a results based management approach whereby the monitoring and evaluation plan was structured according to a logic model.

The logic model of the evaluation plan recognises that the project was required to conduct a number of activities leading to short term outputs. These outputs constituted the building blocks for achieving the outcomes of the project (the specified project aims). The outcomes are designed to ultimately contribute to the impact of open educational resources and practices in the Australian higher education system by improving the educational efficacy in the sector.

For each of the subcomponents of the logic model the relationships among activities, outputs, outcomes and overall impact were monitored through agreed means of verification measured against key performance indicators and output statements. The means of verification included: regular appreciative enquiry interviews with the principal investigator and project officer; review of minutes of all the project team meetings; personal observation by the external evaluator at selected project team meetings and the national symposium, online survey evaluation, independent evaluation interviews with key stakeholders, review of the statement of expenditure, review of key milestone documents and reports by the external evaluator and the international Reference Group.

The project activities, outputs and corresponding monitoring and evaluation outcomes measured against the specified key performance indicators are summarised in the table below:
The project has also achieved the specified communication and dissemination targets. These include conference and seminar presentations, two peer-reviewed journal articles and national dissemination of the project results. The project team has achieved an impressive number of six international conference and seminar presentations in five offshore countries profiling Australia’s work in open education. The national symposium attracted 25 Australian institutions and the project has presented at one Australian conference. National dissemination will be augmented with the dissemination of the final project report within the higher education sector.

The dynamic and rapidly changing international landscape of open education

The dynamic and rapid international development of open education during 2012 have contributed to significant changes in the political, strategic and economical landscape since the research project was conceived. The following developments should be taken into account when reviewing the project’s outputs:

- Internationally, there has been a widening of the scope of open education beyond OER *per se* to include the concepts of OEP, open scholarship, open policy, etc. The concept of OEP includes the policies and practices which support and promote the creation, use and reuse of high quality OER at the institutional level. These developments were accommodated through refinements in the Feasibility Protocol, the focus of discussions and feedback during the national symposium. The funder approved a short extension in the submission of the final report to enable the project team to document these changes in the report.

- The advent of commercial startups during 2012 providing fee-free learning opportunities using the Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) model have attracted large numbers of students worldwide resulting in focussed attention from senior leadership in the higher education sector. While these initiatives do not necessarily qualify as OER, nor do they necessarily provide university accredited degrees, the model will impact on the evolution and mainstream deployment of OER in the formal higher education sector worldwide. It was not possible to incorporate the MOOC related developments into the online survey which was administered prior to the uptake and commercial interest in the MOOC model. Consequently, readers of the final

### Project activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project activities</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct literature study</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design and administer online survey</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct semi-structured qualitative interviews</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile inventory and analyse relevant policies</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct data analysis of survey and interviews</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Project outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project outputs</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan and host a national consultation symposium</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare draft Feasibility Protocol</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publish peer-reviewed, annotated bibliography of literature survey</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record, transcribe, and review individual interviews</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse online survey data and prepare report</td>
<td>Exceeded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
report will need to take this into account when reviewing the survey results.

- The adoption of the 2012 Paris OER Declaration at the UNESCO World Congress on OER in June 2012. The declaration will call on the Governments of the member states of the United Nations to openly license educational materials funded from taxpayer revenue. The Australian higher education sector will need to consider the implications of how the international adoption of the declaration might impact on the licensing of teaching materials produced by institutions receiving government grant for tuition. Moreover, as open education is a global phenomenon, this could impact on export education as countries who adopt the declaration could generate competitive advantage by reducing the cost of higher education provision when compared to countries who do not to sign the declaration. The foresight of funding a national Australian research project on OER for the sector will provide valuable baseline data for assessing open education futures, but at the same time the Paris OER Declaration signals the need and imperative for wide sector discourse on open education and the findings of this research project.

**OER National Symposium**

The National Symposium was a key activity and significant milestone for the project. The symposium aimed to gather feedback on the research findings from Phase 1 and to gather initial feedback from the sector on the draft Feasibility Protocol.

The online evaluation survey for the symposium recorded a response rate of 44% with 56% of respondents representing executive and senior management levels.

The self-evaluation items comparing pre- and post-seminar knowledge of the concepts of OER and OEP provides some evidence of learning as a result of the seminar. The pre-knowledge self-evaluation of participant’s knowledge of the OER and OEP concepts was relatively high with 44% rating their knowledge as “intermediate” and 28% as “advanced”. The post-seminar ratings indicated that the “beginner” category reduced from 28% in the pre-seminar self-evaluation to 6% with corresponding increases in the “intermediate” and “advanced” categories. The post-seminar ratings reported 50% in the “intermediate” category and 44% in the “advanced” category.

The results of the symposium evaluation survey confirmed that the stated aims were achieved:

- 78% of respondents agreed that the symposium succeeded in gathering feedback from the sector on the research findings from Phase 1
- 89% of respondents agreed that the symposium succeeded in gathering feedback from the sector on the draft Feasibility Protocol.

94% of the respondents confirmed that the Feasibility Protocol would be a useful resource to assist with the adoption, use and management of OER at their respective institutions.

**Considerations for open education futures in Australia**

The evaluator conducted telephonic evaluation interviews with two senior university leaders and an experienced higher education practitioner who attended the national symposium. In addition, the evaluation interviews with members of the international reference group provide valuable insights for the future of open education in Australia.

- One interviewee of the national symposium mentioned that the draft Feasibility Protocol was a good catalyst for triggering discussion and reflection on the institutional issues associated with the implementation of OEP. However, the interviewees highlighted the potential for considering a number of customised presentation formats for different target audiences, for example, a “Green Paper” approach for policy-makers and senior managers and various face-to-face forums for relevant target groups, for
There was strong consensus among the interviewees of the national symposium that the future impact of the research project for the sector would necessitate wide and timely dissemination of the project outputs. One interviewee suggested that the Australian Deputy Vice Chancellor’s (Academic) group was critical to promoting future impact and furthermore expressed concern about the apparent disengagement from the higher education policy bodies in the open education discourse.

Better alignment of open education activities and initiatives with Australia’s higher education agenda for social inclusion is key to realising government strategy and provides the means for educational leaders to achieve their respective educational missions using open education approaches.

Given the nascent state of the mainstream adoption of OEP worldwide, one member of the international reference group suggested that the data-collection point was “too soon” when judged against the capability maturity of the survey respondents with reference to informed opinion on OEP, and authentic experience with the adoption of open education approaches on campus. This would need to be taken into account when considering future strategic decisions based on the data generated by the project. Australia could benefit from a follow-up survey at some point in the future which would provide valuable insights into adoption rates as the organisational capability of the higher education sector matures with regards to the mainstream implementation of open education approaches. The current project provides valuable baseline data to monitor implementation progress over time.

Timely, and appropriate dissemination of the project outcomes including follow-up face-to-face sessions with policy-makers, educational leaders and practitioners once the project is completed would enhance return on investment and potential impact for the Australian higher education sector to leverage the benefits and affordances that the mainstream implementation of open education approaches could provide.

As a global phenomenon, OEP is characterised by cross-border and international network interactions. Australia will need to consider how the outcomes of this project could interface and interact with other country, regional and international OER initiatives and collaborations, including for example: OER UK, OER Africa, OER Asia, the global work of the OER Foundation, the OER university international network, and international agencies like UNESCO and the Commonwealth of Learning which have initiatives in the field of open education.

**Conclusion**

This is a seminal project which has the potential to enhance the efficacy and performance of the Australian higher education system using open education approaches. The project is been executed by a capable team of researchers with the necessary rigour and scholarship required. The monitoring and evaluation activities confirm that the team have established firm baseline data for Australia to progress the future potential for the mainstream implementation of open education approaches in the higher education sector.
Appendix B

B.1 Literature Analysis Report and Annotated Bibliography
B.2 Survey and Interview Instruments
B.3 HREC approval
B.4 OER National Symposium Program
B.5 OER Examples of Best Practice
B.6 Supporting OER engagement at Australian universities. An overview of the intellectual policy rights, copyright and policy considerations
Appendix B.1 Literature Analysis and Annotated Bibliography

Methodology

Literature Analysis and Annotated Bibliography Methodology

Defining Open Educational Resources (OERs)
It is important to establish a definition for OERs in order to assist the researchers throughout the project. We will adopt the definition developed by the OER Foundation that states “Open Educational Resources (OERs), are educational materials which are licensed in ways that provide permissions for individuals and institutions to reuse, adapt and modify the materials for their own use. OERs can, and do include full courses, textbooks, streaming videos, exams, software, and any other materials or techniques supporting learning” (WikiEducator, 2011).

Literature Search Approach
The literature search consists of recent work, no older than ten years. Unless seminal works, preference will be given to recent publications in the last five years. Resources include peer-reviewed journal articles (open and closed), books, conference papers, government websites, reports and policies related to institutional copyright, intellectual property and relevant resources associated with OERs.

An annotated bibliography will be compiled of 100 references; it will be a resource for the team members to consult, interrogate and add references to as we progress with the project. Each individual annotation will have no more than 150 words. The annotations will be peer reviewed by the chief investigator. This process will assist the identification of any omissions or glaring misinterpretations. It is not intended to review the accuracy or validity of annotations. The search has been focused on the international and national literature around the themes already identified in the project proposal and classified above.

Searched Databases and Keywords Used
The databases used to search the journal articles, books and reports were ProQuest, ERIC, Emerald and JSTOR amongst others. The search of government and educational institutions websites regarding OER policies has been conducted through general search websites such as Google, Google Scholar and Yahoo. We also used WikiEducator, UNESCO, ICDE, OPAL, OECD and other related websites for policies, frameworks and guidelines searches.

The keywords used for the searches were a combination of:
- Open education
- Open education resources
- OER
- Open content
- Open courseware
- Open educational practices
- OEP
- Open access

And a combination of the above with the keywords:
- Policy
- Policies
- Practices
- Sustainability
- Barriers
- Benefits
Classification of resources
The annotated bibliography entries are classified according to the following categories:

- Empirical Research
- Theoretical Research
- Small case study
- Large case study
- Literature review
- International
- National
- Think piece
- Seminal work
- Variations of seminal work
- National policy
- Institutional policy
- International policy
- Sustainability
- Barriers
- Benefits
- Practices
- Licensing
- Teaching and learning
- Relevance (1, 2 or 3) - This classification will assist the project members to identify the relevance of resources included in the annotated bibliography; 1 representing the most and 3 the less relevant resources in this bibliography.

Zotero, a freely available online reference database, has been adopted to assist the research team to collect, organise, cite, and share this project’s annotated bibliography. In Zotero, the classification of resources will be included as “tag”.

Information Included in the Annotated Bibliography Entries
Some of the information incorporated in the annotation includes:

- The purpose of the paper and its findings (if research)
- The type of research and research methods
- The contribution to the OERs movement
- Relevance to this research project
- Relationships to other papers in this annotated bibliography (if applicable)

Published Literature Review
Particular segments of the project’s literature review will be made available to relevant academic communities and interested parties through targeted conference papers and presentations, and through published journal articles and book chapters.
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Appendix B.2 Survey and Interview Instruments

Survey Instrument

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

RESEARCH PROJECT: Adoption, use and management of Open Educational Resources to enhance teaching and learning in Australia

We wish to invite you to participate in our research on above topic. The details of the study follow and we hope you will consider being involved. We are conducting this research project as part of our Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) grant, with the University of New England as the lead institution. The research team is formed by a group of four experts, two of them based at the University of New England, one at University of Southern Queensland and another one at Massey University in New Zealand. Full contact details of the researchers are available at the end of this sheet and they can be contacted at any time if issues regarding this research arise.

Aim of the Study:

The major aims of this project are:

- to undertake a literature review to identify key themes in the field of open educational resources
- to undertake an survey to uncover the state of play of open educational resources in Australia
- to make recommendations to inform and assist the adoption, use and management of OERs within higher education in Australia

About this Survey:

Information gathered through this survey will be used only for the purpose of this study, and your identity will be kept confidential in any reporting. When reporting on the data collected through the survey, pseudonyms will always be used to protect the identity of participants. There are 37 questions and it will take you approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete this online survey. We thank you for your contribution to this research project.

Research Process:

It is anticipated that this research project will be completed by the end of 2012. The results may also be presented at conferences or written up in journals without any identifying information.

This project has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University of New England (Approval No. HE11/101 Valid to 10/05/2012)
Should you have any complaints concerning the manner in which this research is conducted, please contact the Research Ethics Officer at the following address:

**Research Services**

University of New England  
Armidale, NSW 2351.  
Telephone: (02) 6773 3449 Facsimile (02) 6773 3543  
Email: ethics@une.edu.au

Thank you very for contributing to our research project.

Regards,

Principal Investigator: Dr Carina Bossu,  
DEHub – Faculty of the Professions,  
University of New England  
Armidale NSW 2351  
Phone 6773 2346 or mobile 0407 994 625,  
Email: cbossu3@une.edu.au

A/Prof Brian Simpson  
School of Law W38 Rm 51  
University of New England, Armidale NSW 2351  
Phone 6773 3708  
Email: brian.simpson@une.edu.au

Mr David Bull  
Director University Preparatory Programs - Open Access College  
University of Southern Queensland  
West St Toowoomba QLD 4350  
Phone (07) 4631 1814  
Email: david.bull@usq.edu.au

A/Prof Mark Brown  
The Office of the Assistant Vice-Chancellor (Academic & International)  
Massey University  
Private Bag 11 222, Palmerston North, New Zealand  
Phone +64 6 3505014  
Email: M.E.Brown@massey.ac.nz

**Terms and Conditions:**

By clicking the "Continue" button, you indicate your agreement with the terms and conditions of this research, these are:

"I understand that completing and submitting this survey means that I give my consent for the information I provide to be used in this research project entitled "Adoption, use and management of OER to enhance teaching and learning in Australia" as long as no personal details are deliberately revealed that would allow me (or my institution) to be indentified/associated with any comments I might make".

If you have any questions about the project or problems with this webpage, please contact the lead project researcher: Dr Carina Bossu, DEHub, University of New England - cbossu3@une.edu.au
SECOND PAGE

Section 1: What is your role?

1.1 Which best describes your current role(s)? Select relevant option(s)

☐ Senior Manager
☐ Faculty Dean
☐ Head of School
☐ Associate Dean
☐ Other manager or administrator
☐ Technologist (e.g. web developer, software developer)
☐ Educator (teacher, lecturer, tutor or trainer)
☐ Professional staff developer
☐ Instructional designers
☐ Curriculum designers
☐ Researcher
☐ Learner (student or school pupil)
☐ Legal Officer
☐ Copyright Officer
☐ Library professionals
☐ Policy-maker
☐ Independent consultant
☐ Government official or agent

1.2 Please provide the name of the educational institution you primarily work for:


1.3 How many years have you been working in your current institution? (Dropdown options: 0-3 years, 3-5 years, 5-8 years, 8 years and above)

Section 2: What do you know about Open Educational Resources? In this section we want to learn about your understanding of Open Educational Resources.

2.1 Have you previously heard of the Open Educational Resources concept?

☐ Yes
☐ No

2.2 How long have you been aware of Open Educational Resources?

☐ Less than one year
☐ One to two years
☐ Two to five years
☐ Five to ten years
☐ I have not been aware

2.3 Can you remember what was your primary source or where you first heard of the term?
2.4 Which of the following statements best describes your understanding of the meaning of the term open educational resources?

() They are educational resources that are available online at no-cost for use only.
() They are educational resources that are available in the public domain or have an open license and permit all users to use and re-purposing them at no-cost.
() They are educational resources that are available in the public domain or have an open license that allow all users to use and re-purposing them at no-cost, even for commercial purposes.
() None of the above. Please provide your definition of OERs here:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________

2.5 How would you rate your knowledge regarding Open Educational Resources?

() None
() Basic
() Intermediate
() Advanced

2.6 Is there any else you would like to say about your knowledge of the Open Educational Resource movement?

___________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________

Section 3: What is your institution’s approach to Open Educational Resources? In this section we would like to learn about your institution’s commitment, current and planned initiatives and aspirations regarding Open Educational Resources.

3.1. Does your institution have a current Open Educational Resource project or initiative?

() Yes. Please proceed to question 3.2
() No. Please go to question 3.4
() I do not know. Please go to question 3.4

3.2 If it does, please briefly describe the initiative.

___________________________________________________________________________

3.3 If it does, please provide the web address of such an initiative:

___________________________________________________________________________
3.4 How committed would you say is your institution to the Open Educational Resources movement? Please choose one alternative.

- Very committed
- Partially committed
- Not committed at all
- I do not know

3.5 Is your institution familiar with any of the following Open Educational Resources programs/initiatives? Please choose as multiple alternatives, if needed.

- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) OpenCourseWare
- OpenLearn Open University - UK
- OER Foundation
- WikiEducator / WikiResearcher
- OER university
- Community College Consortium for Open Educational Resources (CCCOER)
- College Open Textbooks Community
- OpenDOAR
- Macquarie E-Learning Centre of Excellence (MERLOT)
- Connexions
- Teacher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa (TESSA)
- AEShareNET
- MELCOE
- LORN (a repository from the Australian Flexible Learning Framework)
- USQ OpenCourseWare
- Flat World Knowledge
- Others. Please specify: _______________________

3.6 Does your institution make use of Creative Commons licenses?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

3.7 Has your institution included (or is planning to include) Open Educational Resources practices and initiatives in its future or current strategic plan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My institution does not have plans to consider OER practices in the future strategic plans.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER practices have been incorporated in my institution’s current or past strategic plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OER practices will be incorporated in my institution’s future strategic plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 Is there anything else you would like to say about the use of Open Educational Resources in your institution?

---

Section 4: What is your PERSONAL view of Open Educational Resources? This section seeks information on your personal view of the open educational resource movement.

4.1 In your experience what is the value of Open Educational Resources for education and training in Australia? Please select the most appropriate response to the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are in the line with academic traditions of sharing knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OERs enable institutions to give something back to taxpayers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OERs can improve the quality of educational resources.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OERs can help to reduce the cost of higher education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OERs help to enhance quality of teaching and learning in higher education.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An OER project is a good marketing strategy for institutions to showcase and attract new students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An OER project will raise the international profile of an institution within a larger global community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OERs have the potential to increase collaboration within an institution and internationally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OERs are not so relevant because they do not fit in the institutions’ fixed curricula.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators can save time and avoid duplication of resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OERs are beneficial to learners because they are flexible, ease to access, require very little or no financial investment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 This question is about the level of government policies and/or regulations that you think are needed around Open Educational Resources in Australia. Please rate the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is an urgent need for public policies to support the access to and availability of OER in the higher education sector.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for specific public policies to support and regulate the use of OER in higher education institutions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public policies are necessary to support the growth of the development for open educational practices in the higher education sector.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no need of any public policies or framework to support OERs in Australia at this stage.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 From an institutional policy perspective, how relevant are the following factors for the effective use of Open Educational Resources in Australia?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support for OER promotion and awareness building.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support and recognition concerning OER projects and initiatives.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support in implementing appropriate licensing schemes regarding copyright.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of quality assurance for OER.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to appropriate technology and infrastructure.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Promotion of guidelines for OER creation and use. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5
---|---|---|---|---|---
Provision of financial support. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5

### 4.4 How would you rate the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using OER leads to institutional innovations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopting open practices is challenging for higher education institutions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The use of OER leads to new pedagogical practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to stimulate the use of OERs, specific skill support at institutional level is needed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5 Please indicate the importance of the following factors as potential barriers to the use of Open Educational Resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not invented here bias: no trust in others’ resources.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of quality of the OERs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitable OERs are difficult to find.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Internet connectivity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of access to computers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of software to adapt the resources to the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient reward system for educators devoting time and energy to OER development.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient support from the management level.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of policies at national levels to support the creation or use of OER.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of policies at institutional level to support the creation or use of OER.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest in creating or using OER.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators and developers lack the skills to create or use OER.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators and developers lack the time to create or use OER.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners’ lack of interest to be involved with OERs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern over copyright/legal considerations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential loss of institutional revenue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion of traditional pedagogy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to embrace new initiatives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. In your institution, how would you rate the following factors in supporting the wider use of Open Educational Resources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implemented organisation-wide</th>
<th>Implemented in some departments /units</th>
<th>Individual efforts</th>
<th>Not existing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An explicit institutional policy.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A partnership with other organisations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific quality assurance processes for OERs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific technological infrastructure for OERs (e.g., an OER repository).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific pedagogical scenarios and models for open educational practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 Is there anything else you would like to personally say about the Open Educational Resource movement in Australian higher education?

4.7 Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the use or growth of Open Educational Resources in higher education around the world?

Section 5: This section seeks information on your involvement and experiences with the open educational resources for teaching, learning and research.

5.1 Please indicate your involvement with the Open Educational Resource activities below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in the use of OERs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved in the development of OERs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am involved in the re-purpose of OERs. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of OERs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of OERs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-purpose of OERs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of open access journals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published in open access journals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Please indicate the frequency in which you use, develop and/or re-purpose Open Educational Resources.

5.3 If you use, develop and/or re-purpose Open Educational Resources, please indicate the kind of OERs you apply in your teaching or content delivery?

() Full units
() Parts of units
() Learning objects
() Other. Please specify: ______________________________

5.4 Do you use any license to claim copyright for resources you have developed and/or re-purposed? Please select relevant option(s).
5.5 If you use, develop and/or re-purpose Open Educational Resources, we would like to hear more about what and how you have employed them?


5.6 How would you rate the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some colleagues are using OER on a regular basis.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching strategies promoting the use of OER are supported in my institution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of open educational resources is supported in my institution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using OERs lead to improvement in educational practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using OERs lead to institutional innovation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using OER leads to new pedagogical practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adoption of OERs promotes sharing of knowledge and the university community service mission.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to stimulate the use of OER, specific skill support is needed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7 We would like to know your opinion and perceptions on the sharing of content materials and other creative works. How would you rate the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to share my teaching materials and creative works I generate without ANY restrictions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to share my teaching materials and creative works I generate ONLY if I am attributed (or cited) as the original creator.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to share my teaching materials and creative works I generate ONLY if others are restricted from changing or modifying my work without my written permission.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to share my teaching materials and creative works I generate ONLY if others are not allowed to make money from my creations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to reuse learning materials and/or creative works generated by others ONLY if I'm allowed to adapt them for my purposes and context.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy to reuse learning materials and/or creative works generated by others WITHOUT the rights to modify and adapt these materials.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will ONLY share my teaching materials if other educators are prepared to do the same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am reluctant to share my teaching materials or creative works BECAUSE others may question the quality of my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.8 When you develop teaching materials for units you teach, are the intellectual property rights (IPRs):  (Please type X in box to indicate selection.)

()- Owned by you with ALL rights granted to the institution
()- Owned by you with SOME rights granted to the institution
()- Owned by the institution with SOME rights granted to you
()- Owned by the institution with no rights granted to you
()- Jointly owned by the institution and you
()- Unclear or disputed IPR position

5.9 Would you like to share with us your additional comments and views on the ownership of intellectual property rights?


Section 6: Can you give us more information about yourself?

6.1 Your gender:

()- Male
()- Female
()- Prefer not to provide this information

6.2 What band best fits your current age? Please choose one of the following options. (dropdown menu)

6.3 Is English your home language / mother tongue?

()- Yes
()- No

6.3 Would you like to be contacted by one of the chief researcher for a telephone interview? Your collaboration to this research study is much appreciated.

()- Yes. Please provide your email address: ________________________________
()- No.
Interview Instrument

Interview Instrument

RESEARCH PROJECT: Adoption, use and management of OER to enhance teaching and learning in Australia

Interviewee

Name (optional): _____________________________________________________________

Your Gender: ( ) F ( ) M Age: __________________________

Name of Institution: _______________________________________________________

Semi-structured questions and probes: Following up on survey

1) What is your understanding of the open educational resource movement? Can you give some examples?

2) What is your position/opinion/perception regarding the value, usefulness and reusability of open educational resources?

3) To what extent have you or your institution used, developed or re-purposed open educational resource? Could you please describe your experiences?

4) What would persuade you to embrace the open educational resource movement—both personally and institutionally (institutional support and recognition; financial incentives; professional recognition)?
5) How comfortable are you with sharing your teaching materials with other educators? Do you have any concerns related to the loss of intellectual property, about commercial exploitation of your teaching materials, or about the repurposing of these without appropriate recognition?

6) Could you please explain your understanding and use of the Creative Commons (CC) license? Do you use them? How do you use them? How often to you apply them? Do you have any other legal or regulatory concerns regarding open educational resource?

7) Does your institution have, or is planning to implement, any strategy to enable the use, adoption and development of open educational resources? Is there any particular policy/support in place to facilitate this implementation?

8) What do you see as the main benefits likely to arise from the use of open educational resource?

9) What do you see as the main challenges facing the open educational resource movement?

10) Do you have anything else you would like to tell us about the open educational resource movement?
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Appendix B.5 OER Examples of Best Practice

Institution Participants:

Athabasca University, Open University (OpenLearn), Otago Polytechnic and Universitat Oberta de Catalunya.

Example No. 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Athabasca Open CourseWare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution name</strong></td>
<td>Athabasca University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Background</strong> [Give brief details of institution, type of learners and learning environment in which the initiative took place]</td>
<td>Athabasca University (AU) is a research university that specialises in online and distance education. It is a founding member of the Open Education Resource Foundation (Athabasca University 2010). AU also hosts WikiEducator (Athabasca University 2009). It is a member of Campus Alberta and eCampus Alberta and is a founding member of the OER university network. It is also a member of the Canadian Virtual University (CVU) /L’Université Virtuelle Canadienne (UVC) collaborative network. It boasts many international collaborations, partnerships and institutional alliances. In 2010, AU reports that it had received $150,000 over two years from the Hewlett Foundation. The purpose of this funding is to promote ‘co-operative and collaborative actions . . . to launch an open educational resources network with focus on action and collaboration’ (Athabasca University 2010). AU’s central mission is to reduce barriers to post-secondary education through excellence, openness, flexibility and innovation. AU is committed to the democratisation of tertiary education through opening educational possibilities to all members of Canadian society, especially those for whom tertiary education has not been an option for example, First Nation and Métis Albertans, students with disabilities, and those who need support in the gap between school and post-secondary education (Athabasca University 2009-2010; Athabasca University 2012; Athabasca University 2012a). Through their Open Courseware site, AU offers open access to some of their courses which are typically taken in their degree programs (Athabasca University 2012b). This courseware material is free of charge. It offers down-loadable OER Flash Learning Objects containing interactive puzzles, games and diagrams as well as video material across of range of different disciplinary areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The initiative</strong> [Identify the characteristics of the initiative, e.g. Area or subject, scope, funding, sustainability plan, target audience, etc.]</td>
<td>Athabasca has a ‘longstanding commitment to adult and lifelong learners, to aboriginal communities, to learners in remote, rural and northern areas, to under-served urban populations and to program students at other universities who seek to accelerate degree completion’ (Athabasca University 2012). AU has an open admissions policy that means that a student’s previous academic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience and achievement is not the basis of admission to AU to either AU’s degree programs or the OER initiative. AU has committed $89,530.152 over the next 10 years to its Open Learning Environment of which $80M has been requested from the Albertan Government (Athabasca University 2012). AU has also developed a Comprehensive Institutional Plan 2012-15 that gives a detailed account of its philosophy around open education, its commitment to access for all Albertans and for long-distance educations students, especially those who are isolated. The plan cites five main goals:

- ‘Leading quality open and distance education,
- Ensuring sustainability and fostering adaptability
- Recruiting and retaining excellent people
- Promoting excellence in research
- Building communities’ (Athabasca University 2009-2010; Athabasca University 2012)

Included in this plan is a commitment to the development of educational technology for Athabasca’s Open Learning Environment.

**Intended outcome(s)** [Describe the objective(s) behind the initiative outlined here]

AU regards its place in the on-line market as well-credentialled given its expertise in on-line teaching and its well-grounded history. AU highlights its main goals in the context of priority initiatives, expected outcomes and performance measures. AU aims to recruit and retain students from regions and backgrounds from which university student populations are not typically drawn, to contribute to the development of its partners, Campus Alberta and e-Campus Alberta, to strengthen funding for students through scholarships and bursaries, and to expand student access through pedagogically insightful learning technologies.

**The benefits** [Describe the benefits of the OER initiative, as experienced by learners, practitioners and/or the institution as a whole]

AU’s comprehensive institutional self-study (2009-2010) is available only to students and staff. The results of that study are included in the Institutional plan; however, there is no description of benefits experienced by either practitioners (teaching staff, for example) or students. That said, what comes through in the Institutional, Business, and University Plan Highlights is a very optimistic view of the future of AU as an online teaching institution in collaboration with various government and non-government enterprises and other educational institutions. The Highlights document states that ‘the community-based, participatory planning approach used in developing this plan emphasized inclusiveness and collaborative decision making’ ensuring that ‘every member of the AU community had an opportunity to participate in the planning process’ (Athabasca University 2009-2010). Thus, we can infer that the self-study as the foundation of those plans, was itself well-disposed towards the educational outcomes and research being carried on at Athabasca. Its commitment to the removal of barriers to higher education for not only Albertans but to adult learners across the globe would see profound
benefits for all of those involved.

While the benefits of the Open Learning Environment in terms of free on-line open course material, are not specifically highlighted here, we might see the open course program as an integral part of Athabasca’s over-all educational objectives and philosophy.

AU argues that there are many benefits for students studying in the distance education mode: accessibility, flexibility, affordability and adaptability. There is no reason to believe that the OER initiative does not follow suit.

**Lessons learned** [Identify the issues that required attention, including modifications in institutional policies and/or teaching practices]

AU identifies access issues for rural, aboriginal students, and for students with disabilities. It sees its ability to provide appropriate academic and student supports to the latter group as one of its weaknesses. They argue that there are social and legal challenges from the latter group, to ‘programs, facilities and technologies’ (Athabasca University 2012). AU argues that these are not issues confronted by itself alone: they are issues across Canada and the world. AU also understands that there are demands for industries and employers for more on-line education specifically suited to the needs of employer groups, students and governments. The digitising of education can accommodate tailored courses with flexible options for on-going learning. AU seeks to embrace this consideration, even while recognising the challenges of a demand led competitive on-line educational market. Indeed, AU sees the growing levels of competition as one of the major threats to its expansion and delivery of its on-line programs.

AU acknowledges its potential weakness in relation to learners’ ‘escalating expectations’. AU also acknowledges the economic barriers to participation, given the current state of the world’s economy. Its budgetary commitments and institutional plan are indicative of its realisation that major technological investment is necessary, and that along with expansion of technology there will be other implications. Its commitment to excellence in all areas can be seen as a way of dealing with these issues.

**Summary and reflections** [A summary of how and why the practice outlined here has been effective or not, what has been achieved and lessons learned]

It appears that AU’s commitment to open education and to Open Courseware has been so far, highly successful. However, there is not a lot of information about how the Open Courseware intersects with AU’s more generalised degree programs. Implicit in their documentation is the notion that there will be some recruitment from the OER options into their degree programs. The OER options would prepare students for the on-line experience integral to full enrolment in an AU course. In a paper released through Technology Enhanced Knowledge Research Institute (TEKRI), the research arm of AU, the problem of receiving appropriate academic recognition for their learning through OER, is discussed. The paper argues that this issue could be addressed by modifying current Prior Learning Assessment and Recognition (PLAR) practices and tapping into the knowledge,
Example No. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>OpenLearn UK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution name</td>
<td>Open University UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Background** [Give brief details of institution, type of learners and learning environment in which the initiative took place] | Open Learn is an open content or open educational resource (OER) initiative of the Open University UK, and the Hewlett Foundation. Launched in 2006, OpenLearn uses current or archived teaching and learning material from Open University Course materials. Materials in OpenLearn are made available through the LearningSpace, primarily a site for educators, where they are adapted for a wider group of students than those enrolled at Open University.

Open University initially envisaged that the principal users of OpenLearn would be educators and students. It has, however, identified three types of users or visitors to the OpenLearn site: volunteer students, social learners and ‘bounce visitors’ (those who visit the OpenLearn site only once). It appears, then that not all visitors are learners in the sense that they follow up with any formal approach to what they find in the site. Open Learn was able to survey 6196 registered learners who volunteered to participate in Open Learn questionnaire research, amongst whom they identified low users (30 minutes or less as registered users) and high users (>30 minutes as registered users). OpenLearn gave shorter questionnaires to low users than to high in the belief that the low users’ experience of the site was more limited than that of high users. Questionnaires focused on the backgrounds of adopters, use and management of open educational resources to enhance teaching and learning in Australia 74
students, their reasons for visiting the site, their attitudes to learning content and the tools for its use, together with student intentions for the future. Students included retirees, holders of PhDs, and ranged from introductory learners to advanced.

The learning environment can be conceptualised in terms of what was available to learn, and what kinds of support students had. In 2006, 4,100 hours of open learning content was available for personal study. In providing OER, the Open University aimed to support students through the use of up to date management tools for learners, to encourage and facilitate open collaborative learning communities, and to contribute to international research into the use and dissemination of digital technologies for higher education learning. According to Andy Lane, the Director of OpenLearn, this 'had increased to 5400 hours of current Open University content through over 450 Study Units ranging from 1 to 50 hours in study time from all academic levels in a LearningSpace mainly aimed at learners; that same content plus a further 8100 hours of archived content of almost complete courses in a LabSpace mainly for educators' (Lane September 2008).

For many students, both the social and content learning aspects of OpenLearn are of high importance (McAndrew, Santos et al. 2009).

| The initiative | Funding for OpenLearn up to the end of 2008 came from the Open University (£1M) and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation (also £1M). £700,000 was allocated for a further 12 months from 2008. The Open University plans to maintain and extend the OpenLearn programme because of its commitment to OER which it now sees as an integral aspect of its business. It outlines a four pronged approach to sustaining the OER commitment:
1. ‘to embed the development and use of OERs within all existing activities;
2. to secure additional recurrent and project grant funding from a variety of sources to build upon this core work and to work with partners around the world;
3. to investigate new business models arising from differentiated or disaggregated services that support learning to very large numbers using digital technologies;
4. to explore the potential of combining the best in current technology developments’ (McAndrew, Santos et al. 2009)

OpenLearn offers a multi-disciplinary range of units based on Open University course materials. Unlike the Open University model, which has a Supported Open Learning (SOL) philosophy and practice, OpenLearn is a... |
### Intended outcome(s)

Describe the objective(s) behind the initiative outlined here:

Andy Lane points out that ‘educational resources are championed as a public good’ (Lane September 2008). OpenLearn is aimed at potential students who would not have had access to tertiary education, and who subsequently might then see themselves in a position to move to enrolling in University courses. However, the lack of opportunity for many people to have access to any tertiary educational resources remains a primary incentive for the development of OER.

Although formalising educational experience by registering for Open University courses might be a possibility for OpenLearn students, this was not part of the initiative as originally conceived. However, there is a correlation between web-site visits and recruitment of students (McAndrew, Santos et al. 2009).

### The benefits

Describe the benefits of the OER initiative, as experienced by learners, practitioners and/or the institution as a whole:

All of those involved in the establishment of OpenLearn can identify beneficial outcomes for the project, and for its continuation. Support from Open University indicates that they see OpenLearn as a wonderful learning and business opportunity that has both national and international implications student numbers, research opportunities and business investment.

The original model of the student user was based on what was seen as the typical student at Open University. However OpenLearn distinguishes between enthusiasts, registered users, and visitors. This tripartite distinction enabled formulation of different approaches to learning, and to the content of the learning modules, and to those who have an interest that is not followed up (the inquisitive). The function of this distinction turned on the enthusiasts’ preparedness to talk about what they did with OER content, to use the content as planned, and also to release themselves to the potential creativity offered through the unboundedness of OER. Clearly, many enthusiasts have benefitted educationally and socially from the twin components of content and social...
networking opportunities offered by OpenLearn, and their patterns of interaction were easily identifiable to OpenLearn researchers.

Researchers were able to trace registered users and visitors through the investigative potential of web tools such as logs and Moodle for the former and IP addresses search engine hits, and cookies for the latter. Registered users were also canvassed for their willingness to participate in research, and about 50% of users agreed. The bulk of research by researchers emerged from the registered users group.

The direct, positive, impact of OER on the educational orientation of students is echoed in the research prospects engendered by the OpenLearn initiative. This is not simply in terms of the amount of research material (book chapters, research papers for example) that has amassed. It is also in terms of the international research collaboration made possible and its inspirational effects in the newly developing OER environment.

At an institutional level, OpenLearn acknowledges that there are different motivations for collaboration, depending on what collaborators want. Fielding Graduate University, California; OpenLearn Scotland Collaborations; University of the Third Age U3A, UK; UnisulVirtual, Santa Catarina, Brazil; UNIDERP, Campo Grande, Brazil were each interested in, and experienced, different ways of using tools, community, and content. Of particular interest is the transformation of teaching and learning that can be effected by collaborative approaches to teaching and learning. Provision of learning tools and content and mentoring for example, were both part of the collaborative package. There was a strong emphasis on the open nature of the tools and content, what they could be used for and how. ‘Institutions have different reasons to collaborate with OpenLearn. They like the freedom to collaborate in the ways that most suit them: their needs their visions, their resources. As with individual users and educators, institutions have motivations that represent their commitment to open content and distance education in general. It is also an opportunity to be associated with Open University without having a legal partnership – OpenLearn allows a much more fluid and informal relationship (McAndrew, Santos et al. 2009).

At a student level, the possibilities afforded by open content, with its emphasis on flexibility and the possibility to move creatively in the learning process, means that students are encouraged to explore and interpret tools and content at their own pace.

**Lessons learned** [Identify the issues that required attention, including modifications in institutional policies and/or teaching practices]

Santos *et al.* identify four areas where difficulties might arise in OpenLearn: academic, technical (production), technical (tools) and research and evaluation. They focus on transformation of content, the kind of tools needed, bringing in ‘content from the world’, giving ‘life to new things the world values’, student numbers, reaching ‘the
world’ and learning (Santos, McAndrew et al. 2007). In their view, all of these issues required attention.

Pedagogically, materials that originated in the Open University required true-to-the-source modification for use by neophyte learners. There are issues with the modification and provision of content materials intended for longer more complex courses and learning (Ferreira, Wilson et al. 23-24 November 2006). This entails a high degree of expertise in the reformulation of content. The use of open support learning tools attempts to ameliorate the absence of the human presence in the learning environment.

Further, some academics experienced difficulty with the idea of ‘repurposing’ materials they had written for other modes of delivery and programmes. Others wondered why, in the language programme in which they were involved, they ‘would be interested in all this work into it—download, translate and put my version back there . . . What am I going to get from all this?’ (McAndrew, Santos et al. 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary and reflections [A summary of how and why the practice outlined here has been effective or not, what has been achieved and lessons learned]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Overall, OER through OpenLearn appears to have had a positive impact on three levels: for students, institutionally for the Open University and for researchers. The aims of the programme seem to have been achieved at a learner level, and there have been some positive flow-on to the Open University that seem to provide a new pool of prospective students. What is less obvious is the impact on academics whose materials have been seconded into use by OpenLearn. Academics could well be seen as producers of a product (information, content) for consumers (students/users).

We see here a transformation of language and the idea of education and learning. While this may not be all good, it is not all bad either. One wonders what content might be given to the term ‘educator’, what is the role of the academic, how research would be envisioned, what effect the individualisation of learning will have on students. One of the issues for staff and student involved with OpenLearn was that they didn’t all have the technology literacy to keep up with or even use, the sophisticated technology that was employed. This is a pressing issue that needs to be addressed. |
### Background

Otago Polytechnic (OP) is in Dunedin, New Zealand. It is a vocational education and training institution, and is publicly funded. OP has been a signatory to the Cape Town Open Education Declaration since 2008 (Capetowndeclaration.org 2012). OP has adopted a default Creative Commons Attribution IP policy, and it hosts the international head office of the Open Educational Resources (OER) Foundation (Otago Polytechnic 2012; Wikieducator.org 2012a; Wikieducator.org 2012b). OP has four institutional priorities: to lead the vocational tertiary sector ‘in the achievement of educational excellence’; ‘to be financially sustainable’; to ‘achieve the highest level of confidence from our communities, anticipating and exceeding their expectations, including our commitments to Kai Tahu’; and to lead the tertiary vocational sector as ‘a socially responsible and sustainable organisation’ (Otago Polytechnic 2011). OP supports OER, and has developed and has made available its own OER courses. It also uses external web services as a source that it adapts and develops for its students. OP also encourages staff to use and develop OER, and supports staff in developing the skills necessary for this development (Otago Polytechnic 2012). Students at OP can participate in OER courses from a range of disciplinary areas from Sustainable Futures to Art to Horticulture to Midwifery to Research. It also provides the opportunity for students to experience Wiki-based courses (Wikieducator.org 2012e). Its commitment to OER is consistently clear from the amount of online information available through the Web, the structure of its own Web-pages and its presence on Wikieducator. Students come from a variety of backgrounds and ‘Student Stories’ accessible from the Home Page of OP’s Web-site is testimony to their good experience at OP.

### The initiative

OP’s OER initiative is based on their commitment to free and open access to educational materials through Creative Commons attribution licensing. With Creative Commons attribution, an author can decide on the level of copyright they want to protect their work, so that specific works can be used by others, provided they attribute authorship in the way determined by the author. To respect and protect Maori culture, OP has developed, in consultation with the local Maori Ngai Tahu law office, a different concept of ownership of IP instantiated in a Maori IP Policy. ‘Broadly speaking, the Polytechnic’s role in this area is one of guardianship of Maori IP and knowledge. The concept of guardianship has also been extended to students’ IP’ (Wikieducator.org 2012c). This commitment is to the Dunedin area of New Zealand, to New Zealand more generally and to the expansion of OER internationally.
With this in the background and with their affirmation of the Cape Town Open Education Declaration, OP has dedicated itself to the advancement of learning for its local communities, across the range of its curriculum. It sees itself as an active protagonist for its communities in terms of focusing on workforce skills, and for making delivery of the associated educational programs accessible in its regional centres, workplaces and people’s houses (Otago Polytechnic Council 2006).

OP's Strategic Directions includes a commitment to financial sustainability for its academic programs. OU has engaged in a project that evaluated the use of social media in OER and research practices. This detailed analysis, 'Measuring Our Open Education' looks at usage, including gains, savings, and costs, and also at staff reactions to OER. As well as examining what has already taken place, the analysis contains projections for the social media platforms, Wikieducator, YouTube, Slideshare, and Blogging. Gains, compared with training costs and returns of staff from the various social media platforms indicate that these enterprises are expensive to set-up and maintain. No definitive conclusions are drawn from the figures available (Wikieducator.org 2012).

**Intended outcome(s)** [Describe the objective(s) behind the initiative outlined here]

OP professes that OER ‘is the means by which education at all levels can be more accessible, more affordable and more efficient’ (Wikieducator.org 2012b). This, together with the use of the Creative Commons Attribution Licence, is the fundamental philosophy underpinning OP’s move towards OER. OP aims to share learning and teaching practices on the basis of open and free access to course materials and research with the idea of producing novel and inventive ways of using what is already available across curricula. Collaboration is central to this philosophy to access the ‘untapped potential’ of individual teachers and lectures that would enable for example low-enrolment courses to become cost-effective (Wikieducator.org 2012b).

**The benefits** [Describe the benefits of the OER initiative, as experienced by learners, practitioners and/or the institution as a whole]

Staff and students at OP are enthusiastic about the benefits of OER, although this is by no means a universal feeling at OP (Butson Russell, Ferguson Shelagh et al. 2010). For example, the research conducted with a small sample of academic staff to trace how they have understood and interacted with OER reveals very mixed reactions, understandings and struggles with the ideas and technology. The researchers remark that uptake of OER practice has been slow in spite of the fact that there is obvious institutional support, typically from researchers and management (Otago Polytechnic 2012b). On the other hand, students are enthusiastic about their learning at OP even though they do not mention OER in particular.

**Lessons learned** [Identify the issues that required attention, including modifications in institutional policies and/or teaching practices]

Academic and teaching staff have reservations about OER, ranging from concerns about the percentage of the world’s population that has access to computers and internet, to a blasé attitude amongst some students because ‘it’s only a wiki so we don’t have to show up’, to
comments about face to face’s being better than OER and EOR not really working since it was online. They also reported that students might think they know it all already because it’s all there on the internet, so they don’t have to do anything else, and that they feel overwhelmed by the technology because they are actually neophytes with the technology, and are ‘scared of the wiki’ (Butson Russell, Ferguson Shelagh et al. 2010). On the other hand, some lecturers have openly embraced the technology (Wikieducator.org 2012c).

Summary and reflections [A summary of how and why the practice outlined here has been effective or not, what has been achieved and lessons learned]

There appears to be a discrepancy between the enthusiastic promotion of OER by management, some academics and researchers, the experience (and inexperience) of other academics and lecturers, their training and expectations, and the experiences of students. It is early days for OER. Recognition of the need for a separate IP Policy for Maori, and the desire to democratise education to produce the best results for students is pedagogically and morally admirable. Clearly, for some, the introduction of OER has been exciting, challenging and rewarding. Others have understandable pedagogical reservations and proceed with caution in terms of their own expertise. Conversation between advocates and antagonists will need to take place with effective plans for change and training being sorted out.

Example No. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>OpenCourseWare UOC <a href="http://ocw.uoc.edu/">http://ocw.uoc.edu/</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution name</td>
<td>Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Background [Give brief details of institution, type of learners and learning environment in which the initiative took place] | Virtual and online university
60,876 students
3,385 virtual classrooms
The UOC is an online distance university, in which teaching takes place in virtual classrooms equipped with the necessary media for professors and students to communicate: forum, notice board, e-mail, calendar, etc. The educational resources needed by students as textbooks, guides and other resources are available through the virtual classrooms. However, the main learning tool is not these resources but rather the assessable activities carried out as part of each course. |
| The initiative [Identify the characteristics of the initiative, e.g. Area or subject, scope, funding, sustainability plan, target audience, etc.] | UOC OCW is a free and open digital publication of high quality educational materials organized as courses in the areas taught at the university (Health sciences, Law and Political Science, Economics and Business administration, School for Cooperation, Arts and Humanities, Information and Communication Sciences, Computer Science, Technologies and Multimedia, Languages and cultures, Psychology and Education Sciences and Tourism). It’s available to the Internet community (teachers, students and self-learners) for use and adaptation under an open license, in our case using Creative Commons licenses. It does not typically provide certification or access to instructors.

The process of producing educational materials in the UOC is completely different than in other universities, in the UOC educational resources are born digital for each subject, being designed and drafted specifically for it and containing everything a student needs to know to pass the course.

“The system for creating materials is quite well-established. Professors must anticipate the need to create new materials one year in advance so that the necessary funding can be allocated in the budget. They must then find authors and review and submit the original texts four months prior to the beginning of the academic year. Finally, they must revise the published materials. The materials are published in XML. They are available in multiple formats, which are generated automatically.”

This system allows us having control of the educational resources production and implementing top-bottom approaches for all educational resources produced by the university.

Sustainability
“Given the current rate of deployment, which has increased with the implementation of the new European Higher Education Area (EHEA), the creation of new material for each subject is proving to be unsustainable. This situation is further compounded when the material in question must be constantly reviewed and updated. Using external resources created by other universities would seem to be the clearest way to cut costs in this sphere. However, these ‘external’ resources could just as easily be internal ones. That is, if the UOC were to change the way it makes its internal resources, the same resources could be used for multiple subjects.”

---

5 Griset, Roger; Rivera López, José Manuel (2010). “Use of open educational resources at the UOC”. In Open Ed 2010 Proceedings. Barcelona: UOC, OU, BYU. [Accessed: 22/10/12]. <http://hdl.handle.net/10609/4901>
6 Idem.
| Intended outcome(s) [Describe the objective(s) behind the initiative outlined here] | Recently, the university drew up a 2009-2014 Strategic Plan, which devotes an entire section to OERs. It is within the framework of this plan that the university has seriously begun to consider the position and actions it should take in relation to this topic. The report being drafted by the working group covers three main points: objectives, analysis and actions. The objectives refer to the situation the university would like to reach; the analysis describes the current lay of the land; and the actions refer to what needs to be done to achieve the desired outcome. [...] The objectives with regard to the adoption of OERs are twofold. Firstly, the university aims to make its internal content available to others. This entails a series of benefits and obligations. Second, it aims to take advantage of resources created by others. Both lines of action have considerable potential."

| The benefits [Describe the benefits of the OER initiative, as experienced by learners, practitioners and/or the institution as a whole] | For professors:
- Accessible from anywhere
- Permanent URL
- Preservation of materials
- Statistics of views and downloads
- Showcase of their teaching materials
- Professional recognition and prestige
- Creating networks
- Tools and collaborative work
- Reuse of materials

For the institution (UOC):
- cost savings by reusing materials
- Brand positioning
- Showcase of the quality of teaching
- Access and preservation of materials
- Statistics of views and downloads
- Student support
- Information about teaching process
- Enhancing quality of educational materials by making it available to the Internet community, which means giving the community the chance to improve its quality.
- Social responsibility. Contributing to educating the society of which it forms a part is part of the university's mission.  

---

7 ídem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons learned [Identify the issues that required attention, including modifications in institutional policies and/or teaching practices]</th>
<th>Summary and reflections [A summary of how and why the practice outlined here has been effective or not, what has been achieved and lessons learned]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Software updates: need to update or migrate from eduCommons (content management system), mainly to improve interoperability and allowing automatic population from other platforms (institutional repository, virtual classrooms…).</td>
<td>- UOC created an OCW following the OCW Consortium internationally used course architecture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- UOC offer educational materials and information of 180 open courses in English, Spanish and Catalan language.</td>
<td>- UOC offer educational materials and information of 180 open courses in English, Spanish and Catalan language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- We are OCW Consortium and UNIVERSIA members, which facilitates being in contact with other institutions using OCW platform and creating a community of practice.</td>
<td>- We are OCW Consortium and UNIVERSIA members, which facilitates being in contact with other institutions using OCW platform and creating a community of practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There has been an institutional implication in the development and application of an open educational resources policy in the framework of the UOC 2009-2014 Strategic Plan. In this sense, UOC University’s Governing Council (on January 19th, 2011) agreed publishing all educational materials with a Creative Commons license, which leads to the following benefits: reusing, revising, remixing and redistributing educational materials.</td>
<td>- There has been an institutional implication in the development and application of an open educational resources policy in the framework of the UOC 2009-2014 Strategic Plan. In this sense, UOC University’s Governing Council (on January 19th, 2011) agreed publishing all educational materials with a Creative Commons license, which leads to the following benefits: reusing, revising, remixing and redistributing educational materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One of the most effective practices have been that educational materials can be accessed from the OCW from their mobile devices, and also that the materials can be found in a range of formats: EPUB, Mobipocket, web, pdf, audiobook (Daisy) and Videobook (MP4). These formats improve accessibility for students with disabilities and personalise the learning process by choosing the most convenient format for them.</td>
<td>- One of the most effective practices have been that educational materials can be accessed from the OCW from their mobile devices, and also that the materials can be found in a range of formats: EPUB, Mobipocket, web, pdf, audiobook (Daisy) and Videobook (MP4). These formats improve accessibility for students with disabilities and personalise the learning process by choosing the most convenient format for them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the other hand, it is not enough to open content to anyone and making it available in the institutional repository as Griset and Rivera (2010) states. It must be publicised, as it is part of the university’s brand and serves as an advertisement for its training offer. A specific marketing plan must thus be crafted for OERs that contemplates strategies for the dissemination thereof.

Authorship: Open University of Catalonia Virtual library – OA&OER team formet by Gema Santos-Hermosa and Cristina Vaquer, Elisabet Cervera and Cristina Lopez
Butson Russell, Ferguson Shelagh, et al. (2010). Otago Polytechnic Staff Perpsectives on the Practice of Open Education.