



OEP Guide

Guidelines for Open Educational
Practices in Organizations (Vs. 2011)



OPAL

OPEN EDUCATIONAL QUALITY INITIATIVE

The "Open Educational Quality Initiative" is an international network to promote innovation and better quality in education and training through the use of open educational resources. It is partly funded by the European Commission. OPAL is initiated through international organizations like UNESCO, ICDE and EFQUEL and a number of Universities like the Open University UK, the Aalto University in Finland, University Duisburg-Essen and the Catholic University in Lisbon, Portugal. It aims at establishing a forum which works to build greater trust in using and promoting open educational resources. The Open Educational Quality Initiative will focus on provision of innovative open educational practices and promote quality, innovation and transparency in higher and adult education. The focus of the OPAL Initiative moves beyond access to open educational resources (OER) to focus on innovation and quality through open educational practices (OEP).

The OPAL Initiating Organizations

The project runs through a time span of around two years (2010-2011) and includes the following partners:



University Duisburg-Essen (Germany)

Coordination



Aalto University (Finland)



The Open University (UK)



European Foundation for Quality in E-Learning (Belgium)



Universidade Católica Portuguesa (Portugal)



International Council for Open and Distance Education – ICDE

UNESCO

List of Authors:

António Andrade, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Portugal
Ulf-Daniel Ehlers, University Duisburg-Essen
Abel Caine, UNESCO
Roberto Carneiro, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Portugal
Gráinne Conole, Open University UK
Carl Holmberg, International Council for Open and Distance Education
Anna-Kaarina Kairamo, Aalto University Finland
Tapio Koskinen, Aalto University Finland
Thomas Kretschmer, European Foundation for Quality in E-Learning, Belgium
Nick Moe-Pryce, International Council for Open and Distance Education
Paul Muddin, Open University UK
Judite Nozes, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Portugal
Veronica Policarpo, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Portugal
Rolf Reinhardt, European Foundation for Quality in E-Learning, Belgium
Thomas Richter, University Duisburg-Essen
Gonçalo Silva, Universidade Católica Portuguesa, Portugal
Zeynep Varoglu, UNESCO



1. Introduction

Many current OER initiatives focus overwhelmingly on access and availability of Open Educational Resources (OER) and not enough on helping individuals and organizations to develop Open Educational Practices (OEP). The Open Educational Quality Initiative (OPAL) is therefore proposing this guideline to improve Open Educational Practices in organizations.

In this document we are going to introduce to you to the concept of Open Educational Practices (OEP) and provide you with a guide on how to improve your practices. The guideline is designed as a maturity model which allows you to position your own organization according to the degree of maturity for each of the individual dimensions we have outlined and described below. In the next section we describe the concept of open educational practices. Afterwards you are presented with three tools to assess the maturity of your organization in relation to its adoption of open educational practices.

2. Defining “Open Educational Practice”

Build on previous research, investigation and consultation we have defined open educational practices as follows: ‘Open Educational Practices (OEP) constitute the range of practices around the creation, use and management of open educational resources with the intent to improve quality and innovate education.’¹ The diagram below is designed to show different stages of open educational practices. The different fields in the diagram correspond to different stages of openness in the use of educational resources and learning architectures. For example field “H” could relate to “I am sometimes using OER for normal lectures”, field “B” would represent rather “I am using open educational resources in open seminars and learning scenarios”

		OER Usage		
		Low No OER (re-) usage	Medium OER (re-)usage or creation	High OER (re-)usage and creation
Learning Architecture	High Social practices, Co- Creation, Sharing (Reflec- tion in action) • „open“ objectives • „open“ methods	A	B	C
	Medium Dialog, Procedures, Rules (Know-how) • „closed“ objectives • „open“ methods	D	E	F
	Low Knowledge transmission (Know that) • „closed“ objectives • „closed“ methods	G	H	I

While there is currently no agreed on classification or definition for “openness” of pedagogical models available, research suggest different aspects of openness or freedom in teaching and learning frameworks. The approach which we adopted to classify pedagogical models/ learning activities regarding their openness follows largely Baumgartner’s (2007)² approach: teacher – tutor – coach, where the ‘teacher’ represents pretty much the ‘teaching as knowledge transfer’ paradigm and gradually opens up to arrive at a model of learning as co-creation and social practices in the category ‘coach’. While we are aware that this is a simplification of reality we believe still that it is giving prototypical indication of three different and distinct degrees of openness in learning environments. However, other alternative approaches to classifying learning activities have been taken into account and which come to similar conclusions, like Paavola, Lipponen and Hakkarainen (2004)³ who suggest learning metaphors along acquisition – partici-

¹ <http://cloudworks.ac.uk/cloud/view/3452>

² Baumgartner, P. (2007): Zen and the Art of teaching. Communication and interaction in education. Hagen.

³ Paavola, S., Lipponen, L., & Hakkarainen, K. (2004). Models of Innovative Knowledge Communities and Three Metaphors of Learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 74(4), 557-576.

pation – knowledge creation, Laurillard (1993)⁴ or a comprehensive analysis of Mayes and de Freitas (2004) for JISC⁵. Following this analysis, pedagogical levels of “freedom” or “openness” have been conceptualized:

- “Low” if objectives as well as methods of learning and/ or teaching are rooted in “closed” one way, transmissive and re-productive approaches to teaching and learning. In these contexts, the underlying belief is that teachers know what learners have to learn and mainly focus on knowledge-transfer.
- “Medium” represents a stage in which objectives are still pre-determined and given, but methods of teaching and learning are represented as open pedagogical models. They encourage dialogue oriented forms of learning or problem based learning (PBL) focusing on dealing with developing “Know how”.
- “High” degrees of freedom and openness in pedagogical models are represented, if objectives of learning as well as methods (e.g. learning pathways) are highly determined and governed by learners. Questions or problems around which learning is ensuing are determined by learners (SRL – self regulated learners⁶), and teachers facilitate through open and experience-oriented methods which accommodate different learning pathways, either through scaffolding and tutorial interactions (ZPD Vygotskian inspired approaches) or contingency tutoring (Woods & Woods strategies of re-enforcement, domain or temporal contingency).

⁴ Laurillard, D. (1993): *Rethinking University Teaching: A Framework for the Effective Use of Educational Technology*, London, New York: Routledge

⁵ Mayes, T. & de Freitas, S. (2004): *Stage 2: Review of e-learning theories, frameworks and models*. JISC desk research study. Retrieved on 2010, November 17, from <http://www.elearning.ac.uk/resources/modelsdeskreview/>

⁶ Carneiro, R., Lefrere, P., Steffens, K., & Underwood, J. (Ed.) (2010), *Self-regulated Learning in Technology Enhanced Learning Environments: A European Perspective*, Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

The Open Educational Practice Maturity Matrix

Step 1: Positioning your Organization in the OEP Trajectory

OEP consists essentially of the use of open educational resources in open learning environments/ architectures.⁷ The following maturity matrix allows for positioning your organization according to the uptake of OEP.

	Not yet started	Early stages/ awareness	Developing/ Commitment	Established	Embedded/ Advanced
1. To what extent are you using and repurposing OER in your organization?	No use/ repurposing of OER takes place.	Individuals are informally starting to use/ repurposing OER.	Some departments or teams are using/ repurposing OER.	OER are used/ repurposed in the whole organization.	The use/ repurposing of OER is embedded into the everyday practice within the organization and supported through an OER policy.
2. Do you have a process for creating OER in your organization?	No process of creating OER is in place.	Individuals are starting to create OER.	Some departments or teams have created OER.	The organization's tools for creating OER are largely accepted and used in the organization.	A process for creation of OER is in existence, tools for creation are used and regularly maintained and tool use is supported by a policy.
3. To what extent are you sharing OER and open educational practices in your organization?	No OER and experiences are shared.	Individuals are informally starting to use tools for sharing resources or OEP.	Some departments or teams have started to use tools for sharing OER and OEP.	The organization's tools for sharing OER and OEP are accepted and used in the organization.	Tools for sharing OER and OEP are accepted and used organization-wide, and supported through a policy.
4. To what extent is your organization working with open learning architectures?	No experience with open learning architectures.	Individuals are starting to use open learning architectures.	Some departments or teams are using open learning architectures.	Open learning architectures are used organization wide.	Open learning architectures are embedded into the organization at all levels; learners are encouraged to choose their own learning objectives and methods for learning and are supported through facilitation and coaching.

Step 2: Creating a Vision of Openness and a Strategy for OEP in an Organization

We believe that OEP can be supported through strategic planning. This second part of the OEP guideline helps you to better understand the strategy within your own context. This section is designed to analyze your strategic environment in relation to relevant dimensions of open educational practice strategy of your organization.

	Not yet started	Early stages/ awareness	Developing/ Commitment	Established	Embedded/ Advanced
1. Is a vision for OEP shared across organization?	Management, staff and learners do not share a common vision.	Different visions are emerging between management, staff and learners in the organization.	Management, staff and learners are starting to communicate about a shared vision for open educational practices within the organization.	Management, staff and learners share a clear and detailed vision of how OEP will develop in the next few years and how it relates clearly and closely to the organization's overall mission and aims, in particular innovation.	A vision for the development of OEP is shared with partners, clients, contractors and the community at large.

⁷ See description of 'open learning architectures' above or in 'OEP Scape', whitepaper from OPAL Project, 2010
Open Educational Quality Initiative ::: OPAL ::: www.oer-quality.org

2. Are OEP included in existing strategies and policies?	OEP are not part of the organization's strategy nor are they included in policies.	Staff and learners are aware of an organizational intention for the development of OEP but are not fully committed. Implementation of OEP is left to individual or team/ department level.	OEP is mentioned in some strategic papers and plans. There is some cross-referencing between an OEP strategy and other strategic plans.	OEP are implemented across the whole organization through a prominent strategy or policy. Leadership from the top exists. Staff and learners are aware of the organization's strategy for the development of OEP. Cross-referencing between the OEP-strategy and the organization's other strategic plans exists.	The management of OEP follows a clear strategic plan or organizational policy. Internal stakeholders as well as partners, clients and other external stakeholders share the vision for the development of OEP.
3. Are OEP embedded in the organization's business model?	OEP are not part of the organization's business model or contributing to their value creation.	OEP is not part of the organizations' business model but individuals recognize the potential of OEP, re-use of resources, and innovation.	Teams and departments are beginning to view OEP as part of their business strategy.	OEP is embedded in the organization's business model, use and re-use of educational resources reduces costs and open learning environments are part of the general services and offerings.	OEP uptake and wide adoption constitute a major asset in uniquely positioning and differentiating the institution in the marketplace and is central to the organization and continuously improved.
4. Are you involved in any partnerships in relation to OEP?	No partnerships within the organization or with other organizations exist with regard to OEP.	Informal links between individuals and/or teams in relation to OEP exist within the organization.	Links between organizations are being established with regard to OEP. From these, a small number of OEP partnership-projects are beginning to occur.	The organization is involved in several ongoing and successful partnerships and/or alliances regarding OEP.	The organization is embedded within a generating environment of social networks and partnerships to share, co-create and exchange experience and practices on OEP.
5. Are OEP perceived as relevant across the organization?	OEPs are not viewed as relevant to the teaching and learning context.	Some individuals view OEP as relevant to some extent.	Teams and groups within the organization start to view OEP as relevant to their own learning/ teaching context.	OEPs are organization-wide perceived as relevant and desired practices by professionals and learners.	OEPs are perceived as a relevant part of the organizations professional work and are communicated as such to learners, outside partners and clients.

Step 3: Implementing and Promoting OEP

The following section contains dimensions which are important to create a favorable environment for OEP within your context.

	Not yet started	Early stages/awareness	Developing/Commitment	Established	Embedded/Advanced
1. Is an IPR, DRM and copyright regulation for OER in use?	No IPR frameworks/concepts are used to support use/re-use of OER.	Some individuals are informally developing OER and share them under free licenses.	Some departments and teams are using free licenses for sharing OER.	Educational resources are published under free licenses and practice, understanding and knowledge of how to use such licenses exists.	An institution-wide policy to create, use and publish educational resources under free and open licenses is embedded in the institution.
2. Is there a motivational framework for OEP in existence (e.g. incentives)?	There are no incentives for OEP.	Individuals are motivated to develop and (re-)use OER and use open learning architectures.	Motivation to develop and (re-)use OER and open educational practices on a department or team level is simulated through incentives.	Incentives to stimulate the transformation of educational scenarios and resources into OEP exist on an organizational level.	OEP is supported through an organization-wide motivation framework.
3. Are OEP used?	There is no use of OEP.	OEP are applied in a few courses.	The use of OEP means that the organization is now offering a small number of new courses, using more flexible and innovative delivery methods and OER.	OEP is an established reality organization wide.	OEP are embedded into the organization's culture and are a subject to regular reflection.

4. Do you have tools to support sharing and exchanging information about open educational practices?	No tools for supporting the sharing of open educational practices (e.g. social networks, blogs, etc.) exist.	Individuals are starting to use tools for sharing open educational practices (e.g. social networks, blogs, etc.).	Teams, departments and learners are adopting tools for sharing and exchange of information about educational practices (e.g. social networks, blogs, etc.).	Use of digital tools to support sharing and exchange about OEP are a widespread reality on an organizational level.	The use of digital tools which support sharing and exchange of information about OEP are embedded into organizational policies and infrastructures and are continuously reviewed and improved.
5. Do you apply quality concepts to OEP?	No quality, evaluation or assessment models for OEP exist within the organization.	Individuals are applying quality concepts for OEP.	The organization has started to apply quality concepts for some elements of OEP (e.g., quality guides for OER, assessment models for open learning.)	Specific quality concepts for OEP are applied organization-wide.	A policy for institution-wide agreed quality concepts for OEP is in use and regularly updated.
6. What level of knowledge and skills do teachers have in relation to open learning architectures and OEP?	Teachers have little or no understanding of open learning architectures.	A small number of teachers have sufficient knowledge to apply OEP.	Knowledge and skills to create open learning architectures within the organization's educational programs are beginning to diffuse from a handful of to teaching staff more generally.	A significant number of teachers across the whole organization have the skills and confidence to successfully create open learning architectures.	The vast majority of teaching staff have the knowledge, skills and confidence to successfully and appropriately create open learning architectures.
7. Level of digital literacy skills ⁸	Teachers have little or no digital literacy.	A small number of teachers are beginning to develop digital literacy.	Digital literacy is increasing as a skill among teachers within the organization's educational programs	The level of digital literacy among teachers is constantly improving.	The vast majority of the teaching staff possesses digital literacy.
8. Are support mechanisms in place to support the development of OEP?	There are no support mechanisms to support teachers in the development of OEP.	A small number of teachers are starting to informally assist each other in the development of OEP.	Support processes to develop OEP are starting to be provided at the team and department level.	There are support mechanisms within the organization to support teachers in the development of OEP	Support mechanisms are embedded in the organization's policy in order to support teachers in the development of OEP.

⁸ For digital literacy skills see report: Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century at http://digitalllearning.macfound.org/atf/cf/%7B7E45C7E0-A3E0-4B89-AC9C-E807E1B0AE4E%7D/JENKINS_WHITE_PAPER.PDF