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Transforming Education through Open Approaches.
Introduction to selected papers

Inés Gil-Jaurena
Editor for Open Praxis. Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia - UNED (Spain)
editor@openpraxis.org

For a fifth consecutive year, Open Praxis has partnered with the Open Education Consortium for the publication of selected papers among those presented in the 2018 Open Education Global Conference, held in Delft (The Netherlands) from 24 to 26 of April, 2018 (https://conference.oecconsortium.org/2018). This follows a collaboration that led to the publication of special issues in previous years (Gil-Jaurena et al., 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017).

The papers submitted for publication in this Open Praxis special issue have followed a separate review process. The Open Education Global Conference 2018 Program Committee first reviewed the proposals for acceptance in the conference. Among those accepted for the conference, 58 had stated an interest in the publication opportunity in Open Praxis. Those best rated by the program committee, a total of 12, were then recommended for potential publication in this special issue. 8 of them accepted the invitation and submitted the full paper to Open Praxis. After following the usual submission guidelines and going through a double-blind peer-review process by two reviewers, additional revisions were requested to authors, and finally 7 papers were accepted for publication.

The theme of the Open Education Global 2018 Conference is “Transforming Education through Open Approaches”. Considering the conference tracks, the selected contributions cover various topics in relation to Open Education, and have been presented at the conference as follows:

- The first paper, about learning from the past and the development of open and distance education research over time, has been included in the “Open Education Research” track.
- The second paper, about the conceptualization of Open Educational Practices, has been presented in the “Open Educational Practices/Open Pedagogy” track, along with other two selected papers (6th and 7th in this special issue). We have placed it in second place in the issue, though, because it provides a general framework.
- The third paper, about the case in Australia, has been included in the “Policies & strategies for Open Education” track.
- The fourth paper, about the case in Kyrgyzstan, has been presented in the “Institutionalizing Open Education” track.
- The fifth paper, about a professional development MOOC, has been presented in the “Innovation through opening traditional practices” track.
- The sixth and seventh papers, about a European project and about an international experience, have been included in the “Open Educational Practices/Open Pedagogy” track, as well.

In this special issue, the papers have been ordered from more general (those that provide an overview or cover a wider context) to more specific (those that report on concrete experiences).

Additionally, the OE Global 2018 Conference Program Chair, Robert Schuwer, has prepared an historical analysis of the contributions to the OE Global conference since 2005 (Days of future passed, the history of OEGlobal in titles). His analysis, included in the Editorial section, provides a valuable overview of the evolution of the topics and of the conference itself.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.10.2.862
In the first selected paper, Martin Weller, Katy Jordan, Irwin DeVries and Viv Rolfe, from various institutions in the United Kingdom and Canada (*Mapping the open education landscape: citation network analysis of historical open and distance education research*), analyze published research in this field since the 1970’s to 2017, highlighting most cited papers and their interrelations. The identification of 8 categories/topics and the analysis of their connections from a historical perspective are relevant inputs for anyone interested in research in open and distance education. The paper is also an invitation to acknowledge earlier works prior to the OER movement, and to link the topics, which have appeared as quite isolated clusters in the citation network.

From a conceptual perspective, Catherine Cronin and Iain MacLaren from the National University of Ireland (*Conceptualising OEP: A review of theoretical and empirical literature in Open Educational Practices*), undertake a literature review focused on the production derived from 4 international projects or initiatives related to open education, and on empirical studies related to OEP (including OER). The paper highlights the evolution and complexity of the topic and some underlying assumptions in the definitions of OEP, and provides a useful synthesis for those involved in Open Educational Practices.

In the first country-based paper in this issue, Carina Bossu and Adrian Stagg, from two universities in Australia (*The potential role of Open Educational Practice policy in transforming Australian higher education*), report on the case of Australia, where there are not national regulations of recommendations about OER and OEP. The authors explore the shift in the educational policies towards a neoliberal ideology that focuses on the economic role of universities, and reflect about the role of policies in the adoption of OEP. The authors raise their concern and proposals to engage with OEP in a context where ideologies collide.

In the second country-based contribution, Anita R. Walz and Jylidy Bekbalaeva, from the USA and Kyrgyzstan respectively (*Assessing the Potential Toward Open Educational Practices in Kyrgyzstan*), present a survey-based study developed in the Kyrgyz Republic to explore the perception of university faculty, administrative and librarians about issues such as OER, copyright, and OEP. The authors identify areas that demand further action in order to increase the use of Open Educational Resources and Practices, as a first approach to the topic in the country.

Reporting on a specific experience, Shironica Karunanayaka, Som Naidu, J.C.N. Rajendra and S.A. Ariadurai, from the Open University of Sri Lanka and the University of the South Pacific in Fiji (*Designing Continuing Professional Development MOOCs to promote the adoption of OER and OEP*), narrate about the scenario-based course launched at the OU Sri Lanka for encouraging faculty to introduce OER into their teaching practice. The authors extensively describe the course design process, which involves different agents in a design-based research approach. The input is of interest to other practitioners involved in online course design.

Also focusing on design, Kate Helen Miller, Ronald McIntyre and Gary McKenna, from two higher education institutions in the United Kingdom (*Collaborative design of Open Educational Practices: An Assets based approach*), report on an ongoing Erasmus + project that, in a transnational partnership, is working on applying a collaborative and community approach to the design of OER. They explain the project framework, provide a practical example of co-creation and envisage the next steps in the project, which will finish in December 2018.

Finally in this special issue that presents selected papers from the Open Education Global Conference 2018, Laura Ritchie, from the University of Chichester in the United Kingdom (*Opening the Curriculum through Open Educational Practices: International experience*), describes an innovative practice that she promoted in partnership with a high school in the USA. The experience implied online and face-to-face collaboration between UK and USA students in the field of Music. The author highlights the benefits of the experience for the students’ learning and points out some implications with regards to curriculum, management, etc., as well as some limitations.
With this diversity of papers, we wish *Open Praxis* readers an enjoyable and critical reading, which we hope will contribute to the debate about open education and to transforming education through open. We specially thank to the authors and the reviewers for their valuable contributions, and to the Open Education Consortium and the OE Global 2018 Conference Committee for the partnership and collaboration in the preparation of this special issue.

**References**


Days of future passed, the history of OEGlobal in titles

Robert Schuwer
Conference Program Chair. Fontys University of Applied Sciences (The Netherlands)
r.schuwer@fontys.nl

This special issue contains some of the almost 180 accepted contributions of this years’ Open Education Global conference (OEGlobal), to be held in Delft from 24-26 April 2018. These annual global conferences are organized by the Open Education Consortium (until 2014 named Open Courseware Consortium), together with a local institution. The first edition in this series of conferences was organized in 2005 by the Utah State University in Logan.

Over the years, the conference grew bigger and attracted more and more diverse participants, both from educational sectors (higher and vocational education) and from region. To illustrate: from the 66 contributions in 2005, 9 came from outside the USA. In this years’ edition, corresponding authors of proposals originated from 29 countries (measured 31 October 2017). Figure 1 provides a graphical overview. The green areas represent the origin of accepted proposals.

![Figure 1: Origin of proposals for OEGlobal 2018](image)

To find out how this conference reflects developments in the world of open education, an analysis is made of the contributions. Table 1 lists the number of contributions per year. In 2016, contributions with a decision “probably accept” (3x) and “no decision” (12x) from the program committee are included in the analysis. In total, 665 contributions are accepted.
To this end, the data for analysis consists of words from the titles of the contributions, assuming that a title is the shortest, accurate description of its content. The following methodology is applied:

- The years 2005 and 2013 up to and including 2018 are selected. The last six editions can make trends visible. Inclusion of the edition from 2005 makes possible comparisons between now and then. The sources for the data are in table 2. The dataset is available for download in http://bit.ly/titlesOEC.
- After a first try, it appeared data cleaning was necessary to avoid synonyms and common singular and plural formulations. The data cleaning consisted of four replacements in the titles:
  - “Open Educational Resources” with “OER”
  - “MOOCs” with “MOOC”
  - “Policies” with “Policy”
  - “Students” with “Student”
- The cleaned titles were subjected to a word count, using the text analysis service TAPoR (http://taporware.ualberta.ca/~taporware/textTools/listword.shtml). Excluded from this word count were common words from the modified Glasgow Stop Words list (http://taporware.ualberta.ca/~taporware/cgi-bin/prototype/glasgowstoplist.txt).
- To avoid contamination caused by case-sensitivity, the tool automatically converts all words to lowercase.
- For each year, the Top 15 most mentioned words in the cleaned titles were taken into the analysis.
- When a word was appearing 3 or more times in the Top 15 in the years 2013-2018, these words were also taken into account for the years they did not make the Top 15.

### Results

The Top 15 words per year resulted in a list of 51 different words. Four of them (open, oer, education and learning) appeared in the Top 15 of all editions. Table 3 list the 18 words with the total highest frequency, starting from those words that appeared in 3 or more Top 15 overviews in the years 2013-2018. Those occurrences that were not in the Top 15 in a specific year are marked in red.

---

Table 1: Number of contributions to OEGlobal per year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># accepted</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># submissions</td>
<td>(missing)</td>
<td>(missing)</td>
<td>(missing)</td>
<td>(missing)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% accepted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Data sources for the analysis of the history of OEGlobal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013, 2016, 2017</td>
<td>Archives from the Open Education Consortium, not online available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td><a href="https://conference.oeconsortium.org/2015/presentations/">https://conference.oeconsortium.org/2015/presentations/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Data from the conference system Easychair (only accessible for admins). Snapshot taken 19 March 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The top 4 could be expected beforehand. The following observations can be made.

- In 2018, 57 contributions mention OER in the title. A further analysis of the contributions from 2018 reveals that 33 contributions with OER in its title are about adoption issues, ranging from institutional to national and cross-national level. 9 contributions are about OER as a means to realize another goal (e.g. deep learning or student success). The remaining 15 contributions address miscellaneous topics with a role for OER. This reflects a steady growth in attention for OER, with more and more attention for adoption.
- The number of contributions regarding MOOCs remains steady, but because of the growth in total number of contributions over the years, the relative number of contributions diminishes.
- Policy, research and impact are ongoing issues in contributions, with fluctuations over the years. These items do count for a small number of contributions.
- The last two editions show a growth in Practices. A further analysis of the titles reveals that in 2017 and 2018 10, respectively 11 contributions with Practice in the title are about Open Educational Practices. In 2018, this topic is also addressed in 5 contributions with “Student” and 6 contributions with “Open pedagogy” in the title. These data reflects a development with more and more attention on the impact of open resources on education and learning.

This last observation is also made visible when comparing the results from 2005 and 2018 (the first and the last edition of this conference). Figure 2 present a word cloud of the Top 15 words from titles.
of both years (including ex aequo frequencies for the 15th position, which explains the higher number of words in both clouds).

The clouds in figure 2 show that among others MOOC, student, impact, policy, pedagogy and practices were no topics in 2005, again reflecting a development with a focus on (institutional) adoption and education instead of focus on resources. On the other hand, topics like community/communities and sustainability (showing in the Top 15 in 2005) are not showing in the Top 15 in 2018, but show up lower in the word list. This reflects that these topics still challenge stakeholders in the open world.

This analysis is looking into the rear-view mirror, creating a picture of how the world of open education has evolved in the last 14 years. Inferring future trends is hard by just looking at the titles. As an example, the topic Learning Analytics is not mentioned in the titles, Artificial intelligence (AI) and Machine learning just once, although both technologies are supposed to play an important role in online education and learning in the near future (Adams et al., 2017). This also shows that analysis of only titles is a quick but superficial way to learn about trends and developments over the years. The methodology is also limited, because choice of themes for a conference and different interpretations of acceptance criteria by a program committee over the years also influence acceptance of contributions. One might expect, however, that choice of themes for an edition of the conference reflects the trends of that specific year and, therefore, would contribute to make the trend visible in the contributions.

One trend I hope that will be visible in the next years is more research and practice in sectors other than higher education. Janssen and Schuwer (2018) describe a study on adoption of OER in Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET). One of the findings of that study is that, with an exception for Community Colleges in the USA, almost no research is available about OER in TVET. At a global level, the picture is that most efforts for adoption of OER (both in terms of research and implementation) focus on higher education. However, these efforts address only 14.6% of the world’s population aged 15-64 years old (World Bank, 2018). We may assume that OER may make even more difference to achieve lower access barriers to quality education in the countries that are not part of the “High Income” countries. But only 9.8% of people aged 15-64 years old are reached in those parts of the world when focusing on higher education.

The theme of the 2nd OER World Congress in Ljubljana in September 2017 (http://www.oercongress.org) was “OER for Inclusive and Equitable Quality Education: From Commitment to Action”. However, if this “Action” does not focus much more than previously on sectors other than higher education, with a focus
on other countries than the “High Income” countries, there is a real danger that OER will contribute to increasing the gap between the “Haves” and “Have-nots” instead of bridging this gap. And that is not the intention of the open world: reducing inclusive access to quality education instead of increasing it!

References
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Independent open educator (United Kingdom)
vivien.rolfe@gmail.com

Abstract
The term open education has recently been used to refer to topics such as Open Educational Resources (OERs) and Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Historically its roots lie in civil approaches to education and open universities, but this research is rarely referenced or acknowledged in current interpretations. In this article the antecedents of the modern open educational movement are examined, as the basis for connecting the various strands of research. Using a citation analysis method the key references are extracted and their relationships mapped. This work reveals eight distinct sub-topics within the broad open education area, with relatively little overlap. The implications for this are discussed and methods of improving inter-topic research are proposed.

Keywords: Open education, distance education, citation network analysis, social network analysis

Introduction
The purpose of this paper is to enrich current scholarship by exploring and identifying key historic papers, authors and themes in open education research. The work builds on a systematic approach that identified a corpus of historical open education articles from the 1970’s which are almost entirely non-cited in the literature today (Rolfe, 2016). It is intended that this study will provide an accessible starting point for researchers to deepen their understanding and further explore and incorporate earlier open and distance education research into their current work.

Open education is an evolving term that covers a range of philosophies and practices aimed at widening access to education for those wishing to learn, with the current focus predominantly on practices based around reuse and sharing. This current focus can be traced back to the Open Educational Resources (OER) movement, and the use of open licences, such as Creative Commons licences.

Current interpretations of open education are often shaped by the OER movement with an emphasis on the ‘5Rs of reuse’ (Reuse, Revise Remix, Redistribute and Retain - Wiley 2014). For instance Wiley (2013, 2017) defines open pedagogy as the ‘set of teaching and learning practices only possible in the context of the affordances of open educational resources as enabled by the 5Rs’ and talks of OER enabled pedagogies. The profile of open education has been further raised in recent years by the popularity of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Although they do not
always meet the 5Rs criteria, MOOCs are open to all and freely available. The growth of awareness and use of open textbooks, as a specific form of OER, has also gained a great amount of attention over the past few years, particularly in North America through projects such as OpenStax and BC Campus.

In addition, the advent of policies around open access publishing has raised the profile of openness in general for many working in higher education. The Registry of Open Access Repository Mandates and Policies (ROARMAP) tracks open access policies at the funder, research organisation and multiple organisation level and indicates 887 at the end of 2017, in 68 different countries. These open access policies have expanded more recently to encompass open access to research data, with support from funding bodies and policy makers.

Policies relating to OER are similarly increasing. Keskin et al. (2018) examined OER and MOOCs policies USA, UK, Canada, South Korea and Turkey and found that each had policies of varying forms to promote the development and use of OER and MOOCs. A European Framework for the Digital Competence of Educators (Redecker, 2017) proposes that a key competence for all educators is to “effectively identify resources that best fit their learning objectives, learner group and teaching style, to structure the wealth of materials, establish connections and to modify, add on to and develop themselves digital resources to support their teaching” (p. 20). Understanding open licenses and the use of OER is stated as a key means to realise this. UNESCO made OER a central method for realising their Sustainable Development Goal 4: Ensure inclusive and quality education for all and promote lifelong learning, with the 2017 Ljubljana OER action plan (UNESCO, 2017).

The formalisation of open principles into policy could be seen to indicate that open education in its various forms has entered much of the mainstream educational practice, since the inception of the OER movement in 2001. However, concepts and practices associated with open education have a longer history than the OER movement. Peter and Deimann (2013) highlight open education practices stretching back to the Middle-ages with the founding of universities which “contained in them the idea of openness, albeit by no means comprehensive. This period highlights ‘open’ as learner driven, resting on a growing curiosity and increasing awareness of educational opportunities” (p. 9). Open education can be traced through the 17th Century with coffee-houses and then into the industrial revolution with schools and working clubs. Then in the 20th Century the founding of ‘open’ universities such as the UK Open University and the University of South Africa developed a model of large-scale provision.

This longer historical perspective highlights that open education is a shifting concept. The authors conclude that

> Historical forms of openness caution us against assuming that particular configurations will prevail, or that social aspects should be assumed as desired by default. […] After a period of open movements many times there have been slight but important shifts from ‘pure’ openness towards ‘pretended’ openness, i.e. some aspects have been modified to offer more control for producers and other stakeholders (Peter & Deimann, 2012, p. 12).

From the current perspective, Weller (2014) proposes three core antecedents for the current open education movement, namely open universities, open source software, and web 2.0 culture. From these a number of coalescing principles can be derived, including: freedom to reuse; open access; free cost; easy use; digital, networked content; social, community based approaches; ethical arguments for openness; and openness as an efficient model. These shared principles are significant for the work that follows, as it suggests that even though practitioners may be working in tightly focused and defined areas of interest, there are commonalities across much of open education. However, while
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this suggests that the current manifestation of open education has its roots in previous interpretations and developments, much of the current literature in what can broadly be defined as open education fails to acknowledge or cite this earlier work. Weller (2016) analysed publications from an OER research repository (the OER Knowledge Cloud), and derived the following categories: Project Case Study; Technical; OER as subject; Research with impact data; Policy; Practitioner; OER in developing nations; MOOCs; Pedagogy; Open practice.

There is a strong tendency to be self-referential across all of these categories, with little reference to open education prior to OER movement. A preliminary systematic search (Rolfe, 2016) for “open education” across a number of databases, retrieved over two hundred articles and revealed that there was an initial peak in the period 1970-74, with articles deriving largely from the concentrating on open pedagogy in UK infant schools, and also from the founding of the Open University. The next significant peak in publications is found in 2010-15 as MOOCs, open textbooks and OER gain traction (Figure 1).

![Number of articles retrieved over time](image)

**Figure 1:** Frequency of published articles on open education over time

There is little connection between these two peaks of open education publications however. For instance, Katz (1972) and Resnick (1972) were two of the most frequently cited papers (41 and 21 respectively) that deal with broadly applicable open education issues, but are rarely cited beyond the 1980s.

As the work above highlights, research and definitions of open education continues to evolve and branch into new areas of focus. However, many of its themes bear certain similarities to earlier research starting from the late 1960s and developing through to the ‘80s and beyond. For example, the popularity of MOOCs was hailed as a revolution in higher education, democratizing learning for millions (Koller, 2012), with 2012 being declared the ‘Year of the MOOC’ (Pappano, 2012). However, completion rates were very low (Jordan, 2014), the demographics of learners favoured those with an existing high level of education (Kolowich 2013), and they were expensive to produce (Hollands & Tirthali, 2014). By 2013, even MOOC pioneer Sebastian Thrun declared that they were ‘a lousy product’ (Chaifkin, 2013). Much of the early MOOC literature ignored
existing literature on distance education and e-learning, declaring them ‘the first generation of online learning’ (Godin, 2016). The literature on supporting students at a distance (e.g. Tait, 2004), e-learning costs (e.g. Bates, 1995; Weller, 2004), or student retention (e.g. Tinto, 1975) may well have provided useful contributions to this development, but was largely ignored. Similarly, much of the current provision in distance education can learn from the development of tools, and production techniques in MOOCs.

It is the authors’ contention that providing connections between these bodies of research in open education is mutually beneficial for researchers and practitioners. The studies into practice since the 1970s have produced an extensive body of theory in open and distance education, which can add valuable insights for current researchers and practitioners. In addition, researchers and graduate students will be able to enrich their studies by tracing ideas, connections, discontinuities and patterns gleaned from the analysis of earlier studies. Further, current discourses about the meaning of openness in education may well benefit from an understanding of historical patterns of open and distance education research, in particular the challenges faced.

**Methods**

Social network analysis (SNA) approaches were used to build a network of the literature cited in the field. SNA is not a single approach but rather a toolkit of different metrics and analyses which can be used in a range of contexts where social relations can be conceived of as links between individual nodes (Borgatti, Mehra, Brass & Labianca, 2009; Kadushin, 2012; Wasserman & Faust, 1994). By viewing social relations as a network, novel insights can be gained in terms of the structure of communities and importance of key connections (Borgatti et al., 2009). By thinking in these terms, the literature cited in an academic publication can be conceived of as a network where each reference is a node, linked to another node (the publication it is cited in) through a tie which represents the social practice of a citation.

This approach has been widely used to visualise the structure of scientific knowledge and map academic disciplines (Börner, Chen & Boyack, 2003; Small, 1999). When applied to a variety of subject areas, this approach has yielded insights into the sub-domains within a field and areas of overlap between them. Dawson, Gašević, Siemens and Joksimovic (2014) used this approach to examine the network of literature cited by papers at the Learning Analytics and Knowledge annual conferences from 2011 to 2013, with a view to “to identify the emergence of trends and disciplinary hierarchies that are influencing the development of the field to date” (Dawson et al., 2014, p. 231).

As such, using citation network analysis serves the goals of the present study to an extent, as a way of identifying sub-domains within literature related to openness and education. However, a key distinction between existing studies and the present study is the exploratory and historical nature of the research. Whereas citation networks typically start with a well bounded and defined set of literature (Dawson et al., 2014, for example), the term openness is not clearly defined and draws upon multiple subject areas, making a well-defined set of literature to include is a challenge (this problem also reflects the aims of the study itself). We also set out to trace the links between contemporary and historical perspectives on openness, which also calls for an exploratory approach to uncover the citation links to earlier works.

To this end, an iterative approach was used to generate the sample of papers selected for inclusion in the citation network. An initial sample of 20 documents were selected, on the basis of literature database searches for items which referred specifically to the history or definition of openness ("open education", "open learning", openness)AND(history,definition)), listed in Table 1.
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Table 1: The collection of initial papers identified to seed the cited literature network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyland, J.T.</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Open Education: a slogan examined</td>
<td>Educational Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis, R.</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>What is open learning?</td>
<td>Open Learning: The journal of open, distance and e-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guri-Rozenblit, S.</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Differentiating between Distance/Open Education Systems: Parameters for Comparison</td>
<td>International Review of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calder, J.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Beauty Lies in the Eye of the Beholder</td>
<td>International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAndrew, P.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Defining openness: updating the concept of “open” for a connected world</td>
<td>Journal of Interactive Media in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friesen, N. &amp; Murray, J.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>“Open Learning 2.0”? Aligning Student, Teacher and Content for Openness in Education</td>
<td>E-Learning and Digital Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter, S. &amp; Deimann, M.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>On the role of openness in education: A historical reconstruction</td>
<td>Open Praxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weller, M.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>The Battle for Open: How openness won and why it doesn’t feel like victory</td>
<td>Book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalsgaard, C. &amp; Thestrup, K.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Dimensions of Openness: Beyond the Course as an Open Format in Online Education</td>
<td>International Review of Research in Online and Distributed Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourlay, L.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Open Education as a “Heterotopia of Desire”</td>
<td>Learning, Media and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver, M.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>From openness to permeability: reframing open education in terms of positive liberty in the enactment of academic practices</td>
<td>Learning, Media and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hug, T.</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Defining Openness in Education</td>
<td>Living Reference Work Entry, Encyclopedia of Educational Philosophy and Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, F.W.</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>An Alternative Approach: Openness in Education over the Last 100 Years</td>
<td>TechTrends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
The references were then extracted from each of the above (forward citations were not included). The literature and references were checked for consistency and duplicate items in a two-column spreadsheet (references in a first column of ‘source’ items and the articles in which they are cited in a second ‘target’ column). The data were then exported as CSV files and imported into Gephi for network analysis (Bastian, Heymann & Jacomy, 2009). The steps involved in the process are illustrated in Figure 2 using some of the references from one of the initial sample of ‘seed’ papers.

Table 1: Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronin, C.</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Openness and Praxis: Exploring the Use of Open Educational Practices in Higher Education</td>
<td>International Review of Research in Online and Distributed Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalz, M., Khalil, M. &amp; Ebner, M.</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Editorial for the special issue on advancing research on open education</td>
<td>Journal of Computing in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, M.L. &amp; Seward, R.</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Openness as social praxis</td>
<td>First Monday</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 2: Illustration of the process of creating a network from the references in a seed paper](image-url)
The papers which were cited by at least two of the original sample items were then added to the sample to include their references in the next iteration. Although this process could be repeated indefinitely, four iterations have been carried out and it was felt that meaningful clusters had emerged at this point. It is worth reiterating that the nature of the network is exploratory rather than exhaustive. At this point, the network included 5,217 references from a total of 172 publications. Note that it was not possible to include references for some multi-cited items due to not having any references, or not being accessible online (books or chapters).

## Results

The full final citation network is shown in Figure 3. Articles which were included in the sample and their references used to build the network are shown as magenta nodes. Those which were cited more than twice but whose references were not included are shown in blue. There were several reasons why this would be the case, including articles not having references, references not being accessible online, or having achieved >2 citations in the fourth iteration (i.e. those which would have been included in a fifth iteration of the network). Nodes which were only cited once are shown in grey.

![Figure 3: Full network of items included in the citation network. Magenta = first sample articles; blue = articles cited more than twice but references not included; grey = articles cited once](image)

The network visualisation in Figure 3 uses the Force Atlas 2 algorithm (Jacomy, Venturini, Heymann & Bastian, 2014). The algorithm is based on two simple principles: “Nodes repulse each other like charged particles, while edges attract their nodes, like springs” (Jacomy et al. 2014). As a result, clusters of papers have emerged based on the extent of sharing the same references, which raises questions of both what the clusters represent, and which key publications act as links between different clusters. In order to clearly characterise the network further, the same layout will be maintained but items for which references were not included will be removed. Highly cited items (>4 citations) for which references were not included will be kept, as this will include notable publications which did not have references or references were inaccessible. The resulting network is shown in Figure 4, with nodes colour-coded to show categories applied by the researcher in order to distinguish the nature.
of different communities\textsuperscript{1}. Items which did not immediately lend themselves to a particular category are shown in grey.

![Figure 4: Annotated version of the network. Colour coding indicates categories applied by the researcher, and node size is scaled to reflect the number of times each item is cited within the dataset](image)

These categories are partly a subjective interpretation of the clustering. Each of them is now considered in turn, and the type of subjects they address.

The Open Education in schools (or Open Classrooms) movement is the earliest cluster present in the network, receiving greatest focus in the early 1970s. The term originated in the UK in the wake of the Plowden report (1967), a comprehensive review of primary school provision at the time. The concept subsequently proved popular in America. In this context, ‘open’ can relate both to the physical layout of classroom spaces, and approaches to designing educational tasks.

Distance education emerges in the network from 1980 onwards, with a focus on the growing phenomenon of open and distance universities. Two notable shifts occur which link distance education to other subsequent themes in the development of openness. From the mid 1980s, the term ‘open learning’ becomes more prominent, signalling a shift towards learner-centred pedagogy and removing barriers. Towards the end of the decade, technological advances such as computer-mediated communication and the nascent World Wide Web become increasingly important. Both lay some of the groundwork for the subsequent theme of ‘E-learning and online education’.

\textsuperscript{1}A browsable version of this network, including full references for all nodes, can be found online at http://www.katyjordan.com/ICDE/network/
E-learning and online education rose to prominence in the 1990s and early 2000s, bridging the gap between distance education and OER. This period saw a mainstreaming of many of the issues relating to open education, as e-learning became an area of interest for traditional universities and not just open education providers. Over this period, e-learning (and related terms, such as technology enhanced learning) become increasingly synonymous with the Internet and web-based technologies, while largely not losing sight of the importance of pedagogy and adapting teaching practices rather than relying on new technology alone.

Open access publishing entered the network as a concept towards the end of the 1990s, with a focus on metrics and how OA compares to traditional scholarly publishing during the 2000s. In contrast to the other themes so far, this cluster is not primarily concerned with education in terms of teaching, but rather focused on the research activities and outputs of higher education. As such, it is not widely linked to the other themes in the network, but has been an important contributor towards open practices in terms of digital scholarship.

The Open Educational Resources (OER) theme is a tight-knit community at the heart of the network. The OER theme emerges around the year 2000, initially focusing upon learning objects, open source education, and OpenCourseWare. The theme is central to the citation network, both drawing upon existing work in e-learning and distance education, and influencing subsequent themes of MOOCs and open practices. While the discourse around OER emphasise opening up quality educational resources on a global scale, later in the theme a recognition that access is not enough and need to be combined with open educational practices emerges.

Social media emerged as a theme in the network, from the mid 2000s. While the majority of papers included in the network are written from a more general Internet Studies or Communication perspective rather than focused on education or academia, the position of the theme suggests that this body of work has been influential in thinking about open practices and scholarly activities online. Use of online social networking tools is particularly prominent, but the theme also includes ideas related to ‘Web 2.0’ and social media more broadly, such as blogging. In very recent years, this theme has been less well represented as the focus has shifted towards use of tools as part of Open practices.

Massive open online courses (MOOCs) represent one of the most recent themes within the network. Although ‘open’ is ostensibly foregrounded, being part of the acronym itself, the relationship with the discourse surrounding openness in education is less clear. The group of papers on the theme of MOOCs have some shared connections to the OER and e-learning clusters, but are distinct.

The theme of Open practices is one of the most recent and ongoing areas for research in the field. Its location within the network shows how it sits at the intersection of social media, open access publishing, and OER. It includes articles focused upon digital scholarly practices, and open educational practices, spanning both the research and teaching remits of higher education.

In addition to identifying research themes through characterising the clustering within the network, viewing the connections in this way also gives insight into their relative proximity. Open practices have emerged as the connection between three of the major communities - OER, Open Access publishing, and social media. MOOCs appear to be most closely related to OER, whilst the two oldest communities (Open education in schools, and Distance education and open learning) are only weakly linked to the main body of the network, and only to each other through more recent work. The temporal development of the network can be seen more clearly through Figure 5.
In addition to the two communities (Open education in schools, and Distance education and open learning) highlighted as some of the oldest papers in the network in Figure 5, there are also a handful of older, highly-cited papers at the heart of the network. These nodes are also not easily classified within a particular community (Figure 3). The most highly cited nodes (>7 citations) within the network are listed in Table 2, and their positions within the network are labelled in Figure 6. For items in Table 2 which were highly cited but did not clearly sit exclusively within one particular community, the ‘category’ field is left blank.

![Figure 5: The network, colour-coded according to publication date](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD (2007)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lave &amp; Wenger (1991)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenger (1998)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downes (2007)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hylen (2006)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued*
In addition to considering the number of citations as a way of identifying key papers within the network, betweenness centrality is a network metric which can be used to identify papers based on their position within the network structure. Betweenness centrality is calculated based on the number of shortest paths; that is, the shortest way to navigate through the network between any two given nodes. The 20 publications with the highest betweenness centrality are listed in Table 3, and their network positions shown in Figure 7. Note that some of the ‘category’ fields in Table 3 are left intentionally blank, as these items did not fall clearly into one of the emergent communities or another in the network, i.e. they correspond to some of the nodes which are colour-coded as grey in Figure 4.

![Figure 6: Labelled positions of the highly cited publications listed in Table 2 within the network (cropped)](image)

**Table 2: Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geser (2007)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley (2007)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caswell et al. (2008)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vygotsky (1978)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siemens (2005)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO (2002)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boyd &amp; Ellison (2007)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAndrew et al. (2009)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Distance education and open learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harnad &amp; Brody (2004)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>OA publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenkins et al. (2006)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: The 20 publications exhibiting greatest betweenness centrality in the network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Betweenness Centrality</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OECD (2007)</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iiyoshi &amp; Kumar (2008)</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weller (2011)</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>Open practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel (1996)</td>
<td>662</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downes (2007)</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dholakia, King &amp; Baraniuk (2008)</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>Open education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel et al. (2006)</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Open source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hylen (2006)</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajjem, Harnad &amp; Gingras (2005)</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>OA publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fini (2009)</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>MOOCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurillard (1993)</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>E-learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weller (2014)</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAndrew et al. (2009)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Distance education and open learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veletsianos (2012)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>Open practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAuley et al. (2010)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>MOOCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown &amp; Adler (2008)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>Open education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehlers (2011)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>Open practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fini et al. (2008)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Open education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lane &amp; McAndrew (2010)</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McAndrew (2010)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 7: Labelled positions of the publications with high betweenness centrality listed in Table 3 within the network (cropped)
Discussion and Conclusions

This research is not intended to be exhaustive, nor are the identified prominent studies intended to be canonical. It would be possible to realize a different network with different seeding inputs. However, this research does offer a new and interesting view on the development of the field of open education over time. The eight distinct sub-topics within open education over the past four decades were identified as open access, OER, MOOCs, open educational practice, social media, e-learning, open education in schools and distance learning. These communities are perhaps not surprising, although in some ways the relationships between them are. For instance, large islands exist consisting of such areas as open education in schools, MOOCs, and distance education and open learning. While e-learning has a preponderance of citations, it again exists by itself with little connection to the other areas. The lack of connection between MOOCs and e-learning literature for instance, reinforces the anecdotal sense that this field has developed without recognition of work that has preceded it.

There has been a temporal aspect to much of this development which is represented in Figure 5. Distance education morphed into e-learning literature during much of the 1980s and 1990s. The initiation of the OER movement since 2002 has also coincided with open access as a field of interest. The rise of web 2.0 and social media in the late 2000s led to research relating to academic use of these tools. Social media, OER and open access can be seen as precursors to MOOCs and open practice respectively. Open education in schools has seen different periods of interest, but remained largely distinct from the others. Each of these practices might make reference to its precursor movement, but rarely beyond that.

However, the linking between the sub-topics in the network should not be viewed simply as newer developments, such as MOOCs, acknowledging and learning from prior developments, but also established areas benefiting from new insights. For example, Tait (in press) analyses the future of open, distance education universities and highlights a lack of innovation as a potential threat to their long-term sustainability. Similarly, Paul (2016) argues that open universities have been resistant to adopting many of the digital methods in delivery, allowing other providers to ‘steal their clothes’ in Daniel’s (2017, p. 2) phrase. The research in topics such as MOOCs, social media and OER are closely related to open university practice and so provide a route for innovation that falls within the remit of such universities. Strengthening the relationship between these research areas then might be seen as a first step in addressing this innovation lag.

Of the eight areas identified there seems to be a relationship between how tightly clustered the references are and the clarity of definition. For example, clear definitions exist for open access (e.g. Suber, 2004) and OER (e.g. UNESCO, 2002). E-learning comparatively is less well defined, covering any aspect of ICT in education, online learning, learning management systems, and so on. The references here are thus less well connected. Similarly, open educational practice (OEP) is an emerging field which does not have a clear definition, as Havemann (2016) states, ‘the value of OEP as a concept is in its more wide-ranging remit’. Thus, what is included in this classification is more disparate than for others. It can also be seen however as a connecting thread between all the other fields. OEP addresses the manner in which each of these other areas are implemented and educators adapt their practice.

These and other patterns in the diagram give evidence of a lack of solid connections between what intuitively would appear to be strongly related areas. It also highlights the importance of publications that act as nodes between these ‘islands’, forming possible bridges between the different communities. Open education does not constitute a discipline, in the manner of a hard science for example, so there is no agreed canon of research that all researchers will be familiar with.
with. It is also an area that practitioners tend to move into from other fields, often because of an interest in applying aspects of openness to their foundational discipline. This can be seen as an advantage, in that different perspectives are brought into the domain, and it evolves rapidly. However, it also results in an absence of shared knowledge, with the consequence that existing knowledge is often ‘rediscovered’ or not built upon. In order to partly address this issue, the authors have created a Beginner’s Guide with a summary of key articles in each of the eight areas identified (Jordan & Weller, 2017).

There are limitations to the research which should be acknowledged. The first of these is that there is a backward perspective as the citation network builds on past papers, so there may be a lag between significant papers and their recognition via this method. The method therefore provides a means of establishing a historical perspective but does not reflect the current state of the field and leading edges of research. Further, it is not possible to get a sense of the history of highly cited items which do not have references themselves to the same extent, in a network they tend to be dead-ends rather than nodes. Perhaps most significantly here are biases inherent in the social practice of citation and academia more generally, such as gender (Savonick & Davidson, 2016) and northern hemisphere bias which this work could serve to reinforce. One method of addressing this would be to reseed the initial citation network with explicitly sourced references to prioritise a particular perspective, for example publications from the global south. Also, the inaccessibility of references within print publications privileges electronic journal articles. Finally, in this approach certain types of paper tend to be more highly referenced, as noted by Dawson et al. (2014), “The analyses also indicate that the commonly cited papers are of a more conceptual nature than empirical research reflecting the need for authors to define the learning analytics space” (p. 231). The results of the method then can be influenced by the initial seeding articles. This can also be seen as a benefit however, as different versions of the network can be created to serve different purposes.

However, accepting these limitations, the method and findings of this research represent an initial attempt to provide a conceptual mapping of the broad field of open education. The findings provide some evidence that sub-topics within this area operate largely in isolation, with little cross referencing. Given the shared principles outlined previously, as well as commonality in many of the motivations and problems and techniques, this can be seen as detrimental to the development of the field as a whole. It is hoped that this work will provide some means of addressing these silos of practice.
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Abstract
Conceptualisations of open educational practices (OEP) vary widely, ranging from those centred primarily on the creation and use of open educational resources (OER) to broader definitions of OEP, inclusive of but not necessarily focused on OER. The latter, referred to in this paper as expansive definitions of OEP, encompass open content but also allow for multiple entry points to, and avenues of, openness. This paper explores the theoretical and empirical literature to outline how the concept of OEP has evolved historically. The paper aims to provide a useful synthesis of OEP literature for education researchers and practitioners.
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Introduction
Open education is defined broadly as encompassing resources, tools and practices to improve educational access, effectiveness, and equality worldwide (Lane, 2009; Open Education Consortium, n.d.). An abiding theme throughout the history of open education, however, has been the difficulty in precisely defining the concept. Even at its earliest stages, the definition was difficult to pin down. In reviews of the literature in the 1970s, open education was defined as “flexibility of space, student choice of activity, richness of learning materials, integration of curriculum areas, and more individual or small-group than large group instruction” (Horwitz, 1979, pp. 72-73), as well as conceiving of “the teacher as facilitator of learning [and] the development of student responsibility for learning” (Marshall, 1981, p. 183). The mission of The Open University (UK), founded in 1969, was (and still remains) to be open to people, places, methods and ideas (MacKenzie, Postgate & Scupham, 1975; The Open University, 2018). From learning objects in the 1990s to MOOCs (massive open online courses) in the 2010s, definitions of various forms of open education have been diverse and often contested. The exception is open educational resources (OER), the definition of which has remained nearly constant since it was coined in 2002: “teaching, learning and research materials in any medium, digital or otherwise, that reside in the public domain or have been released under an open license that permits no-cost access, use, adaptation and redistribution by others with no or limited restrictions” (UNESCO, 2012).

An observation by Noddings and Enright in 1983 could just as easily be made today:

Part of the problem of definition stems from the careless, if evocative, use of the term open by educators and the popular press to describe the wide variety of educational innovations which proliferated at the same time as open education classrooms were being developed (Noddings & Enright, 1983, p. 183).

‘Open education’ often carries the weight of describing not just policy, practices, resources, curricula and pedagogy, but also the values inherent within these, as well as relationships between teachers and learners. So is open education a slogan or a philosophy, a metaphor, model, or movement?
Noddings and Enright (1983) explored precisely this point, asserting the need to “resist the evangelical mode” in favour of the historical and critical. This paper takes a historical and critical approach in exploring conceptualisations of open educational practices (OEP).

While open education has a long history (Hendricks, 2017; Morgan, 2016; Rolfe, 2017), the specific concept of ‘open educational practices’ has emerged only in the past decade (since 2007). Conceptualisations of OEP vary widely, ranging from those centred on the creation and use of OER to broader definitions of OEP, inclusive of but not necessarily focused on OER. These *expansive definitions of OEP* encompass open content but also allow for multiple entry points to, and avenues of, openness. The Cape Town Open Education Declaration (2007) points to an expansive approach:

> ... open education is not limited to just open educational resources. It also draws upon open technologies that facilitate collaborative, flexible learning and the open sharing of teaching practices that empower educators to benefit from the best ideas of their colleagues. It may also grow to include new approaches to assessment, accreditation and collaborative learning.

Several open education researchers have highlighted the range of conceptualisations of OEP in locating their own work (see Czerniewicz, Deacon, Glover & Walji, 2017a; Havemann, 2016; Masterman, 2016; Paskevicius, 2017; Stagg, 2014). The purpose of this paper is to trace a path through the theoretical literature on open educational practices to explore how the definition has evolved and how these roots appear in current empirical studies of OEP. In our review of the OEP literature, and recognising that there is some overlap, we have classified theoretical literature as that which conceptualises unique definitions of OEP and empirical literature as that which gathers and analyses data in order to understand the development and use of OEP in specific contexts. The paper reviews the theoretical and empirical literature on OEP, discusses key themes and assumptions emerging from this review, and suggests areas for further research.

### Evolving definitions of OEP

Within the OEP literature, there are a number of key bodies of work (associated with specific projects) that have clearly influenced the development of the field. In our analysis, one or more of the following bodies of work were cited in all subsequent academic literature in the area of OEP:

i. OLCOS (Open eLearning Content Observatory Services) project (2006-2007)
ii. OPAL (Open Education Quality) initiative (2010-2011)
iii. UKOER programme (2009-2012)
iv. CILT (Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching) research, UCT (2009-present)

#### i) OLCOS project

The earliest definition and exploration of open educational practices (OEP) in the research literature emerged as part of the OLCOS (Open eLearning Content Observatory Services) project (2006-2007). OLCOS was a Transversal Action undertaken as part of the European Commission’s eLearning programme1 (Geser, 2007a, 2007b; Schaffert & Geser, 2008). The project partners were based in six educational/research institutions in five countries2. The aim of the OLCOS project was to foster the

---

2. The OLCOS project partners were Salzburg Research (Austria), Mediamaisteri Group (Finland), European Centre for Media Competence (Germany), FernUniversitaet (Germany), European Distance and E-Learning Network (Hungary), and Open University of Catalonia (Spain) (Geser, 2007a).
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creation, sharing and re-use of OER in Europe and beyond. In the final project report, however, the project recommended moving beyond focusing on OER alone (Geser, 2007a):

The OLCOS project has explored how OER can make a difference in teaching and learning. Our initial findings show that OER do play an important role in teaching and learning, but that it is crucial to also promote innovation and change in educational practices. The resources we are talking about are seen only as a means to an end, and are utilised to help people acquire the competences, knowledge and skills needed to participate successfully within the political, economic, social and cultural realms of society (p. 16).

The OLCOS project methodology included a detailed literature review, workshops, and interviews with experts. The final report had a five-year time-horizon and thus was titled *Open Educational Practices and Resources: OLCOS Roadmap 2012* (Geser, 2007a). OEP were defined as: “...practices that involve students in active, constructive engagement with content, tools and services in the learning process, and promote learners’ self-management, creativity and working in teams” (Geser, 2007a, p. 37).

The report also identified enablers and inhibitors of OER and OEP and provided tailored recommendations for policy makers, funding bodies, senior managers, teachers, students, education repositories and e-learning developers. The authors cited OER/OEP enablers as: resources to fund OER development; institutional policies on openness; and widespread use of open licensing. OER/OEP inhibitors were identified as lack of all of the above, as well as lack of realistic OER business models and lack of recognition and support for open educators. While progress has been made in some of these areas in the past decade, many remain issues of concern warranting action.

A significant contribution of the OLCOS project was its definition of OEP and the establishment of its importance with respect to OER and open education in general. The report noted that while OER can help to foster learners’ self-direction, creativity, critical thinking, problem-solving and collaboration, this is not possible while the prevalent notions of “teacher-centred knowledge transfer” (Schaffert, 2008, p. 24) and “teachers perceived as dispensers of knowledge” (Geser, 2007a, p. 16) persist. The authors conceptualised the core of OEP as social constructivist learning and teaching. Published a decade ago, the *OLCOS Roadmap 2012* continues to be cited widely by OEP researchers (see Alevizou, 2012; Armellini & Nie, 2013; Cronin, 2017; Czerniewicz et al., 2017a; Czerniewicz, Deacon, Wali & Glover, 2017b; Hogan, Carlson & Kirk, 2015; Lane, 2010; Masterman, 2016; Paskevicius, 2017; Peter & Farrell, 2013; Stagg, 2014).

**ii) OPAL initiative**

A second widely cited OEP work is that from the Open Education Quality (OPAL) initiative. This two-year, cross-European initiative (2010-2011) set out to produce a framework of OER practices that improve quality and innovation in education. In addition to the final project report, *Beyond OER: Shifting Focus to Open Educational Practices* (Andrade et al., 2011), a number of papers and blog posts published before, during and after the project provide a rich picture of how the conceptualisation of OEP evolved (Camilleri & Ehlers, 2011; Camilleri, Ehlers & Pawlowski, 2014; Conole, 2011; Conole & Ehlers, 2010; Ehlers, 2011a, 2011b). Early in the project, Conole and Ehlers (2010, p. 2) defined OEP as: “a set of activities and support around the creation, use and repurposing of open educational resources (OERs)”. Their conclusions proposed a somewhat broader definition of OEP though still focused on OER: “the use of OER with the aim to improve quality of educational processes and innovate educational environments” (Conole & Ehlers, 2010, p. 3). In the final OPAL report, OEP was defined even more broadly (Andrade et al., 2011):
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 (p. 12).

The OPAL report and related work conceptualised OEP as a transition from phase 1, focused on building OER and “embedding OER into learning and teaching practice” (Andrade et al., 2011, p. 11) to phase 2, focused on “using OER to transform learning” (Ehlers, 2011a, p. 4). Building on the OPAL findings, Ehlers (a member of the project team and co-author of the project report) developed a framework describing the constitutive elements of OEP (2011b, p. 4). The framework maps two dimensions in relation to one another: OER usage (low to high) and learning architecture (closed to open). Ehlers proposed that positive movement in either dimension leads to increasing OEP. While maintaining a focus on OER, the model illustrated that OER is just one constituent of OEP:

OEP essentially represent collaborative practice in which resources are shared by making them openly available, and pedagogical practices are employed which rely on social interaction, knowledge creation, peer-learning, and shared learning practices (Ehlers, 2011a, p. 6).

The main OPAL project report (Andrade et al., 2011) and related papers by Ehlers and Conole (noted above) continue to be cited widely by researchers in OEP (see Armellini & Nie, 2013; Atenas, Havemann & Priego, 2014; Carey, Davis, Ferreras & Porter, 2015; Casey & Evans, 2011; Coughlan & Perryman, 2015; Cronin, 2017; Czerniewicz et al., 2017a, 2017b; Hogan et al., 2015; Karunanayaka, Naidu, Rajendra & Ratnayake, 2015; Masterman, 2016; Murphy, 2013; Nascimbeni & Burgos, 2016; Paskevicius, 2017; Smyth, Bossu & Stagg, 2016).

iii) UKOER programme

The UKOER programme provided a further development in the conceptualisation of OEP. In 2009 the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), seeking to build on knowledge and practice gained from previously-funded OER projects (e.g. Jorum, Jisc Digital Repositories Programme), began funding initiatives to explore and support OER and OEP (McGill, Falconer, Dempster, Littlejohn & Beetham, 2013). One of these initiatives, the Jisc/Higher Education Academy Open Educational Resources (UKOER) programme, ran from 2009 to 2012. The purpose of the UKOER project was twofold: to deepen understanding of OER and OEP and to produce an evidence base (and enhance the status) of work supported in the UK and in the international OER field (McGill et al., 2013). Overall, 80 projects were funded by UKOER and the initiative produced several outputs: OER use case studies, the OER infoKit, the UKOER10 symposium, the Open Practices: Briefing Paper (Beetham, Falconer, McGill, & Littlejohn, 2012), and the final UKOER report, Journeys to Open Educational Practice (McGill et al., 2013). The latter two publications, in particular, have proven to be of ongoing significance for researchers in OEP and open education more broadly.

Beetham et al. (2012) analysed the UKOER project outcomes and formulated an expansive definition of OEP encompassing six distinct practices:

- OER production, management, use and reuse
- Open/public pedagogies
- Open learning (including peer-to-peer learning and open accreditation)

---

3 OER infoKit: https://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/open-educational-resources
4 UKOER10 symposium: https://www.jisc.ac.uk/guides/open-educational-resources
- Open scholarship (including open research, open data and open access publication)
- Open sharing of teaching ideas
- Use of open technologies (including social media and digital open tools)

Using empirical evidence from a range of UKOER projects, Beetham et al. (2012) showed that not all forms of OEP occur together, and more specifically, that OER and OEP are not necessarily coincident. OEP often emerges through OER activities, but creation/use of OER may not always be the first sign of openness in educational practice: "other practices may have more immediate pay-offs and a lower adoption threshold" (p. 11). Thus, it is important to consider the use of OEP in specific contexts. The authors found, for example, that different academic disciplines tended to adopt the aspects of OEP that amplified their existing pedagogic practices.

In addition to providing an expansive conceptualisation of OEP, the UKOER research highlighted the potential of OEP to "flatten the traditional hierarchy and change the balance of power in learner/teacher relationships" (McGill et al., 2013, p. 10) and identified key issues for students, staff, institutions and the community, particularly highlighting the challenge of "cultural inertia/cultural change" with respect to openness (Beetham et al., 2012, p. 10). The work that emerged from UKOER continues to be an important resource for OEP researchers, particularly those focusing on power relations, inequality, and/or culture change (see Carey et al., 2015; Cronin, 2017; Czerniewicz et al., 2017a, 2017b; Paskevicius, 2017; Udas, Partridge & Stagg, 2016).

iv) CILT (Centre for Innovation in Learning & Teaching), UCT

With the prevalence of OER and MOOC production emerging from the Global North, researchers in the Global South have asserted the need for more diverse perspectives in, and contributions to, academic knowledge (Czerniewicz, 2013; Czerniewicz & Naidoo, 2013). The same is true for OEP, where “most OEP frameworks draw on Global North contexts and there’s [a] lack of shared understanding of terms and of open pedagogy” (ROER4D, 2017). Researchers in CILT (Centre for Innovation in Learning & Teaching) at the University of Cape Town (UCT) have published work which comprises the fourth significant body of OEP research identified in the literature review. CILT has been and continues to be active in many areas of open education research and practice – open scholarship, OER, MOOCs, and OEP – a notable example of which is the recent ROER4D (Research in Open Educational Resources for Development) project (Hodgkinson-Williams & Arinto, 2017).

As with the three strands of OEP research already described, CILT research has emphasized the importance of broadening studies of OER to include OEP, with a particular emphasis on wider global perspectives:

The move to incorporate ‘practice’ in the definition signifies the acknowledgement that content disembedded from its context is difficult to adapt without some understanding of the pedagogical and epistemological assumptions underlying the creation of the resource. The latter are of particular import as different views on what is considered ‘worthwhile knowledge’ are likely to increase with the ready access to materials from different parts of the world (Hodgkinson-Williams, 2010, p. 6).

In 2009, based on an extensive review of the literature as well as extant practice at UCT, Hodgkinson-Williams and Gray (2009) created a framework for analysing openness along a continuum using four degrees of openness: social, technological, legal and financial. In a later refinement of the framework, Hodgkinson-Williams (2014) elaborated further, disaggregating the social dimension of openness into two dimensions: cultural and pedagogical. The revised framework has five attributes of openness within a larger ‘Open Education’ cycle:
• **Technical** (interoperability and open formats; connectivity; technical skills & equipment; availability and discoverability of resources)
• **Legal** (open license parameters; open license knowledge and advice)
• **Cultural** (conceptions of knowledge as given or constructed; curricula)
• **Pedagogical** (student demographics and types of engagement; pedagogic, learning & assessment strategies; accreditation/certification)
• **Financial** (costs ranging from free to fees; sustainable business models)

This broad and critical conceptualisation of OEP has been cited by many OEP researchers (see Arinto, et al., 2017; Cox & Trotter, 2016; Cronin, 2017; Czerniewicz, et al., 2017a, 2017b; Nerantzi, 2017; and Paskevicius, 2017).

**Evolving definitions of OEP**

The four theoretical conceptualisations of OEP prevalent in the literature, comprising three specific OER/OEP projects and one body of research emerging from an academic unit, are summarised in Table 1. Despite their differences, all four conceptualisations of OEP focus on both OER and collaborative pedagogical practices as a means of transforming education. Of the four, the UKOER and CILT conceptualisations are the most expansive: encompassing a broad view of scholarship, including both research and teaching; acknowledging the potential decoupling of OER and OEP, detailing the integral role of context in the use of OEP, and establishing the need for diverse and inequality-focused perspectives.

---

**Table 1: Four key strands of OEP research cited in the literature**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLCOS project</th>
<th>OPAL initiative</th>
<th>UKOER programme</th>
<th>CILT research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>2009-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of OEP</strong></td>
<td>“practices that involve students in active, constructive engagement with content, tools and services in the learning process, and promote learners’ self-management, creativity and working in teams” (Geser, 2007a)</td>
<td>“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” (Andrade et al., 2011)</td>
<td>6 practices: OER production, management, use and reuse; open/public pedagogies; open learning; open scholarship; open sharing of teaching ideas; use of open technologies” (Beetham et al., 2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In our analysis, we found that one or more of these definitions of OEP have been cited in all subsequent academic literature in the area of OEP. In recent theoretical work, for example, Stagg (2014) proposed a model of OEP focused on OER adoption, referencing conceptualisations of OEP from both the OLCOS and OPAL projects. And in a proposed model of OEP in relation to teaching practices, Paskevicius (2017) positioned his work with respect to all four strands identified above. A range of empirical work is examined later in this paper.

OEP-related concepts

In addition to diversity across various conceptualisations of OEP, education researchers in many domains have described and theorised the practices defined in this study as OEP using a variety of other concepts. Networked learning and connected learning, for example, also acknowledge the ubiquity of knowledge across networks and share core assumptions about the importance of educational access, equity and participatory learning (Gogia, 2016). Yet even within the domain of open education, multiple concepts have evolved, and continue to evolve, as researchers and practitioners seek to identify and analyse ‘open practices’. These concepts include open scholarship (Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2012a; Weller, 2011), networked participatory scholarship (Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2012b), open pedagogy (DeRosa & Robison, 2015, 2017; Hegarty, 2015; Weller, 2014), open teaching (Couros, 2010; Couros & Hildebrandt, 2016), and critical digital pedagogy (Rosen & Smale, 2015; Stommel, 2014). All describe emergent scholarly practices that espouse OER use/production, open learning and teaching, collaboration (in the form of networked participation) and empowering learners to co-create knowledge.

Open scholarship and networked participatory scholarship

Current conceptions of open scholarship and the ‘open scholar’ began to emerge in the literature in 2009 (Anderson, 2009; Burton, 2009) and developed rapidly thereafter. Open scholarship was characterised as a “new type of education and scholarship context” which sought to maximise social learning, media richness, participatory and connectivist pedagogies, ubiquity and persistence, open data and research, and connections (Anderson, 2009). Weller (2011) proposed a definition of the open scholar encompassing open digital identity, open networking practices, use of open tools, and open publishing. Veletsianos & Kimmons (2012a) also proposed a definition of open scholarship as a set of phenomena and practices related to scholars’ uses of digital and networked technologies for both research and teaching, all underpinned by “grounding assumptions regarding openness and democratization of knowledge creation and dissemination” (para. 3). Veletsianos and Kimmons articulated three major forms of open scholarship: open access and open publishing; open education (including OER and open teaching); and networked participation, also called networked participatory scholarship.

Networked participatory scholarship (NPS) itself has become a central concept in research in the fields of digital, networked and open education (Costa, 2014; Jordan, 2017; Masterman, 2016; O’Keeffe, 2016; Stewart, 2015, 2016; Veletsianos & Stewart, 2016). Veletsianos and Kimmons (2012b) define networked participatory scholarship as an emergent practice: “use of participatory technologies and online social networks to share, reflect upon, critique, improve, validate, and further their scholarship” (p. 768). Examples of NPS include use of social media and social networking for scholarly purposes and courses structured as networks. Knowledge is positioned around social connections rather than around content, enabling scholars to “re-envision teaching, instruction, their role as teachers, and the ways that knowledge is acquired in modern society” (Veletsianos & Kimmons, 2012b).
Both open scholarship and networked participatory scholarship align with expansive definitions of OEP in the sense of using a broad view of scholarship, i.e. inclusive of both research and teaching. While open scholarship is a broad ‘umbrella’ term, covering a wide range of open practices, networked participatory scholarship focuses on the individual scholar who enacts open identities and practices.

**Open pedagogy and open teaching**

Open pedagogy and open teaching are similar to the preceding concepts, with one exception. While open scholarship and NPS relate to a broad spectrum of scholarly practices, i.e. research as well as teaching, open pedagogy and open teaching focus on the latter. In 2010, Couros defined open teaching as “facilitation of learning experiences that are open, transparent, collaborative, and social” by open teachers who “support their students in the critical consumption, production, connection, and synthesis of knowledge through the shared development of learning networks” (p. 115). Couros (2010) and Couros and Hildebrandt (2016) developed the concept of open teaching based on several years of teaching experiences and student feedback on an open-access, graduate level, educational technology course (EC&I 831 Social Media and Open Education) at the University of Regina.

The concept of open pedagogy initially emerged in the first wave of open education in the 1960s and 1970s, reflecting the educational mind-set and wider political movements of that time, e.g. advocating for human rights, decolonisation and social justice (Deimann & Sloep, 2013; Freire, 1996; International Commission on the Development of Education, 1972; Lane, 2009; Siemens & Matheos, 2010). The concept has re-emerged in the context of the current open education movement and is often counterpoised with OEP. Hodgkinson-Williams and Gray (2009) defined open pedagogy in their work exploring degrees of openness:

> While acknowledging the potential value of content, we contend, however, that it is the opening up of educational processes, which we are calling Open Pedagogy (OP) enabled by the Web 2.0 technologies that are set to play the more transformational role in the collaboration between students and lecturers (p. 101).

Weller (2014) similarly defined open pedagogy as making use of open content, but with an emphasis on the network and learners’ connections within and across networks. Hegarty (2015) described open pedagogy as a combination of three main practices: using participatory technologies; developing open, collaborative and networked practices; and facilitating learners’ contributions to OER. More recently, DeRosa and Robison (2017) have defined open pedagogy as “[using] OER as a jumping-off point for remaking our courses so that they become not just repositories for content, but platforms for learning, collaboration and engagement with the world outside the classroom” (p. 118).

DeRosa and Robison (2015, 2017) and Rosen and Smale (2015) present their definitions of open pedagogy and open digital pedagogy, respectively, as versions of critical digital pedagogy. Critical digital pedagogy focuses on the potential of open practices to create dialogue, to deconstruct the teacher-student binary, to bring disparate learning spaces together, and, often, to function as a form of resistance to inequitable power relations within and outside of educational institutions (Morris & Stommel, 2014; Stommel, 2014). Similarly, Farrow (2015) contends that a critical approach should be at the heart of open education:

> By democratizing the processes through which educational materials and processes are designed and delivered, open education allows a greater plurality of voices to be heard and to contribute, and the experiences of groups who are often marginalized may be better heard: perhaps this is what we should really mean when we refer to education as ‘open’ (p. 14).

Overall, each of the above definitions of open pedagogy aligns with expansive definitions of OEP. We consider open pedagogy to be a subset of OEP; while open pedagogy embodies a critical approach and emphasis on context, it is focused on teaching and learning as compared with broader aspects of scholarship.

Conceptions of open pedagogy continue to evolve, with a notable increase in discussion and debate amongst open educators and researchers from across the Global North and Global South in 2017, the ‘Year of Open’ (Bali, 2017). One of these debates centred on a contestation of whether OER was an essential component of open pedagogy – mirroring similar developments within OEP. David Wiley, author of the 4R, and later the 5R, framework of OER (Wiley, Bliss & McEwen, 2014), had formerly espoused a firmly OER-focused definition of open pedagogy, i.e. “open pedagogy is that set of teaching and learning practices only possible in the context of the free access and 4R permissions characteristic of open educational resources: (Wiley, 2013, section 5, para. 1). Reflecting upon the burgeoning diversity of interpretations of open pedagogy, Wiley latterly proposed a more specific concept to enable clarity in his work: OER-enabled pedagogy, “the set of teaching and learning practices only possible or practical when you have permission to engage in the 5R activities” (Wiley, 2017). Clearly, this new definition aligns with OER-focused definitions of OEP. This example highlights a hallmark of open education research since its inception, i.e. the tendency for ‘open’ to encompass many different interpretations and the capacity for the field to evolve accordingly.

**Empirical studies of OEP**

Much of the extant literature in open education focuses on OER, open textbooks, and open access publishing. However, our concern in this paper is exploring the literature on OEP. In our review of the empirical OEP literature, we focused on studies that gathered and analysed data (e.g. via surveys, interviews, observations, case studies) in order to understand the development and use of OEP in specific contexts. Many empirical studies of OEP focus specifically on practices and policies that support the creation, use and repurposing of OER. Examples include:

- In their study of open educational practices for curriculum enhancement, Armellini and Nie (2013) developed a framework of OEP based on “patterns of OER reuse" mapped against the processes of curriculum design and delivery.
- In her study of OEP in higher education, Murphy (2013) defined OEP as “policies and practices implemented by higher education institutions that support the development, use and management of OER and the formal assessment and accreditation of informal learning undertaken using OER”.
- Schreurs et al. (2014) studied the social learning activities of open practitioners, defining OEP as "a set of activities and support around the creation, use and repurposing of OER and MOOCs".
- In defining open teaching landscapes, Atenas et al. (2014) considered OEP in the context of developing “a framework to enhance the development and quality of OER”.
- And Naidu and Karunanayaka (2017) developed an Open Educational Practices Impact Evaluation (OEP-IE) Index in order to study the impact of OER integration on teaching and learning in Sri Lankan schools.

These studies, and nearly all empirical studies that use OER-focused definitions of OER make reference to definitions of OEP developed within the OLCOS and/or OPAL projects. Karunanayaka et al. (2015), for example, developed support for academic staff who develop and implement OER-based e-learning by using the OEP frameworks developed by Ehlers (2011b). Overall, this body of
work, both theoretical and empirical, focuses on ‘phase 2’ of OER (as identified in the OPAL project), i.e. improving learning experiences and empowering learners through the use of OER.

Other empirical studies use more expansive definitions of OEP, often citing the earlier OEP studies (Andrade et al., 2011; Ehlers, 2011a, 2011b; Geser, 2007a), but also drawing on the work of Beetham et al. (2012) and Hodgkinson-Williams (2014). These studies move beyond a focus on OER-related activities and in some cases, recommend considering OEP separately from OER. Nascimbeni and Burgos (2016) take such an approach in their study of “the Open Educator”:

> We believe it is important to ‘disconnect’ the concept of open teaching from the use of OER since many teachers are indeed using open methodologies in their classroom activities, for example by fostering co-creation of knowledge from students allowing them to enrich the course content with any complementary information they deem important. In our view, these teachers can be indeed considered Open Educators even if they do not use – and maybe do not even know the existence of – OER (p. 7).

Czerniewicz et al. (2017a, 2017b) explicitly used an inequality lens in their work on ‘MOOC-making and open educational practices’. Using both empirical research and the OEP frameworks developed by Beetham et al. (2012) and Hodgkinson-Williams (2014), they present four dimensions of OEP in a MOOC environment: (i) legal openness; (ii) pedagogic openness and learning in open networks; (iii) encouraging others to teach and learn in open networks; and (iv) reusing content in teaching and other contexts (Czerniewicz et al., 2017a, 2017b). As in the UKOER project, OEP in this study was found to be highly contextualised, with use of OEP preceding and then leading to further use of OER.

Similarly, in a separate empirical study, Cronin (2017) found evidence that the use of OEP, specifically networked participatory scholarship and open pedagogy, can lead to OER awareness and use. In a study of the open practices of educators in international health projects, Coughlan and Perryman (2015) concluded that existing OEP frameworks are not sufficiently comprehensive or nuanced to analyse existing practice. They proposed extending the OPAL OEP matrix to add a social configuration dimension. Many other open education and OEP researchers also focus on social learning and collaboration, particularly the use of social media and participatory technologies for learning (Casey & Evans, 2011; Timmis, 2012; Veletsians, 2015; Veletsians & Navarrete, 2012; Waycott, Sheard, Thompson & Clerehan, 2013).

Some studies use expansive definitions of OEP to explore power relations and inequality within higher education. For example, Rowe, Bozalek and Frantz (2013) noted shifts in power within open learning environments, i.e. “a movement of power away from teachers as students took control of their learning, and the emergence of critical attitudes towards knowledge and authority” (p. 605). And in their ‘Open Empowered Learning Model’, Smyth et al. (2016) frame OEP as a way to “support social transformation, sharing and co-creation of knowledge in fully open ecosystems, where benefit for social good is expected” (p. 211). Bossu and Fountain (2015) used this expansive definition of OEP to create an open online professional development course to develop and enhance the capacity of academics in Australia to adopt and incorporate OER and OEP.

**Discussion**

This paper describes a review and analysis of the literature in OEP with the aim of identifying how the conceptualisation of OEP has evolved. In summary, across the literature, there are four distinct strands of OEP research (summarised in Table 1). The earliest work (emerging from OLCOS and OPAL, independently) began as OER studies but concluded with broader recommendations for developing OEP. Both projects proposed definitions of OEP that included the use and creation of OER as well
as collaborative pedagogical practices. Subsequent research by UKOER and CILT acknowledged these earlier OEP conceptualisations but added further analytic complexity. The UKOER research expanded the concept of OEP, allowing for a decoupling of OER and OEP and underscoring the importance of context. CILT research further established the need for contextualised studies of OEP, particularly highlighting the need for perspectives beyond those of the Global North, and also provided a framework for assessing the complexity of openness in practice.

In conducting our analysis, we found that underlying assumptions in early studies of OEP remain evident in more recent OEP literature. One of these assumptions is that OEP is predicated on the use of OER. When the concept of OEP first emerged in the OLCOS and OPAL project reports and related work, it facilitated new conversations about open education in practice, particularly with respect to teaching and learning. However, later empirical studies have found that aspects of OEP may emerge independently of OER and may in fact lead to OER use – rather than the reverse being the case (Beetham, et al., 2012; Cronin, 2017; Czerniewicz, et al., 2017a, 2017b). As Zourou (2016) notes: “the value of openness is understood differently and it triggers different types of practice, not always open” (para. 43). Adoption of OEP is often uneven and does not always begin with the use of OER. There remains a clear delineation in the empirical literature between studies that define OEP as necessarily inclusive of OER and studies of emergent practices that highlight multiple entry points to, and avenues of, openness. Such differences mirror similar debates in the conceptualisation of open pedagogy, an example of which is the recent coining of the term “OER-enabled pedagogy” (Wiley, 2017).

The foundational assumptions of OEP are not new. With a focus on social learning and construction of knowledge by learners, definitions of OEP and OEP-related concepts have their theoretical foundations in constructivist, social constructivist and connectivist educational philosophies. Expansive conceptualisations of OEP also adopt a critical approach, often with the aim of challenging traditional educational practice. Overall, we found that expansive conceptualisations of OEP encompass a broad view of scholarship including both research and teaching; acknowledge the potential decoupling of OER and OEP; recognise the integral role of context in the use of OEP; and acknowledge the need for diverse and inequality-focused perspectives.

**Conclusion**

We contend that understanding the roots of the various definitions of OEP can help to illuminate underlying assumptions in existing work as well as in the current approaches of researchers and practitioners. This understanding is valuable for researchers of OEP, but also for researchers of OER and other aspects of open education. Limitations of the research include the narrow focus on OEP and open education alone. As noted within the paper, we did not explore the considerable body of work in the areas of OER, open textbooks and MOOCs; nor did we include research in the areas of networked learning and connected learning. Further study of the connections between these domains would yield additional valuable insights, as suggested by Gogia (2016). However, we found that the use of a narrow ‘OEP’ lens for this study enabled a deep exploration of subtle but important epistemological differences in the work in this area.

The deceptively simple term ‘open’ hides a “reef of complexity” (Hodgkinson-Williams & Gray, 2009, p. 114), much of which depends on the particular context within which OEP is considered. Thus, it is imperative to move beyond open-closed dichotomies and even unified conceptions of openness. We contend that expansive conceptualisations of OEP acknowledge the complex, actual and situated practices of teaching and learning – where context influences the choice and use of OER where OEP may emerge before the use of OER, and where critical approaches to open education may be realised.
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Abstract
Open Educational Practices (OEP) have played an important role in assisting educational institutions and governments worldwide to meet their current and future educational targets in widening participation, lowering costs, improving the quality of learning and teaching and promoting social inclusion and participatory democracy. There have been some important OEP developments in Australia, but unfortunately the potential of OEP to meet some of the national educational targets has not been fully realised and acknowledged yet, in ways that many countries around the world have. This paper will gather, discuss, and analyse some key national and international policies and documentation available as an attempt to provide a solid foundation for a call to action for OEP in Australia, which will hopefully be an instrument to assist and connect practitioners and policy makers in higher education.

Keywords: open educational practice; OEP; OEP policies; open policies; higher education policy; Australia

Introduction
Open Educational Practices (OEP) support flexible educational practices and the promotion of quality and innovation learning and teaching within open learning ecologies (Open Educational Quality Initiative, 2011; Paskevicius, 2017). OEP have been playing an important role in assisting higher education sectors and governments worldwide to meet current and future educational targets in widening participation, lowering costs, improving the quality of learning and teaching, promoting social inclusion, and participatory democracy. However, as open practices are still relatively new educational approaches, mature and transferable supporting policies are yet to become mainstream. Even so, many countries have attempted to trial, develop, and implement educational policies that incorporate and recognise OEP activities and programs, in order to leverage the affordances to meet the previously mentioned targets.

Over the last decade, the scope of OEP in Australian higher education has expanded, influencing learning and teaching. Following international momentum to ‘open up’ education via a number of global OEP initiatives, some Australian universities have engaged in institutional and collaborative projects; both internally and federally funded.

Likewise, state (schools, and professional and vocational training) and federal levels have begun to engage through initiatives such as AusGOAL (https://www.australia.gov.au/directories/australia/ausgoal) and Government 2.0 (https://www.finance.gov.au/archive/policy-guides-procurement/gov20/). Federal initiatives have also focused on open source software (OSS) adoption, freely and openly licencing government documents and reports, and open access to publically-funded research. The latter is supported by institutional repositories that store, and
make available research output and data, usually enabled by Creative Commons licences. This responds to pressure from research funding bodies who increasingly stipulate open access in funding requirements (Picasso & Phelan, 2014).

Whilst these initiatives are equivalent to other global open access practices - notably those in the UK, the US, Canada and across the European Union - Australian federal attention has not yet focused on educational resources. Australia does not have a specific framework or regulation that supports higher education adoption of OER or OEP (Stagg & Bossu, 2016), unlike more mature policies in the previously cited countries.

Despite this lack of national priority focus, a small number of OEP reports and research projects have been funded by the previous Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) to investigate and develop OEP across the sector. These reports have all strongly lobbied for OEP intervention, support, and policy development at national level (Bossu, Brown & Bull, 2014; Bossu et al., 2016).

However, despite federal funding, the Australian government has failed to commit to, or reflect, the recommendations in educational policy. This paper will contribute to the Australian open policy environment by articulating the role of educational policy and the links between current government targets and OEP. The position taken is that educational policy can be framed as a lever for action by institutions, funding bodies, and practitioners, but can create risk via the promotion of a policy-compliance culture – a culture that is antithetical to openness. The paper concludes with a call to action anchored to three recommendations for OEP in Australian higher education. Before starting the related policy discussion, an overview of OEP is needed for better understanding of issues being explored in this paper.

The Potential Of Open Educational Practices

Open educational practice (OEP) emerged as an evolution of the open educational resources (OER) movement, where the focus was mostly on increasing access to new and existing digital educational resources. Although OEP is still a new field of study within education, some preconditions for adopting OEP effectively have already been established:

- There should be engagement amongst all of the stakeholders in the OER process (authors, users, managers and policy makers).
- Ensuring that there is support to guide creation and use of OER, and technologies to assist storage and dissemination.
- An understanding of the context in which OEP is adopted and implemented (Open Educational Quality Initiative, 2011).

Even though OEP have not reached mainstream education yet, they have certainly transformed and challenged the core values and structures of higher education around the world, but unfortunately, with less intensity in Australia. From the way learners are now experiencing learning and empowered being co-creators of knowledge, to how learning should be designed to maximise these experiences, to the current role of educators and the new strategies and support required from educational institutions to recognise and accredit such learning (Smyth, Bossu & Stagg, 2016). In many cases, OEP has promoted further collaborations amongst institutions, encouraged further dialogue and stakeholder engagement in higher education, and motivated the use of open technologies and new open pedagogical approaches, as a way to incorporate some of the current transformation in pedagogy and curriculum. However, as in other areas of education, policies at institutional and
national levels also play an important role in OEP, by providing guidance, structure, boundaries, recognition and alignment with other aspects of the system in which OEP belongs to.

The Role Of Educational Policy

Australian higher education has traditionally viewed educational policy as intrinsically linked to social equity and inclusion. The most common lens for articulating these principles has been “population parity” (Naylor & James, 2015, p. 1); or the statistically proportional inclusion of under-represented socio-cultural, and socio-economic population groups. This has been mirrored in government-set targets (Bradley, Noonan, Nugent & Scales, 2008), and in university responses to policy (Universities Australia, 2016). This tone, set by the Labour Education Minister John Dawkins in *Higher Education: A Policy Statement* (1988) was underscored by his perception of the role of universities, namely;

> [the university] is a primary source of the skills we need in our cultural, artistic, intellectual and industrial life. It acts to gather and preserve knowledge. It promotes greater understanding of culture, *often at odds with majority attitudes*, and in doing so, supports the development of a more just and tolerant society (Dawkins, 1988, p. 7, emphasis added)

However, contemporary educational policy is directly at odds with the humanist perception of the societal value of education. This value has shifted from social participation and that understanding of broader culture (‘*often at odds with majority attitudes*’) and instead indexes outcomes against a neo-liberal economic rationalisation of a university education as narrowly aligned with job-readiness and future economic success. Given this perceptual shift, it can be reasonably argued that the ‘value proposition’ of open educational practice (OEP) in the current political climate needs to be examined critically by practitioners, especially if levers – in the form of national policy – are sought.

Public And Private Good: An Ideological Difference In Policy

The notion of the university as a ‘public good’ is reflected in early Australian educational policy. Dawkins’ statement explicitly states that:

> We want to be a society that understands its own political processes, enables all citizens to participate in those processes and does not accept without question decisions made on its behalf… We do not want a higher education system that fails to analyse and, where necessary, criticise the society in which it operates, or one that chooses not to spread knowledge among those with fewer opportunities to increase their own understanding of events (Dawkins, 1988, p. 7, emphasis added)

Higher education was perceived as a public good – the keystone to an inclusive national agenda of societal participation. The implicit philosophy was that citizens had the right of access to education, with higher education providing a societal role that often transcended the prevailing norm. However, counter-productive government policy was instituted the same year with HECS (Higher Education Contribution Scheme). Students were now incumbent for university fees, and the new Scheme notionally made university more accessible by allowing students to defer their fees as a government loan that would be repaid once their future earnings reached a set threshold (income-contingent loans). This threshold has been varied over the last three decades, and the repayment of student loans has not been without criticism, both within Australia and in countries like the UK which also administer income-contingent loans (Findeisen & Sachs, 2016). By linking student loans to income, governments form explicit inter-relationships between education and tax regimes (Findeisen & Sachs, 2016). There have even been suggestions of emerging alternatives or amendments to income-contingent loans,
such as normalising the national student debt by levying higher tax repayments for students in higher tax brackets - which would result in high-earners re-paying more than the base sum of the loan, whilst lower earners repay less than the total sum of their loan (Findeisen & Sachs, 2016), to systems that allow individual investors to pay for student loans and then enter into income-sharing arrangements post-graduation (Holliday & Gide, 2016). In either case, the introduction of HECS signalled a three-decades-long perceptual shift away from the common good, and that directly impacts on the perception and values that underpins OEP.

The ‘Value Of Education’

The language and value statement of universities has likewise dramatically changed in the last thirty years. Universities Australia (2016) focuses on highlighting the contribution of the higher education sector to the national economy (p. 3), international competitiveness (p. 3), the need for government funding to “position Australia cleverly for future prosperity” (p. 4), and increasing investment in industry-collaborative research partnerships to foster innovate and entrepreneurial graduates and researchers (p. 7). The statement ascribes dollar values to the “stock of knowledge” (p. 8), describes future graduates as “our future leaders, inventors, and wealth generators” (p. 12) and that they exit degrees “career-ready [and] globally competitive” (p. 13). Almost absent in this document is the university’s role in building a participatory democracy, and the three-decade-old statements about universities providing critical viewpoints have been replaced by a preference for increasing economic growth and the rationalisation of education as an export.

The substantive change in discourse is unsurprising when the perception of graduate outcomes is considered. An increasing commodification and massification of higher education are symptoms of the neo-liberalist interpretation of the university that is reflected in the language of Keep It Clever: Policy Statement 2016, which is a report published by Universities Australia (2016). There is also an element of ‘moral panic’ in the rhetoric surrounding Australia’s ‘decline’ and ‘loses’ on a globalised landscape (Zajda, 2013, p. 234). Rather than design a higher education system based primarily on ‘social good’, the Australian system has privileged organisational restructuring, positioning, and outcomes on corporatized models – and now uses this structure for reporting and accountability (Zajda, 2013). The resulting perception is of education as a tradable, exportable commodity – a product with a defined economic value, and one that represents a market-driven investment by the consumer (students). Education is unable to be commodified (Connell, 2013), but associated aspects of the experience can. The reintroduction of student fees supported by a student loans scheme (HECS), and the publishing of ‘league tables’ for university research outcomes, for example, reinforce a scarcity model. Student fees for education are paid by the individual, not the State, which reinforces that education is a ‘private good’ – that the outcomes based on individual investment, and that the benefits are likewise personal rather than for society. League tables present a hierarchy of institutions nationally, creating a false sense of ‘quality’ – or rather prestige for individual investment. Reputational capital through credentialing becomes a commodity as the individual trades on the reputation of their alma mater for advantage in the job market.

This change from a humanist ideology of higher education to one predicated by economic values and labour market readiness creates an environment that inherently challenges open educational practice at the level of national policy. Open education is often presented as “social good” (Glennie, Harley, Butcher & van Wyk, 2012, p. 7) – that can lead to either uncritical research or a lack of evaluative processes. This political and ideological shift may be responsible for the prevalence of research-focused open policy, and a lack of Australian educational resource policy (Stagg & Bossu, 2016). Open data has been positioned as an enabler for research collaboration, cross-disciplinary
research, and reducing the cost of original research data collection – all outcomes consistent with economic rationalisation.

It is into this environment that open practice must demonstrate a clear value proposition. Open practitioners need to be mindful of the underpinning rationale shaping educational policy in Australia and how higher educational institutions have become complicit in recasting the value of education in society. It is therefore unsurprising that open educational practice is able to gain traction in Australia at the practitioner and institutional levels - as more bounded cultural values can be expressed at these levels with sufficient leverage - yet has failed to make any impact (or even reach a basic level of awareness) at the national level. The role of open policy advocates therefore becomes more complex - not just in lobbying for change, but in finding ‘common ground’ between differing ideologies. The crux of this challenge, therefore, how do stakeholders in educational policy locate this ‘common ground’ as a way of bridging the current disconnect between disparate policy viewpoints?

Educational policy as it relates to ‘the common good’, currently exists mostly for an agenda of social inclusion, and for academic freedom in Australia. These two areas are selected for comparison as they are founded in the values inherent in, and value of, educational systems; thus there is certain conceptual alignment with OEP. However, both manifest problematically in the national environment. It is the alignment of OEP with existing policy targets and foci that are of specific interest to this paper.

Since 1988, the approaches and metrics for attaining social inclusion have been under sustained criticism for both the classification proxies used to determine targets and eligibility, and the superficiality of reporting against targets. Classification of student equity groups is reliant on postcode of students’ place of origin and further predicated on parental occupation (Universities Australia, 2008). These imprecise measures that fail to account for a multi-causal understanding of intentions to, and the experience of, study are the foundation for Australian social inclusion targets. Additionally, the results of high school education are used by all states as part of university admissions, although secondary school performance is not always an indicator of university success (Naylor & James, 2015). It is unsurprising then, that despite three decades of policy, widening access for students from remote and rural communities and low socio-economic backgrounds remains “one of the persistent and seemingly intractable equity issues in Australia” (James, 2012, p. 85). Policy built on these measurements, and reliant on secondary school academic barriers is challenged to deliver meaningful outcomes. There is little evidence to suggest that under-represented groups have little aspiration to attend university – the main challenge facing these learners is access to education (Naylor & James, 2015).

Reporting against inclusion targets is likewise a problematic space as the primary statistical data presented in policy documents such as Keep It Clever: Policy Statement 2016 rely on absolute numbers as opposed to representational statistics. For example, 2014 data reports a 60% increase in indigenous students (from 7038 in 2008 to 11286 in 2014), claiming a direct positive correlation between the implementation of a demand-driven education system in 2008 and improved social equity (Universities Australia, 2016, p. 18). However, this change represents an increase from 1.4% to 1.6% when viewed as a portion of total student numbers from 2008 to 2014; students from low socio-economic backgrounds increased from 16.8% to 18.2% over the same period; and regional and remote students as part of total student population decreased from 20.7% to 20.4% (Universities Australia, 2016, p. 18). Despite policy targets and national agendas, little improvement was demonstrated over the six years.

Similarly, academic freedom historically languished as a value under legislative compliance. The 2003 Higher Education Support Act (HESA) makes every institution responsible for including a statement interpreting and contextualising academic freedom; this action is legislatively required. A national audit conducted in 2008 (five years after the activity became Federal law) found that only eight
universities (19%) were compliant; thirty-four institutions lacked any statement pertaining to academic freedom, despite the necessity of Federal compliance (Analysis and Policy Observatory, 2008).

In both cases, intentional policy has not been able to mobilise resources, or mitigate challenges faced by the entire sector. Rather, the environment is either one of non-compliance (academic freedom), or one that applies superficial, ill-fitting metrics (social inclusion). Furthermore, social inclusion targets are primarily concerned with reporting enrolments among particular student cohorts – currently there are no requirements to report retention, attrition, and academic performance for the cohort. This leads to a demand-driven model that focuses on student entry, potentially at the expense of strategic resource allocation to student support mechanisms.

Any discussion of policy-driven OEP activity, therefore, needs to analyse the deficiencies in a singular approach, and rather seek to establish an environment in which OEP presents a strong value proposition, rather than simply striving for mandated targets.

National Level OEP Supporting Documents

There have been attempts to provide evidence-based guidelines and recommendations at national level to influence Australian government OEP strategies and activities. Ironically, these guidelines and recommendations have been mostly developed through indirect government funded research projects and fellowships, such as the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT).

One example of these developments is the Feasibility Protocol, a set of guiding principles to assist OEP practitioners, senior executives and policy maker to make informed decisions regarding the adoption of OER at different levels; individual levels, including educators and learners, institutional levels and at the sector level (Bossu, Bull & Brown, 2015). The feasibility was a key outcome of a two year project (2010 to 2012) funded by the OLT, which surveyed key stakeholders across the Australian higher education sector to uncover the state of play of OEP in Australia, including the use of OER, participants’ awareness and willingness to engage with OEP (Bossu et al., 2014). Most importantly, findings from this project provided in a set of principles to policy and decision makers at the sector level to consider. Some of them include:

- Provide government incentives and funding to promote research in OEP and encourage adoption across the higher education sector;
- Develop national level OEP dedicated policies to provide educational institutions and practitioners guidance on OEP engagement;
- Investigate the opportunities that OEP can bring to bridge the gap between formal and informal education;
- Consider OEP as a way 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.); and
- Examine how OEP can 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) (Bossu et al., 2014).

Amongst more recent funded projects is the Students, Universities and Open Education (OpenEdOz) project (http://openedoz.org/). The OpenEdOz was built on previous related projects, and aimed to bridge the OEP policy gap at national level (Wills, Alexander & Sadler, 2016). One of its main deliverables was a Roadmap to a National OEP Strategy, which intended to assist the government to realise the potential of OEP for the Australian higher education sector and open up opportunities for further national policy development and support in which OEP can flourish. The policy roadmap
was informed by the analysis of a range of national and international evidenced-based case studies related to OEP projects and initiatives gathered during the project (Bossu et al., 2016). The Roadmap is a detailed instrument, and shows the complexities of OEP adoption. It provides 25 Contributing Strategies divided by 10 Signposts, including Advocacy, Students, Teachers, Standards, Intellectual property, licensing and copyright, ICT infrastructure, research, and so forth. Also, the Roadmap suggests a number of relevant national organisations that would be appropriate and possibly “facilitators of action” to each of its strategies (Wills et al., 2016, p. 8).

Additionally, a study commissioned by the Higher Education Standards Panel and the OLT to report on the challenges, issues, opportunities and the effects that existing alternative models to deliver and recognise students’ learning can pose to Australian universities, to the sector and to the Higher Education Standards Framework (Ewan, 2016). According to the author, “it offers a view of the landscape and highlights aspects of the topography that will likely influence higher education’s journey into the future.” (Ewan, 2016, p. 6). Relevant to this paper however, is the set of suggestions made to higher education policy makers, which states that:

A coordinated approach will be necessary to ensure that Australia is not left behind in the wave of global attention to open education and the considerable implications it will have…Foremost among these is the need to agree on a national strategy to leverage contemporary IT for improving productivity of higher education through use of Open Educational Resources and the need for a national body to drive the strategy development (Ewan, 2016, p. 59).

These projects represent attempts to provide evidence-based recommendations and show legitimate concerns that the delay in adopting and lack of support for OEP initiatives could have serious consequences to higher education in Australia. Most importantly, findings from currently research shows that OEP has the potential to restore the essence of education, its value and purpose. OER, coupled with open practices can assist the Australia government to meet its educational targets to increase access to higher education to rural and remote students at a lower cost, therefore reducing student debt. By encouraging OEP at national level, the Australian government would still guarantee excellence and quality of education, as OEP can enable flexibility, innovative and affordability in learning and teaching. In fact, these are some of the elements underpinning the current paper titled Driving Innovation, Fairness and Excellence in Australian Higher Education (Australian Government, 2016). This paper discusses “potential reforms that support the Government’s vision of a stronger, more innovative and responsive system of higher education that preserves equity of access while meeting the financial sustainability savings” suggested in the current federal budget (Australian Government, 2016, p. 3). Unfortunately, it seems that the Australian educational system, in particularly higher education, is losing an opportunity by not adopting OEP as an approach to solve these challenges.

Crafting A Call For Action

Globally OEP policy developments have been maturing rapidly. There are currently several national level approaches and strategies being adopted by key global developed, and developing, economies around the world as an attempt to engage with OEP. These developments include investments and strong support of OEP through policy, funds, declarations and research and are largely motivated by the recognition of the role of OEP in meeting educational and social inclusion targets and policies, as the demand for access to education increases and the capacity of educational institutional to deliver education remains stagnated. Other factors influencing the growing number of such policy developments are, for example, the increasing numbers of OER and OEP initiatives, the growing levels of awareness of OEP, the rise in funding opportunities by national, international and philanthropic
organisations, and the support and recognition of OEP by international bodies such as UNESCO and the Commonwealth of Learning (COL) through documents and declarations.

The most recent document developed in collaboration with governments’ entities and international bodies was the Ljubljana OER Action Plan (UNESCO, 2017), which was created during the 2nd World Open Educational Resources (OER) Congress, hosted by UNESCO and the government of Slovenia in 2017. This Action Plan acknowledges and builds on existing declarations and guidelines on Open Educational Resources such as the Paris OER Declaration (UNESCO, 2012), the 2007 Cape Town Open Education Declaration (http://www.capetowndeclaration.org/read-the-declaration), the 2009 Dakar Declaration on Open Educational Resources, and the 2015 COL and UNESCO Guidelines on Open Educational Resources in Higher Education (Commonwealth of Learning, 2015). These are important international documents and strategies that have been providing the foundations for countries, nations and organisations to develop OEP capacity and support policy development.

However, Australian developments remain unsupported and isolated. Many educational institutions leaders and practitioners are aware of OEP but the lack of national support and a commodified educational system, leave them with limited or no options but meet government targets to receive their share of federal funds. Australian OEP researchers and advocates believe that meaningful strategies are required for Australia to achieve comparable results in OEP and that these strategies must reach stakeholders at several levels, including sector, institutional and individual levels. Below, the authors make recommendations for a call to action at these levels. This call is underpinned and supported by existing research in the field of OEP, policy guidelines and frameworks developed to assist policy makers, institutional leaders and practitioners to adopt OEP.

**Policy Development**

As discussed above and as in most countries, educational policy has played a significant role in shaping higher education in Australia. Open policies in particular have gained importance as OEP advances globally. According to the Going Open: Policy Recommendations on Open Education in Europe (OpenEdu Policies) research report, “policies on open education are extremely important in encouraging institutions and individual educators to embrace open education in their own work. Besides providing the right framework for action, they raise awareness and help individuals make decisions that will lead to the achievement of a common goal” (Inamorato dos Santos, 2017, p. 24).

The authors believe that policy development for OEP in Australia would be a helpful support to increase the adoption of OEP across the sector by becoming a lever for action at the institutional and practitioner levels for the purpose of meeting educational outcome goals, and potentially changing the way educational institutions look at knowledge resources, and teaching. However, policy development should be one of the actions to be taken towards OEP adoption. This is because, and as discussed previously, when misapplied, policy becomes a tool of compliance, or of abrogated responsibility.

One key example is the status of academic freedom in Australia, included in the Higher Education Support Act 2003 (Australian Government, 2003), which gives the educational institutions the responsibility to articulate the values, scope, and spirit of this freedom. This is federal law and yet only eight of the forty-two universities have complied (after the Act has been in force for fourteen years). In other words, the fact that a policy exists does not guarantee that it will give the intended results or even be applied.

Therefore, policy development for OEP in Australia should be for national awareness and provide options and directions for practitioners, national interest groups, discipline-specific bodies, and institutions, knowing that these directions would have government support. Our stance is also supported by the Ljubljana OER Action Plan (UNESCO, 2017).
**Raise Awareness**

OEP, and consequently OER, awareness raising have been one of the key recommendations and call for action in several research publications and reports in Australia (Bossu et al., 2014; Wills et al., 2016; Ewan, 2016) and elsewhere (OPAL, 2011; COL, 2015, UNESCO, 2012). In fact, in the seminal work *Open Educational Resources: A way forward* (D’Antoni, 2008), awareness raising was the number one “priority for promoting the advancement of the OER movement” (p. 11), followed by communities and capacity development (which is the action discussed next). In addition, increase understanding of OEP amongst stakeholders will assist policy maker, educational leaders and practitioners to make informed decisions about the adoption of OEP within their contexts, so that they take full advantage of the potential of OEP to enhance and innovate learning and teaching in higher education in Australia.

However, a recent report published by the Babson Survey Research Group (Seaman & Seaman, 2017) revealed that despite the fact that awareness of, in this case just OER amongst U.S academics has increased from previous years, “the proportion that reported they had never heard of OER fell from 66 percent in 2014-15 to [only] 56 percent this year”, indicating that overall understanding of OER is still low (Seaman & Seaman, 2017).

One strategy to raise understanding of OEP is to engage a range of stakeholders in dialog and consultation regarding OEP and its potential role to support higher education in Australia (Smyth, Bossu, & Stagg, 2016). Attempts should be made to develop a national community of practice (CoP) in OEP in Australia, where participants would have the opportunity to contribute discussions at national, institutional and practitioner levels. Other engagement activities that would assist raise awareness regarding OEP are: to further review existing national and international OEP policies; to undertake further research in OEP; to disseminate research findings to the sector; to develop and compile resources for government, institutions and practitioners and to mechanisms to evaluate impact.

**Capacity Building**

Capacity building can be key to raising understanding and empowering educators to make informed decisions about enhancing learning and teaching within their contexts. It is important to understand that transformation and change, particularly within the higher education landscape, can occur very slowly and can attract many sceptics. Academic staff professional development and capacity-building are important and influential instruments to empower academic staff to embrace and participate in change (Healey, Bradford, Roberts, & Knight, 2013). Previous research on OEP have identified a lack of appropriate capacity building programs available for academics as one of the main reasons for the limited adoption of OEP in Australian universities (Bossu et al., 2014). Similarly, this call for action has also been recommended by several international publications and reports (D’Antoni, 2008, OPAL, 2011; COL, 2015, UNESCO, 2012), including the most recent *Ljubljana OER Action Plan* (UNESCO, 2017).

Therefore, educational institutions must provide educators with opportunities for building capacity in OEP so that they understand and take full advantage of the opportunities of OEP. There is a substantial body of literature exploring methods, approaches, frameworks and techniques for capacity building worldwide, particular for the use of learning technology to enhance learning and teaching (Kirkwood & Price, 2014). Also, there are many resources available on the web to assist academic staff to develop further skills in OER including government websites, professional associations, research groups and universities’ websites. Even though there is no one-size-fits-all capacity building approach, the strategies available has the potential to assist academic developers and academic staff in providing theoretical and practical basis for program implementation.
In Australian, capacity building programs to promote OEP in higher education seem to be the most popular strategy amongst the universities starting experimenting with OEP, as capacity building can be key to OEP adoption through raising awareness and understanding of the potential of OEP to enhance learning and teaching (Bossu & Fountain, 2015). However, in order to promote long lasting transformation in learning and teaching, capacity building programs for educators should be engaging and hands-on, and promote reflection on practice so that they can realise the potential and possibilities of OEP to help their students learn through their previous professional experiences and beliefs (Webb, 2003).

Conclusion And Final Considerations

University-level adoption of OEP is not completely contingent on national policy, but whole-of-sector traction is reliant on national-level awareness from policy makers. It is the realisation that the current rhetoric positions education as a ‘private good’ and one that can be commercialised and ‘exported’ that drives a deeper understanding of how to construct a value proposition for OEP in the policy space. This realisation can be argued as a causal link between the misalignment of the goals of OEP lobbyists and government policy-makers. If OEP is positioned as ‘disruptive’ or ‘in conflict’ with current educational practices, gaining traction becomes even more problematic.

As a response to the possible conflicts in ideologies, a middle ground can be established by identifying opportunities to explicitly link open practices to current educational practices. This positions OEP as a supporting approach (and not the only approach) to achieving articulated outcomes for Australian Higher Education. This paper has outlined the ideological differences that Australian higher education is ill-developed in open practice, despite sharing concerns for equity of access, scalability, and collaboration. It is necessary therefore to show that openness is not a direct competitor with traditional education systems, but an approach that can enhance, and provide innovative and substantively new opportunities for learning and teaching in Australia, benefiting not only learners and educators from all walks of life, but also institutions and governments nationally and internationally. Based on existing body of knowledge and supporting policy documents in OEP, including the recent the Ljubljana OER Action Plan (UNESCO, 2017), we proposed a call for action that includes three key dimensions; policy development, raise awareness and capacity building. These dimensions should be developed at sector, institutional and practitioner levels to promote a more holistic understanding and approach to OEP in Australian higher education.

As a final consideration, we also would like to recommend to OEP researchers, advocates, educational leaders and policy makers that this call for action should be underpinned by a translational research framework. Originally applied to public health research and policy, translational research aims to bridge the gap between policy makers and practitioners (Wethington & Dunifon, 2012), a perceptual and ideological disconnect among stakeholders that has been discussed in this paper. It encourages a more holistic understanding of phenomena, by considering data, contextual influences and factors, and the nature of the broader environment in which the phenomenon sits. Translational research has been viewed as an appropriate lens for educational research, especially as it intersects with public policy and seeks collaborative representation from a wider range of stakeholders (Brabeck, 2008; Mitchell, 2016). Translational research can draw upon diverse data sources to support specific foci and outcomes. By adopting an approach founded in translational research it is possible to engage in a more inclusive and open discussion with stakeholders and to collaboratively seek the alignment and value of OEP in a national agenda. As such, this research approach would be underpinned by a major question driving this paper – is there a ‘middle ground’ for OEP and educational policy, and if so, how do unearth this foundation to build policy that reflects the diverse needs of Australia as a society that embraces access to education?
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Abstract

The study was undertaken to understand the propensity for increased engagement with open educational practices (OEP), to include methods prioritizing student-centered teaching & learning, and awareness, use, and development of open educational resources (OER) among higher education faculty in Kyrgyzstan. The study employed a mixed-methods research design, combining qualitative and quantitative data obtained from 35 faculty, librarians, and administrators in institutions of higher education in Kyrgyzstan. This study aimed to identify current teaching practices and learning resource usage practices, gauge levels of knowledge regarding Kyrgyzstan's Copyright law, Creative Commons licenses, and Open Educational Resources, and investigate perceptions regarding potential roles for libraries in enabling others' learning regarding Copyright and Creative Commons, and open educational resources. Analysis of the results revealed a higher than expected gravitation toward student-centered pedagogy than previously assumed. The study also identified broad use of digital downloads as learning materials, conflation of open educational resources with free online resources, and positive perceptions of libraries' potential to instruct regarding Kyrgyz copyright, Creative Commons, and open educational resources, and needs for further professional development training for librarians.

Keywords: Open Educational Practices; Open Educational Resources; Teaching & Learning; Kyrgyzstan

Introduction

The higher education system of Kyrgyz Republic has been going through multiple transformations at structural and institutional levels since the country gained its independence in 1991. Kyrgyzstan was introduced to open educational resources (OER) in early 2000. The OER initiative launched by the Ministry of Education and Soros-Kyrgyzstan Foundation has now reached many partners across educational institutions. Many of the projects are implemented at institutional level and aim to educate people on OER and to provide training on OER adoption and implementation. OER and other open educational practices (OEP), open pedagogy in particular, show promise in addressing shortages and aging of educational materials and in the transition from teacher/expert Soviet-era style pedagogy to deeper and more open learning practices.

We undertook this research in part to determine to what degree Soviet-era teaching practices are still prevalent in higher education, with the understanding that current practices may assist or work against implementation of open educational practices in Kyrgyzstan. The survey aimed to assess the potential for further adoption of open educational practices within higher education and focused on identifying baseline information regarding aspirational and reported teaching styles and practices, curriculum materials currently in use and their origin, level of awareness regarding Open
Educational Resources, Creative Commons licenses, and Kyrgyz Copyright law, and perceptions regarding the potential role of academic libraries in providing instruction on Copyright, Creative Commons, and OER.

**First and Second Phases of Open**

Open Educational Resources (OER) are considered one of the most important educational innovations in the new millennium. Having emerged in early 2000's, the OER movement has grown considerably in the past decade to a global network of educational institutions, individuals and organizations that promote openness, collaboration, innovation and collective development and use of open educational materials (Butcher, 2011; Open Education Consortium, 2017).

The term OER refers to educational content in different formats that is openly licensed and available for use and re-use by students and educators. OER are subject to the litmus test of the 5 Rs: Retain, Reuse, Revise, Remix, and Redistribute (Wiley, n.d.). The central idea behind the concept of OER implies that the world’s knowledge is a public good and that technology provides unprecedented opportunities for people to share and to use that knowledge (Smith & Casserly, 2006).

Open Educational Practices (OEP) are a second phase of open, which include but go beyond access, availability, and creation of OER course material (DeRosa & Jhangiani, 2017) to “improve learning experiences and innovate educational scenarios” (Ehlers, 2011). OEP venture into open learning architectures beyond University walls, into “open pedagogy.” Open pedagogy is defined as “OER-enabled pedagogy” -- pedagogical practices reliant on OER (Wiley, 2017), or “open pedagogy” which as an “access-oriented commitment to learner-driven education AND as a process of designing architectures and using tools for learning that enable students to shape the public knowledge commons of which they are a part” (DeRosa & Jhangiani, 2017). Student creation of non-disposable assignments that can be shared with the world fit nicely here (Hendricks, 2015). The second definition embeds a social justice commitment, understanding that access and creation of knowledge artifacts should be democratic, not limited to an elite or privileged group. Such an emphasis harkens back to the late 1970s when Canadian Claude Paquette outlined three sets of foundational values of open pedagogy as: autonomy and interdependence; freedom and responsibility; and democracy and participation, which essentially define “open” as being “very much about learner choice” (Morgan, 2016). Both of these definitions of “open pedagogy” can be complementary to OER, but are noticeably more focused on educational processes rather than informational content or artifacts created, consumed, or adapted in the process of learning. Existing learning theories and practices of constructivism and experiential learning have significant overlap with both OER-enabled pedagogy, and open/learner-centric pedagogy.

While not all scholars agree that new pedagogies are required in order to realize the potential of open educational resources, aspects of open practices may be selected to amplify existing pedagogic practices (Masterman, 2015). Open educational practices incorporate or the same intent and many of the same practices as student-centered learning, whose primary goal is fostering deep learning and understanding as facilitated by deep approaches to learning. Open advocates link increasingly student-centered pedagogy to improved student outcomes as a part of a more “open” teaching process (Huitt & Monnetti, 2017). In contrast, surface approaches are described as having a “reproducing orientation and extrinsic motivation and a fear of failure which is accompanied with rote memorisation and a narrow-syllabus bound attitude” (Baeten, Kyndt, Struyven & Dochy, 2010). Open pedagogy, while varied in types of practices, is much the opposite and asks students to engage in
“creating,” shaping outcomes, utilizing agency, and the instructor acting as coach. As DeRosa and Jhangiani (2017) summarize:

...we might think of Open Pedagogy as an access-oriented commitment to learner-driven education AND as a process of designing architectures and using tools for learning that enable students to shape the public knowledge commons of which they are a part. We might insist on the centrality of the 5 Rs to this work, and we might foreground the investment that that Open Pedagogy shares with other learner-centered approaches to education (n.p.).

Baeten et al. (2010) analyzed over 100 studies in which teaching methods emphasized “student responsibility and activity in learning” and “a coaching role of the teacher”. Many of the findings of Baeten’s article mirror concerns the authors have regarding student (and instructor) perpetuation of surface or rote learning approaches rather than moving toward deep learning approaches. While admittedly complex, Baeten’s review found that a teacher’s orientation toward students plays a role regarding student adoption of deep or shallow learning practices. Students of teachers that are more involved and willing to change their conceptions are more likely to adopt deep approaches to learning. Students are likewise influenced by their perceptions of the course: Courses with an orientation toward students, including options for independent study influence students to take deeper learning approaches. Student confidence in their teacher’s teaching, such as “answering students’ questions, giving feedback, structuring the course, providing materials and illustrating lectures” also lend themselves to student adoption of deep learning practices. Relevance of activities to the student’s future professional practice bode well for students opting for deeper learning engagement. These practices bode well as deep learning approaches. The 5Rs (retain, reuse, revise, remix, and redistribute) bode well as an ethical orientation toward knowledge sharing. Student skill in adopting and developing appropriate forms that fit the function of information they are developing and working is an important part of their learning. To the degree that instructors are supported and adhere to best practices for stimulating student engagement in deeper learning practices, increasingly diverse students may learn and understand in ways that are more transformative.

**The Kyrgyz Context**

The educational system of Kyrgyz Republic has been going through multiple transformations at both structural and institutional levels since the country gained its independence in 1991. Currently, more than 50 institutions of higher education offer bachelor’s and master’s degrees, as well as specialist’s degrees comprising five years of training. While the academic programs are developed within the framework of the national educational standards, universities have a high degree of autonomy in defining their teaching methods and adopting educational technologies and innovations (European Commission, 2012). Given donor agendas, higher education institutions struggle with self-determination and whether internationalization serves the mission of transformative education in and for Kyrgyzstan (Merrill, 2011). Educational policy aside, we posit that a move to more student-centred learning may aid Kyrgyz administrators, faculty and students in developing quality rubrics, and specifically Kyrgyz approaches to education which are relevant to the Kyrgyz context rather than those imported by a funder.

The Kyrgyz Republic’s Ministry of Education sets licensing requirements for educational institutions. At every level, including Higher Education, the Ministry requires institutions to provide learning materials (e.g., textbooks, etc.) for students rather than students purchasing these themselves. The concept of OER also aligns with the vision of the Kyrgyz Republic’s Ministry of Education, which placed “providing conditions for continuous education throughout life” among its key priorities.
OER was first brought to attention of the academic community via occasional initiatives by education advocates in the early 2000’s. One of the initial efforts to present OER countrywide was undertaken by the U.S. Embassy in 2008 with a series of events introducing Open Yale Courses at major universities in the capital city and one of the major cities in the Southern region (“V Oshe sostoyalas'”, 2008). In 2007-2008, the Library and Information Consortium of Kyrgyzstan initiated several projects related to open access and open repositories, trying to bring attention to open educational practices. However, OER had not come into focus until 2014, when the inaugural international conference Open Educational Resources (OER) and Digital Education brought together the government, public sector, educational practitioners and international experts to discuss the advancement of open education and free access to knowledge in the countries of Central Asia and Mongolia (OER Impact Map, 2014). The OER initiative launched by the Ministry of Education and Soros-Kyrgyzstan Foundation has now reached many partners across educational institutions. Many of the projects are implemented at institutional level and aim to educate people on OER and to provide training on OER adoption and implementation. These initiatives include launch of digital repositories of open educational materials, OER awareness campaigns (KyrlibNet), panel discussion (AUCA News, 2017), summer camps for educators (Soros Kyrgyzstan Foundation, 2017), and grant programs to support OER implementation (Soros, 2017). Some of these efforts have branched into open educational practices and open pedagogy, for example training in Wikipedia Editing at OER Summer Camps and remix of openly licensed Sociology course material at AUCA in Fall 2017. However, few developments focusing on policy development have taken place at the national level.

In spring 2017 the country had a major copyright reform, resulting in the amendments in the Intellectual Property Right Law, which mandates publicly funded educational resources to be publicly available (State Service Intellectual Property and Innovation, 2017). The legislation also has provisions on referring to fair use for educational purposes and facilitates the use of open licenses by creators and authors of works. The document also implements provisions of the Marrakesh Treaty, which the country acceded to the same year. This international copyright treaty, administered by World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO, n.d.), has a clear humanitarian and social dimension and aims to facilitate access across national borders to print works by the blind, visually impaired or otherwise print-disabled persons through creating a set of mandatory limitations and exceptions. The treaty allows the libraries in the participating countries to provide and exchange accessible formats, such as Braille, audio, and large print across national borders (WIPO, 2017; EIFL, 2017). The Kyrgyz Republic’s copyright reform has been recognized a significant step that will allow further policy development in the sphere of copyright, digital rights and Creative Commons licensing.

Policy developments aside, concerns remain. Though at least six institutions of higher education were established after independence, concern remains regarding instructional practices and program based reforms which lack clear academic outcomes. Because of a lack of other career options, more students than ever are attending University. Institutions which under the Soviet regime led diploma holders to specific jobs now produce students with diplomas who are on their own to find a use for the skills they may have developed. Some institutions are willing to grant a diploma after four or five years regardless of academic or professional quality indicators. (DeYoung, 2013). Universities lack placement centers or services, and a large number of students find work competing with their studies.

Economics aside, teacher/expert and passive-student pedagogies persist (DeYoung, 2008). The primary instructional mode during the Soviet-era was to receive texts from Moscow, lecture from the
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texts, and require students to repeat or recall information (DeYoung, 2013). As recently as 2016, research at one institution indicated that teaching styles suggested by the Kyrgyz education system are “very old, outdated, left from the former Soviet System”. Further exacerbating factors included a reported lack of in-service training and shortage of instructional materials (Muhametjanova & Cagiltay, 2016). In a theoretical study, de la Sablonnière, Taylor and Sadykova (2009) posit that the current normative teacher/expert methods create problems for the promotion of a student-centered approach in Kyrgyzstan. Believing that there is promise because of government reforms and international attention, de la Sablonnière et al. (2009) argue that Kyrgyzstan could be a model example of a successfully implemented reform for other countries facing like challenges. She posits that instructors would need to change their roles by developing ways to measure competence, elicit interaction with students during lectures, consider students’ prior knowledge, and learn to guide student learning. Similarly, students would need to become more active in the learning process. There is a role also for institutions: Instructors who wish to move from a teacher/expert to a student centered approach need assurances of job stability, resources, and support. de la Sablonnière et al. (2009) suggest that vocal minority of practitioners may cause others to question their current adherence to instructor-centric pedagogy, and that creative change may result -- if there is a clear articulation regarding teaching methods, a free exchange of ideas and experiences, collaboration between institutions, access to information resources, and support from the Ministries of education and international organizations (de la Sablonnière et al., 2009).

In this context of hoped-for change, expert/teacher Soviet-era pedagogy is a barrier to student-centric open educational practices, deeper learning approaches, and likely to more creative and meaningful technology-rich learning. Continued adherence to traditional Soviet era teaching styles may decrease the fruition of open educational practices to arrive at their full potential.

**Gaps in the Literature**

Having been introduced in the early 2000s, OER is a relatively new phenomenon in Kyrgyzstan. Introduction of the term OEP is even newer. There is limited domestic research on educational developments in Kyrgyzstan and a significant lack of research on open educational resources or practices. The study is an attempt to fill in this gap. There is a need to identify the current state of awareness of OER and current teaching practices as these and other factors help to evaluate the propensity adoption of OEP by instructors and higher educational institutions. The study aims to identify the shift in the current teaching and learning practices, knowledge of OER, open licensing, related concepts of copyright, and perceptions regarding potential roles of libraries in educating others on these topics.

The majority of past research documents have been developed in the form of reports providing overview of the structure, developments and recommendations. The potential for OER in the Post-Soviet context was studied by the UNESCO’s Institute for Information Technologies in Education attempting to analyze the use of information communication technologies (ICTs) in education and perspectives for the development of OER in former Soviet bloc countries. While there are many online resources developed and shared by educational institutions, most of them do not fall under the definition of OER as “teaching, learning and research materials, that reside in the public domains and have been released under open licenses that permit use, repurpose and reuse by others” (UNESCO, 2011).

Earlier efforts to obtain fragmentary survey data on OER were undertaken by the Association of Electronic Libraries in 2014-2015 within the framework of the countrywide OER awareness campaign. The KyrLibNet team conducted information and training sessions at major universities.
of the country, highlighting topics such as OER, types of OER, OER advantages and limitations, and introduction to Creative Commons Licenses. A brief survey was conducted at each training site to identify potential barriers in the use and adoption of OER. Respondents consisting of faculty, librarians, students, graduate and doctoral students and researchers identified several factors preventing successful development and use of OER. Preference of print format over electronic was named one of the barriers in the adopting OER, which is mostly available in digital formats. Other factors included lack of general awareness of OER, lack of technology skills, perception of time and efforts needed to be invested in order to find and to evaluate suitable OER, concerns about copyright infringements and lack of motivation and institutional support. (KyrLibNet, 2017). These findings were consistent with the barriers in the OER adoption in non-English speaking countries defined by UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education (UNESCO, 2011).

Very little is known about instructor awareness of OER vs. “free online” resources. In a recent study on propensity for technology adoption, Muhametjanova cites familiarity with MIT’s OCW (Open CourseWare), a portal of openly licensed content, and proposes this as a tool to be shared by all universities in Kyrgyzstan (Muhametjanova & Cagiltay, 2016).

Further research on student -as well as Administrator- perceptions and aspirations is warranted, but are not part of this study.

Survey Research

Research Intent and Scope

One hundred and twenty faculty, administrators, and librarians employed in institutions of higher education in Kyrgyzstan were invited to respond to a mixed methods electronic survey available in English and Russian (see appendix). The survey was distributed to faculty via librarians on the Kyrgyz Library and Information Consortium email list, a university all-faculty mailing list, and through the Kyrgyz Open Education group email list which consists of librarians, faculty, and academic staff from universities across Kyrgyzstan. The survey was sent three times during a one-month period. The survey aimed to assess the potential for further adoption of open educational practices within higher education and focused on identifying baseline information regarding aspirational and reported teaching styles and practices, curriculum materials currently in use and their origin, level of awareness regarding Open Educational Resources, Creative Commons licenses, and Kyrgyz Copyright law, and perceptions regarding the potential role of academic libraries in providing instruction on Copyright, Creative Commons, and OER.

Research Questions

1. What curriculum resources are higher education faculty in Kyrgyzstan currently using?
2. What teaching methods/pedagogies are higher education faculty in Kyrgyzstan currently using?
3. What is the level of awareness of (higher education) faculty and library directors regarding Creative Commons licenses and Open Educational Resources (OER)?
4. What is the level of awareness of (higher education) faculty and library directors regarding Kyrgyz Copyright and Intellectual Property Laws?
5. How potentially helpful do (higher education) faculty and library directors believe libraries could be regarding enabling others’ learning regarding Copyright, Creative Commons, and/or Open Educational Resources?
Method

An online survey instrument was developed using Qualtrics (see appendix). The mixed methods survey comprised 33 questions to reflect the aims and objectives of the study. In October-December 2017, the questionnaire was distributed electronically among one hundred and twenty faculty, administrators and librarians employed in higher educational institutions. The survey was available in English and Russian. The overall response rate was of 66.7%.

Results

Study Participants

Eighty individuals from nineteen higher education completed portions of the survey. For purposes of the survey, individuals not employed at institutions of higher education and respondents who indicated that they do not teach were removed from the sample before analysis on teaching related topics, resulting in a sample of 35. The responses of five additional individuals who indicated employment at institutions of higher education but not teaching were included the analysis for the last two topics: awareness, and potential library roles.

Respondents who teach were diversified across various disciplines. Disciplines with four or more respondents included: English language (18%), Computer Science (9%), Education/Pedagogy (9%), Economics, (7%), and Mathematics (5%).

While all higher education institution types in Kyrgyzstan were represented, the sample is weighted toward private and intergovernmental institution types and Kyrgyz geographic areas located in the capital and northern part of the country.

Reported use of curriculum materials

While textbooks as learning resources are a focal point for rural school-level initiatives (World Bank, 2017), higher education respondents indicated using a wide range of learning resources: textbooks, videos or films, audio/sound recordings, literature, workbooks, iTools, books (beyond textbooks), journal articles, and laboratory notebooks in their courses. Little is known about the proportions of use and origin of these media beyond textbooks. For those using textbooks, the age of textbooks is of particular note. Of faculty reporting using a textbook, 56% indicated it was at least 6 years old. Twenty percent reported using a textbook that was at least 13 years old. This may be a smaller issue for disciplines that change at slower rates, but is a very significant issue given the amount of socio-political change Kyrgyzstan has faced in the last ten years, not to mention that physical materials wear out with use.

Textbooks were obtained from many different sources: the institution’s library as expected, from the teacher, online, and in some cases students were asked to purchase their own textbooks. Fewer than half of respondents indicated requesting that the library purchase the material. The largest percentage of respondents indicated finding learning material online when asked for titles, some frequent answers revealed freely available online material offered by its producers, such as: “English file” or “Any Logic in 3 days” (English File, n.d.; Grigoryev, 2014). Other specific titles listed were found to be current, in-copyright textbooks whose commercial publishers do not make digital versions freely available and are likely illegally posted. Furthermore, multiple respondents indicated using Internet search engines to locate PDFs of titles or found them in peer-to-peer file sharing systems that redistribute in-copyright materials without permission.
Teaching practices and pedagogies

The research question on teaching methods and pedagogies was supported by seven questions. Respondents were asked what they believe are the three most important things they do in the classroom that help students learn. The following methods were cited: interactive strategies applied, situational and problems solving learning methods, group work, real-life examples, and case study or seminar discussions. Several mentioned discipline specific methodologies or theories including: Total physical response, Suggestopedia, and Morphological box thinking, Bloom’s taxonomy, PPP (Presentation, Practice, Production), ESA (Engage, Study, Activate), and CLT (Communicative Language Learning). Only one respondent mentioned “lecture” and only one respondent mentioned “tests”. Very few mentioned engaging in the process of building or creating something.

We wanted investigate to what degree Soviet-era teacher-centric pedagogy is still in practice. We asked instructors what they believe are the three most important things they currently do in the classroom which help students learn; respondents most frequently cited interactive strategies, applied, situational or problem solving learning methods, group work, real-life examples, and case study or seminar discussions. Only one respondent mentioned “lecture” and only one respondent mentioned “tests.” We asked how often they actually utilized particular practices which mapped to teaching styles and teaching style clusters as described by Grasha (1994). Of 27 respondents to the question, six indicated always lecturing and two indicated never lecturing. Using a weighted average, lectures ranked squarely in the middle (17 of 34 practices) with regard to how frequently respondents reported using lecture in class. Still, we found higher average rankings of “expert/formal authority” (Cluster 1) styles than an “expert/facilitator/delegator” teaching style (Cluster 4 practices) encouraged by Grasha (1994).

In the course of the survey we asked whether students were expected to create anything in their courses. Of the 38 respondents, 29 (78.38%) indicated that they require students to create something in their class. Students reportedly created: presentations, independent projects, student portfolio, term and research projects, problem evaluation and solving, topical analysis, creating [a] real world situation, [u]se of examples from real world sector, individual and group projects. One respondent indicated that students were required to create a 3D Hologram. In subsequent responses it was clear that students created presentations and articles to share at academic competitions and conferences. Other responses indicating that students create, “knowledge, results, ideas, hard work” implied that few faculty asked students to create shareable and real-world artifacts.

Follow up questions asked if instructors provide ways for students to publicly share the work they created. Instructors reported that students shared in class, at seminars, conferences, competitions or in academic journals, suggesting that journal articles are one possible artifact created. Other respondents mentioned sharing via a Gallery Walk, social networks, file sharing services, the course management system, lesson visits, public presentation, and on stage. Institutional repositories often hosted by libraries were not mentioned as a place to share artifacts created as part of a course.

Reported awareness

We aimed to identify baseline knowledge and level of activity regarding copyright and intellectual property licensing topics in higher education. Ninety six percent of respondents indicated that they had heard of open educational resources and thirty nine percent of respondents indicated that they had used or created “Open Educational Resources”. However, when asked about their level of familiarity with the term and use of “Creative Commons licenses” which enable most open educational resources, these numbers dropped significantly: 36% indicated having never heard of Creative Commons licenses, including seven who had previously indicated having used or adapted/created
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and shared OER. Clearly, for many there is a knowledge gap regarding what makes something an open educational resource, and that free online materials are not necessarily open educational resources. That said, 20% of respondents indicated that they had heard of Creative Commons licenses and had used some.

When asked about their familiarity with Kyrgyzstan’s Copyright law, three quarters of respondents indicated that they have at least general information about Kyrgyz copyright law. Of these, 18 indicated that they provide assistance to others on the topic. Of the 25% without general information nearly all indicated that they had heard of Kyrgyz Copyright Law but had never tried to find any information about it. Self-reported knowledge about the scope of Kyrgyz Copyright Law varied with 73-90% of respondents being aware that Kyrgyz Copyright law protects author rights, allows authors to grant rights for others to use their work, and allow educational use of copyrighted works under some conditions.

**Perceptions regarding potential library roles**

Part three of the survey aimed to identify current uses of their college or university library by faculty and administrators and whether or not respondents believe that their library could be helpful for learning more about copyright, Creative Commons licenses, and/or open educational resources. Ninety to ninety-seven percent of faculty and administrator respondents indicated that they believe their institution’s library can be helpful in learning about these three topics. Respondents offered helpful comments regarding whether comprehensive and reliable information about author rights in Kyrgyzstan is available online, and one noted that “many librarians in Kyrgyzstan are not aware [of] license and authors’ rights”. Of the 10 academic librarians or academic library directors responding to the survey, two indicated providing assistance to others on copyright topics, two indicated knowing a lot about copyright, and four indicated general awareness of copyright information.

**Discussion**

Reported teaching practices were mixed between teacher-centered and student-centered more than we had expected, with “lecture” appearing only half way down the list, and several faculty mentioning student-centric practices such as interactive strategies and references to real-world examples. Taking the first steps to explore and implement open pedagogy may be a challenge for instructors, particularly with its strong emphasis on student agency, active, engaged student learning, the instructor as a “coach,” and interaction with curating and creating in the “real world” rather than assignments that mainly the teacher sees. Grasha (1994) notes “…it is not easy [for instructors] to take a less central role and to empower students”. A qualitative study covering a broader range of institutions and more inclusive of cultural factors and aspirations of instructors may better reveal the nature, cultural expectations, and incentives around teaching practices in higher education across the country.

While Wikipedia editing has been taught in some professional development settings, the practice of using non-disposable assignments for learning is likely still a new idea for most instructors. Further research is also needed to determine whether additional shareable artifacts such as documents, videos, term papers, short stories, blog posts, or other purposeful and shareable creative works and “non-disposable assignments” (Hendricks, 2015) beyond presentations that are created by students.

Instructors reported using a range of curriculum materials. Of concern and consistent with other research (Muhametjanova & Cagiltay, 2016) and the authors’ prior knowledge is the shortage of recently published learning materials. It would be interesting to further research library budgets...
and roles regarding course materials and faculty awareness thereof. It would also be interesting to hear perceptions of library directors regarding their potential role in the emerging library publishing movements as exemplified by the Library Publishing Coalition (https://librarypublishing.org) and Open Textbook Network Publishing Pilot (2017) and movements to support collaborative faculty publishing such as the Rebus Community (https://about.rebus.community), and the BC Open Campus (Aesoph, 2018). The use, adaptation, and creation of open educational resources may be a sustainable way to build locally derived learning materials that may legally be customized and shared, thus reducing institutional material costs, leveraging instructor and student real-world practice of deeper and higher order learning skills, developing life and work abilities for an increasingly open world.

As the results show, there is a certain degree of awareness of OER and open educational practices among higher educational institutions in Kyrgyzstan. Further education is needed to clearly convey the differences between openly licensed/OER content, content which is in-copyright and free online, and content which is in-copyright and online but likely online illegally.

Most respondents expressed a positive response to the potential of libraries to provide education and guidance regarding Copyright, Creative Commons licenses, and Open Educational Resources. If libraries are to take on providing guidance in these areas, additional professional development and staffing will be needed.

**Recommendations**

Fostering collaboration especially among disciplinary and instructor networks among institutions and organizations will bring positive impact on the advancement of OER and open educational practices in the country. Further implementation of open educational practices will depend on continued professional development opportunities, capacity building, institutional support, and relevant training and rewards for those who choose to implement open educational practices. There is a need to address the knowledge gap and misinformed notions regarding the meaning of OER and free online resources, as the latter may substitute for illegally distributed materials. Faculty, librarians, and educational practitioners will require further training and professional development opportunities regarding Creative Commons licenses, and the potential of open educational practices including open pedagogy. Academic libraries can take a lead in promoting OER, Creative Commons and copyright issues, given the librarians have proper training on these topics and practical experience in implementing relevant projects. Finally, OER and open educational practices remain a rich research area for the future, highlighting opportunities for research, development and assessment of open educational practices, analysis of faculty and student preferences regarding reading and teaching using print and electronic formats. Further study is needed regarding the outcomes of current faculty pedagogical practices in parallel with more open educational practices to determine their relevance and value for faculty and students achieving learning goals in varying disciplines and at varying levels of teaching.

**Limitations**

Though the survey was targeted to gather countrywide data, the number of participating institutions is insufficient to generalize to all higher education institutions in the country. As most of the respondents were from the institutions located in the capital city and northern part of the country, the survey has limitations in geographical representation. The survey also lacked multiple-choice options in two places which limited the depth of analysis.
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Appendix: Survey about Open Educational Practices in Kyrgyzstan

This research study is conducted by Jyldyz Bekbalaeva, Library Director of the American University of Central Asia, and Anita Walz, Fulbright Specialist to the American University of Central Asia from Virginia Tech. The purpose of this study is to understand what curriculum materials and teaching methods are used by higher education faculty in Kyrgyzstan, the level of awareness of higher education faculty and library directors regarding Creative Commons Licenses, Open Educational Resources, Kyrgyz Copyright and intellectual property laws, and to what degree faculty and library directors believe libraries can be helpful in enabling others' learning regarding Copyright, Creative Commons, and open educational resources. This online survey should take you approximately 20 minutes to complete. This survey is voluntary and confidential. Your responses will be accessible only by the research project co-investigators. There may be no direct benefit to you for participating. You will not be paid for your participation. However, findings from this survey will be helpful for developing future library, faculty development, and curriculum resources. Your institute name will be concealed in published research. This precaution is intended to prevent negative repercussions to institutions. This research (#17-581) is approved by the Institutional Review Board at Virginia Tech. The Institutional Review Board is a group of people that review research studies and protect the rights of people involved in research. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact IRB Chair, Institutional Review Board Virginia Tech at: [IRB email address].

I am a:

- Librarian
- Faculty member (full time)
- Faculty member (part time)
- Researcher or doctoral student
- Administrator
- Other ____________________________________________

Work experience

- Years of experience working at the University level __________________________________

My institution is:

- American University of Central Asia
- Kyrgyz National University
- Kyrgyz-Turkish Manas University
- International Ataturk-Alatoo University
- Bishkek Humanities University
- Kyrgyz State Pedagogical University
- Kyrgyz Russian-Slavic University
- Kyrgyz Technical University
- Kyrgyzstan State University of Construction, Transportation and Architecture
- Kyrgyz State Law Academy
- Kyrgyz National Agrarian University
- Kyrgyz State Medical Academy
- Issyk Kul State University
- Jalalbat State University
- Osh State University
• Talas State University
• Naryn State University
• Batken State University
• University of Central Asia
• Other ____________________________

My highest diploma or degree is:
• Bachelors
• Masters
• Diploma on Higher Education
• Doctorate (PhD, EdD, MD, JD)
• Other ____________________________

I teach in the following disciplinary areas (mark all that apply)
• Anthropology
• Agriculture
• Biology
• Business/Finance
• Chemistry
• Communication
• Computer Science
• Economics
• Education/Pedagogy
• Engineering
• Environmental Sciences / Natural Resource Management
• Fine Arts / Design / Theatre
• Geography
• Geology / Geo Sciences
• Government / Political Science
• History
• International Relations
• Journalism
• Language - Russian
• Language - Kyrgyz
• Language - English
• Language - other ____________________________
• Law
• Mathematics
• Medicine
• Mining
• Music
• Philosophy
• Physics
• Psychology
• Public Administration
• Religion
• Rural / Regional Development
• Sociology
• Statistics
Tourism / Leisure Studies
Other _________________________________
I do not teach

TEACHING PRACTICES FOR FACULTY: USE OF PEDAGOGY / METHODOLOGIES

What do you believe are the three most important things you do in the classroom that help students learn?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

In teaching at the college or University level, how often do you use the following teaching methods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>About half the time</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term papers</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutorials</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest presentations</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video/audio presentations of content</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest speakers</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-centered class discussions</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict standards/requirements</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades/tests emphasized</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating ways of thinking/doing things</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching/guiding students</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illustrating alternatives</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing personal viewpoints</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing thought processes involved in obtaining answers</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using personal examples to illustrate content points</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having students emulate the teacher’s example</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group discussion</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What types of learning skills do you ask students in your courses to use? (inside or outside of class) (mark all that apply)

- Memorize and recall (remember)
- Understand complex information (understand)
- Use information in a context different than where it was learned (apply)
- Differentiate between or compare ideas (analyze)
- Critique or defend a decision or position (evaluate)
- Develop or author a new or original work (create)

Do you require students to create anything in your classes?
- Yes
- No

If yes, what do you require students to create in your classes?

If yes, do you provide a way for students to publicly share what they created in their classes?
- Yes
- No
If yes, how or where do you provide a place for students to publically share what they created?

__________________________________________________________________________

USE OF MEDIA / CONTENT

What types of media or learning resources do you use in your courses?
- Textbooks
- Books (beyond textbooks)
- Journal articles
- Newspaper articles
- Videos or films
- Audio or sound recordings
- Podcasts
- Workbooks
- Laboratory notebooks
- Other ____________________________________________

What is the publication year(s) of the textbooks you are using?
- Earlier than 2000
- 2000-2004
- 2005-2010
- 2011-2017
- I don't use any textbooks.

In what language(s) are the textbooks written?
- Russian
- Kyrgyz
- Turkish
- English
- Other ____________________________________________

Where do textbooks for your class come from?
- Provided by the college or university library
- I find textbooks online
- I use my own materials
- Students buy their textbooks
- I don't use any textbooks
- Other ____________________________________________

Do you use textbooks you find online for free?
- Yes
- No

What are the titles of the textbooks you find online for free?
__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Please list the website or URL where you located the free online textbook(s):

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

Do you assign students to use these textbooks that you find free online?
• Yes
• No

How do you direct students to these materials?
• I email a PDF of the textbook to the students.
• I email a URL of the textbook to the students.
• I upload a PDF or file to a computer or computer system at my college or university.
• I explain to students during class how to find these materials.
• I ask students to tell other students how to find the textbook(s).
• I print out a hard copy for students’ use.
• I request that the library purchase a copy for student use.
• Other ________________________________

AWARENESS OF OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES

How familiar are you with the following terms?

How familiar are you with the following term: Open Educational Resources
• I’ve never heard of this
• I’ve heard of this but never looked for any
• I’ve heard of this but never used any
• I’ve heard of this and have used some
• I’ve heard of this and have adapted or created and shared some.

How familiar are you with the following term: Creative Commons licenses
• I’ve never heard of this.
• I’ve heard of this but never looked for any.
• I’ve heard of this but never used any.
• I’ve heard of this and have used some.
• I’ve heard of this and have adapted or created and shared some.

AWARENESS OF KYRGYZ COPYRIGHT LAW

How familiar are you with Kyrgyzstan’s Copyright law?
• I’ve never heard of this
• I’ve heard of this but never tried to find any information on this.
• I’ve heard of this and know general information regarding Kyrgyz copyright.
• I’ve heard of this and know a lot about this topic.
• I’ve heard of this and provide assistance to others regarding this topic.
Are you aware that Kyrgyz Copyright law:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protects author rights</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows authors to grant rights for others to use their work?</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows educational use of copyrighted works under some conditions?</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERCEPTION OF LIBRARY POTENTIAL HELPFULNESS

Do you use your institution’s library?
- Yes
- No

For what purposes do you use your institution’s library?
- I get books or textbooks
- I can recommend the library acquire books and textbooks
- I use electronic databases and resources
- I obtain journal articles from the library
- I use library services such as reference, research help, or interlibrary loan
- I invite librarians to do a workshop for my students
- I use other library help

Do you think your institution’s library can be helpful to learn more about copyright?
- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Do you think your institution’s library can be helpful to learn more about open licenses or Creative Commons?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

Do you think your institution’s library can be helpful to learn more about open educational resources?
- Yes
- No
- Don’t know

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS

What other comments or questions do you have about topics covered in this survey?

________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
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Abstract

There is growing interest in the adoption of open educational resources (OER) and open educational practices (OEP) in a variety of contexts. Continuing professional development (CPD) among practitioners in the effective adoption of OER and OEP is critical in this scenario. Massive open online courses (MOOCs), which also grew as part of the open education movement, provide a feasible means for this purpose. MOOCs are considered a ‘disruptive innovation’ in making free and open learning opportunities accessible to large numbers. Yet, the design of an effective massive online course that is as robust as a great online course with smaller student numbers where good principles of teaching and learning are maintained, is very challenging. Most contemporary MOOCs tend to have a content-driven focus of knowledge transmission, deviating from its original focus of knowledge generation. With the intention of providing learning experiences to promote learner engagement with OER, rather than presenting content about OER, we designed four CPD MOOCs to support the integration of OER and adoption OEP by practitioners based on a scenario-based learning (SBL) approach. This paper presents the analysis and design phases of this process, discussing the challenges faced and innovative strategies adopted in our pursuit to answer the question, “How best to design effective MOOCs on OER and OEP for continuing professional development of practitioners?”
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Introduction

In order to develop capacity among educators in the integration of OER in their teaching practices, the Open University of Sri Lanka (OUSL) implemented a professional development (PD) course on OER-based e-Learning (OEReL), with the support of the Commonwealth Educational Media Centre for Asia (CEMCA). This fully online course of 24 weeks comprised five modules adapted from a core set of modules in a course on OER-based e-Learning that was developed by CEMCA, in collaboration with the Wawasan Open University, Malaysia, as part of its institutional capacity building programme to promote use of OER (CEMCA, 2014). At the successful completion of its implementation, there was an imperative for the continuation of this course beyond OUSL to other Universities and higher educational institutions in Sri Lanka, and in the region, by re-designing it in the form of a MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) for continuing professional development (CPD) of practitioners.
As revealed by research conducted in relation to the OEReL course, (see Karunanayaka, Naidu, Rajendra & Ratnayake, 2015, 2017; Karunanayaka, Rajendra, Ratnayake & Naidu, 2016), it had much strength as a PD online course for educators on OER-based eLearning. However, a common issue faced by the participants as full-time academics, was the difficulty to engage in and complete all required learning and assessment tasks within the stipulated time-frames. Due to this, many participants dropped out during the course, and the completion rate of the full course was only 29%. In order to extend the existing course to a wider audience, while addressing these issues, it was decided to substantially re-design the OEReL course as four independent CPD MOOCs on OER and OEP, each of a shorter duration.

While the concept of MOOCs has gained significant attention in making free and open learning opportunities accessible to large numbers, the real challenge lies in the design of an effective massive online course that is as robust as a great online course with smaller student numbers where good principles of teaching and learning are maintained. To deal with this challenge, a design-based research (DBR) approach is adopted in this project, which comprises an iterative process of analysis, design, development, and implementation while testing theory and producing design principles (Reeves, 2006). This paper reports on the analysis and design phases of this DBR process, during which the learning experience design of the CPD MOOCs took place, adopting innovative theoretical constructs, and using a scenario-based learning (SBL) approach.

Review of Literature

MOOCs grew out of an interest in open and flexible learning. Since its emergence in 2008, the MOOC phenomenon has gained rapid attention and wide recognition as a promising educational innovation, and is considered a model of free, open and life-long learning (Anderson, 2013; Bates, 2015; Daniel, 2012; Downes, 2012). Trends in MOOC development indicates significant changes in MOOC types in relation to their pedagogical designs, from "c" (connectivist) MOOCs to "x" (extended) MOOCs and further to various hybrid/dual layer MOOCs (Bozkurt, Akgün-Özbek & Zawacki-Ritcher, 2017; Liyanagunawardena, Adams & Williams, 2013).

The first generation of cMOOCs supported a connectivist theory of learning that viewed knowledge as distributed and learning as a social process, focusing on ‘knowledge creation and generation’, while the second generation of xMOOCs focused on ‘knowledge duplication’ (Siemens, 2014). Key design principles for cMOOCs are: autonomy of the learner- in terms of learners choosing what content or skills they wish to learn; diversity- in terms of the tools, participants and content; interactivity- in terms of co-operative learning and communication; and openness- in terms of access, content, activities and assessment (Bates, 2014). In contrast, common design features of xMOOCs comprise transmitting information through video lectures, computer-marked assessments and peer assessments, automation of all key transactions, and no or very light discussion moderation (Bates, 2015).

The current dominance of xMOOCs in education indicates a transformation of MOOCs from its original intention of knowledge sharing among networked learners, back to the conventional transmission of information from an expert to novices. This implies a deviation in the purpose of MOOCs from a humanitarian motive to a more business-oriented motive (Bozkurt et al., 2017; Yuan & Powell, 2013). This change of focus of MOOCs from a ‘distributed knowledge network’ to a ‘hub and spoke model’ of learning (Siemens, 2012) raises concerns about the real purpose of MOOCs. However, it is argued that this c/x MOOC binary is no longer representative or useful (Bayne & Ross, 2014), and that the design of MOOCs is evolving with all kinds of variations (Bates, 2015).
If the main purpose of a MOOC is to ensure meeting learner needs and support learners achieve the intended learning outcomes, such course design essentially requires application of sound principles and practices of online teaching and learning.

The four key dimensions of MOOCs—Massive, Open, Online, Course—imply their main characteristics and required design features. Foremost, a MOOC is a large ‘online course’. Its ‘openness’ element is not only about cost and access, but also about the flexibility in choices of content, activities, assessments and interactions by learners (Bates, 2014). While the ‘massiveness’ of these courses is often interpreted only in terms of the large student numbers enrolled, other dimensions of massiveness such as diversity among learners and their interconnections are just as significant. This complex nature of MOOCs essentially requires making critical pedagogical decisions in the design of MOOCs. However, despite increasing number of MOOCs, many such initiatives lack the expected rigor of a full course, and face various pedagogical challenges. Most contemporary MOOCs exhibit models of conventional lecture-based practices, disregarding widely known and sound principles of online learning (Naidu, 2015).

Given the expectation of MOOC learner characteristics such as autonomous, independent, self-motivated, and self-directed, MOOCs are ideal for providing higher education opportunities. MOOCs help to democratize higher education, with a preference towards a continuing education model (Evans & Myrick, 2015). MOOCs have a vast potential to support CPD and thus transform professional practices, provided the learning environments are designed in appropriate ways (Laurillard, 2014; Littlejohn & Milligan, 2015; Pickering & Swinnerton, 2017). Pedagogical design of CPD MOOCs thus requires crucial attention, intensely supported with theory of learning, while more creative and open-minded approaches are desirable (Bayne & Ross, 2014; Laurillard, 2014).

Conceptual Framework

The adoption of OER and OEP requires an understanding of the concepts, and skills in finding, identifying, and creating OER, as well as how best to integrate OER to support the teaching-learning process. This requires practitioners to move beyond a mere focus on access to OER, and engage in various scholarly practices of openness, resulting in OEP which are participatory, collaborative and innovative in nature (Andrade et al., 2011; Ehlers, 2011; Beetham, Falconer, McGill & Littlejohn, 2012).

A Scenario-based approach to Learning (SBL) which models situated cognition (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989) is adopted in this project to provide the conceptual framework for the design of the CPD MOOCs on OER and OEP. This approach is grounded in constructivist pedagogy (Jonassen, Peck & Wilson, 1999) where learners are placed in authentic real world learning scenarios that provide the context and scaffolding for all learning activities (Naidu, Menon, Gunewardena, Lekamge & Karunanayaka, 2007).

The SBL approach contains three basic attributes: A Learning Scenario – where learners are situated in authentic learning scenarios; Learning Activities – where learners assume key roles, and face various challenges; and Assessment Tasks – where learners demonstrate developed competencies, and enable teachers to assess their achievement of the intended learning outcomes. The development of SBL seeks to promote the design of effective, efficient, engaging learning experiences based on innovative pedagogical models, and supported with OER (Naidu & Karunanayaka, 2014). Several theoretical guidelines based on first principles of instruction (Merrill, 2002) and good practices of online learning (Anderson, 2008) also provided useful insights in the design process of the CPD MOOCs.
Methodology

The design and development of these CPD MOOCs adopted a design-based research (DBR) approach. DBR is a systematic and flexible methodology aimed at improving educational practices through an iterative process of analysis, design, development, and implementation. It therefore serves as a useful approach where researchers function as designers, to design solutions/strategies, in collaboration with the practitioners, in order to improve their educational practices in real life situations.

The DBR process includes four phases: analysis of existing levels of practices by researchers and practitioners; designing, developing and implementing solutions as appropriate; testing and refining solutions in practice; and reflection by researchers and practitioners on authentic problems to produce design principles and enhance solution implementation (Reeves, 2006). This paper focuses on the analysis and design phases of the DBR process, during which the learning experience design of the CPD MOOCs occurred during a series of interactive course design workshops conducted at the OUSL.

At a time when ICT-integrated teaching and learning is gaining wider popularity within the education systems, and with the growing need for raising awareness on the potentials of OER and promoting OEP among educators, the OUSL has embarked on this novel venture to develop CPD MOOCs to support the adoption of OER and OEP by practitioners. The course design team engaged in a sequence of systematic and carefully structured activities, keeping in line with the appropriate theoretical constructs and the conceptual framework adopted.

Research Questions

Based on the broad key research question, “How best to design an effective CPD MOOC on OER and OEP?” the following sub-research questions guided this inquiry.

1. How innovative theoretical constructs can be adopted in the design of CPD MOOCs on OER and OEP?
2. What challenges were faced in the design of learning experiences of the CPD MOOCs on OER and OEP?
3. How were these challenges met and overcome?

Participants

The learning experience design process of the CPD MOOCs took place with the participation of eleven members in the course team, comprising four researchers and seven resource persons, who are practitioners in the higher education sector with significant professional experience. Their interest and commitment in promoting open, online and flexible learning and teaching was a common characteristic which motivated their voluntary participation and engagement in this novel endeavor at OUSL.

Process

Stage 1 of the DBR approach commenced with an analysis of the problem and existing practices, by researchers and practitioners in collaboration. The team engaged in reviewing the modules of the existing OERELE course and discussing at length, the design strategies to be adopted in the CPD MOOCs, based on their experiences and good principles of online learning.
Next, in stage 2 of the DBR approach, development of solutions to address the key problem “How best to design an effective CPD MOOC on OER and OEP?” occurred, informed by existing design principles and technological innovations. Here, the team engaged in a highly challenging and dynamic process of designing efficient, effective and engaging online learning experiences in the four CPD MOOCs, in accordance with the SBL pedagogical approach, supported with relevant theoretical constructs.

**Collection and analysis of data**

Throughout the course design process, a variety of data was collected using several methods - concept mapping, written self-reflections, focus group discussions, and analysis of the designed artifacts.

Concept mapping was used as a strategy to visualize the concept formation by organizing and representing relationships between them (Novak & Cañas, 2007), which also helped in planning the structure of the CPD MOOCs. Three versions of concept maps were created- individual concept maps of team members; two small group concept maps combining individual ideas and a final group concept map merging all agreed design features. Further, the members engaged in writing self-reflections at various stages of the process. Reflective writing was guided by answering three questions- ‘What?’ ‘So what?’ and ‘Now what?’ (Rolfe, Freshwater & Jasper, 2001). In addition, focus group discussions among participants were held at the interactive workshops.

During these activities, the learning outcomes and key content areas were identified with the constructive alignment of all, and the course team arrived at consensus in the specific design features to be adopted, considering the needs and purposes of the target group. These resulted in several versions of various artifacts such as course maps, learning scenarios, learning activities, assessment rubrics, learner support documents, which demonstrated the conceptual development during the design process, in line with the guiding principles of teaching and learning.

The content analysis of concept maps, self-reflections, focus group discussion transcripts and designed artifacts reveal how innovative theoretical constructs were adopted in the CPD MOOC design, what challenges were faced during the process and how those were overcome by the participants.

**Results and Discussion**

*How innovative theoretical constructs can be adopted in the design of CPD MOOCs on OER and OEP?*

The key focus during the analysis stage was understanding the purpose of a CPD MOOC, and conceptualising the specific requirements, accordingly. The concept map presented in Figure 1 illustrates a summary of the conceptualized overall plan of the CPD MOOCs.
Revisiting the existing OEReL course and based on prior experience, it was decided to design four stand-alone CPD MOOCs focusing on the required key content areas on OER and OEP. Since these are meant for practitioners and professionals in the field, the duration of each CPD MOOC is to be limited to four weeks, with an expectation of 3-5 hours of learning time per week.

Considering the fact that a MOOC is an online course, the basic requirements such as having an organized structure with start and end dates, course materials, learning and assessment activities constructively aligned with the learning outcomes, and adequate learner support features were identified. At the same time, recognizing that a MOOC should not only promote independent learning but also provide an opportunity for learners to connect, collaborate, and engage in the learning process, key features such as making the learning environment flexible, facilitative, challenging, motivating, interactive, resourceful, contextualized and personalised were thought-out. In order to maintain the ‘openness’ and ‘massiveness’ of a MOOC, it was decided to provide free and open access, multiple/lateral entry options (for the four CPD MOOCs), multiple options in learning and assessment tasks, and varied multimedia formats to cater to diverse learner needs and individual differences. These CPD MOOCs will be released under a Creative Commons license, thus making them fully ‘open’, in terms of re-usability.

A summary of the learning experience design of the CPD MOOCs in line with guiding principles of effective, efficient, and engaging (e3) teaching is presented in Table 1.
Table 1: Design strategies of the CPD MOOCs in line with guiding principles for e³-teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding principles for e³-teaching (Source: Naidu, 2010)</th>
<th>Design strategies of the CPD MOOCs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers and learners are clear about the learning outcomes (see Naidu, 2007).</td>
<td>Specific learning outcomes for each CPD MOOC formulated, in line with the key competency- ‘Ability to integrate OER and adopt OEP in professional practice’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Learning is situated within a meaningful context and within the culture and the community in which learners live and work (Merrill, 2002).</td>
<td>Learning scenarios created for each CPD MOOC (in the form of short videos), reflecting real life situations of practitioners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Learners are engaged in pursuing and solving meaningful and real-world challenges and problems, and where they have opportunities to work on a variety of problems and tasks of increasing complexity with timely and useful feedback (Barrows &amp; Tamblyn, 1980; Hattie &amp; Timperley, 2007; Merrill, 2002).</td>
<td>Learning activities created as challenges within the scenarios, similar to real life challenges. A variety of activities with increased complexity embedded across the four CPD MOOCs. OER integrated as supportive learning resources. Peer feedback and tutor feedback mechanisms built in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The learning activities in these learning situations are clearly articulated and explicitly linked to knowledge and skills already mastered (see Merrill, 2002; Naidu, 2007).</td>
<td>Three types of learning/assessment tasks - Individual activity (a creation); Collaborative activity (discussion forum); Reflective activity (self-reflections), linked with the learning scenario, and existing knowledge/skills of learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Learners, while working on learning situations, are required to think for themselves by reflecting in and upon their actions and regulating their own performance (Naidu &amp; Oliver, 1999).</td>
<td>Learning/assessment tasks designed to encourage reflecting on their actions. Requirement to maintain a reflective journal, to promote reflective practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The development of understanding is promoted as a social process with learners acting upon authentic situations in groups and with dialogue, discussion and debate (Barrows &amp; Tamblyn, 1980; Vygotsky, 1978).</td>
<td>Peer-facilitated discussion forum to support co-construction of knowledge and community building. Links to social media to facilitate networking and social learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The assessment of learning outcomes is closely aligned with the learning context (Spector &amp; Koszalka, 2004).</td>
<td>Constructive alignment of learning/assessment tasks with the intended learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The assessment of learning outcomes is linked to meaningful problems and tasks, and aimed at helping students further develop their knowledge, skills and problem-solving abilities (Spector &amp; Koszalka, 2004).</td>
<td>The learning activities directly linked with the learning scenario, function as assessment tasks - Individual activity (a creation); Collaborative activity (discussion forum); Reflective activity (self-reflections).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The assessment of learning outcomes is designed to develop self-regulatory and meta-cognitive skills (Spector &amp; Koszalka, 2004).</td>
<td>Assessment rubrics created for each assessment task to facilitate development of self-regulatory and meta-cognitive skills among learners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The SBL pedagogical approach provided a useful framework to plan the design strategies in line with appropriate theoretical constructs indicated in Table 1. The process involved identifying the overall key competency, formulating specific learning outcomes for the four CPD MOOCs, creating learning scenarios reflecting real life challenging situations and developing a variety of learning/assessment tasks supported with OER integration as learning resources, based on the ‘learning engine’ framework (Naidu & Karunanayaka, 2014).

Several innovative design features were incorporated here. The learning scenarios which act as ‘triggers’ to activate learning, are to be presented in short video form, to gain learners’ attention and situate them in the learning context in a motivating manner. At the end of each video, the role to be played by the learner will be indicated as a challenge faced. This is the first task in the form of a ‘creation’ of an artifact, enhancing individual efforts in finding solutions to the challenge in a creative way, to promote creative learning.

The second task requires sharing of their creations in the peer-facilitated discussion forum, to receive and provide peer feedback, encouraging collaborative learning and co-construction of knowledge. Links will also be provided to social media (eg. Facebook closed group) to facilitate networking and social learning.

To support learner engagement in these activities, various media forms of carefully selected OER will be linked appropriately. These will offer the relevant and specific content, to support individual and group knowledge construction.

The third and the final task is writing a self-reflection at the end of learning experience, to promote reflective learning. Assessment rubrics are provided for each task that will help facilitate self-regulated learning and meta-cognition. As evident by Table 1, all these innovative design features are supported by theoretical constructs and guiding principles of effective, efficient, and engaging teaching and learning.

**What challenges were faced in the design of learning experiences of the CPD MOOCs on OER and OEP and how were these challenges met and overcome?**

Designing specific strategies in accordance with the complex nature of a CPD MOOC, and maintaining its participatory and distributed nature, while promoting independent, self-regulated and life-long learning was very challenging. However, various strategies were adopted to overcome these challenges. Table 2 presents a summary of the key challenges faced by the participants and what strategies supported overcoming those, as revealed by the self-reflections and focus group discussions.
For the majority of the participants the MOOC concept was novel, and some of them were not familiar with the concepts of OEP and SBL too. The constant guidance provided by the team leaders via email, and engaging in group discussions and concept mapping were supportive for them to become familiar with these concepts. Development of learning scenarios was found to be quite challenging, and it took several rounds of very intensive work, producing many versions of individual and group efforts to achieve consensus.

While the focused and structured workflow during the interactive workshops supported development of learning/assessment tasks constructively aligned with the learning outcomes, it was challenging.
as well. All participants appreciated the interactive workshops during which everyone was able to actively participate and collectively contribute towards the CPD MOOC design. Time constraint was a common factor for all participants. Engaging in distributed individual work, presenting and receiving peer feedback, and collaborative group work during the interactive workshops were emphasized as very supportive strategies to minimize and overcome the challenges.

Concluding Remarks and Way Forward

A major purpose of the work that is reported in this article is to push the boundaries of the design of MOOCs and especially for continuing professional development of practitioners. These are people, often with very little disposable time, and in need for just-in-time learning opportunities in open and flexible formats. They need a lot more than subject matter content knowledge, which is often what they are fed. They need to know how to approach problem solving in situ.

The majority of contemporary MOOCs are failing to adequately meet these needs. This project is an example of how we can do better with smarter learning experience designs and without placing undue strain on limited resources, as is often the case. This project also lifts the conversation around the role of MOOCs in the continuing professional development of practitioners to another level of sophistication. It points out that contemporary MOOCs are failing to learn from the lessons of learning and teaching online and repeating many of the mistakes. It suggests that we can do better with attention on better design of the learning experience of practices on a large scale.

Our thesis is that the next generation of MOOCs have to be better than what we have seen. And this project is a step in that direction. This is the first paper on this work that has only just begun. Its focus is on the analysis and the design aspects of this project. In the coming months and years, we look forward to offering our readership more insights on our innovations and initiatives.
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Abstract
This paper outlines a collaborative approach to the design of open educational resources (OER) with community stakeholders so they can be shared with other community practitioners openly, online and repurposed for other contexts. We view curriculum not as something that educationalists provide but rather something that emerges as learners engage with an educational context. We draw on a Project consisting of a partnership between five European Institutions of Higher Education and a range of community stakeholder groups. The partnership will develop a suite of OER for community workers who are implementing assets based approaches in different contexts. We argue that these approaches are negotiated in that one cannot decide how they might operate in a given context without engaging in deliberative discussion. The challenge for us as open education practitioners is how to turn those deliberations into OER and to highlight the important pedagogical aspect of the design process.
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Introduction
The paper draws on research carried out for the Erasmus+ funded project ‘Designing Collaborative Educational Resources (COERS) for Assets Based Community Participation (ABCP) across Europe’ (Assets Com) (ref. 2016-1-UK01-KA203-024403). The project commenced in January 2017 and is funded for two years. This paper focuses on the question posed by a collaborative approach to the design of Open Educational Resources (OER): how to design open educational resources (OER) with community stakeholder groups so they can be shared with other community practitioners openly, online and repurposed for other contexts. Central to this question is one of practice: what makes our educational practice open? As educational practitioners in academia, who focus on social justice and community development, engaging with community stakeholder groups to conduct research, shape curriculum development and pedagogic practice is familiar. As in many practice-based disciplines, curriculum is developed and emerges from and through a deeper understanding of context (Illeris, 2011), and is developed in, for and through practice. The focus in, for and through is important as it surfaces an underlying pedagogic assumption within practice-based learning, learning arises from, takes place in, and is for practice (Evans, Hodkinson, Rainbird & Unwin, 2006). The paper looks at
how this approach might be applied to the development of OER. Using our work on a cross European project, it teases out some of the challenges, principally focusing on how to ensure the OER draw from and speak to practice, through the development of what we term ‘Collaborative Open Educational Resources’ (COERs). As open education practitioners we look to address two challenges. The first is concerned with contextualisation, with taking learning arising from a deep examination of practice in a particular context, and design something that speaks to practitioners across a range of contexts. The second challenge arises from our solution to the first. Our work underlines the importance of not conceptualising learning contexts as containers primarily consisting of content but rather as relational and fluid effects of practice (Edwards & Miller, 2007). As educational designers we need to attend to how learning takes place across a range of learning contexts. So we ask how can we as educators facilitate the recontextualisation of learning? To understand context in relational terms has effects on how we conceptualise the mobilizing of learning and associated pedagogic practices. For the project team one way this has occurred is through deliberative reflective discussion, and therefore we propose that the COERs need to foster a similar deliberative reflection in and on practice (Dewey [1910] 2012) both for the design team and for those using and repurposing the COERs for different contexts.

Before addressing these challenges, the paper provides a short overview of the transnational partnership on which the paper is based and an introduction to assets based approaches to community development. It then explores the approach to design of educational resources that is being taken and the associated challenges. We illustrate these first with a discussion on how the project team has used assets based deliberative processes in our approach to research and design followed by an example of how this approach is extended to working with one of the community stakeholder groups in Scotland. Through these examples we explore the deliberative process in which we engaged with our partners in Higher Education and our community stakeholders and what this means for the development of collaborative and open educational resources.

Background and Context

The purpose of the research and the larger project is to share innovation in practice and generate new knowledge in relation to both the implementation of assets based approaches to working with communities and the design of open educational resources. Asset based approaches are based on a set of assumptions about the self and community which have implications for educational practice, therefore before looking at an example, it is worth saying a little about the transnational partnership, assets based approaches and the way curriculum is developed in our discipline.

Transnational Partnership

The Assets Com project is based on a transnational partnership which was developed with the specific intention of sharing innovative practice and generating new knowledge. The partnership consists of five Higher Education Institutions (HEIs): The University of the West of Scotland in Scotland, the University of Maribor in Slovenia, the University of Bologna in Italy, the University of Laurea in Finland and the University of Southern Denmark in Denmark. Each HEI is working with a range of community stakeholder groups in their geographical locals. The project is funded under the Erasmus+ programme. The Key action is to develop strategic partnerships for cooperation, innovation and the exchange of good practices. The priorities of the project are to develop innovative and open inter-professional educational resources that can be used in the further training of public
sector practitioners and a range of community focused practitioners. The resources should provide a means of equipping practitioners with the inter-professional skills needed to foster inter-agency and inter-generational connectivity, mobilise existing community assets and engage in pioneering forms of collaboration. In so doing practitioners will become able to nurture increased participation and social capital and reduce levels of fear and distrust in the most disadvantaged communities across Europe. Importantly the proposed project will address the implementation of the 2013 Communication on Opening up Education (European Commission, 2013) by helping learning institutions, teachers and learners to acquire digital skills and learning methods and supporting the development and availability of open educational resources.

**Assets Based Approaches and Community Development**

The ‘Asset-Based Community Development’ (ABCD) approach was developed for the sustainable development of communities based on their strengths and focuses on ‘potential’ and not the ‘deficits’ of an individual or community – with the aim of empowering both individuals and communities to take full control of their lives (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). The ABCD framework consists of four community-led building processes which are as follows:

1. **mapping assets** – realising individual and community capacities;
2. **building relationships** – strengthening links among local assets for mutually beneficial problem-solving within the community;
3. **mobilising** – for economic development and information sharing;
4. **convening** – assembling the community to develop a vision and a plan – bring together as broadly a representative group as possible to embody the will and wishes of the community.

As an approach it has varying political support in different countries and also varying recognition as a distinct approach to working with communities. Research in diverse parts of the world reports some of the positive impacts of these approaches. Assets based approaches have been implemented in ‘Community Integration Initiatives’ (CII) in Scottish and Danish locations to help build local capacity for action and collective action (Deuchar & Bone, 2015). The capacity of ABCD; how it operates in practice; and the types of outcomes that result from its use, indicate that, when implemented within different communities in the Philippines, Ethiopia and South Africa, ABCD harnessed: (1) ‘power within’ through reversing internalised powerlessness; (2) ‘power with’ by strengthening opportunities for collective action; and (3) ‘power to’ by emphasising and building local capacity for action successfully (Mathie, Cameron & Gibson, 2017).

However, with assets based approaches roots in bottom up activism and alongside increasingly top down policy initiatives, community workers can find themselves in the middle with little support. Our project aimed to look at how to support these workers through the collaborative development of OER. We started by investigating what the challenges were across the partner countries with regard to the professional development of community workers who are implementing assets based approaches in their work with communities. Appreciative inquiry (AI) is a key method with in assets based approaches used in action research to highlight positive aspects of practice. The founding concept of AI is to be inclusive and collaborative and to focus on building on the positive. Through this identifying of ‘good practice’ in communities it soon became clear that there is no simple and straightforward translation of this concept or ‘good practice’ across national and professional contexts. It should not come as a surprise that an approach that asks practitioners to attend carefully to their context articulates theory and practice differently across different contexts.
Indeed the value of a comparative analysis comes from these differences. However, these differences also provide a significant design challenge for us as open educational practitioners, how to create a resource that draws on the deep understanding from a particular context while speaking to practitioners across contexts. Before addressing this challenge directly we look at how this in depth engagement has arisen.

**Designing with Stakeholders**

Our approach to designing OEP draws together established practices in community development around the inclusion of practitioners and learners in the development of curriculum with work in participatory design (Macintyre 2016; Macintyre 2014a). For us the P in OEP means thinking about how our educational practice is shaped by openness. However, it also means thinking through how P for pedagogy and participation, in particular how disciplinary values around pedagogy and participation then shape and reshape openness. For example just as ABCD emphasises people’s capacity, so participatory approaches in design emphasise the need to work *with* people, whether they are practitioners, learners, or clients. This is more than surveying needs; the focus is on using the strengths and assets of individuals and communities and bringing them together to instigate positive change. In the case of participatory design it typically involves working directly with people to develop educational content throughout the process. Participatory approaches recognise people as experts in their own lives. This means the role of the designer or academic is not as ‘expert’, but as a facilitator of a process to help translate those insights into education material (Malpass, 2017). Engagement may vary through the design process, this approach is time consuming and challenging for all those taking part and previous work with marginalised groups found much of our time was spent building confidence amongst participants and establishing their right to participate (Macintyre, 2014b). This is where the element of appreciative enquiry can make a big difference to how readily the participants feel able to contribute their expertise from their own lived experiences.

Even when expert practitioners feel confident to talk about their ‘good practice’, their expert status is often based on a set of routines and tacit assumptions which can be difficult to articulate. It is difficult because knowing is in, for and through practice, it is about process, with each process of knowing apparently locked into a particular context. However, working with practice focused academics, and community workers deeply embedded in practice networks, does provide an opportunity to look inside those contexts. Allowing us to engage practitioners in deliberative discussions to share and develop critical questions about practice as part of shared sense making. Drawing together insights from across contexts we employed a cross case comparative and analytical process to surface these tacit assumptions and interrogate them through the lens of assets based approaches.

Addressing our first challenge, to develop an approach which allows us see deeply into practice in and between particular contexts is useful to us as researchers, but how does this researchers’ way of knowing become an educational resource. As researchers often we look to create a coherent and closed narrative, as open education practitioners our challenge is to design and develop an OER that allows practitioners to use these in depth case studies generated from one context to shape their learning in, for and through practice in other spaces. Through engaging with our partners and stakeholders in a collaborative curriculum design process we started to understand the design of educational resources as being about much more than
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designing content. We realised the core of ABCD approaches was how people engage, our role was to be open about what was learnt but to focus on capturing the detail of learning processes and understanding what practitioners value and how they learn. Using examples from the project cross national partnership and the Scottish context we explore this in more detail in the next section.

Collaborative Open Educational Resources in Practice

Any question about what to do requires a sense of the “right thing to do”, and “how we know what we know”. Just as design researchers interrogate their own practice, probing “what works”, the tacit routines and assumptions based on past success (Corbett, 2005) or indeed failure (Cope, 2011). As researchers we are used to the idea of being reflexive, attending to our place in “the field” and how we are placed by others. Our identity as research practitioners means we also tend to follow particular norms, sharing these norms with the expert practitioners (Whitehead & McNiff 2006), framing issues in similar ways. This framing and reframing often involves complex reasoning, as Dewey ([1910] 2012) notes the “double movement” of reaching down into the everyday detail, while also reaching out, and it is vital that we attend to how all actors, including ourselves, move between those positions. Therefore through the research and development processes of the Assets com project we have been paying attention to our own learning journey and the deliberative processes of reaching down into the everyday detail of practice and the collaborative reaching out across our varying partner community contexts to make sense of our own and each other’s practices. In essence, we have been modeling assets based approaches through our own practice in order to notice and take note of our own deliberative processes and their outcomes.

Through the timeline of the project (Figure 1) there are a range of collaborative practices and deliberative processes through which we are engaging our academic partners and our community stakeholder groups. To date (month 15 of the project) we have worked through the first three intellectual outputs to identify gaps/challenges in the professional development of community workers who are implementing assets based approaches and developed detailed case studies across our partners national contexts collaboratively with our community stakeholders. We have also carried out a critical review of case based learning and produced a learning and facilitation framework. We are now at the stage of planning our COERs. As the partners worked with the community stakeholder groups on the various outputs required for the project the relationships and collaborative processes of building shared understanding and insights were developed. As well as attending to the content and themes it became apparent that context was far more than a container of content but importantly is shaped and formed through the practices and process which constitute it. In case based learning we have tension around how to draw on the detailed insights from particular contexts while also leaving enough space for practitioners to see themselves in the context and how it might apply to their own practice. Through engaging with partners our speculations about use of the COERS started to focus on how we might use the case study to open up the process of how the practitioners know what to do when certain situations arise. Through sharing the case studies and generating the critical questions that arose through our own sense making processes we were able to start to make the tacit knowledge embedded in practice more explicit. In addition we are beginning to uncover some of the often unnoticed practices of knowledge making across the different community stakeholder groups.
Next we describe an example from Scotland where the researchers have been working closely with an arts based community stakeholder group to illustrate how this action research is moving forward and addressing the challenges identified above.

The example group is a social enterprise in the South West of Scotland that is firmly founded on an assets based approach in all the work it does with its local communities, and in terms of developing the organisation and their staff. Through the research process we used an appreciative enquiry model. We asked staff about their practice, we watched them work with the young people, we asked the young people about what they were doing and what they made of it. We asked the managers about how the organisation was managed and how staff were trained and developed as assets based practitioners. We asked what the challenges were and how they addressed them. Relationships were established between the researchers, the staff and the young people. We explained what the Assets Com project was trying to do in terms of sharing innovation and generating new knowledge. We negotiated how the project could benefit the organisation and how the organisation could help the project achieve its aims and objectives and at the same time further the aims and objectives of their organisation.

Through this engagement over a period of time we moved beyond passive observation of the use of ABCD, and became directly involved in the process. During an observed session one of the managers demonstrated an approach he used when working with the young people to explore issues of self-identity, family identity and community identity. A process that enabled young people to view themselves as creative people that were able to express themselves through the medium of art and develop positive views about themselves, their families and their communities. Intrigued by the exercise, we asked the partner if this same approach could be used as a tool for professional development of the practitioners who are working with the young people, and whether they would work with us to adapt the approach for this purpose. The partner agreed and the facilitator captured the process on film and wrote up an account of the process and the critical questions that arose from it. This was then presented to the trans national partnership and used as a tool to generate further critical questions about what was happening in that context and what could be learnt from that and used in other contexts across professional and national boundaries.
The processes of working with the community group to produce the educational resource for the purpose of professional development and piloting it with the staff of that organisation, and then capturing that process to share with the project partners, involved a certain amount of stepping into and out of the learning context physically and intellectually. It also involved moving elements generated in one context to another through video capture and through descriptions provided by the researchers. Moving from particular sets of social and situated practices to the general requires you to speculate, to imagine how and what is useful in one place could be useful for others in other places with different personal, family, community, professional and national contexts. Of course we could have relied on our own professional judgement, however this seemed at odds with ABCD. This process of attempting to align our design process with the ABCD values pushed us to think about who and what are the important actors that constitute a learning context and how we might work with these through the design process to maximise learning from the COERs.

So in keeping with participatory approaches and ABCD we facilitated a series of events through our partner project meetings in the various national and community contexts, where research practitioners worked with the community practitioners. The aim was to draw on embodied theoretical and practice knowledge from across the academic and practice spectrum as a way to sense check our speculations about what was useful. However, we found participants used the practice knowledge embedded in the context to generate new practices and new theoretical insights which we believe will be useful to a broad audience of community practitioners working with assets based approaches. The collaborative approach to designing the OERs acted as a stimulus for all these learning processes to occur and worked as a pedagogical tool to stimulate the learning and knowledge creation process. It allowed us to see into and then beyond the context to trace the contextualising actors, and in doing so made us realise that in ABCD approaches the important questions are about process and about how people learn together. Our approach to research is based on those same values, and so it follows that these values also inform our approach to the development of educational resources.

Moving between these positions involves us thinking about the past and our experiences and speculating about the future (Di Salvo, 2012). In that sense the challenge faced by expert practitioners is the same one faced by designers of educational resources. Imagining what happens once an OER is “out in the wild” who will use it and how it will be used is often speculative. You make judgements on how to structure the course based on your experience, and on noticing what practices constitute your context and the contexts of others. We have done this through working collaboratively cultivating open educational practices that are underlined by an assets based approach, providing opportunities across the partnership for us to speculate on the future use of these resources and working collaboratively to design them based on those imagined uses.

**Conclusion**

We still have a lot of work to do. However, we can draw out some important insights about the development of COERs based on the work we have done already. By employing an assets based approach to our research, using it as a lens through which to diffract multiple cross cultural practices, and then letting them flow through our development of COERs we start to see the spectrum and varying tones of these practices, and discern appropriate pedagogic practices. This approach to open educational practice focuses on the participatory and pedagogic component of openness, and the role of assets based approaches in this process. We propose that by using an appreciative enquiry approach throughout from the research, through the project partnership, and the design process, we are able to promote an openness to knowledge generation and knowledge
sharing that holds potential for future directions in open education. While we have individually written about the participatory element of open educational practice (e.g. Macintyre 2016) we have not, so far, woven our work on pedagogy (e.g. Mannion, Miller, Gibb & Goodman, 2009) and the pedagogical challenge of identifying resonance across practice contexts into the established OER/OEP literature. In part this relates to the stage of the work. However, it also relates to the challenge of articulating what an open pedagogy is, and what freedoms it might afford (Lane & Van Drop 2011).

In considering the freedoms afforded by an openness and the pedagogic implications that flow from this we have drawn on work around OER and Widening Participation, in particular action research into the social, structural and situational barriers to learning suggests a focus on partnerships and participatory approaches helps situate practice and understand the place of openness in peoples learning journey (Cannell & Macintyre 2017). From this we learnt a great deal about how the freedoms of OER have been and continue to be constrained, but not necessarily what we needed to do to deal with those barriers. Our approach in this work has been to use assets based approached to inform our work with communities and practitioners in a way that moves beyond collaborative content production into working with partners to develop appropriate pedagogic practices or open educational practices.

However, we have also drawn on our discipline, exploring pedagogic practice, and the values central to ABCD. We found an assets based approach to exploring the how fosters an open approach to learning for all involved in the journey. As researchers and open education practitioners it meant allowing those to flow through research into learning design, and led to us finding common ground with practitioners. From this developed a deeper understanding of practitioners’ experience. However, the deliberative processes that occurred across practice, academic and national boundaries enabled the processes of recontextualisation to unfold. The recontextualisation of learning across these variously bounded spaces occurred through a choreography of project wide encounters that brought together various different groups of people, ideas, and artefacts through a range of virtual and face to face deliberative encounters. While this approach worked for us we are not suggesting assets based approaches as a model or set of values that apply universally, we understand the particularity of our experience. We simply suggest that applying them as professional and personal values fosters a certain openness to practice. Through engaging in a deliberative discourse with practice and practitioners we have underlined the importance of conceiving of context not as a container for content but as a relational effect of practices, it is not just about what, the how matters as we explore how to use the freedoms afforded by OER to share learning across and between different contexts and shape new open educational practices.
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Abstract

A successful international learning initiative focusing on student agency began with a link facilitating OE-enhanced teaching between a UK university and a US high school class. It became an international trip organised and funded by five UK students and their teacher who travelled to California, teaching and performing music across formal and informal learning settings. The project is now a credit-bearing class, retaining the original initiative’s openness within the university curriculum where final-year students collaborate with the teacher, self-organising to design and plan curricular details from travel logistics to musical interactions. Students engage in heutagogy, demonstrating the highest levels of autonomous, personal learning in this co-learning environment. Their assessment, a reflective journal, encourages deeper learning processes. The original trip was documented as an eBook including 10,000 student-authored words telling their collaborative learning journey. The book was published without DRM an accessible model for other students and educators.
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Introduction

Institutional learning is seldom without constraints; teachers navigate timetables, content, criteria, and resources as they devise and deliver the best possible learning experiences for the students. The understanding of student learning has long since progressed from being about content and knowledge to focusing on student-centred experiences and processes (Kolb, 1984). Although much of the taught content in higher education is personalised to focus on a specialism or type of student, a further step is required to transform this into truly personal learning where students initiate, create, and control their learning (for an in-depth discussion of personalised vs. personal learning see Downes, 2017). As students take control of their learning they seek information from sources and people, and the resulting web of connected practices are not limited to face-to-face encounters. Technology enables fast and easy connections across distances and cultures, and it is possible to engage with a wider, global learning community. Including aspects of open learning in teaching benefit students and teacher, but there can be resistance to change and sometimes it is difficult to integrate these into university class teaching (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). Lehtomäki, Moate and Posti-Ahokas (2016) stress the importance of innovating to create opportunity and mainstreaming internationalisation within university curricula, as “higher education institutions are to prepare global citizens for the uncertain future, where people, work and all matters are more interconnected than ever before” (p. 2011).

This article presents the pedagogic principles behind this curriculum innovation, discussing the benefits and challenges to teachers and students. The original student-led initiative and its outcomes are described, and suggestions are presented to transfer it across a range of disciplines to future classes and projects.
Background

The Psychology of Learning & Teaching class that I teach in the Music Department at the University of Chichester, has always engaged in various open educational practices: there is no text book, students are encouraged to reach out to the wider musical and teaching community to both seek information and apply concepts discussed in class. In 2015 a series of opportunities to connect and work across disciplines and cultures resulted in a dramatic change to the pattern of teaching and learning, beginning with a connection with Righetti High School's English class' teacher David Preston, in California, to explore issues of communication, motivation, and general interpersonal interactions when learning music. The UK students collaborated as a class-group, teaching music over Skype developed various individual and small-group projects involving exchanging sound recordings, making video tutorials, and teaching one-to-one lessons to the high school students. These connected activities were extra to the coursework, and completely optional to students, however they provided an open source dimension to the learning and allowed students a direct application of the teaching and learning concepts in the class.

One month later the high school teacher in California extended an invitation to meet the students and see the fruition of these collaborations first-hand, in America. The lecturer extended an invitation to the university class, simply asking who would like to do this, and five students immediately said yes, they would like to take the collaboration further and meet face-to-face. The five worked with their lecturer to plan, organise, and raise funds for their trip to California three months later in May 2015. The trip was completely outside the curriculum and the degree, but the students were inspired to make it happen. The project became a dramatic extension of the previous virtual collaborations and was a completely student-led initiative. The gravitas of connection motivated them, and the commitment and results were more than impressive.

There was no resistance from the university as the trip was completely separate from the curriculum. This meant the group were free of traditional constraints that go with a credit-class, e.g. no assessment or outcome requirements. Their lecturer underwrote the trip and there were real pressures to repay her costs. Without the help of a template or handbook, only a timescale, they were challenged to be innovative. The students quickly developed organisational and planning skills, set goals and achieved real financial deadlines, and learned public speaking and blogging skills as they prepared and raised funds for the trip. This integration of skills and deliverables was far more demanding than components of any traditional curriculum, and because the students had chosen to undertake the project, they were that much more motivated, despite the daunting elements of purchasing plane tickets, organising car hire, and the unknown anticipation of meeting students in California. As one student from the group explained, “Failing wasn’t an option for us. There was no plan B. When we said we are going to America, we were going” (Ritchie, 2017, p. 61). Over the following three months, the group raised £8,000 toward the trip, and further significant in-kind donations were received toward accommodation, board, and transportation needs to drive the group and their instruments over 700 miles from Los Angeles (LA) to Yosemite and back again.

Open Curriculum

This was the first project of this type these students had met in their education where there were no fixed outcomes beyond the experience itself. They knew they would meet the high school students and share music with them, and expected this sharing would involve some form of teaching and performance. They named the initiative Musiquality and their aim was ‘to bring connection and quality through music’ and specific goals were left open, to be quantified by the group; nearly all the surrounding details of learning, preparation, and delivery were left to them. There was no exam,
or culminating single moment to define ‘the trip’. The demands on their cognitive understanding required both a macro and microscopic analysis of events in real time, for the logistical planning alone. The musical preparation undertaken was more typical of previously learned tasks, but the radically different interpersonal dynamics of the group made this a steep learning curve.

The alignment of skills, aims, learning and future tasks, encourages an awareness of experience, and deeper learning. The value of the aims and outcomes is in the individual and collaborative experience, the reflections occurring during the days and months following the trip, and the resulting wider perspective. Articulating these applications through reflection, in this instance to capture the open nature of the experience, enabled student transitions out of learning and into life to have ‘less abrasion’ (Askham, 2008).

### Teacher / Student Roles

Students and teacher become interdependent peers, each leading with one hand while supporting with the other. Learning happens through experience, as active, student-directed activity, and the outcomes of the preparatory experiences enable the group to form a networked built on people’s strengths and supported their weaknesses. Without the constraints of the classroom or timed sessions, students can self-select and formed its learning through processes resembling an integration of children’s experimentation when playing and the motion of a murmuration of birds. Downes (2017) describes this bird-cloud as a “perceptual system for starlings” (p. 358). Each bird is in tune to others around, and this adaptive, learned behaviour developed to best suit the birds and their situation.

The international and collaborative aspects of the trip put different responsibilities on students that impact learning beyond any closed classroom or textbook setting. To encourage the students to take on pedagogic responsibility, the lecturer put herself in the genuine position of a learner, taking on an unfamiliar musical role within the group, and the students assumed responsibility for teaching the ‘teacher’. In this case the lecturer was taught to be a singer in a band, and relied on the expertise of the students to learn. As opposed to a modelled situation, when the learning is essentially an act, here the teacher-student roles were truly reversed. Professionally, many teachers would not be comfortable choosing this risk, as it required trust in the teaching and mentoring demonstrated by the students, openness in learning, and there was more than a chance of being exposing as a failure when the group performed together in America.

As in the work and experience of Horton and Freire (1990), when the learner is allowed to control the path of their education, so much more can be accomplished. Their international experience quickly became an immersive experience that exceeded any classroom-based role-play or simulated experience from the realm of a workshop, game, or practice, into reality. In America the group worked with a variety of students and teachers in both formal school settings and informal creative spaces, ranging from performing in a racquet ball court in UCLA, to recording a song with high school students in a lodge in Yosemite, to teaching kindergarteners singing and clapping games on the grass outside their classroom. The scope of the initiative and its success demonstrate the range of possibilities when students are enabled to lead learning without the implied boundaries of the classroom and formal education settings. The trip was not without teacher direction, but this type of learning requires a different type of teaching that is more “mentoring and guiding development” (de Freitas et al., 2010, p. 82). The theoretical framework underpinning this is based on a mixture of the pedagogical ideas found in heutagogy (Blaschke, 2012), experiential learning, co-learning (see The Peeragogy Handbook [Corneli et al., 2016], and Howard Rheingold’s Stanford course Social Media Issues: http://socialmediaissues.net/), and connectivism (Siemens, 2005; Downes, 2017).

---
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These all involve taking active responsibility for self-directed, autonomous learning and aspects of connection, reaching out to other sources both within and outside the group.

As opposed to focusing the learning on individual tasks or specific content, there was a shift similar to that found in immersive game design, to "choreographing learning experiences as a whole, mediated by structured and semi-structured social interactions" (de Freitas et al., 2010, p. 82). From the skills come the tasks became the framework for a module attending to core concepts and skills, but build in a way that the tasks could be different every year, depending on and decided by the cohort.

Integration into the curriculum

In 2016 after two successful trips outside the curriculum, this open initiative was formally proposed and validated as a credit-bearing part of the curriculum. In order to transform the initial open-initiative into a module, there were benchmarks to address, learning outcomes to devise, appropriate assessments to formulate, and the module had to be appropriately situated within the degree programme. The BMus Music with Teaching degree prepares graduates to teach as self-employed practitioners; teaching instrumental/vocal lessons is part of the portfolio career of a performing musician. The approved module, MUS681 International Experience, occurs as the culmination of the four-year BMus degree and allows students to assimilate three years of theoretical learning and skills development through classroom-based peer-to-peer workshops. It transforms structured visits to local schools into a real-life setting where the students truly control, design, and implement the content of their teaching experiences.

The International Experience module aims for students to exercise personal agency and choice in developing different practical skills and exploring their application in a variety of teaching and performance contexts. Students are invited to apply to enrol on the International Experience module prior to their final year of study. The class is built on open learning, without a textbook, students connect beyond the walls of the classroom to create and curate resources and deliver their own content. Exercising student agency begins well before the class begins, with the responsibility of designing the details of their curriculum, and planning the details of their trip from travel logistics to the delivery and dates of their musical interactions throughout the module. The working environment created is one of co-learning, where students are engaged in the highest levels of autonomous learning.

Each cohort must self-organise in a way that attends to individual’s needs, as well as connecting within and beyond the group to create an educational project. The students must also commit to planning and fundraising to support the outreach aspects of their teaching initiative: this experience is a valuable part of learning and sets the students up to truly take ownership of the curriculum. The modular content becomes the lived learning experience of the students’ designed curriculum. This experiential learning enables self-efficacy beliefs to grow (see Zimmerman, 2000; Urdan & Pajares, 2006; Ritchie, 2015) and as active self-directed learners, students engage with higher cognitive and self-regulation processes (Bembenutty, Cleary & Kitsantas, 2013). The materials, processes, and delivery change with each cohort, and similarly the instructor’s role also changes depending on the student goals.

The cross-cultural and collaborative interactions within the module, which are planned, but remain ‘unknown’ until the trip happens, highlight aspects of learning that Siemens (2005) describes as “nebulous environments of shifting core elements- not entirely under the control of the individual” (p. 5). Having to organise, navigate uncertainties, and each act as leaders for different aspects of the trip puts new responsibilities on students that impact learning differently to a closed classroom or textbook setting. The wider engagement with schools and communities well beyond the students’
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known home or study contexts contributes to developing student’s perception and perspective. Throughout the module reflection is encouraged and stepping back, analysing, and documenting are elements of self-regulation and higher order cognitive skills that lead to meaningful comprehension, giving the students both knowledge and experience. The assessed reflective journal encourages students to detail their learning process and engage with deeper learning.

There is no template for the class and every cohort is different. For example, 2017 was the first credit-bearing year for the International Experience module and registered students included a pianist, a singer (who was blind), and a clarinettist; each had their own goals for the class. The pianist wanted to perform concerts in LA for a professional CV, the clarinettist wanted to be involved with the organisation of events and the logistical side of the trip, and the singer was interested in the physical learning settings in schools. The group worked together to accommodate each person's goals and create a curriculum that allowed each to excel, explore, and be pushed to the best of their abilities. “This was the time to take risks, and we did” (K. Rustage, speaking at RAISE Conference, 2017).

Students become both the learners and the leaders, and experience the transfer of skills from the classroom into potential future roles as musicians and teachers. When the teacher becomes a co-learner, this creates a different dynamic; the teacher models learning, organisation, and performance for, but also with the students as they work together. The teacher does not lead or teach through directives. Another student explained the experience:

"Laura has that rare ability to teach people without actually teaching them. She opens doors so that they can learn for themselves. She doesn't actually tell you what to do." (S. Arthurs, speaking at RAISE Conference, 2017).

In this setting the teacher can facilitate and encourage, but needs the students to be able to complete the planned curriculum. We relied on one another and this made the whole experience of co-learning far more real. The people with whom we connected also became an integral part of the learning process. These open aspects of the class encourage both receptivity and inclusion. Each person plays a different role, and the assessed content of the module, allows individual reflection on both learning and process, helping to reinforce awareness and encourage deeper learning (Cowan, 2006; Gaunt, 2008).

The 2018 cohort was completely different, including a bassist, ukulele player, and singer, and their curriculum and experience, although focusing on the same skills of planning, communication, collaboration, inclusion, and performing, was also very different than past iterations. The group created a student-centred, individual and participatory experience for everyone. They delivered interactive workshops in Los Angeles primary schools, teaching ukulele and traditional Polish songs to children, and then adapting the workshops as training for UCLA students who volunteer as summer-camp staff for the UniCamp programme. The UCLA students will learn first to play and sing the songs, and then to teach them as workshops integrated within the curriculum of the summer camp programmes. This cohort raised funds to provide 60 instruments for UniCamp and schools they worked with in America.

**Outputs and impacts**

Each year, after the module, students have applied to and presented in conferences and given workshops on topics including engagement, collaboration, assessment, and creating networks. The sense that the value of the experience is not bounded by a timetabled slot, by expectations of learning ‘things’ or by assessment is important and prepares students for on-going learning and connection. Conference presentations and workshops to transfer skills developed to the realm of
wider academic, performance, and teaching settings, giving these students experience in areas they could choose as future career paths.

The impact of that first student-led trip resulted in more than the adoption of open educational practice as a formal module. The original cohort and I realised the importance of communicating to our peers how ordinary students and teachers achieved beyond expectation, far from the walls around them and beyond textbooks. Often people only see the polished final product of learning in the form of a publication, performance, or presentation, and the challenges of negotiating learning processes are not made public. Both students and teachers have to figure this out on their own, and as with any learning, there needs to be self-belief to succeed. The strongest influence on self-efficacy is accomplishment, and the next most important influencer is vicarious experience (Bandura, 1997). Presenting the pedagogical practice from start to finish in the book, and including aspects of the individual and group journeys provided an outcome, a testimony to possibility, and continues to serve as model for future learners and educators.

The group documented their planning and learning processes and created an eBook: California Dreaming (Ritchie, 2017). The book was written collaboratively, integrating parts of blog posts, transcriptions of audio recordings, Slack conversations, and reflective contributions from international collaborators. For those involved in the original trip, demonstrating that ordinary university students and teachers could achieve something beyond expectation, far from the walls around them or the text in front of their eyes, was important to model for future learners and educators. The students wrote over 10,000 words of the text and it was not diluted or censored to show only the positive aspects, but includes the entire journey from the first Skype contact to California. In the spirit of openness the eBook was published with no DRM and is available to download for free.

**Applications across disciplines**

This initiative is transferable to other subject areas. Whether the concept is transferred to the context of a dissertation project or a module within a continuing curriculum, outcomes can be measured and thus including this type of ‘open’ within an institutional framework does not mean breaking from regulation, but aligning this new practice with existing and understood goals for deliverables. The module is underpinned by developing invaluable communication, time management, logistical, and leadership skills. Having these widely applicable skills at the centre of the validated document allows this module to act as a template for other disciplines, and the discipline-skills learned through a degree specialism can be addressed through the educational outreach aspect of the module. The specific tasks and content can be devised year on year as the curriculum is open.

The highly active involvement of individuals also suggests a small-group structure. It is possible that a scale adaption could be developed involving several groups of students being mentored by a teacher, yet acting independently. Teaching for personal learning, as opposed to using a fixed content curriculum or even content personalised for a group, is hugely rewarding for all involved. However, the teacher cannot completely control or foresee the direction of teaching and this goes against the traditional understanding that the teacher knows. It also requires humility and a real willingness to fail, because when mentoring and working together with students in the months before the trip as they create their curriculum of teaching, workshops, and site visits, the less-polished iterative stages of the project that are typically private will be seen and shared.

Students of any specialism can engage the wider public in both formal and informal contexts at settings such as schools, at libraries, and in community groups as they share an understanding and passion for their subject. Music does lend itself to public engagement, however the principle of this curriculum initiative can be directly applied to subjects far beyond this teaching-oriented class.
For example, medical practitioners could create an engaging presentation and leave listeners with a model of the body, or a relevant artefact that could be used in further inspiring and educating those listening.

There are cost implications involving decisions about the extent to which such a class could be subsidised and whether students would be expected to also fund aspects of the trip. It is imperative that all participants are fully committed, as this ensures the success of the project. Including an outreach initiative and naming it helps students to own what they do and reinforces a purpose beyond credits or assessment. The outreach aspect becomes more valuable when sustained learning and wider connections with people’s lives can be illustrated through the educational message. The concept behind the name Musiquality transcends any individual year group and allows for the uniqueness of successive cohorts while maintaining an underlying ethos. Ownership of the educational outreach also gives more impetus to include fundraising as part of the process, so students truly assume responsibility for all aspects of devising and carrying out their project. Students gain a sense of worth and accomplishment that comes with achieving iterative goals that prepare students for the practical learning that follows as they organise and implement the skills-specific aspects of their curriculum abroad.

Conclusion

Although initially opening the curriculum through this approach to teaching requires more effort from the teacher and significant commitment from the students, it is worth pursuing. It enables students to actively demonstrate agency and develop both subject-specific knowledge and a range of wider soft skills that enhance their employability (Knight & Yorke, 2004). Engaging with a cross section people and cultures beyond typical learning circles expands perspectives, hones awareness of learning and communication, and helps to prepare students to live in a connected world.
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