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Executive summary

Project context
Copyright and open licensing has been identified as one of the greatest challenges to the development and adoption of open educational practices (OEP) in Australia (Bossu, et al., 2014). Without clear information on open licensing for educational materials and its interaction with Australian copyright law, Australia’s higher education sector will be restricted in its ability to use, develop and distribute material such as open educational resources (OER) and massive open online courses (MOOCs) effectively or to be globally competitive in this market.

This project aimed to address a critical need identified in previous Australian Government Office of Learning and Teaching projects: to review the copyright and legal issues affecting OEP and to improve Australia’s competitive strength in the international market for open education services by providing confidence for educational institutions around the development and production of open online resources.

Aims
To achieve this, the project had three primary objectives – to:

- collect and analyse data on the current plans and needs of Australian universities in relation to copyright, licensing and OEP
- develop and disseminate effective and practical copyright and licensing tools that will assist teachers and university managers when making business and pedagogical decisions around the deployment of online education material and services such as OER and MOOCs
- disseminate information that will facilitate the development of effective policies in Australian universities and the wider sector around the development and implementation of OEP.

Approach
The project was undertaken jointly by Swinburne University of Technology and University of Tasmania. The project team included staff from both institutions with expertise in the application of copyright law in the higher education sector, research in learning and teaching and the use and development of OER.

A survey was distributed through direct email to 389 individuals from 38 Australian universities and also through the electronic newsletters and bulletins of six key professional and industry bodies. During survey data collection, participants were asked whether they would be willing to participate in further discussion about the issues covered in the survey. Seven individuals were then selected for further follow-up interviews to provide a deeper
understanding of issues explored through the survey, based on their responses and institutional affiliations. The interviews were recorded and transcribed for later analysis. Project findings from the survey and interviews informed the development of two key project deliverables: the OEL Toolkit and six case studies of OEP best practice in Australian universities.

**Deliverables**

The project produced the following:

- distribution of results from the OEL survey to key stakeholders across the Australian higher education sector covering the development and implementation of OEP and the open delivery of online course material
- a series of six short case studies of best practice examples of OEP and open licensing strategies at Australian universities
- the project website, which provides a platform for delivery of the OEL research outcomes, related information and ongoing access to the OEL Toolkit
- an effective OEL Toolkit available for use by Australian universities delivered via an online platform and licensed openly for re-use
- a national series of workshops/forums held to disseminate the OEL Toolkit and gather stakeholder feedback on the use and practical applications of the toolkit within Australian universities.
- a downloadable graphic representation of the ‘continuum of openness’
- public presentations on the OEL project and its outcomes at national and international industry conferences and workshops.

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

**Dissemination and impact**

The project team undertook a range of dissemination activities throughout the project, which included both planned and opportunistic activities. Presentations on the project and the toolkit were given to industry representatives nationally and internationally. Visits to the OEL website were tracked using Google Analytics. The total number of page views from site launch from February 2015 to December 2016 was 40,298 from 7138 unique visitors.

The OEL project has received significant national and international attention. It was referred to in the New Media Consortium (2016) *2016 higher education horizon report* under the heading ‘Increasing use of blended learning designs’. It also received the Swinburne University of Technology 2016 Vice-Chancellor’s Global Initiative award.
In March 2017, the OEL Toolkit received international recognition, winning the Open Tool category of the 2017 Awards for Open Education Excellence from the Open Education Consortium global network.

**Recommendations**

As a result of the OEL project activities – surveying key stakeholders in the Australian higher education sector about the adoption of OER and OEP, developing and testing the OEL Toolkit and engaging with developers and users of OER – the OEL project team makes the following recommendations. Implementation of these will allow ongoing use and expansion of the OEL Toolkit and will contribute to the continued improvement and adoption of OER to enhance learning and teaching in the Australian higher education sector.

- Promote the OEL Toolkit through relevant Australian government agencies, higher education peak bodies and national organisations involved with improving digital access to education and open access to information.

- Form an informal coalition of representatives of key Australian higher education institutions engaged with OER to oversee decentred development and maintenance of the OEL Toolkit by the sector.

- Adopt the OEL Toolkit as a key element in the proposed OpenEdOz National Roadmap for an Australian Open Education Strategy.

- Engage international OER experts and practitioners to promote use of the OEL Toolkit in other situations or jurisdictions, with the aim of contributing to the increased worldwide development and adoption of OER.

- Undertake further research into the adoption of open licensing by Australian higher education institutions and its contribution to Australia’s dissemination of quality online learning resources.
# Table of contents

Acknowledgments ................................................................. iii

List of acronyms used .......................................................... iv

Executive summary ............................................................. v

Project context ........................................................................ v

Aims ...................................................................................... v

Approach ................................................................................ v

Deliverables .......................................................................... vi

Dissemination and impact ..................................................... vi

Recommendations ................................................................... vii

Tables and figures ................................................................ x

Chapter 1. Project context and rationale ................................ 1

1.1 International context of open educational resources ........ 1

1.2 Australian context .......................................................... 2

1.3 Project rationale ............................................................. 3

Chapter 2. Project approach ................................................. 4

2.1 Project team ................................................................. 4

2.2 Research plan ............................................................... 4

Chapter 3. Project findings .................................................. 7

3.1 Sampling ......................................................................... 7

3.2 Research findings .......................................................... 7

3.3 Findings summary ......................................................... 14

Chapter 4. Project deliverables ............................................ 15

4.1 OEL Toolkit .................................................................... 15

4.2 Case studies ................................................................... 20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 The ‘continuum of openness’</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5. Project impact, dissemination and evaluation</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Project impact</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Evaluation</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Dissemination</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6. Final considerations and recommendations</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Future role of the OEL Toolkit</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Recommendations</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: Certification by Deputy Vice-Chancellor</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Case studies</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: External evaluator report</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D: The continuum of openness</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E: Other dissemination activities</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix F: Ethics and survey instrument</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables and figures

Tables

Table 1: OEL Toolkit development workshops ................................................................. 6
Table 2: Analysis of risk to OEL Toolkit relevance from legislative change .................. 19
Table 3: Impact Management Planning and Evaluation Ladder model matrix ................. 21
Table 4: Conference presentations .................................................................................. 24

Figures

Figure 1: Factors affecting institutional participation in OEP initiatives ......................... 11
Figure 2: Responses to ‘Who do you think owns copyright to your teaching material?’ ...... 12
Figure 3: Digital materials most commonly used in respondents’ teaching .................... 13
Figure 4: OEL Toolkit user interface, initial response screen .......................................... 16
Figure 5: OEL Toolkit guidance presentation .................................................................... 17
Figure 6: OEL Toolkit glossary function ......................................................................... 18
Figure 7: Daily website visitors, September to December 2016 ..................................... 23
Figure 8: Daily website visitors, December 2015 to December 2016 ............................. 23
Chapter 1. Project context and rationale

1.1 International context of open educational resources

Open educational resources (OER) represent an emerging movement that is re-shaping learning and teaching in higher education worldwide. The growth of the open education trend ‘is a response to the rising costs of education, the desire for accessing learning in areas where such access is difficult, and an expression of student choice about when and how to learn’ (Johnson, et al., 2010, p. 6). Also, OER has the potential to meet the growing demand for higher education worldwide, and to provide opportunities for lifelong learning, including non-formal and informal education (Kanwar, et al., 2010). The OER movement ‘is a technology-empowered effort to create and share educational content on a global level’ (Caswell, et al., 2008, p. 2).

Currently, many universities around the globe have launched open content, supported by open practices initiatives and projects. Many learners from all walks of life have benefited from learning through openly licensed resources, and many educational institutions, including distance education providers, have obtained significant rewards in terms of enhancing their reputations, increasing student enrolment and developing innovative ways to produce distance learning materials (Weller, 2014).

Globally OER and open educational practices (OEP) have expanded rapidly. Currently, there is a whole range of such initiatives, projects and repositories available. There are openly licensed videos, photographs and open textbooks, learning management systems, full courses and lectures, authoring and sharing applications, repositories of academic and government publications and open access journals, and much more. Major OEP initiatives operate in most continents.

In policy development, there have been a number of international initiatives to develop standards for open access to scientific and scholarly publications, including the Berlin Declaration on Open Access to Knowledge (Max Planck Society, 2003) and the Science Commons Protocol for Implementing Open Access Data (Science Commons, 2007). The Cape Town Open Education Declaration stated that ‘differences among licensing schemes for open resources create confusion and incompatibility’ (Open Society Institute and the Shuttleworth Foundation, 2007, para. 5) and invited students, educators, authors, institutions, publishers, policymakers and governments to commit to and participate in the open education movement.
The Paris OER Declaration (UNESCO, 2012, p. 2), which draws upon such previous international conventions and declarations, recommends *inter alia* that nation states:

- reinforce the development of strategies and policies on OER
- facilitate finding, retrieving and sharing of OER
- promote the understanding and use of open licensing frameworks
- encourage the open licensing of educational materials produced with public funds.

However, OEP have not been embraced across mainstream higher education yet, and there remain challenges to be overcome. According to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development report *Giving knowledge for free*, copyright and licensing are one of four major issues critical to the adoption of open educational practices (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2007).

### 1.2 Australian context

The Australian Trade Commission report *More than MOOCs* (Austrade, 2013), suggested that open education initiatives, and in particular massive open online courses (MOOCs), offer the Australian higher education sector significant opportunities for expansion through increasing online education offerings and promoting openly accessible courses to potential students internationally.

A significant barrier to the creation of openly accessible educational resources by the Australian higher education sector has been both the legislative framework (Trounson, 2012) and lack of understanding of this framework by academic and professional staff at Australian institutions (Bossu, et al., 2014).

Several recent projects funded by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching have recommended further effort to more clearly define the copyright issues involved in the creation of OER within Australia and provide remedial services that can assist the sector in understanding and overcoming the challenges. One such project, entitled *Adoption, use and management of open educational resources to enhance teaching and learning in Australia* (Bossu, et al., 2014, p. 6), noted ‘copyright and intellectual property policies issues, which were considered by many participants as one of the biggest challenges of OER and OEP adoption’.

Another report, *Bridging the gap: teaching adaptations across the disciplines and sharing content for curriculum renewal*, recommended a ‘review of the legal issues associated with OER in Australia which would be beneficial, in particular further work on exceptions in existing copyright law which could be used by OER repositories’ (Wilson, et al., 2013, p. 5).
A more recent research project, *Students, universities and open education*, undertaken at the same time as the OEL project, makes wide-ranging recommendations on OER, identifying a need to ‘evaluate and reform Australia’s approach to intellectual property in education and then to widely disseminate understanding of the reform’ (Wills, et al., 2016, p. 17).

### 1.3 Project rationale

One of the greatest challenges to the development of OEP in Australia has been copyright and open licensing. Without clear information on open licensing for educational materials and its interaction with Australian copyright law, Australia’s higher education sector will be restricted in its ability to effectively use, develop or distribute material such as OER and MOOCs, or to be globally competitive in this market.

This project aimed to address a critical need identified in previous Office for Learning and Teaching projects: to review the copyright and legal issues affecting OEP and to improve Australia’s competitive strength in the international market for open education services by providing confidence for educational institutions around the development and production of open online resources.

With the goal of furthering adoption of OER in the Australian higher education sector through greater understanding of copyright and licensing, the project had three primary objectives. These were to:

- collect and analyse data on the current plans and needs of Australian universities in relation to copyright, licensing and OEP
- develop and disseminate effective and practical copyright and licensing tools that will assist teachers and university managers when making business and pedagogical decisions around the deployment of online education material and services such as OER and MOOCs
- disseminate information that will facilitate the development of effective policies in Australian universities and the wider sector around the development and implementation of OEP.

This report provides an overview of the activities undertaken to fulfil these objectives, describing the research undertaken, the methodologies employed and how the outcomes of the project, including the OEL Toolkit and case studies (Appendix B), will assist the Australian higher education sector to understand and deploy OER.
Chapter 2. Project approach

2.1 Project team

The project was undertaken jointly by Swinburne University and University of Tasmania. The project team included staff from both institutions with expertise in the application of copyright law in the higher education sector, research in learning and teaching and the use and development of OER.

Members of the team were geographically distributed initially between Hobart and Melbourne and later more broadly. The reference group for the project had an advisory and evaluative role. The group provided particular assistance with the development, evaluation, piloting and delivery of the survey and with analysis of the results.

Professor Margaret Hicks was the external evaluator for the project, also acting as a critical friend during the life of the project and delivering an objective evaluation of the project and its outcomes to the project team (included as Appendix C).

2.2 Research plan

The project was conducted in two major stages designed in line with the D-Cubed Dissemination Investigation Project guidelines for effective dissemination, put forward by the Office for Learning and Teaching.

2.2.1 Stage 1

The first stage involved a review of relevant literature, also including documentation related to Australian copyright law and previous OLT-funded projects that investigated different aspects of OER and OEP in Australian higher education (Bossu, et al., 2014; Wills, et al., 2016; Wilson, et al., 2013).

Stage 1 included the design and development of an online survey for distribution across the higher education sector. The primary purpose of the survey was to gather an effective dataset to inform the design of the practical tools developed during the project. The survey instrument consisted of 33 questions asking individual participants about their understanding and experiences with OER and OEP, including their use of open licenses and institutional policies and initiatives involving OER and OEP.

The survey was administered using Opinio software. This software offered a simple interface for creation of a digital survey instrument and allowed for secure storage of data to comply with research protocols. The survey was distributed through direct email and through the electronic newsletters and bulletins of six key professional and industry bodies.

Individual recipients were recruited from three main categories of staff from higher education institutions: managers and policy makers, educators and content developers, and
information professionals (including librarians, lawyers and copyright officers). The professional networks and industry peak bodies that promoted the survey through their mailing lists and websites were:

- Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education
- Australasian Council on Open, Distance and e-Learning
- Open and Distance Learning Association of Australasia
- Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia
- Council of Australian University Directors of Information Technology
- Council of Australian Directors of Academic Development.

During survey data collection, participants were asked whether they would be willing to participate in further discussion about the issues arising from the survey. Sixty-six respondents provided contact details and agreed to participate in further interviews. Seven key stakeholders were then selected, based on their responses, expertise and institutional affiliations, for further follow-up interviews to provide a deeper understanding of issues explored in the survey. Interviews were semi-structured and organised around a series of nine questions that provided the participants with opportunities for reflection in an open format.

The interviews were recorded and transcribed for later analysis, and the identity and personal and professional information provided by participants was protected at all times during the study. Participants were chosen via purposive sampling, which assisted the project team to garner richer insights through the provision of critical and in-depth information to the investigation (Minichiello, et al., 2008). The project and the methods of data collection and analysis were approved by Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee (SHR 2014/314) and the Tasmania Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (H0014661) (Appendix F).

The project adopted a thematic approach to data analysis, which helped the researchers to confirm themes and concepts identified in the literature, as well as those that emerged during data collection. This form of analysis also helped the researchers to identify patterns, and to reduce and refine the data into themes and to aid interpretation as an ‘inductive inquiry’ (Boyatzis, 1998, p. 5).

The findings informed the development of two key project deliverables: the OEL Toolkit and the six case studies of OEP best practices in Australian universities.
2.2.2 Stage 2

Stage 2 of the project involved the development, implementation and dissemination of the project outcomes and deliverables, informed by the stage 1 data collection and analysis.

Initial specifications for the OEL Toolkit, the project’s key deliverable, were developed in the early part of this stage. The project team decided to produce an interactive online tool, and the technical team at the Tasmanian Institute of Learning and Teaching was appointed to assist in the development of the toolkit’s online platform and interface. The project team was involved in different phases and iterations of the toolkit, assisting the technical team with content development and with editing, proofreading and testing.

The initial specifications and requirements based on analysis of the survey data were the starting point for the toolkit structure but, as development progressed, user feedback from stakeholder workshops became increasingly important when refining the structure and content.

The team undertook a national series of stakeholder workshops across the higher education sector. This was a strategy for both disseminating the project outcomes and gathering feedback from potential toolkit users. After each workshop, feedback from participants was collected and analysed. Where possible the most useful and appropriate suggestions were then incorporated into the toolkit content and interface. This development process afforded rapid movement from a basic working prototype to a polished product aligned closely to user requirements. Table 1 shows the dates, locations and number of participants in the stakeholder workshops.

Table 1: OEL Toolkit development workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No. of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 July 2016</td>
<td>Curtin University, Perth</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 September 2016</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 October 2016</td>
<td>The University of New South Wales, Sydney</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 October 2016</td>
<td>Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 3. Project findings

This chapter presents and discusses some of the project’s key findings based on the analysis of data from the online survey and interviews.

3.1 Sampling

The survey was distributed, through direct email, to 389 key individual higher education stakeholders from 38 Australian universities and to six professional networks and industry peak bodies. The average response rate for the survey was 34.83%. Throughout this report, the values of ‘adjusted relative frequency’ are used as they more clearly reflect percentage-based answers, because $N$ varied from question to question.

The majority of responses came from three significant groups of participants, based on each participant’s role within their institution. These were library/information management professionals (25.49% (39)), educational/instructional designers (20.26% (31)) and copyright officers and teachers/lecturers (both with 17.65% (27) of responses). Senior executives (7.84% (12)), administration/management staff (13.07% (20)), technology professionals (8.5% (13)) and others (3.92% (6)) – including a variety of managerial, compliance and elearning advisory roles – represented the rest of the sample.

When asked to nominate a primary discipline, most participants indicated they were in non-academic roles (48.92% (68)). For those who were based within a discipline, education was the most common response (19.42% (27)). The rest of the disciplines presented were spread out more or less evenly throughout this sample, indicating a good representation of all disciplines providing a good overview of experiences with OER and OEP.

3.2 Research findings

3.2.1 Definitions

Participants were asked to declare their agreement or disagreement with the UNESCO 2012 Paris OER Declaration definition of OER and to raise any concerns around defining OER. The definition was provided in full: OER are ‘teaching, learning and research materials in any medium, digital or otherwise, that reside in the public domain or have been released under an open licence that permits no-cost access, use, adaptation and redistribution by others with no or limited restrictions’ (UNESCO, 2012, p. 1).

The overwhelming majority of participants (90.79% (138)) agreed with this definition, while 5.26% (8) were unsure and a small group (3.95% (6)) did not agree with it. Twelve participants also provided further comments, including concerns about the meaning of ‘limited restrictions’, whether openly available material always needed to permit adaptation and the need for acknowledgement of the author.
When defining OEP, participants were invited to comment on the definition developed by the Open Education Quality Initiative: ‘Open Educational Practices (OEP) constitute the range of practices around the creation, use and management of open educational resources with the intent to improve quality and innovate education’ (Open Educational Quality Initiative, 2011). While the majority of participants agreed with this definition (78.95% (120)), 12.5% (19) were unsure while 8.55% (13) disagreed (the rest provided no answer). Most of those who indicated some concern with the definition commented on its vagueness and the need to refer specifically to practices such as sharing and re-use, and aims such as enabling equitable access to education.

It was important for the project team to understand the participants’ levels of understanding (or lack thereof) in relation to OER and OEP, so that appropriate resources and information could be included in the toolkit.

3.2.2 Policies and practices

In this study, the project team aimed to gain an understanding of the range of OEP activities and initiatives across institutions and the challenges, misconceptions and other issues faced by those wanting to create and/or use OER. A range of questions was included to address this. In responses to the question about the importance of OEP as a part of their institution’s activities, most participants considered OEP to be either somewhat important (50% of responses (76)) or very important (13.16% (20)), with 25.66% (39) saying they were not important, while 11.18% (17) were unsure.

When asked whether their institution had a current policy or strategic plan related to OER or OEP, most participants (42.55% (60)) replied negatively; while 28.37% of participants (40) said yes and another 29.08% (41) were unsure. It was interesting that 30 respondents provided optional written answers for this question. Eleven participants wished to clarify that while their institution did not have a specific policy on OER, the use of open resources was encouraged and implied, as well as mentioned within some other policy/strategic plan (most commonly within a blended learning or teaching and learning plan or as part of the copyright strategy). Twenty-two participants provided publicly accessible URL links to their current institutional OER policies while six said their institutions were currently working on an OER policy. A few commented that their existing OER policy was primarily focused on the sharing of research, or on MOOCs and one participant noted that, despite discussions about sharing resources beyond their institution, a strategy being considered did not stipulate the basis on which resources would be shared.
Most participants answered yes (69.29% (97)) to the question of whether their institution currently offered any open courses and/or open educational resources (such as MOOCs, OER repositories, free lecture podcasts and downloads), while 20% (28) said no and another 10.71% (15) were uncertain. Those who answered yes were further asked what type of resources their institution made available. Participants could make multiple selections from the list of possible resources and could add their own suggestions. The most common option chosen (with 60.83% of responses (73)) was ‘MOOC/s and/or other forms of online courses available to anyone’. The other most common responses were:

- openly available online videos/podcasts (e.g. audio/video recordings of lectures) – 33.33% (40)
- openly accessible repository of educational resources – 22.5% (27)
- online course modules, learning activities or lecture notes available to anyone, also 22.5% (27).

A small group of participants (7.5% (9)) mentioned ‘textbooks available online for free used by anyone (i.e. Open Textbooks)’ while for the rest the answer chosen was either ‘not applicable’ (15% (18)) or other (10.83% (13)). As for the last group, the type of resources referred to included those created for iTunes U, iBooks, YouTube and their own internal or MOOC platforms. It is interesting that while many participants provided in the comments a link to their institution’s openly available material, some noted that it was ‘open’ for access but ‘all rights reserved’, or did not meet the open definition ‘because of current licensing’, or was ‘only available to students enrolled in that subject’.

Survey participants were also asked about the likely future role of OEP at their institution. The majority of participants (47% (55)) believed that MOOCs and other similar courseware are likely to continue being offered by their institutions in the future. Other future activities predicted by participants were:

- openly available videos and podcasts – 29.91% (35)
- online course modules and other course material such as lecture notes – 29.91% (35)
- openly accessible repository of educational resources – 28.21% (33)
- textbooks available online for free use by anyone (i.e. Open Textbooks) – 11.97% (14)

Even though the number of participants predicting future MOOCs offerings appeared high (47% (55)) amongst the institutions participating in this study, this is less than reported for existing MOOCs (60.83% (73)). However, one area where respondents appeared to indicate activities could increase was open textbooks initiatives.
3.2.3 Factors impacting institutional participation in OEP initiatives

Participants were asked about factors likely to influence their institutional participation in open education initiatives. Among the top factors deemed as ‘very important’ were ‘enhancing global profile of institution’ (59.22% (61)), ‘encourage interactive student centred learning’ (56% (56)), ‘attracting more/new students’ (54.37% (56)), ‘innovative design of learning resources’ (52.94% (54)), ‘exploring new pedagogical practices’ (52.43% (54)) and ‘marketing opportunities’ (50.48% (53)). Additional factors not included in the list but added by participants included individual academic ego, the fear of being ‘left behind’, easing the transition of students into the university during the first year, and opportunities to upskill staff. As seen in Figure 1, the least important factors selected were ‘develop commercial partnerships’ (23.47% (23) deemed it not important) and ‘competition from other providers’ (20.79% (21)).

![Figure 1: Factors affecting institutional participation in OEP initiatives.](image-url)
When asked about the intellectual property (IP) issues considered when deciding whether to participate in open education initiatives, most respondents mentioned that the issue that concerned their institutions the most was the ‘complexity of copyright and licensing’ (87.76% (86)). Other IP related concerns acknowledged were:

- copyright ownership of material on the internet (82.65% (81))
- understanding of open licences (75.51% (74))
- risk of infringing someone else’s copyright (71.43% (70)).

Other concerns included ‘the potential for misuse of intellectual property’ (59.18% (58)), ‘ability to licence external material’ (58.16% (57)), ‘interaction with Part VA/VB of Australian Copyright Act 1968’ (52.04% (51)) and ‘licensing terms applied by online distribution platform/provider’ (52.04% (51)). Only a small group of participants (9.18% (9)) did not think their institutions considered any IP issues.

### 3.2.4 Copyright ownership and use of educational content

Survey participants were asked who they thought owned copyright in teaching materials they produced. The majority of participants (48.15% (39)) believed that their institution was the primary holder of copyright in any teaching materials they develop with some rights granted to them; while 29.63% (24) believed their institution was the sole copyright holder with no rights granted to them (Figure 2).

![Figure 2: Responses to ‘Who do you think owns copyright to your teaching material?’](image-url)
When asked about which digital materials they most commonly use in teaching, the main responses included presentation files (such as PowerPoint), with 78.26% (54) choosing this answer; and various image files (.gif, .jpg etc.), with 75.36% (52) of responses (Figure 3).

![Figure 3: Digital materials most commonly used in respondents’ teaching.](image)

In response to the question ‘what type of learning and teaching resources created by others do you use or adapt in your own teaching?’ (where participants could make multiple selections of answers), the majority (87.84% (65)) chose material openly available on the internet, while 64.86% (48) indicated scholarly publications. Other popular responses included:

- resources created collaboratively in their organisation (62.16% (46))
- resources created by colleagues in their institution (56.76% (42))
- government-produced resources (55.41% (41))
- resources created in another institution (47.3% (35))
- commercially produced resources (43.24% (32)).

Most participants (68.57% (48)) said their most common way of using teaching and learning resources created by others in their teaching was by adding hyperlinks to their material or by embedding the resource directly into the relevant webpage (60% (42)). Some said that they made changes to the material copied (52.86% (37)) while 51.43% (36) indicated that they copied without changing. A further 38.57% (27) said they combined multiple resources and 18.57% (13) made annotations.
Other matters explored through the survey included self-declared levels of understanding about open copyright licensing, the manner in which participants engage with learning and teaching resources made available by others under various licenses, and factors affecting their use of such materials created by others. The survey also asked about other aspects of openly licensed materials such as the various avenues available for sharing teaching materials, difficulties experienced when integrating external resources in one’s own teaching materials, and the availability of advice on OEP.

3.3 Findings summary
The survey and interview results indicated significant activity in the areas of OEP and OER in the Australian higher education sector. Respondents felt OEP was important for improving the global profile of their institution and would allow for innovation in pedagogical practices and learning design. Policies and strategic plans were often still under development. However, the results indicated a high level of need for information to address concerns about how to deal with the complexity of copyright and licensing, clearer information about intellectual property ownership and the wider issues around incorporating open practices into institutional strategies. Responses also indicated an awareness of different levels of ‘openness’ and that if licensing is too complicated it can potentially have a chilling effect on the development or dissemination of resources.
Chapter 4. Project deliverables

This project produced a series of deliverables. This chapter provides information about the OEL Toolkit, the case studies of best practices in OEP, and the ‘continuum of openness’ graphic.

4.1 OEL Toolkit

4.1.1 Toolkit design and development

The design of the OEL Toolkit interface began with a requirements document, to which all team members contributed. This included requirements such as mobile device compatibility, ability to download guidance for later use and compliance with accessibility guidelines.

A diagrammatic outline of the user workflow was created, which was based on modelling a series of questions that an academic dealing with OER may ask a copyright officer. Project team members brought their experience of the common issues experienced when engaging academic staff with copyright related problems and combined this knowledge with survey data to understand how best to structure the toolkit user experience to provide useful guidance to users. The development process used by the project team involved an iterative approach to the simultaneous development of textual content, technical architecture and user interface aspects.

The software underlying the toolkit is open source: MySQL for the underlying database structure and PHP for formatting the data for the web. These coding languages are commonly used in developing websites and interactive content and will allow for the toolkit potentially to be adapted by other institutions or individuals.

A style guide was created to guide the editorial voice for the toolkit. Members of the project team wrote guidance text snippets after the underlying structure was in an advanced stage. The purpose of developing a style guide was to ensure that a unified voice, uniform plain language style and agreed definitions were used throughout the toolkit.

4.1.2 Toolkit development process

The development process was based on an agile, iterative methodology, involving a rapid prototyping process that incorporated user feedback and testing through stakeholder workshops, which also acted as early dissemination activities for the toolkit. The initial specifications and requirements based on analysis of the survey data were the starting point for the toolkit content. As the content development progressed, however, user feedback from workshops became increasingly important to refining the toolkit.
Development tasks were divided into three streams: design and visual identity, content development and the coding of the underlying database and web interface. Each aspect of the toolkit was developed concurrently and adjusted as further user feedback was received from workshops. The OEL Toolkit is accessed as a web app www.oel.edu.au/toolkit, presented within the OEL project website (Figure 4).

Figure 4: OEL Toolkit user interface, initial response screen.

The toolkit provides an online interface to content and information relevant to the licensing of OER, accessed initially through a choice of five activity nodes representing the OER lifecycle. The underlying concept is that users navigate through a decision tree, providing contextualised responses to questions about their intended activities. Throughout the process, they are presented with snippets of information aligned to their answers, linking them to relevant resources and providing context. After responding to a sequence of questions, the user is then provided with an individualised selection of guidance and information sources directly relevant to their needs.

Guidance is delivered to the user as they move through the questions and as a final collated guidance summary listing after the user has selected answers to all the relevant questions. The summary may also be downloaded for later use as a PDF document and can be printed or emailed. It includes contextual information based on responses to the specific questions used to generate guidance. When the guidance summary is presented in PDF format, hyperlinks to relevant resources are displayed as complete URLs in addition to being clickable directly from the document. This allows the user to retain link information if the document is printed.
The guidance is presented alongside a listing of the questions that the user answered (to generate the guidance), which allows for a high level of transparency and understanding of the framework governing copyright and platform terms and conditions (Figure 5). It also allows the user to take the guidance summary to an institutional copyright officer or legal advisor as a useful starting point for further discussion and assistance around their use of OER.

Figure 5: OEL Toolkit guidance presentation.

Many terms used in relation to copyright and intellectual property are necessarily specialised and their meaning may vary from commonly understood definitions. Although the use of complex language was minimised during toolkit development, the provision of accurate guidance requires the use of some specialised terms. The glossary developed for the toolkit allows users to access definitions of terms that may not be easily understood. Definitions of these terms were collected from online resources available for reuse within the licence conditions of the toolkit. The Tasmanian Institute of Learning and Teaching development team undertook technical implementation of the glossary (Figure 6). Glossary definitions are available for terms that appear with a dotted blue underline in the toolkit, and the full set of definitions can also be accessed.
4.1.3 Ongoing maintenance and risk assessment

Ongoing delivery of the toolkit and website required consideration of technical, legal and policy issues. Planning for ongoing maintenance and hosting of the toolkit, website and related resources has been based on a five-year time frame for keeping the toolkit and website available, as per the project proposal.

4.1.4 Terms of use and disclaimer

The entry page to the toolkit displays a disclaimer, which explains to users the status of the guidance provided by the toolkit and that the information included is general information and not legal advice. It also includes a link to the full OEL Toolkit terms of use www.oel.edu.au/terms-of-service, which users must agree to before they can access and use the toolkit. The terms of use explain that the site includes links to external sites, which are not endorsed in any way, and reminds users that the toolkit only takes account of the law in Australia.

The terms of use are a key part of the toolkit, as the decision-tree structure and links to external content mean that users of the toolkit play an active role in interpreting the information and how it relates to their own circumstances. Users are advised to exercise their own skill and judgement, and where appropriate to seek legal or other professional advice before acting or relying on any guidance provided.

4.1.5 Adaptions to changes in the legal context

The toolkit offers guidance to users within the context of the current legal framework of Australian copyright law. Future changes to the Australian Copyright Act 1968 could potentially reduce the usefulness of the toolkit. The project team considered the potential risks and required actions if such a change should occur within the five-year lifespan of the toolkit (Table 2).
Table 2: Analysis of risk to OEL Toolkit relevance from legislative change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Likelihood in five years</th>
<th>Overall risk</th>
<th>Required actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor changes, e.g. changes to statutory licences</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Minor amendment to toolkit contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major changes, e.g. introduction of fair use</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low/medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Take-down of toolkit for significant upgrade to content</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following commencement of the *Copyright Amendment (Disability Access and Other Measures) Act 2017*, which introduced changes to the statutory licences in the *Copyright Act 1968*, a number of minor amendments were made to the toolkit contents to ensure its effective ongoing operation under the revised legislation.

The Australian Law Reform Commission report *Copyright and the digital economy* (2014) and the Productivity Commission report *Intellectual property arrangements: inquiry report no. 78* (2016) have both recommended the introduction of a fair use exception to Australian copyright law. Such an exception would have a major impact on the legal framework of copyright in Australia and would require a significant upgrade to content in the OEL Toolkit. This would be likely to require additional funding.

### 4.1.6 Further development of the toolkit

At the time of writing (April 2017), the toolkit successfully delivers on the stated objectives of the project. Further development will be undertaken by staff at University of Tasmania during 2017. This will include the development of an account and administration interface for simpler ongoing maintenance of toolkit content, including by a wider group of authorised external users.

With the development of an account and administrative interface, there is also the potential for adaptation of the underlying framework to make it multi-jurisdictional. This could translate the benefits of the toolkit for the Australian higher education sector to other geographic and legal contexts. As the textual and graphical content as well as coding and design are made available under open licences, this could provide significant benefits for users in other situations as the existing content could be adapted without the costs of developing a new toolkit.
4.2 Case studies

Informed by the data collected from the survey responses, the project team selected and developed a series of six short case studies of best examples and practices of OEP and open licensing strategies in the Australian higher education sector (included as Appendix B). Universities were selected based on their positions within the sector, ability to assist with case study development and significance of existing and future developments related to OEP. The case studies are structured around a set of common headings, which allowed for a comparison of approaches and activities at each institution.

These case studies draw on desktop research from publicly accessible resources on institutional websites and through discussion with relevant institutional staff.

Each of the case studies was approved for release by the institution covered. All the case studies are available on the OEL Project website www.oel.edu.au/resource as PDF documents under a Creative Commons ShareAlike 4.0 licence to enable access and sharing.

4.3 The ‘continuum of openness’

A graphic representation of a ‘continuum of openness’ was adapted from the ideas of Hilton and colleagues (Hilton III, et al., 2010) and further developed during the project to facilitate discussion of the many factors that need to be considered when exploring the issues around openness. The OEL project focused on the copyright and licensing aspects of openness, but the continuum demonstrates how the technical and accessibility-related factors are also important considerations when evaluating how open a resource is. It also presents openness as operating on a spectrum rather than as a binary consideration with a single correct setting. The ‘continuum of openness’ is included as Appendix D and is also available on the OEL Project website www.oel.edu.au/resource.
Chapter 5. Project impact, dissemination and evaluation

This section describes the impact of the project, the dissemination strategies employed and the evaluation of the project by the external evaluator.

5.1 Project impact

The project developed a plan for impact, based on the Impact Management Planning and Evaluation Ladder model. This model provides a framework for describing different types of change that can be achieved through educational development projects. Each stage, or ladder rung, is incrementally broader in impact than the last.

Table 3: Impact Management Planning and Evaluation Ladder model matrix for OEL project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated changes at:*</th>
<th>Project completion</th>
<th>Six months post-completion</th>
<th>Twelve months post-completion</th>
<th>Twenty-four months post-completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Team members</td>
<td>Recognition nationally and internationally for project team members as experts in OEP and open licensing.</td>
<td>One or more of the team members has partnered with international peers on a further research grant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Immediate students</td>
<td>Impact will be on curriculum and educators rather than directly on students. No direct impact on students is anticipated from this project. Project team is communicating and cooperating with another OLT project related to student impact and OEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Spreading the word</td>
<td>Minimum of three conference presentations and professional events. Four workshops held in Australian cities. Website analytics data indicate continued engagement with toolkit, both nationally and internationally.</td>
<td>Citations of journal articles published by team members on project research demonstrate ongoing relevance of project’s research outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Narrow opportunistic adoption</td>
<td>Swinburne and University of Tasmania engage with project and Case study/interview participants engage with toolkit development as part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anticipated changes at:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project completion</th>
<th>Six months post-completion</th>
<th>Twelve months post-completion</th>
<th>Twenty-four months post-completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>toolkit during life of project and project team members contribute to OEP.</td>
<td>of business planning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Narrow systemic adoption</strong></td>
<td>Swinburne and University of Tasmania adoption of toolkit as aid in decision making in relevant areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. <strong>Broad opportunistic adoption</strong></td>
<td>Toolkit used in decision making by Australian universities and individual academic staff.</td>
<td>Toolkit used in decision making by Australian universities and individual academic staff.</td>
<td>Toolkit used in decision making by Australian universities and individual academic staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Broad systemic adoption</strong></td>
<td>National engagement with toolkit by universities and peak bodies.</td>
<td>International engagement with toolkit by universities and relevant bodies in sector.</td>
<td>International engagement with toolkit by universities and relevant bodies in sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These are approximations; text is not expected in every cell.

### 5.2 Evaluation

The role of the evaluator as a critical friend for the OEL project was important in providing formative advice and evaluation during key decision-making periods, and in guiding the development of the project process and deliverables.

The evaluation report provides an overview of project activities and a positive evaluation of the project outcomes. The evaluation report is attached as Appendix C.

The ongoing sustainability of the project’s primary outcome, the OEL Toolkit, is recognised as a concern; however, as noted in section 4.1.5, the risks related to ongoing management of the toolkit have been evaluated and, where possible, planned for.

### 5.3 Dissemination

Dissemination activities were undertaken throughout the project and included both planned and opportunistic activities. Promotional postcards were created early in the life of the project including basic information on project aims, contact details and website information. These were used by project team members, when attending conferences and events, for distribution in conference venues and also for informal promotion to individuals.
In addition to conference presentations, the toolkit development workshops in Table 1 were also conducted as dissemination activities. This allowed interested stakeholders to have an opportunity both to use the toolkit, and to provide feedback and contribute to its development. This increased the likelihood of participants adopting and promoting later versions of the toolkit across the sector.

5.3.1 Website engagement

Website visits were tracked using Google Analytics. The total number of page views from site launch from February 2015 to December 2016 was 40,298 from 7138 unique visitors. As the site remained relatively static throughout the project, this level of engagement indicates a good level of interest in the project with peaks noticeable around presentations at industry events. A 90-day snapshot is shown in Figure 7.

![Figure 7: Daily website visitors, September to December 2016.](image)

Numbers of visitors to the site fluctuated significantly, although the general trend was noticeably upward over the last year of the project as dissemination activities were undertaken and the toolkit was made available on the website (Figure 8).

![Figure 8: Daily website visitors, December 2015 to December 2016.](image)
5.3.2 Conference presentations

Conference presentations on the OEL project provided an opportunity to reach several of the national and international groups identified as stakeholders.

Table 4: Key conference presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter/s</th>
<th>Topic/title</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>‘Open education licensing: a toolkit for Australian educators’</td>
<td>OER17</td>
<td>6 April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina Bossu, Robin Wright,</td>
<td>‘Enabling open education in Australia by supporting open licensing decisions’</td>
<td>ODLAA 2017 conference</td>
<td>7 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Carew, Beale van der Veer</td>
<td>'Open education licensing: a toolkit for achieving openness in the global education market’ – panel presentation/poster</td>
<td>Ascilite 2016</td>
<td>29 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carina Bossu, Robin Wright,</td>
<td>'Enabling open education in Australian universities with an open education licence toolkit'</td>
<td>OpenEd 2016</td>
<td>2 November 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony Carew, Beale van der Veer</td>
<td>'Once you’re online, what’s the difference? Plagiarism, sharing, re-mix and appropriation in online education’ – keynote address</td>
<td>Charles Sturt University Ed Week Learning &amp; Teaching Conference</td>
<td>19 November 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>Open education licensing project</td>
<td>OER15</td>
<td>14 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Whitehead, Robin Wright</td>
<td>‘Open 4 business: Australian universities get real with open licensing’</td>
<td>Australian National Symposium on OER</td>
<td>4 November 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further dissemination activities are listed in Appendix E.

5.3.3 Recognition of project outcomes

The 2015 New Media Consortium’s NMC technology outlook: Australian tertiary education included open licensing as a topic, a summary of the OEL project and a link to the project website (New Media Consortium, 2015, p. 15). The OEL project was also included in New Media Consortium’s 2016 higher education horizon report (New Media Consortium, 2016, p. 19) under the heading ‘Increasing use of blended learning designs’. This international report, published jointly by Educause and the New Media Consortium, provides a summary of current activities and a forward-looking analysis of technology and change for the higher education sector. Inclusion in the report represents recognition of the value of the project and also a useful avenue for dissemination to a large audience.
The OEL project received the Swinburne University of Technology 2016 Vice-Chancellor’s Global Initiative award. This recognises outstanding initiatives that strengthen Swinburne’s vision to be a leader in international education.

In March 2017, the OEL Toolkit received international recognition, winning the Open Tool category https://bit.ly/32zSZvo in the 2017 Awards for Open Education Excellence from the Open Education Consortium global network.
Chapter 6. Final considerations and recommendations

The OEL project has provided an opportunity for the Australian higher education sector to explore one of the most important, but often not clearly understood, aspects of OER: the impact of copyright law and licensing on the sharing of online educational resources. The project was conducted at a significant time for the sector, with educational resources and practices increasingly moving online and being made accessible to users in other legal jurisdictions. Within this context, the OEL Toolkit and the industry events conducted as part of the project have proved highly valuable to Australian educators and educational developers who recognise the need for a greater engagement with the issues of copyright and licensing. Australian higher education institutions are increasingly expanding their online products and services, and a clear understanding of these issues will allow for better productivity and improved quality as many of these institutions expand into the global marketplace for educational products and services.

6.1 Future role of the OEL Toolkit

The OEL Toolkit has been introduced in an environment of rapidly developing understanding around open licensing and its impact on the Australian higher education sector. It also exists at a critical juncture for the international publishing industry and the academic mission of supporting access to knowledge and information. Digital technologies allow information to be spread across the globe at almost no cost, which has created a significant challenge to the commercial activities of publishing houses that for generations have been the powerhouse of scholarly information dissemination.

As academic institutions increasingly operate as in-house producers of rich digital media resources, they need a flexible tool to navigate the changing legal structures that support their activities, including learning and teaching. The project team hopes that the OEL Toolkit will operate as a developing resource that keeps pace with changes in this environment and allows educators and the developers of Australian educational content to make their own way in the increasingly complex world of copyright licensing and open education.

In addition, the licensing of the toolkit itself under an open licence (CC BY-SA) will enable even wider dissemination of the toolkit contents and structure, including its possible adoption or modification for operation in other jurisdictions.
6.2 Recommendations
As a result of the OEL project activities – surveying key stakeholders in the Australian higher education sector about the adoption of OER and OEP, developing and testing the OEL Toolkit and engaging with developers and users of OER – the OEL project team makes the following recommendations. Implementation of these will allow ongoing use and expansion of the OEL Toolkit and will contribute to the continuing improvement and adoption of OER to enhance learning and teaching in the Australian higher education sector.

- Promote the OEL Toolkit through relevant Australian Government and higher education peak bodies and national organisations involved with improving digital access to education and open access to information.

- Appoint an informal coalition of representatives of key Australian higher education institutions engaged with OER to oversee decentred development and maintenance of the OEL Toolkit by the sector.

- Adopt the OEL Toolkit as a key element in the proposed OpenEdOz National Roadmap for an Australian Open Education Strategy.

- Engage international OER experts and practitioners to promote use of the OEL Toolkit in other situations or jurisdictions, with the aim of contributing to the increased worldwide development and adoption of OER.

- Undertake further research into the adoption of open licensing by Australian higher education institutions and its contribution to Australia’s dissemination of quality online learning resources.
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I certify that all parts of the final report for this OLT grant provide an accurate representation of the implementation, impact and findings of the project, and that the report is of publishable quality.

Name: Professor Duncan Bentley  Date: 27/4/17

Professor Duncan Bentley, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Appendix B: Case studies

Case studies may be accessed via the links below, or through the project website at http://www.oel.edu.au/resource/

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Sturt University (CSU)</td>
<td>CSU’s motivation to engage with OER is rooted in its operation as a university ‘for the public good’ which sees ‘collaboration’ as one of its underlying values.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-CSU.pdf">http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-CSU.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland University of Technology (QUT)</td>
<td>QUT has been a strong and long-time advocate for Open Access. Engaging in OER is a constructive next step. OER are seen as important components in providing flipped classroom experiences, and accommodating more flexible learning needs.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-QUT.pdf">http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-QUT.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Canberra (UC)</td>
<td>UC has a strong commitment to Open Access. Prof Nick Klomp, UC’s Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), describes engaging with OERs as an opportunity to democratise education.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-UC1.pdf">http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-UC1.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Queensland (USQ)</td>
<td>Access to USQ OER is via its Learning Object Repository (LOR), which allows both academic and professional USQ staff the opportunity to openly licence and share their teaching and learning materials. Some of these materials have already been repurposed and reused by other Australian and US universities, Australian TAFE Colleges, and open courses.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-USQ.pdf">http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-USQ.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinburne University of Technology</td>
<td>At Swinburne, OERs are regarded as leading to innovation, better practice, greater collaboration between academics, and ultimately less duplication of material.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-Swinburne-1.pdf">http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-Swinburne-1.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tasmania (UTAS)</td>
<td>UTAS actively promotes the use of OER and OEP. This is reflected in its coherent policies, strategies and staff-faced communications.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-UTas.pdf">http://www.oel.edu.au/resources/uploads/2016/11/Case-Study-UTas.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: External evaluator report

Evaluation Report: OLT Innovation and Development Grant

Open Education Licensing

Effective open licensing policy and practice for Australian universities: making online education really work

Project leader: Robin Wright

Evaluator: Professor Margaret Hicks, Adjunct, University of South Australia

Background

The aim of this project was to ‘to identify and analyse the critical copyright challenges facing Australian universities in their development of OEP by investigating existing open education licensing policies and practices’ (Project Application, p2). The project was led by Robin Wright, Swinburne University and project managed successively by Felix Wilson, Susannah Bell and Andrea Scott. The project team included Derek Whitehead (Swinburne University), Dr Carina Bossu (University of Tasmania), and Luke Padgett (University of Tasmania). The reference group included three experts from different Australian universities who supported the project team for the duration of the project. The project began in August 2014 and concluded in December 2016.

The key objectives of the project were to:

- collect and analyse data on the current plans and needs of Australian universities in relation to copyright, licensing and OEP;
- develop and disseminate effective and practical copyright and licensing tools that will assist teachers and university managers when making business and pedagogical decisions around the deployment of online education material and services such as OER and MOOCs; and
- disseminate information that will facilitate the development of effective policies in Australian universities and the wider sector around the development and implementation of OEP.

I was engaged as the evaluator of the project at the beginning of the project and I have worked collaboratively with the project team providing formative input until the conclusion.
Appendix C: External evaluator report

of the project. The project leader had developed a detailed evaluation plan as part of the application process and this was reviewed and ratified at the first project team meeting (December, 2014). A set of evaluation questions and an evaluation plan (see Appendix 1) informed by ALTC and OLT evaluation resources (Dept. of Education and Training, 2016) and Owen (2007) were agreed by the team and these framed the evaluation process and this report. The focus of the evaluation was to determine if the project’s aims have been achieved, and outcomes were delivered within budget and on time.

Outcomes

There were three clear objectives identified for the project and for each objective there was a set of outcomes aligned with the distinct stages of the project. Each objective built on the previous objective and informed the next stages, ultimately resulting in a tool-kit. All of the outcomes have been achieved and they are publicly available on the project website: http://www.oel.edu.au/.

Appendix 2 provides detail of the evaluation plan, including the status of success indicators for each of the objectives and subsequent outcomes.

Products and outputs

The overall deliverable for this project was a toolkit that consisted of a number of resources, based on an Australian context, and informed by the research conducted throughout this project. The toolkit was publicly launched in November 2016 and is available at http://oel.edu.au/toolkit/. As this has only occurred recently there is no usage data available at this point. The OEL website also contains other useful information including information about the project, research approach, resources including case-studies and the Continuum of Openness graphic, and the project blog.

Project Management

The project was managed by project officer, Felix Wilson, who maintained project management over 7 months at the beginning and end of the project, Susannah Bell who was engaged with the project for 12 months and Andrea Scott who was engaged with the project for 9 months. Although there were changes to project managers due to changes in employment, processes for managing the project remained consistent as did the project leader and project team. A wiki was established at the beginning of the project and all documentation was maintained and updated on the wiki. Consistently throughout the project there were regular meetings between the project leader and project officer(s); regular virtual and face-to-face meetings with the full project team; and regular meetings and engagement with the reference group. All of these meetings were minuted, action lists were documented, and the budget was monitored. As already mentioned there was a detailed evaluation plan identified early in the project and monitored throughout. A detailed risk management matrix was documented in project brief. As the evaluator I had
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full access to all documentation and communicated regularly with the project leader and project manager.

In February 2016 an extension of 6 months was requested and granted by the OLT. Delays had been caused due to changes in project officers, additional time needed for survey and toolkit development, and technology issues for communication. Both participating universities provide just under $40,000 (combined) to support this extension. With this extension being granted in February 2016 the project was delivered within the extended 6-month time frame.

Dissemination

From the beginning of this project dissemination was a key consideration and this remained consistent throughout the duration of the project. The project leader and project team took every opportunity to promote the project at national and international conferences and events.

There were 4 formal workshops scheduled which also served as dissemination activities. 52 people participated in these workshops.

Workshop 1 – Perth – Curtin University – 7 July 2016
Workshop 2 – Brisbane – Queensland University of Technology – 6 September 2016
Workshop 3 – Sydney – University of NSW – 12 October 2016
Workshop 4 – Melbourne – Swinburne University of Technology – 13 October 2016

The project has been promoted through conference presentations by the project leader and other team members. To date, 5 conference presentations have been completed including 3 national conferences and 2 international conferences.

A website www.oel.edu.au containing a blog was also established at the beginning of the project (January 2015) and used to disseminate project information and explore wider relevant OER topics. The project also used the Twitter account @OELproject to engage with the sector and workshop/conference participants.

Sustainability

As with all projects, there is concern about the longer term sustainability of project outcomes once the funding concludes. The technical project team at the University of Tasmania are continuing to develop an administrative interface for the toolkit to enable easy upgrades by the sector. Access to the toolkit will be maintained by project team members with responsibility passed on to others in the sector as required. However; it may be necessary to seek additional funding if significant changes are made to the Australian Copyright Act 1968 during this period, to ensure the toolkit remains effective.
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General

Undertaking a project of this nature that includes multiple stakeholders can be a complex and difficult endeavour. This project has exemplified a process and practices for achieving this. Three key elements that have contributed to this success include:

1. Establishing strong collaborative engagement with a wide group of stakeholders from the beginning of the project
2. Engaging an effective project management approach for the duration of the project
3. Identifying and enacting a dissemination and evaluation strategy across all stages of the project.

The project has delivered excellent outcomes and tangible resources that have been disseminated to the sector. This provides a valuable resource to the sector in an area of importance.

References


Professor Margaret Hicks

14 December 2016
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Effective open licensing policy and practice for Australian Universities: making online education really work

Evaluation Plan

Project

The Open Education Licensing (OEL) project is a joint research and development project between Swinburne University of Technology and the University of Tasmania with support provided by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT).

Background and overview

One of the greatest challenges to the development of open educational practices (OEP) in Australia is copyright and open licensing. Without clear information on open licensing for educational materials (such as Creative Commons licences) and its interaction with Australian copyright law, Australia's higher education sector will be unable to effectively use, develop or distribute material such as open educational resources (OER) and Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) or be globally competitive in this market.

This project addresses a critical need identified in previous OLT projects; to review the copyright and legal issues effecting OEP. It will survey current OEP in Australian universities and use the data collected to develop an Open Education Licensing Toolkit. The Toolkit will be a practical online resource for university teaching and learning and business planning professionals. The project aims to improve Australia's competitive strength in the international market for open education services by providing confidence for educational institutions around the development and production of open online resources.

Objectives

The project has three primary objectives:

To collect and analyse data on the current plans and needs of Australian universities in relation to copyright, licensing and OEP;

To develop and disseminate effective and practical copyright and licensing tools that will assist teachers and university managers when making business and pedagogical decisions around the deployment of online education material and services such as OER and MOOCs; and

To disseminate information that will facilitate the development of effective policies in Australian universities and the wider sector around the development and implementation of OEP.
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Budget

The project is funded by an Innovation and Development grant from the OLT. The total budget for the project is $326,947, with $222,000 funding provided by OLT and an additional $104,947 provided as in-kind support by Swinburne University of Technology and the University of Tasmania.

Timeline

August 2014 to July 2016

Evaluation

The project evaluation will be undertaken by external evaluator Margaret Hicks margaret.hicks@unisa.edu.au in consultation with the OEL project team and agreed stakeholders as outlined in the Evaluation Plan.

Evaluation purpose and scope

Purpose of evaluation

Evaluation of the project will serve two purposes. Formative evaluation will scrutinize the project aims and plan throughout the process and thus guide the completion of the project and help ensure that it meets its objectives. Summative evaluation will assess the project outcomes at completion.

The evaluation process may change during the life of the project. The evaluation planning process will incorporate recognition that the project remains open to new insights and evidence-driven changes in approach from the project team, external evaluator, reference group, and other stakeholders.

Role of the external evaluator

The external evaluator will act as a critical friend during the life of the project and will also deliver objective evaluation of the project and its outcomes to the project team, which will be included in the final report to the OLT. The role of the evaluator as a critical friend will be important in providing formative advice and evaluation during key decision-making periods, and in guiding the development of the project process and deliverables. Formal evaluation will be based on objective measures of identified success indicators, and will provide quantitative data relating to the extent to which the project has successfully achieved its stated aims.

Success indicators

These success indicators provide measurable definitions of completion of a particular aspect of the project. They will be reviewed alongside the evaluation criteria which were
part of the initial application for funding (Appendix A). The initial success indicators for this project have been identified as follows:

**Objective 1: To collect and analyse data on the current plans and needs of Australian universities in relation to copyright, licensing and OEP;**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Method of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The literature identified provides appropriate overview of existing body of knowledge around OEP.</td>
<td>Key themes of identified literature to be recorded in minutes of team meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 The survey instrument is distributed to appropriate target groups.</td>
<td>Surveys distribution and agreement by project team of appropriate coverage recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Survey response rate provides sufficient data for validity and/or relevance.</td>
<td>Response rate to survey sufficient to ensure validity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Focus group sessions provide detailed and appropriate information for case studies.</td>
<td>Minimum of three detailed case studies are produced based on focus group participant data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Analysis of data from case studies and survey guides the development of the toolkit.</td>
<td>Project team agreement on use of data in guiding toolkit development is documented in meeting minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Research and data management processes adhere to appropriate policies and guidelines.</td>
<td>Ethics clearance granted by Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee or sub-committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective 2: To develop and disseminate effective and practical copyright and licensing tools that will assist teachers and university managers when making business and pedagogical decisions around the deployment of online education material and services such as OER and MOOCs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Method of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Toolkit development process utilises feedback from stakeholders to ensure relevance and effectiveness of outcome.</td>
<td>Stakeholders engaged in toolkit development process and provide feedback on design and content decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Short qualitative case studies provide overview of OEP in Australian tertiary educational institutions.</td>
<td>Project team approves the case studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Online interface to toolkit provides information in an easy to use and efficient interface.</td>
<td>User testing of interface undertaken during design and implementation to ensure effectiveness and ease of use for target audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 The toolkit provides information that meets the needs of teaching staff and university management.</td>
<td>User testing of toolkit interface and content plus approval from project team and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Dissemination and promotion activities related to the copyright and licensing toolkit reach target</td>
<td>Records of attendance/audience details at</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| Objective 3: To disseminate information that will facilitate the development of effective policies in Australian universities and the wider sector around the development and implementation of OEP |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Method of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Toolkit and related publications assist in the development of effective OEP policies in Australian Universities.</td>
<td>User testing and interviews indicate that the information can be used effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Project team members present research papers/presentations based on project at appropriate professional events.</td>
<td>Minimum of three presentations at relevant industry conferences and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Project team members publish articles based on project work in appropriate academic journals.</td>
<td>Minimum of three articles based on project work submitted for publication before the close of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 National program of workshops/forums on OEL Toolkit conducted.</td>
<td>Minimum of three workshops held in different Australian cities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 The final report meets all requirements and contractual obligations of the Office for Learning and Teaching.</td>
<td>Final project report (part one) accepted by the OLT for publication.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Success indicators for project management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Method of evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget resources are managed effectively.</td>
<td>Reporting to OLT demonstrating effective budget management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timelines guide project progress effectively.</td>
<td>Reporting to OLT indicating that timelines managed appropriately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk management strategy for the project is effective.</th>
<th>Reflection by project team in conjunction with evaluator on risk management processes and issues.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reporting requirements to OLT are met.</td>
<td>Acceptance of interim reports and part two of the final report are accepted by the OLT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Formative evaluation**

During the formative evaluation, the success indicators and the evaluation criteria will be used as discussion points to monitor the progress of the project and provide constructive advice and feedback at key points and on important deliverables. Guidance received from the external evaluator will be recorded and used to contribute to decision making during the project.

**Summative evaluation**

Summative evaluation will provide an overall objective assessment of the project in relation to its aims, objectives, and success indicators.

The external evaluator will develop a range of questions to address to the project team and agreed external stakeholders to explore the achievement and effectiveness of the project success indicators. The questions will be delivered to the participants via telephone and the answers collated for inclusion in the final evaluation report.

The summative evaluation will also include a wider assessment of the impact of the project on the sector and the effectiveness, usefulness and value to the sector of the OEL Toolkit based on an evaluation of the project success indicators and evaluation criteria.

**Evaluation Meetings**

Formal meetings between the external evaluator, project team, and project officer will be held four (4) times over the life of the project either in person or via video or teleconference as indicated below. The evaluator will be provided with access to the project wiki, which includes project documentation, meeting agendas and minutes and other relevant documents. Additional contact with project team will be via telephone, and email, as required.

The project budget includes funding for travel and accommodation for the evaluator for two face-to-face evaluation meetings which will be held in either Melbourne or Hobart as agreed. The other meetings will be held using appropriate communications technology.
## Meeting Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Dates</th>
<th>Discussion Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| September/October 2014 | - Project overview  
                        | - Role of external evaluator  
                        | - Evaluation plan  
                        | - Timeline of meetings and evaluation activities  
                        | - Survey instrument design |
| March 2015          | - Survey implementation  
                        | - Data analysis and review of survey outcomes |
| August 2015         | - Toolkit development  
                        | - Case studies  
                        | - Data analysis |
| March 2016          | - Toolkit  
                        | - Dissemination activities  
                        | - Summative evaluation and final evaluation report |

### Interim and Final Reports

The project evaluator will prepare an interim progress report at the end of year 1 and a final report at the end of year 2. The report contents will be discussed with the project team as developed and the final versions will be delivered to the project team and the OLT as required.

The final report will contain a description of the formative and summative evaluation processes used for the project and the evaluation outcomes, including evidence of the impact of the project and its value to the sector.

As well as the success indicators and evaluation criteria, the reports will address:

The extent to which project aims, objectives, outcomes and deliverables have been attained;

The view of identified industry stakeholders on the benefits delivered by the project for the sector;

Unexpected benefits or costs in completion of the project; and
Appendix C: External evaluator report

Commentary on sustainability and ongoing value of the project outcomes.

The final report will be provided to the project leader by the external evaluator by the end of June 2016 as required for inclusion in the final report to the OLT or as agreed. It will form part of the final report to the OLT at the completion of the project.

Robin Wright

Project Leader

Open Education Licensing project

5 September 2014

Minor revisions by FW January 2015 based on feedback from the face to face meeting held in December 2014.
### Appendix A: Evaluation criteria from funding application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Effectiveness of data collection processes in achieving project aims | • Did the survey address the key questions of the project in relation to universities’ current and/or planned OEP:  
  - business models (e.g. altruistic, revenue by data collection, research, course fee, content fee, certification etc.);  
  - policy approach, and  
  - delivery methods (e.g. in-house or hosted platform, owned or third party content)  
  • Have participants’ recruitment processes been successful in engaging stakeholders in the research project?  
  • How effective were the data collection processes in addressing the project needs?  
  • What is the best way for other higher education institutions be encouraged to take up the outcomes generated by the project?  
  • How effective were the ethical procedures adopted by the project? |
| Identification of key themes and trends       | • How effective have the data collection methods been in uncovering key trends and opportunities in relation to open education policies, practices and open licensing in Australia? |
| Appropriateness of outputs in relation to the themes and trends identified in the data | • What lessons have been learned from this project and how might these be of assistance to other institutions, researchers, decision-makers and other related stakeholders?  
  • To what extent have the OEL Toolkit, case studies and related documentation achieved their intended goals? |
| Effectiveness of dissemination strategies     | • How effective were the OEL Toolkit workshops/forums in providing feedback and assisting use/further development of the toolkit?  
  • Have papers/presentations been given at appropriate academic, government and sector events?  
  • What has been the impact of this dissemination strategy? |
| Effectiveness of project processes            | • Do any changes/amendments need to be made to ensure the project meets its intended aims?  
  • Were there any variations from initial proposal, and if so, why?  
  • What unintended benefits accrued from the project?  
  • What factors helped/hindered achievement of the outcomes? |
| Timelines                                     | • Were timelines managed appropriately?  
  • What strategies were in place for risk management? |
| Budget management                             | • Did the budget accurately describe the time/resources required to undertake the project? |
### Appendix 2: Open Education Licensing OLT Project: Evaluation plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Method of evaluation</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1:</strong> To collect and analyse data on the current plans and needs of Australian universities in relation to copyright, licensing and OEP;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Data collected from survey provides themes for comparison with existing literature and body of knowledge around OEP.</td>
<td>Key themes from survey / identified literature to be recorded in minutes of team meeting.</td>
<td>24-25/11/2015</td>
<td>Detailed discussion of key themes from survey data and current literature conducted during face to face meeting at UTas. Minutes of meeting located on project wiki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 The survey instrument is distributed to appropriate target groups.</td>
<td>Surveys distribution and agreement by project team of appropriate coverage recorded.</td>
<td>16/06/2015 - 18/07/2015</td>
<td>Distributed invitations to 389 recipients from 38 Australian universities - also sent to 6 industry bodies for dissemination amongst members (SB 8/07/2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Survey response rate provides sufficient data for validity and/or relevance.</td>
<td>Response rate to survey sufficient to ensure validity.</td>
<td>18/07/2015</td>
<td>-166 people responded to the survey, 111 fully completed - 132 responses and 93 of the completed surveys came from the invitations (33% response rate and 23% completion rate) (SB 31/07/2015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Survey and interviews provide detailed and appropriate information for case studies.</td>
<td>Minimum of three detailed case studies are produced based on survey and interview participant data.</td>
<td>8/03/2016 - 28/11/2016</td>
<td>- 6 in-depth interviews conducted with survey respondents - 7 Case Studies have been completed and 6 have been approved and added to the OEL website in a PDF version found under the resources section of the website. <a href="http://www.oel.edu.au/resource/">http://www.oel.edu.au/resource/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Analysis of data from case studies and</td>
<td>Project team agreement on use of data in</td>
<td>8/03/2016</td>
<td>Ongoing discussion to date, and toolkit development in process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Method of evaluation</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>survey guides the development of the toolkit.</td>
<td>guiding toolkit development is documented in meeting minutes.</td>
<td>28/11/2016</td>
<td>Data and toolkit development processes documented in minutes of meetings over the course of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Research and data management processes adhere to appropriate policies and guidelines.</td>
<td>Ethics clearance granted by Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee or sub-committee.</td>
<td>21/1/2015, 27/1/2015, 5/6/2015, 8/9/2015, 12/1/2016</td>
<td>Final Swinburne ethics approval received. Survey, Interview and Ethics application documents located at on wiki. UTas ethics approval received. Gained approval for revised survey, change of personnel and extended period Swinburne HREC progress report accepted. Extension to Swinburne ethics approval granted until 31/3/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Success indicator</td>
<td>Method of evaluation</td>
<td>Timeline</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2: To develop and disseminate effective and practical copyright and licensing tools that will assist teachers and university managers when making business and pedagogical decisions around the deployment of online education material and services such as OER and MOOCs</strong></td>
<td>2.1 Toolkit development process utilises feedback from stakeholders to ensure relevance and effectiveness of outcome.</td>
<td>Stakeholders engaged in toolkit development process and provide feedback on design and content decisions.</td>
<td>7/7/2016</td>
<td>1st Toolkit stakeholders workshop – Perth Workshop held at Curtin by LT/DW with 19 participants providing feedback on Toolkit content and interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/9/2016</td>
<td>2nd Toolkit stakeholder workshop – Brisbane Workshop held at QUT by RW/KD/BV with 17 participants providing feedback on Toolkit content and interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12/10/2016</td>
<td>3rd Toolkit stakeholder workshop – Sydney Workshop held at UNSW by RW / TC with a small group of 6 participants providing feedback on Toolkit content and interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13/10/2016</td>
<td>4th Toolkit stakeholder workshop – Melbourne Workshop was held at Swinburne by RW, TC and had a group of 10 participants providing feedback on Toolkit content and interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Short qualitative case studies provide overview of OEP in Australian tertiary educational institutions.</td>
<td>Project team approves the case studies.</td>
<td>8/03/2016</td>
<td>7 case studies nearing completion by Research Assistant (KD), still requiring authorisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28/11/2016</td>
<td>7 Case Studies completed and 6 have been approved and added to the OEL website in a PDF version found under the resources section of the website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Online interface to toolkit provides information in an easy to use and efficient interface.</td>
<td>User testing of interface undertaken during design and implementatio to ensure effectiveness and ease of use for target</td>
<td>28/11/2016</td>
<td>Testing of interface was designed and worked on using data and feedback from stakeholder workshops. Toolkit interface is currently in Version 7 and can be seen here. <a href="http://www.oel.edu.au/toolkit7/">http://www.oel.edu.au/toolkit7/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Method of evaluation</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>audience.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>The toolkit provides information that meets the needs of teaching staff and university management.</td>
<td>User testing of toolkit interface and content plus approval from project team and stakeholders.</td>
<td>28/11/2016</td>
<td>Project team and Stakeholders are pleased to launch the OEL Toolkit today which will provide information that meets the needs of teaching staff and university management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Dissemination and promotion activities related to the copyright and licensing toolkit reach target audience/s.</td>
<td>Records of attendance/audience details at dissemination events</td>
<td>7/7/2016, 6/9/2016, 12/10/2016, 13/10/2016, 29/11/2016</td>
<td>Perth workshop 19 participants, Brisbane workshop 17 participants, Sydney workshop 6 participants, Melbourne workshop 10 participants, Ascilite conference 25 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Online components of the toolkit are used widely and usage increases as dissemination activities are undertaken.</td>
<td>Web analytics data show sufficient and increasing usage of the toolkit as dissemination activities are undertaken.</td>
<td>13/12/2016</td>
<td>In progress After each workshop conducted between August and November there was a recorded increase in use of the online toolkit. However, a longer time range is required to ascertain usage trends. Toolkit use is tracked at a granular level through the database. Google analytics is used to track devices used and geo-location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Online components of the toolkit are ‘discoverable’ through search engines.</td>
<td>Toolkit design process includes discoverability requirements. Testing to verify discoverability during implementation</td>
<td>13/12/2016</td>
<td>Completed During development, the Toolkit was hidden from web crawlers to prevent users discovering the site before it was ready. Now, that setting has been removed and the Toolkit can be discovered by web crawlers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Method of evaluation</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2</strong></td>
<td>2.8 Online components of the toolkit comply with relevant accessibility requirements.</td>
<td>Testing of interface against appropriate standards (to be identified during toolkit design phase).</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>The OEL Toolkit interface was designed with accessibility requirements in mind, and implemented with standards-based code. Will be evaluated against the WCAG AA standard to ensure broader accessibility, particularly with regard to keyboard navigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 3</strong></td>
<td>3.1 Toolkit and related publications assist in the development of effective OEP policies in Australian Universities.</td>
<td>User testing and interviews indicate that the information can be used effectively.</td>
<td>User testing conducted during workshops indicated that information would meet the needs of participants and their staff. Responses (incl. tweets) received after launch at ASCILITE showed toolkit considered valuable.</td>
<td>4/11/2014 - 28/11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Project team members publish</td>
<td>Minimum of three articles based on project work</td>
<td>13/12/2016</td>
<td>Due to pressure of toolkit development and promotion, plus pace of change with both copyright and open education, academic articles will now not be submitted until after</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Success indicator</th>
<th>Method of evaluation</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 National program of workshops/forums on OEL Toolkit conducted.</td>
<td>Minimum of three workshops held in different Australian cities.</td>
<td>7/7/2016 6/9/2016 12/10/2016 13/10/2016</td>
<td>Perth workshop 19 participants Brisbane workshop 17 participants Sydney workshop 6 participants Melbourne workshop 10 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 The final report meets all requirements and contractual obligations of the Office for Learning and Teaching.</td>
<td>Final project report (part one) accepted by the OLT for publication.</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success indicators for project management</td>
<td>Budget resources are managed effectively.</td>
<td>Reporting to OLT demonstrating effective budget management.</td>
<td>10/2/2015 19/8/2015 16/2/2016</td>
<td>First progress report delivered to OLT. Second progress report delivered to OLT. Third progress report delivered to OLT. Extension to project approved by OLT until 31 December 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management strategy for</td>
<td>Timelines guide project progress effectively.</td>
<td>Reporting to OLT indicating that timelines managed appropriately.</td>
<td>10/2/2015 19/8/2015 16/2/2016</td>
<td>First progress report delivered to OLT. Second progress report delivered to OLT. Third progress report delivered to OLT. Extension to project approved by OLT until 31 December 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management strategy for</td>
<td>Reflection by project team in conjunction</td>
<td>02/12/2014</td>
<td>Detailed risk management matrix documented in Project Brief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objectives | Success indicator | Method of evaluation | Timeline | Status |
---|---|---|---|---|
| the project is effective. | with evaluator on risk management processes and issues. | | (SB 8/07/2015) | |
| Reporting requirements to OLT are met. | Acceptance of interim reports and part two of the final report are accepted by the OLT. | 10/2/2015 19/8/2015 16/2/2016 | First progress report delivered to OLT. Second progress report delivered to OLT. Third progress report delivered to OLT. Extension to project approved by OLT until 31 December 2016. |
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The continuum of openness is also available at http://www.oel.edu.au/resource/
## Appendix E: Other dissemination activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Dissemination details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carina Bossu</td>
<td>Presentation and demonstration of OEL Toolkit at QUT seminar ‘Open Education and the Future of Publishing Business Models’</td>
<td>1 March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Padgett</td>
<td>Demonstration of OEL Toolkit at University Copyright Network meeting, Canberra.</td>
<td>23 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>Preview demonstration of OEL Toolkit at Open Access Week event, Swinburne University of Technology.</td>
<td>28 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>Presentation to QULOC (Queensland University Libraries Office of Cooperation) meeting: on OEL project and toolkit.</td>
<td>2 September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>Contributed to Universities Australia webinar on OEL Project and Open Education in Australia (for University Copyright Network participants).</td>
<td>12 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>Presented at Vic. University Copyright Network meeting on OEL Project and Open Education in Australia.</td>
<td>9 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>Post about OEP in Australia in Open Knowledge Foundation’s ‘Around the World’ series.</td>
<td>2 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>Presented at Learning Transformations, Swinburne event on OEL Project and Open Education in Australia.</td>
<td>29 April 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>Presented information about the project to an event for Swinburne staff to celebrate awards and grants from the OLT.</td>
<td>4 December 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Padgett</td>
<td>Promoted project at Washington OER Conference.</td>
<td>21 November 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Wright</td>
<td>Presented information about the project to a meeting of Australian OERu partners in Sydney.</td>
<td>10 November 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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To: Ms Robin Wright, Information Resources

Dear Ms Wright,

SHR 2014/314 - Effective open licensing and practice for Australian Universities: making online education really work

Approved duration: 21/01/2015 to 21/07/2015 [adjusted]

I refer to the ethical review of the above project protocol by a Subcommittee (SHESC1) of Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC). Your responses to the review, as per the email sent on 20 January 2015 with attachments, were put to the Subcommittee delegate for consideration.

I am pleased to advise that, as submitted to date, the project may proceed in line with standard ongoing ethics clearance conditions here outlined. Please note that approval from the University of Tasmania is required before the study can commence (evidence of this should be submitted to the Swinburne Research Ethics Office as soon as is practicable).

- All human research activity undertaken under Swinburne auspices must conform to Swinburne and external regulatory standards, including the current National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research and with respect to secure data use, retention and disposal.
- The named Swinburne Chief Investigator/Supervisor remains responsible for any personnel appointed to or associated with the project being made aware of ethics clearance conditions, including research and consent procedures or instruments approved. Any change in chief investigator/supervisor requires timely notification and SUHREC endorsement.
- The above project has been approved as submitted for ethical review by or on behalf of SUHREC. Amendments to approved procedures or instruments ordinarily require prior ethical appraisal/clearance. SUHREC must be notified immediately or as soon as possible thereafter of (a) any serious or unexpected adverse effects on participants any redress measures; (b) proposed changes in protocols; and (c) unforeseen events which might affect continued ethical acceptability of the project.
- At a minimum, an annual report on the progress of the project is required as well as at the conclusion (or abandonment) of the project. Information on project monitoring, self-audits and progress reports can be found at: http://www.research.swinburne.edu.au/ethics/human/monitoringReportingChanges/
- A duly authorised external or internal audit of the project may be undertaken at any time.

Please contact the Research Ethics Office if you have any queries about on-going ethics clearance. The SHR project number should be quoted in communication. Researchers should retain a copy of this email as part of project recordkeeping.

Best wishes for the project.
Yours sincerely,
Astrid Nordmann
SHESC1 Secretary

Dr Astrid Nordmann
Research Ethics Officer
Swinburne Research (H68)
Swinburne University of Technology
PO Box 218, Hawthorn, VIC 3122
Tel: +613 9214 3845/Fax: +613 9214 5267
Email: anordmann@swin.edu.au
Dear Dr Bossu

Ethics Ref No: H0014661

Project title: Effective open licensing policy and practice for Australian Universities: making online education really work

The above Prior Approval application has been approved by the Deputy Chair of the Tasmania Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee, on behalf of the full committee. Approval is for four years and conditional upon receipt of an annual Progress Report. Ethics approval for this project will lapse if a Progress Report is not submitted.

A copy of the approval letter is attached for your records.

The Ethics Committee wishes you all the best with the project.

Kind regards

Katherine

Katherine Shaw
Executive Officer, Social Sciences HREC
Office of Research Services | Research Division
University of Tasmania
Private Bag 1
Hobart TAS 7001
T +61 3 6226 2763
www.utas.edu.au/research
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Open Education Licensing Survey

This survey is part of the Open Education Licensing (OEL) research project being carried out by Robin Wright and Derek Whitehead of Swinburne University of Technology and Dr Carina Bossu and Luke Padgett of the University of Tasmania. The project is supported by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. For more information see www.oel.edu.au

The aim of this survey is to understand the current and planned policies and practices around the delivery of open educational resources (OER) by Australian universities and to find out what practical licensing tools and information are needed to improve how OER are delivered.

We appreciate your contribution to this research. The survey should take no more than 20 minutes.

The survey closes 14th July 2015 - however early responses are much appreciated.

ABOUT THE SURVEY

Information and data collected via this survey will only be accessible to members of the research team and will remain confidential. Data from the survey will be retained securely for five years post publication. The aggregated results and analysis of the data collected will be used to inform the project’s findings and for the development of an OEL Toolkit and resources to assist OEP in Australian higher education institutions. Findings from the survey may also inform the production of academic publications, conference papers and research reports. All information included in publicly available material will be de-identified and only aggregated data will be included. If quotes are published, any potentially identifying information will be removed (unless the researchers have obtained separate written permission) and if necessary pseudonyms used.

This survey is conducted in accordance with Swinburne University Human Research Ethics Guidelines. Your participation in this research is voluntary, and you may decline to participate without risk. By proceeding to complete the survey, you are indicating that you have read and understood the information above, and are agreeing to participate. You are not required to answer all questions although we would appreciate you completing as many as you feel are applicable.

For any questions about the study or procedures, please contact Robin Wright (rwright@swin.edu.au or 03 9214 4669).

This project has been approved by or on behalf of Swinburne’s Human Research Ethics Committee (SUHREC) in line with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. If you have any concerns or complaints about the conduct of this project, you can contact:
Appendix F: Ethics and survey instrument

Research Ethics Officer, Swinburne Research (H68)
Swinburne University of Technology, P O Box 218, HAWTHORN VIC 3122.
Tel (03) 9214 5218 or +61 3 9214 5218 or resethics@swin.edu.au

‘Open Education Licensing: Effective open licensing policy and practice for Australian universities’ is supported by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching. For more information visit www.ool.edu.au

Participant role and knowledge

Q1: Which of the following best describes your role/s at your institution?

☐ Senior Executive
☐ Technology professional
☐ Educational / instructional designer
☐ Library / information management professional
☐ Administration / management
☐ Teacher / lecturer
☐ Copyright Officer
☐ Other

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Q2: Which academic discipline area do you primarily work in (if any)?

☐ Mathematical Sciences
☐ Chemical Sciences
☐ Environmental Sciences
☐ Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences
☐ Engineering
☐ Medical and Health Sciences
☐ Education
☐ Commerce, Management, Tourism and Services
☐ Psychology and Cognitive Sciences
☐ Studies in Creative Arts and Writing
☐ History and Archeology
☐ Physical Sciences
☐ Earth Sciences
☐ Biological Sciences
☐ Information and Computing Sciences
☐ Technology
☐ Built Environment and Design
☐ Economics
☐ Studies in Human Society
☐ Law and Legal Studies
☐ Language, Communication and Culture
☐ Philosophy and Religious Studies
☐ N/A

Q3: There is no universally accepted definition of Open Educational Resources (OER). However, the UNESCO 2012 Paris OER Declaration uses the following: “teaching, learning and research materials in any medium, digital or otherwise, that reside in the public domain or have been released under an open licence that permits no-cost access, use, adaptation and redistribution by others with no or limited restrictions” Do you agree with this definition?

☐ Yes
☐ Unsure
☐ No (please provide other definition below)
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Q4: The OPAL Open Education Quality Initiative defined Open Educational Practices (OEP) as follows: “Open Educational Practices (OEP) constitute the range of practices around the creation, use and management of open educational resources with the intent to improve quality and innovate education.” Do you agree with this definition?

☐ Yes
☐ Unsure
☐ No (please provide other definition below)

Q5: Are Open Educational Practices (OEP) currently an important part of your institution’s activities?

☐ Very important
☐ Somewhat important
☐ Not important
☐ Unsure

Institutional policy and practice

This section asks questions related to the policies and practices of your primary employing institution.

Q6: Does your institution currently have a policy or strategic plan that includes open educational resources or open education practices?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Unsure

If the policy or strategic plan is publically accessible, please provide a link.
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Q7: Does your institution currently offer any open courses or open educational resources? (For example MOOCs, open education resource (OER) repositories, free lecture podcasts or downloads)

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure

Q8: If your institution does offer open courses or open educational resources, what is currently offered? (Multiple selections OK)

☐ Openly accessible repository of Educational Resources
☐ Openly available online videos/podcasts (eg. audio/video recordings of lectures)
☐ MOOC/s and/or other forms of online courses available to anyone
☐ Textbooks available online for free use by anyone (i.e. Open Textbooks)
☐ Online course modules, learning activities or lecture notes available to anyone
☐ N/A
☐ Other (please describe)

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Where can we locate information about them? Please provide web links if available.

Q9: If your institution has future plans to offer open courses or open educational resources, or expand upon existing ones, what will be offered? (Multiple selections OK)

☐ Openly accessible repository of Educational Resources
☐ Openly available online videos/podcasts (eg. audio/video recordings of lectures)
☐ MOOC/s and/or other forms of online courses available to anyone
☐ Textbooks available online for free use by anyone (i.e. Open Textbooks)
☐ Online course modules, learning activities or lecture notes available to anyone
☐ N/A
☐ Other (please describe)
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If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Where can we locate information about them? Please provide web links if available.

Q10: What is your institution using to deliver open educational services or products? Please indicate all those used.

☐ edX  ☐ Coursera
☐ Open Learning  ☐ D2L (Desire 2 Learn)
☐ Future Learn  ☐ Class2Go
☐ Open2Study  ☐ OERu
☐ P2Pu  ☐ iTunesU
☐ YouTube/Vimeo  ☐ Moodle
☐ Blackboard CourseSites  ☐ Internally hosted repository available to external users
☐ Externally hosted repository available to external users  ☐ N/A
☐ Other (please specify)

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Q11: How important were any of the following factors for your institution when deciding to participate in open educational initiatives?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved quality of teaching and learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore new pedagogical practices</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve internal re-use and management of resources</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative design of learning resources</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage interactive/student centred learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaboration</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attract more/new students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance global profile of</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve efficiencies/reduce costs</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition from other providers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore new business structures/opportunities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing opportunities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer pathways into/enhance existing courses</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop commercial partnerships</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idealistic</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to sharing knowledge</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More equitable access to education</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand social/community interaction</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list any other factors which you consider were important:

Q12: Did your institution consider any of the following intellectual property (IP) issues when deciding to participate in open education initiatives?

- Complexity of copyright and licensing
- Copyright ownership of material on the internet
- The potential for misuse of your intellectual property
- Risk of you infringing someone else's copyright
- Ability to licence external material
- Interaction with Part VA/VB of Australian Copyright Act 1968
- Understanding of open licences
- Licensing terms applied by online distribution platform/provider
- Did not consider intellectual property issues
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Any other comments on intellectual property issues relevant to your institution?

---

**Personal practices of educators / designers**

This section asks you about your own practices around the use and sharing of educational resources.

*If you do not personally use, create or share OER (Open Educational Resources) you may wish to skip ahead to Question 27.*

**Q13: Who do you think owns copyright in teaching materials you develop?**

- Me
- Jointly owned by the institution and me
- My institution with some rights granted to me
- Unsure
- Me with some rights granted to my institution
- Jointly owned by me and other academics
- My institution with no rights granted to me

Any other comments on intellectual property rights at your institution?

---

**Q14: How often do you use the following kinds of digital material in your teaching?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Material</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation files (such as powerpoint)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text files (such as .docx)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly literature (such as .pdf)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government reports (such as .pdf)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image files (such as .gif, .jpeg etc)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video files (such as .mp4)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Types</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music and sound files (such as .wav, .mp3 etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software files</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tests/quizzes/surveys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specify relevant file types


### Q15: What type of learning and teaching resources created by others do you use or adapt in your own teaching?

- [ ] Commercially produced resources
- [ ] Resources created collaboratively in your organisation
- [ ] Material openly available on the internet
- [ ] Scholarly publications
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Resources created by colleagues in your institution
- [ ] Resources created in another institution
- [ ] Government produced resources
- [ ] None

If you have chosen "other", please specify:


### Q16: How do you use or adapt learning and teaching resources developed by others?

- [ ] Copy without changing
- [ ] Embed into webpage
- [ ] Add hyperlinks
- [ ] Other
- [ ] Copy and make changes
- [ ] Make annotations
- [ ] Combine multiple resources (ie. re-mix)

If you have chosen "other", please specify:
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Q17: How would you rate your understanding of open copyright licensing?
☐ None  ☐ Basic  ☐ Intermediate  ☐ Advanced

Q18: If you use learning and teaching resources created by others, have you done so under any of the following licences?
(For more information on the Creative Commons (CC) Licences, see http://creativecommons.org/licenses/)
☐ CC BY  ☐ CC BY-NC  ☐ CC BY-SA  ☐ CC BY-ND  ☐ CC BY-NC-SA  ☐ CC BY-NC-ND
☐ GNU Free Documentation License  ☐ Free for Education Licence  ☐ Open Publication Licence (OPL)
☐ Free Art License  ☐ Part VA/VB educational licences in Australian Copyright Act
☐ Author permission  ☐ Commercial licence  ☐ Licence obtained via permissions service
☐ Unsure  ☐ Other

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Q19: Which of the following factors has an impact on your use of material created by others?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High impact</th>
<th>Some impact</th>
<th>No impact</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discoverability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal reusability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical reusability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File size</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface usability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open file formats / standards</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editability</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Please list any other factors which have an impact on your use:

Q20: Do you share the teaching materials that you create (either individually or as part of a team) so that others may reuse or adapt them? (Select all that apply)
- Online for anyone to access
- Online for a restricted audience
- With colleagues at other institutions internationally
- With colleagues at other institutions nationally
- With members of my institution
- With members of my faculty or school
- With close colleagues only
- I don't share teaching materials

Any other comments regarding your sharing of teaching resources?

Note: if you have answered/chose at least one of the following items: [8] in question 20, skip the following question

Q21: Have you shared your teaching materials under any of the following licences? (For more information on the Creative Commons (CC) Licences, see http://creativecommons.org/licenses/)
- CC BY
- CC BY-SA
- CC BY-NC
- CC BY-ND
- GNU Free Documentation License
- Free for Education License
- Open Publication Licence (OPL)
- Free Art License
- Author (your) permission
- Unsure

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Note: if you have answered/chose at least one of the following items: [8] in question 20, skip the following question

Q22: How do you share your teaching materials?
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☐ Within the institution's Learning Management System (LMS)
☐ Emailing files directly to individuals
☐ Uploading them into an institutional repository
☐ Uploading them into a subject repository managed outside your institution
☐ Adding them to a shared folder on a network drive
☐ Through social media websites such as Academia.edu or Facebook
☐ Through a personal blog or website
☐ Through a document sharing service such as Slideshare
☐ Adding them to an internal intranet
☐ A cloud storage service such as Dropbox
☐ Other

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Note: if you have answered/chosen at least one of the following items: [8] in question 20, skip the following question

Q23: How do you prefer to share your teaching materials?
☐ With anyone without any restrictions
☐ With anyone without restrictions as long as I'm attributed
☐ Only for non-commercial uses
☐ Only if anything the materials are included in is shared under the same terms
☐ Only if others can't change or modify my work
☐ Only for educational use
☐ Only if my institution's branding is not removed
☐ If the user asks my permission
☐ Only with specific individuals
☐ Other

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Q24: Do you think you will share your teaching materials more widely in future?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unsure

Q25: If you include resources from others in your teaching materials (remix or adapt), have you had difficulties with any of the following?
☐ Technical issues (eg. combining file formats)
☐ Properly attributing the authors of the works being used
☐ Understanding licence terms for combining resources
☐ Applying your own licences for further reuse
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☐ Combining materials under multiple licences into new resources
☐ N/A
☐ Other

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Q26: Do you share the teaching materials that you have remixed so that others may reuse or adapt them? (Select all that apply)
☐ Online for anyone to access
☐ With colleagues at other institutions internationally
☐ With colleagues at other institutions nationally
☐ With members of my institution
☐ With members of my faculty or school
☐ With close colleagues only
☐ I don't share teaching materials

Any other comments regarding your sharing of re-mixed resources?

Role of information professionals

Q27: Which of the following roles in your institution provide advice on using open educational resources (OER) and sharing learning and teaching resources?
☐ Copyright Officer/s
☐ Legal Office
☐ Discipline co-ordinator
☐ Unsure
☐ Librarians
☐ Learning and teaching support staff
☐ Administrative staff
☐ Other

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Q28: For Information Professionals - Do teaching staff ask you for advice about identifying openly licensed resources for use in their learning and teaching activities?
☐ Regularly
☐ Occasionally
☐ Rarely
☐ Never
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Q29: For Information Professionals - Do teaching staff ask you for advice about how to share their own learning and teaching resources outside the institution?

☐ Regularly  ☐ Occasionally  ☐ Rarely  ☐ Never

Q30: For Information Professionals - Where do you obtain information about copyright and licensing of educational resources?

☐ Australian Copyright Council (ACC)  ☐ Australian Digital Alliance (ADA)
☐ Australian Libraries Copyright Committee (ALCC)  ☐ Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA)
☐ Creative Commons (CC)  ☐ JISC
☐ Open Education Consortium (OEC)  ☐ Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC)
☐ Smartcopying.edu.au  ☐ Universities Australia (UA)
☐ University Copyright Network (UCN)  ☐ Colleagues
☐ Reference books  ☐ Other university copyright websites
☐ Internet search  ☐ Unsure
☐ Other

If you have chosen "other", please specify:

Q31: Which institution do you primarily work for? (optional - however, this information will help with our research)

☐ Australian Catholic University  ☐ Australian National University
☐ Bond University  ☐ Central Queensland University
☐ Charles Darwin University  ☐ Charles Sturt University
☐ Curtin University  ☐ Deakin University
☐ Edith Cowan University  ☐ Federation University
☐ Flinders University  ☐ Griffith University
☐ James Cook University  ☐ La Trobe University
☐ Macquarie University  ☐ Monash University
☐ Murdoch University  ☐ Queensland University of Technology
☐ RMIT University  ☐ Southern Cross University
☐ Swinburne University of Technology  ☐ University of Adelaide
☐ University of Canberra  ☐ University of Melbourne
☐ University of New England  ☐ University of New South Wales
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Newcastle</th>
<th>University of Notre Dame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Queensland</td>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of the Sunshine Coast</td>
<td>University of Western Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Sydney</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other: ____________

Completion

Thank you for participating in the Open Education Licensing Project survey. Your participation will help the research team to better understand the Australian higher education sector requirements for guidance about licensing of educational resources.

The research team would appreciate having the opportunity to conduct a short interview with a selected number of respondents about their responses to the questions in this survey and 'open' activities within their organisation. Interviews would be conducted via telephone or face to face, depending on preferences and location. Please provide your name and email address if you would be willing to be contacted for an interview.

Q32: Name

__________

Q33: Email address

__________