Appendix 7: Evaluation Framework

Key evaluation question: Is a devolved model of content creation sustainable and adept at creating a reliable flow of new OER?

[References to related documents are included in the footnotes to the table.]

Factor to Evaluate	Questions to Address	Method(s)	Measure of Success	Evidence from the project
That an appropriate licence can be found, to which all parties can subscribe	Does the licence offered meet the needs of Oxford?	Testing and proof of concept against department content creators needs	Clearer understanding of legal requirements Number of contributors who have signed the licence	Discussed licence in detail at focus groups.[1] Questions relating to licensing options were included in the survey.[2] Feedback gathered from meetings with contributors and departments suggested two lengthy release forms were onerous and off-putting.[3] Training provided on copyright and creative commons licensing, increasing the open content literacy across the University.[4] 140 contributors have signed the licence (as at 21 April 2010). In the first year of the project, we have had three contributors who raised some form of objection to signing the licence: • One contributor refused to sign because of an exaggerated stance taken during a debate and the contributor did not want the recording published. • One contributor refused to sign the BY-NC-SA licence but would agree to sign a no

				derivative works licence due to previous experience of misrepresentation in the media.
				• One contributor was not happy to sign the licence due to the clause waiving moral rights, however this clause was easily removed and therefore it did not prohibit publication.
That a significant proportion of material can be cleared under an appropriate licence	Are there any barriers to providing material? What factors influence decisions to make content available?	Investigate barriers and cultural issues	A significant volume of material is licensed as open content proving that any perceived barriers have been addressed	See comments above. Survey focussed on motivational factors for releasing material under a CC licence, plus asked what assistance would be needed.[2] As at 21 April 2010, 150+ hours of audio and video podcasts (over 280 items) are available for global reuse and redistribution as a result of this project. There is a clear drive to disseminate; academics are regularly requesting the support of the podcasting team to increase their dissemination activities (possibly to meet research funding requirements). For example, 30% more requests for support were received in the same 6 month period in 2010 versus 2009. The project generated new content rather than repurposing legacy material, this may have made copyright clearance easier. The project was able to be selective in the materials that were made open. For example if a presentation included copyright material we did not include it. Or if recordings included Q&A sessions we deleted them to avoid any potential IPR disputes with audience members. This minimised the copyright clearance workload which could otherwise have been significant.

That content creators can be supported in making informed choices about their content	What factors influence staff making informed choices? How does OER fit into the content creation cycle?	A model of open content literacy	Successful staff development event to test the model. Embed OER training within the institution	The project ran two training events covering copyright, Creative Commons and OER.[4] This training will become a standard course offered by the IT Learning Programme at Computing Services each term. In addition, a short OER section will be included in all relevant courses run by the IT Learning Programme at Computing Services. Academics seem happy to contribute as long as there is no significant impact on their time, i.e. the recordings can take place as part of their usual teaching or research activities. Two contributors refused when asked to support an activity which would require them to spend additional time on materials related to their podcasts.
The materials can be organised in ways to improve resource discovery	How can materials best be tagged and organised to improve resource discovery?	Indicative tagging categories	Clearer understanding of factors influencing discoverability	Improved metadata schema.[5] An expert cataloguer was used to maximise quality of the metadata and cataloguing. CC items are clearly identified on the web. Content is available through multiple delivery channels.
The materials can be managed in an efficient and cost-effective way	Can we adopt a production process which streamlines workflows and minimises production costs?	Inhabit existing content workflow. Indicative cost model	Standard process used with minimal adaptation specifically for this project	A standard institutional podcasting process was used with only a minor adjustment to capture licence information.[6] The project encouraged the devolved model of content production with the additional CC licence, this has worked well in departments with established teams supporting departmental podcasting activities (e.g. James Martin 21st C School, Said Business School). The project encouraged appropriate use of audio

				versus video to reduce production costs when there was no perceived value to using high cost video (although academics have high expectations and want to produce the highest quality outputs).
The project and materials are high quality	What are the indicators of quality? What quality assurance is in place?	Assessment against quality indicators	Quality/status of contributors, quality of recordings	Quality of the project (and team) can be seen in the fact that more academics recommend to colleagues to become involved, indicating trust and an appropriate level of professionalism. Quality assurance: Quality of content is assured at the academic level, by the speaker themselves and their involvement with the academic activity of the University. Quality of the technical and recording is assured through support, training and technical advice. Quality of the published content is checked for sound quality by project team. Quality of the assets as learning resources is measured by feedback from users, colleagues and peers.
That the streamlined workflow provides maximum benefits to the Institution	Are we maximising benefits to the institution of a single point of ingest to multiple delivery channels	Review of ease of use requirements	Better services for delivery	Consistency of production methods ensure consistency of outputs (benefits quality). Central point of expertise can be called on to support others. Stability of delivery – supported central service versus departmental systems.
That this work is sustainable at Oxford.	Midway through the project all OUCS projects' exit/sustainability plans are reviewed by the user support team (UST) to assess the impacts, benefits, and value of the programme in the broader context and to stimulate discussion with the community of users at Oxford. This monitoring ensures that the project can respond flexibly to changes in the technical and political environment and that it is not overtaken by events. The sustainability of the			By using an existing and established workflow, the project has the best possible chance of continuing when funding stops. Training in podcasting skills and copyright/Creative Commons/open content literacy have become standard offerings at the University.

	'Open Spires' service at Oxford will be considered, evaluated and taken forward by this group. Following this pilot project, OUCS will consider, for an institution-wide OER service:	Adoption of the devolved model of content production has been successful and will continue to be supported by the centre.
	• **Infrastructure** – Hardware, software, hosting, delivery, processes, standards, facilities, maintenance • **Expertise needed** – Competencies, roles, staff, suppliers, outsourcing • **Management** – Leadership, organisation, staffing, administration • **Economic models** – Setup/ongoing costs, investment, income generation, sponsorship • **Marketing** – Strategies for marketing and promotion, training and support • **Legal and intellectual property** – Simplified contributors form, IP rights needed, licensing & legal agreements, digital rights management, software registration • **Risk assessment** and management, including financial risks	One legal form which covers all podcasting activities at the University has been drafted and is awaiting approval by Council. This will significantly ease the burden of paperwork and improve the content contribution process.[7] Significant efforts have been made to market the project internally and externally, and Oxford's podcasting activities have received National press coverage.[8]

[1] See Appendix 1: Summary of Focus Groups.

[2] See Appendix 3: Survey Report.

[3] See Appendix 4: Use Case 1.

[4] See Appendix 9: Training Session Summary.

[5]See Appendix 12: Metadata schema.

[6] See OpenSpires Final Report, *Figure 1: OpenSpires Content Workflow*.

[7] See Appendix 2: Background to the OpenSpires licence.

[8] See Appendix 10: Dissemination Outputs.