



Appendix 6

Opening up by degrees

The Ripple Project Evaluation Report

An independent evaluation report commissioned by the Ripple project, funded under the Higher Education Academy/JISC Open Educational Resources Programme Phase 2

Date: August 2011

Evaluator:

Rhonda Riachi, Learning Development Consultant

Contact:

rhonda@riachi.free-online.co.uk

<http://www.riachi.org.uk>

Opening up by degrees: the Ripple Project Evaluation Report

An independent evaluation report commissioned by the Ripple project, funded under the Higher Education Academy/JISC Open Educational Resources Programme

Section 1: Evaluation report

1. Introduction

The Ripple project brought together academics from two quite different institutions – Harper Adams University College and Oxford Brookes University – under the leadership of a third, the University of Oxford. With their different organisational structures, discipline focus and cultures, the idea of bringing together teams from an agricultural college (with approx 4,000 students), a post-1992 university (approx 18,000 students) and an ancient university (approx 21,000 students) might seem unduly challenging. What they had in common was a willingness to share open educational resources (OER) and to encourage academics in their institutions to make their own learning resources available for others to use. This evaluation report captures the thoughts and feelings of the team leaders from Harper Adams University College and Oxford Brookes University at the end of project, reflecting on the work they accomplished, both collaboratively and in parallel, plus an assessment of the effectiveness of the workshop model and the impact of the Ripple project within their own institution.

2. Method

Telephone interviews were conducted with the two team leaders, Roger Greenhalgh of Harper Adams College and Richard Francis of Oxford Brookes University. The evaluation questions were based on the evaluation plan submitted to the JISC in the project plan, and were agreed in advance with the Ripple Project Manager, Lisa Mansell. Both project partners have been shown the transcripts of their interviews and have approved the comments shown here.

The following section highlights the key issues raised in the interviews, with the responses from Harper Adams University College shown in a sans serif font and those from Oxford Brookes University shown in a serif font. The full responses of the team leaders to the evaluation questions follow in Section 2.

3. Key evaluation points

Effect on the institutions

Looking at the general effect of the project on their institutions, the team leaders cite evidence of both structural and cultural change. Both partners witnessed a learning process unfolding among their staff and an increasing engagement with OER. The organisation and content of the workshops has promoted this process; in effect, the workshops have modelled the principle of sharing that lies at the heart of OER.

The name of the project is very apt – it is like throwing a stone into the pond and seeing the ripples bouncing back and forth... Many more ripples have gone out than I can name here...

It is hard to believe how much change this has seeded. To do something complicated, the received wisdom was to get in the consultants, and then they go away again... now, instead of getting in the consultants or sending people off on training, we exchange and share; we invite our colleagues to come to an event here and we disseminate what we find.

We were right not to think of it as a project to produce OER, but to stimulate the process. The value lies in direct influence on infrastructure and processes... The project has accelerated the pace of development both on workflows and infrastructure for wider scale release of OER... The main way has been learning from others – a range of experts through the workshops who have been through this process – not only Oxford but also the Open University, Coventry, etc.

Benefits of the Ripple model

When asked about the support they had received from the Oxford University Ripple project team, the response was very positive. The workshops provided a suitable forum for exploration, learning and discussion. In addition, Ripple project staff have been providing an ad hoc ‘consultancy service’ by attending meetings or events at the partner institutions to offer advice, guidance and generally share their experiences. The provision of consultancy services has been welcomed.

Yes, [this was the right forum] very much so; the project has given us huge confidence at this end. ... I chose to bring a slightly different mix of people to each workshop, and the knock-on effect has been really motivating... We probably would have found things [about OER] without Ripple, but Ripple provided the conviction and I did not have to “sell” the ideas any more.

Yes – I am really upbeat about it. People who attended also agree. It has strengthened the relationship between the two institutions [Oxford Brookes and Oxford University]. ... The range of topics was good and expertise very good. We were very happy to host a workshop and it worked very well; we felt fully in partnership... The formats were good. The offer of consultancy is being taken up now...

Participation in the workshops

Encouraging participation in the workshops was an important role for the team leaders. Both institutions brought a different group of people to each workshop. This might have made for some discontinuity, yet the overriding impression was that the influence of the project was broadened as a result.

I handpicked people who I knew would be receptive. They came back enthusiastic and then I needed to find a way to sustain that. The most obvious change was that we triggered their confidence to engage a bit wider with others and other institutions. It has helped to support team growth in a way that was not happening before.

The onus was on me to convene the right people for each workshop... [A colleague] from the marketing team only came to one workshop, but it allowed him to feed what was going on in RADAR [the Oxford Brookes repository] back to the marketing strategy (in time for the review) as well as RIPPLE.

Involving senior colleagues at their institutions was a challenge, as their diaries tend to fill up faster than most. Although they were generally not successful in getting senior management participation, both team leaders felt that it did not matter as they had been able to influence and involve senior staff in other ways.

We got others from the Marketing dept but not the Head of Marketing. There was not enough lead-in time to get them interested (needs 8 to 10 weeks in advance to get it into their diaries). That's not anyone's fault and in the end it did not matter, as those who attended have spread the word and got the ideas raised with the senior people.

On one occasion I would have liked a more senior person from Marketing along – it is important to try hard to get the right people there. I have since engineered a meeting between the Ripple team and our Pro-Vice Chancellor at a recent Learning and Teaching Conference.

At Oxford Brookes the influence of the Ripple project on senior-decision decision makers has led to new policy developments. Whilst the cultures of Oxford University and Oxford Brookes are very different, the example of how the former had implemented podcasting has inspired the latter to find their own way to implement the approach.

Ripple did not teach us how to do podcasts nor did it set out to do this, because the Oxford approach to podcasting would inevitably be different to ours; but it has drawn support for the development of iTunesU from the Chief Information Officer at OBU, directly as a result of our involvement in Ripple.

Staff at Harper Adams University College were both challenged and inspired by their exposure to other institutional cultures and by the ethos of sharing resources across the sector. This has also been reflected in more recognition for their work within the college, so the “Ripple effect” has been particularly beneficial.

One of our technical staff decided to write something about what we had done on QuestionMark for a conference; I would never have expected that before. Now all the staff are more confident to engage with other institutions and have a better understanding of the big picture... [Another] one of our technical staff won the Developer Challenge at a computing conference with a proof of concept regarding a technical development; he engaged with that because he could see how it would benefit the wider community. What was important was that it was a national gathering and the Principal understood what a great resource the team are.

In addition to the workshops the project partners were encouraged to contact staff in the project team for advice. Both partners were enthusiastic to build a community of practice around the project in order to sustain their efforts in the longer term. Communications between the partners and with the project team have been good, and a limited ‘consultancy’ service and sharing of good practice continues.

There has been a series of ad hoc conversations – one of our e-learning staff is involved in video work and has got into email exchanges with CM at OUCS [Ripple Technical Officer], bouncing ideas off each other. Having established common ground we are able to network and exchange ideas and contribute to the wider community, adding more bricks to the foundation.

Readiness for wider OER release

In assessing their institution's state of readiness for producing OER, both partners agreed that the means and the will to do so were evident. The Ripple project had helped to seed a change which they felt would continue, even in the face of cuts to budgets and the reorganisation of staff.

Whilst we probably still have 80% Luddites on our staff, there is something which has joined up the 20% who are now innovators. If you are a lone innovator you get ground down. But an initiative that helps people to focus and to realise that they are part of a groundswell gives a threshold effect; you can keep rekindling that spirit to keep going.

We can't go straight to open release with many items but now there is increased activity, and some new items will now go straight to OER or via the intermediate stage of the teaching collection within RADAR. It's opening up by degrees. [The project] has put us in a position to issue guidelines and prime the pump...

With regard to how the efforts would be sustained once the project was over, both partners felt their internal support would be sufficient to keep up momentum. The OER approach has influenced policy makers in both institutions.

What we now have is a significant investment in the infrastructure so that all staff are able to produce high quality material and can find a way to put them into OER. Although the OpenFields [an open educational repository for land-based materials] funding has been pulled, the college will continue to underwrite that resource.

People are already lining up to release materials. The RADAR steering group meeting in July will develop recommendations for approval by our Executive Board... Ripple has helped us to identify the need to place a strategic emphasis on identifying suitable OERs at programme level as part of curriculum development and review, and on what are the reasons for doing OER and its relevance to us.

Cultural differences

The cultural and structural differences between the two partners and Oxford University were obvious from the outset. Again, in other circumstances this might have created a barrier to sharing, but their experience in the workshops was of a genuine, open exchange of views, and the insights gained were applicable to their own institutions. A key theme here is of gaining the confidence to make the changes in one's own environment by seeing how others' have achieved change in theirs.

Oxford University went into iTunesU with a fairly naïve approach – they did not ask all the questions they have advised us to ask *a priori*. But they chose the kind of OER material to release very sensibly and knew very well how to get academics on board (gaining an international audience and marketing, etc) so they had the confidence to go ahead. By sharing that approach - very honestly, warts and all, so to speak - they gave us confidence.

At the beginning of the project there were concerns from JISC about the different cultures of the organisations involved... Some comments at this end were that some of the Oxford stuff was not taken seriously originally, viz: "we're not in that league – they have the money to do this." That mindset has changed now...

Exchange projects like Ripple can serve to both highlight and overcome differences in culture. The workshop process – discussing what has been done, why and how – provides a reflective space in which educational staff can examine their own situations and compare and contrast with their peers. In the relaxed exchanges organised by the Ripple project the teams experienced a feeling of camaraderie, and the team members were encouraged to feel more confident in their ability to introduce and promote OER in their own institutions.

The main way has been learning from others – a range of experts through the workshops who have been through this process – not only Oxford but also the Open University, Coventry, etc. Secondly, it is about confidence, raising the profile through a number of people and feeling confident in own expertise and that we are not alone in confronting these issues...

It is difficult to prove – and perhaps erroneous to expect – that an institution’s culture can be changed by a short project like Ripple, but we can say that the influence of the project’s activities has been felt by both institutions, perhaps more apparent at Harper Adams University College than at Oxford Brookes University. This is not surprising, given that they were starting from a different baseline when the project began, and Harper Adams University College is a much smaller institution than Oxford Brookes University. Asked whether there had been a change of culture, they responded:

Yes and it is going very far. It’s even got to the point where the audio-visual staff want to attend a workshop, and now they want to move to my department (instead of the estates department).

Yes, but it would be over-egging to say that the project did that. However, Ripple has helped us to identify the need to place a strategic emphasis on identifying suitable OERs at programme level as part of [the] curriculum development and review [process], and on what are the reasons for doing OER and its relevance to us.

Extending the reach of educational materials

Through the podcasting examples demonstrated by the Ripple team, both institutions saw at firsthand how OER could be used as marketing tools. This has brought the project to the attention of senior staff and has proven a powerful incentive for policy makers to engage with OER. Institutional resources whose value was previously seen to be dependent on their scarcity now take on a new value as they become available to the public.

The RAE used to measure impact by the quantity of research publications in reputable journals; now there is a new impact in the open arena via Google and it provides a great marketing tool. One of our resources now comes top of a Google search. We are repurposing formerly turgid research into something usable that gives you credibility that other materials could never give.

Now there is a strong interest in using teaching materials as marketing. Attending the Ripple workshop has helped [a colleague from the marketing department] to make the case for openly accessible, authentic teaching materials being used for marketing, something which was also recommended by a third-party review of the communications strategy.

4. Conclusion

The Ripple project has been a productive learning process for the teams at both Oxford Brookes University and Harper Adams University College. The differences between the institutions, rather than being a barrier, served to provide a welcome fresh perspective on the topic of how to embark on the development of OER. Both academic and technical staff in the two institutions have been able to develop their OER practice and influence their colleagues.

From a policy perspective the project has enabled significant change in a short period of time, influencing decision-making in both institutions. In addition to sustaining their efforts in OER within

the institutions, the goodwill generated by this collaboration has inspired further co-operative efforts that will extend well beyond the end of the project's life. Within the ethos of sharing educational resources for the benefit of all, which is the guiding principle of OER, this is an exemplary project.

Section 2: Evaluation question and responses

Note: Some names have been rewritten as initials to protect individual's identities.

Evaluation questions	Harper Adams College	Oxford Brookes University
<p>Looking at the effect of the Ripple team support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Did they fulfil the project aims? • Did workshop delivery give an appropriate level of support? • Was this the right forum to get the message to the right people? 	<p>This was the right forum, very much so; the project has given us huge confidence at this end. At the beginning of the project there were concerns from JISC about the different cultures of the organisations involved. Our IT team have been under-confident about their own abilities and where they fit in the grand scheme of things. I chose to bring a slightly different mix of people to each workshop, and the knock-on effect has been really motivating.</p> <p>One of our technical staff decided to write something about what we had done on QuestionMark for a conference; I would never have expected that before. Now all the staff are more confident to engage with other institutions and have a better understanding of the big picture.</p>	<p>Yes – I am really upbeat about it. People who attended also agree. It has strengthened the relationship between the two institutions [Oxford Brookes and Oxford University]. The input was very useful in different ways. The onus was on me to convene the right people for each workshop; on occasion I didn't quite feel that the order or the timing was right to get the right people – not a failing on anyone's part. PR [Ripple Principal Investigator] did acknowledge that a copyright session was not the best place to start; a bit daunting to start on.</p> <p>However, the range of topics was good and expertise very good. We were very happy to host a workshop and it worked very well; we felt fully in partnership. There was a danger that if we had not hosted the workshop we would have felt too passive and the difference between institutions might have become a negative factor.</p>
<p>Was the time invested by staff attending worthwhile?</p>	<p>Definitely. Now they can attend other events and know they can contribute. The thing we struggled most with was getting senior people to attend. We got others from the marketing dept but not the head of marketing. There was not enough lead-in time to get them interested (needs 8 to 10 weeks in advance to get it into their diaries). That's not anyone's fault and in the end it did not matter, as those who attended have spread the word and got the ideas raised with the senior people.</p>	<p>Yes, absolutely. On one occasion I would have liked a more senior person from Marketing along – it is important to try hard to get the right people there. I have since engineered a meeting between the Ripple team and our Pro-Vice-Chancellor at a recent Learning and Teaching Conference.</p>
<p>How and when are the different means of</p>	<p>Through the workshops we were pointed to lots of literature (e.g. Web2Rights) which I had known about and</p>	<p>The formats were good. The offer of consultancy is</p>

Evaluation questions	Harper Adams College	Oxford Brookes University
<p>sharing expertise effective? E.g. workshops, mentoring, shared workflows, documentation, guidance, CAMEL process...</p>	<p>had pushed to colleagues in the past. When my colleagues attended they got the message that they needed to do something about it – it acted as positive reinforcement. We probably would have found things without Ripple, but Ripple provided the conviction and I did not have to “sell” the ideas any more.</p> <p>Mentoring: MW (at Oxford Brookes) is now working with LA at Harper Adams – a sort of mutual mentorship, bidding for more funds to develop resources. Some mentoring is about OER and some concerning the subject area.</p> <p>There has been a series of ad hoc conversations – one of our e-learning staff is involved in video work and has got into email exchanges with Carl Marshall at OUCS [Ripple Technical Officer], bouncing ideas off each other. Having established common ground we are able to network and exchange ideas and contribute to the wider community, adding more bricks to the foundation.</p> <p>The name of the project is very apt – it is like throwing a stone into the pond and seeing the ripples bouncing back and forth.</p>	<p>being taken up now – we recently hosted a visit from RW (from OSSWatch at OUCS – an expert on Creative Commons, etc). As a result the group who met him will meet again in July to thrash out the OER licensing. A set of guidelines will be created and taken to our Executive Board.</p> <p>I also had conversations on the phone with PR [Ripple Principal Investigator] – very helpful.</p> <p>One thing that did not work, sadly, was the suggestion of blogging. OBU hosted the wiki – no problems there, and we also suggested adding it to the Oxford blog, but we could not get it to work (but this is not a major thing).</p> <p>PR [Ripple Principal Investigator] has now set up a WordPress blog to share resources and peer review them; explore the question of re-use. “Is the difference between the institutions an issue?” (said a JISC reviewer) – I hope that it will still be possible to use this forum to review the materials. It is a bit late in the day, but we have identified common ground (e.g. each institution has some medical resources of relevance to the others).</p>
<p>What intentions to pursue OER release have arisen from the workshops?</p>	<p>There have been a few. For example, one of the items at the OBU workshop on geography has sparked another idea here to release more items to OER. Many more ripples have gone out than I can name here.</p>	<p>We were right not to think of it as a project to produce OER, but to stimulate the process. The value lies in direct influence on infrastructure and processes. My colleague SB has got a lot out of it – the drive to harvest materials and disseminate to other destinations (OAIPMH protocol); he has developed scripts with others to embed RADAR OERs in web pages.</p>

Evaluation questions	Harper Adams College	Oxford Brookes University
		<p>The project has accelerated the pace of development both on workflows and infrastructure for wider scale release of OER. I have tried to build this into the transition to Moodle – we will be looking at using RADAR as the back-end for Moodle. We are viewing this as an open VLE, as opposed to the current institutional silo – I have worked to make Ripple relevant to OBU, by setting up an Open Architecture for the LMS and by enabling the sharing of resources that are strategically important for the implementation of our student engagement strategy (SESE).</p>
<p>Has the programme support enabled increased awareness locally?</p>	<p>Yes, definitely.</p>	<p>Yes, it has helped enormously – a big impact on a significant group of interested staff. Next stage is to cascade knowledge out – e.g. following on from the success in the School of Health and Social Care, the marketing teams in other departments and faculties now want taster resources for their sites too.</p>
<p>What was the effect of different staff attending the workshops?</p>	<p>I handpicked people who I knew would be receptive. They came back enthusiastic and then I needed to find a way to sustain that. The most obvious change was that we triggered their confidence to engage a bit wider with others and other institutions. It has helped to support team growth in a way that was not happening before.</p> <p>Another example – RB, one of our technical staff, won the Developer Challenge at a computing conference with a proof of concept regarding a technical development; he engaged with that because he could see how it would benefit the wider community. What was important was that it was a national gathering and the Principal understood what a great resource the team are. A few weeks later, when looking at the Matterhorn platform, I went to UC Berkeley in California to meet the developers and Principal was “gobsmacked” (his word) that people at</p>	<p>It worked well – e.g. TG from the marketing team only came to one workshop, but it allowed him to feed what was going on in RADAR back to the marketing strategy (in time for the review) as well as RIPPLE. Now there is a strong interest in using teaching materials as marketing. I chose him to come (the head of dept could not attend) because he was already trying to influence University marketing strategies in the direction of OER. Attending the Ripple workshop has helped Tim make the case for openly accessible, authentic teaching materials being used for marketing, something which was also recommended by a third-party review of the communications strategy.</p>

Evaluation questions	Harper Adams College	Oxford Brookes University
	Berkeley were prepared to meet us.	
<p>Has the number of people engaged in OER release increased?</p>	<p>Yes – there are about 20 staff engaged in OER now. This will be reflected in our case study.</p>	<p>Yes – this will be reflected in the health care case study.</p> <p>PR [Ripple Principal Investigator] said he did not expect there to be so much activity going on, as the project was about testing the water. We have reaped the benefit of having RADAR in place – people are now getting used to it and policies are being developed.</p> <p>This is as much to do with the increased push for engagement with RADAR by the team and thinking carefully about how to increase OER through advice and support – e.g. licensing guidance, in-house training courses. We can't go straight to Open Release with many items but now there is increased activity, and some new items will now go straight to OER or via the intermediate stage of the teaching collection within RADAR. It's opening up by degrees. This has put us in a position to issue guidelines and prime the pump.</p>
<p>Are you ready for more widespread release of OER? What steps are being taken to sustain the process?</p>	<p>Yes. We have lost staff because of the loss of HEIF funding; we had taken on five interns to produce learning materials through the HEIF funds and their jobs were going, but now we have found funding to retain two of them to the end of October on a trial basis. What we now have is a significant investment in the infrastructure so that all staff are able to produce high quality material and can find a way to put them into OER. Although OpenFields funding has been pulled, the college will continue to underwrite that resource.</p>	<p>Yes – we are much more ready now.</p> <p>The meeting with RW has led directly to the next phase of writing guidelines for appropriate licensing for OER release; then embedding RADAR into the VLE upgrade so that sharing of resources happens more widely in the university, and identifying more items for release. People are already lining up to release materials. The RADAR steering group meeting in July will develop recommendations for approval by our Executive Board.</p>

Evaluation questions	Harper Adams College	Oxford Brookes University
<p>How does your institution manifest OER readiness? How does this change through engagement with an OER project?</p>	<p>Contact with the outside world is part of this. It is hard to believe how much change this has seeded. To do something complicated the received wisdom was to get in the consultants, then they go away again. A lot of stuff never got more widely disseminated because it was not easy enough to do and it relied on a strong technical team.</p> <p>At the same time as we got involved in Ripple my role changed to Head of Information Services, so I had the opportunity to shape the IT team to work differently. My aim is shape the cultural change in the team and thus in the institution. So now, instead of getting in the consultants or sending people off on training, we exchange and share; we invite our colleagues to come to an event here and we disseminate what we find.</p>	<p>The main way has been learning from others – a range of experts through the workshops who have been through this process – not only Oxford but also the Open University, Coventry, etc. Secondly, it is about confidence, raising the profile through a number of people and feeling confident in own expertise and that we are not alone in confronting these issues. Thirdly, it is about obliging ourselves to find the time to integrate this work into the strategic development of the institution (e.g. the student experience strategy) – it demands that you think strategically.</p> <p>Our readiness is shown by having workflows in place, knowledgeable staff, and provision of and attendance at workshops, e.g. on copyright and contribution to RADAR.</p>
<p>Has there been a culture change in your institution and how far does that go?</p>	<p>Yes, and it is going very far. It's even got to the point where the audio-visual staff want to attend a workshop and now they want to move to my department (instead of the estates department).</p>	<p>Yes, but it would be over-egging to say that the project did that. However, Ripple has helped us to identify the need to place a strategic emphasis on identifying suitable OERs at programme level as part of curriculum development and review, and on what are the reasons for doing OER and its relevance to us.</p>
<p>How do cultures of OER release, adoption and use differ, e.g. between different kinds of institution or between FE colleges and HEIs?</p>	<p>Some comments at this end were that some of the Oxford stuff was not taken seriously originally, viz: “we’re not in that league – they have the money to do this.” That mindset has changed now. The LandEx group of colleges we are in (along with Sparsholt College, etc) are mostly FE rather than HE and have much smaller IT teams and don’t have the capability to engage with this; it is hugely difficult to get them involved. Maybe we can show some leadership and do something that will influence the sector. There were some suspicions of competition in the past.</p> <p>The RAE used to measure impact by the quantity of</p>	<p>Clearly there are differences between Oxford and OBU and HA; we have tended to work in parallel rather than in conjunction. Ripple did not teach us how to do podcasts nor did it set out to do this, because the Oxford approach to podcasting would inevitably be different to ours; but it has drawn support for development of iTunesU from the Chief Information Officer at OBU, directly as a result of our involvement in Ripple. We have not involved our FE college partners in this, so it is difficult to say how it would work with them.</p>

Evaluation questions	Harper Adams College	Oxford Brookes University
	<p>research publications in reputable journals; now there is a new impact in the open arena via Google and it provides a great marketing tool. One of our resources now comes top of a Google search. We are repurposing formerly turgid research into something usable that gives you credibility that other materials could never give.</p>	
<p>In what ways does an institutional culture manifest in different approaches to OER?</p>	<p>Whilst we probably still have 80% Luddites on our staff, there is something which has joined up the 20% who are now innovators. If you are a lone innovator you get ground down. But an initiative that helps people to focus and to realise that they are part of a groundswell gives a threshold effect; you can keep rekindling that spirit to keep going. The technology can be relatively easy to fix; it's the people that are hardest to get right!</p>	<p>Oxford University went into iTunesU with a fairly naïve approach – they did not ask all the questions they have advised us to ask <i>a priori</i>. But they chose the kind of OER material to release very sensibly and knew very well how to get academics on board (gaining an international audience and marketing, etc) so they had the confidence to go ahead. By sharing that approach - very honestly, warts and all, so to speak - they gave us confidence. They could see that our resources were more about teaching and learning as opposed to lectures. There were moments when we felt “it’s all very well for you, but our set-up is quite different...”, but we were always able to air these differences and gain insights from them.</p>
<p>What OER releases have you achieved through the project?</p>	<p>In summary: there is a combination of things not released at this point because of a hiccup, but they are in progress.</p> <p>1) We have a couple of thousand images for a joint institutional repository, OpenFields, and are planning to use a third client to syndicate to JORUM. Problem was that the images swamped the repository so we are now trying to refine the search engine – perhaps we were too successful!</p> <p>When the HEIF funding came to an end we were expecting renewal; but the funding formular has changed and we were not successful in our bid, so some staff are now being made redundant. My ability to correct the OpenFields problem has been put on hold and I had to down tools. I have now chosen a different tool - Asset</p>	<p>There are three main collections in progress. PR [Ripple Principal Investigator] had said it was not about quantity but more about setting ourselves up for the process, and putting ourselves into a position to develop OER on a larger scale later. So we do not have large collections of stuff at present, but the three areas in progress are:</p> <p>1) Health: a set of taster materials (3 objects, with more in preparation), which are teaching materials in RADAR (our RLO repository), as a resource for the School of Health & Social Care to market their programmes – a clear purpose was identified, workflows identified and the repository has been used to the full. The Faculty web developer has been</p>

Evaluation questions	Harper Adams College	Oxford Brookes University
	<p>Bank, run by the marketing department. We will revamp that tool and move all OER materials through that. We are trying to integrate that with www.RLO-harperadams.ac.uk (a public web site) and will then pass materials onto JORUM – probably about two months away.</p> <p>About 2,000 objects are waiting to be released. These are now going through the rights clearance process with individual staff, having identified what they would be happy to release. Metadata need to be refined to make them findable – annotations, etc – this is my homework over the summer. About 6 staff are involved.</p> <p>2) Video materials: we have about 20 of suitable quality to release; some snapshots are available through the RLO site. We are doing a media server migration now and when done will pass the videos onto JORUM. Experience of doing this made us realise that doing this manually did not make sense, so we decided to go for a lecture capture platform. Having been involved with the STEEPLE project and the Matterhorn platform, and seen that there are people who can support the product, we have gone for that. We are looking to streamline the OER production process and build a robust framework for seamless method of producing video to media server and syndicated to YouTube. Deployment is planned for over the summer in time for September.</p> <p>3) From an earlier project, funded by the university modernisation fund, we have had people building question banks (MCQs) to gather a volume of assessment materials until the end of March. We will release these as OERs in order to get others to add to them. Three subject areas – veterinary and animal health. The serendipity of that product generation has fed into the Ripple project; I am now checking through the material to get as much as possible into OER. We are keen to get this done, as the OER phase 3 bids have been published and we want to bid again.</p>	<p>able to take an RSS feed of the outputs in RADAR and embed it on the public course web pages. This has come a long way in a short time, thanks to OER being understood as a strategic step in a move towards online distance learning. There has been a 50% increase in applications to the course since the taster materials were put up. This is being worked up as a case study and is already cascading to other departments in Faculty. Other Faculties are also expressing interest.</p> <p>2) Primate conservation: a collection of images of primates and their habitats. Numbers are low but rising – there is potential for several hundred; we anticipate that a large part of the collection will be available by the end of the project, but there are issues about staff time (the staff member is doing this from home and the lead academic has left). We chose this collection because the lead academic was very keen to make it available and because we had few worries about copyright; all images are in-house and not complex to put on RADAR. There has been an issue with getting permission where students had taken the photos but are no longer at Brookes.</p> <p>3) Resources on theology & religion: the reason to put these in OER was because the dept are very anxious to reach a wider audience and producing stuff relevant to other subject areas. This is a non-homogenous set of resources and in different formats, 40 or 50 resources. Issues about copyright: some resources were created as result of a study trip to India and were associated with a fellowship project (one contributor); the partner in India is asserting copyright, and negotiations are in progress, so this is not OER in JISC terms yet. The focus in these</p>

Evaluation questions	Harper Adams College	Oxford Brookes University
		<p>resources is on inter-disciplinarity and we are looking at how they are reused by the students; students will create their own resources in future in the course of their assignments. The resources cover topics relevant to philosophy, history, sociology, and theology and religion courses, so there is no reason why they could not be used by others.</p> <p>There is other material now in the public domain and created alongside the project (cf the material presented at the OBU Ripple workshop). Those staff benefited just as much as those engaged in Ripple – it was a really fortuitous convergence (e.g. the Power of Experience project by Laura Novo de Azevedo, Lecturer in Planning and Urban Design). This dimension is as much to do with student engagement and student-generated OERs: this is a difference between the Oxford Brookes and Oxford University approach to OER.</p> <p>One example is “A guide to interpreting originality reports in Turnitin” – by Lindsay Williams, OBU Business School. She develops resources for induction of first year UGs. This was put in RADAR and also put on YouTube – we would not have taken that step were it not for Ripple. The focus of this kind of resource is different from those from Oxford University.</p> <p>Also in parallel with and benefitting from Ripple is a collection images of people and events at Brookes taken by our Media Workshop photographic team. Called The Album, it currently contains over 100 images with the potential to reach 400. This has given us experience of handling image collections - all available as OER with CC-NC-ND licence.</p>

Evaluation questions	Harper Adams College	Oxford Brookes University
		<p>At the same time we have been involved in another JISC-funded OER project - 2012 Legacies for Learning - to build a collection of open resources for educational use on the organisation of the Olympic and Paralympic Games and their legacy, led by the HLST Subject Centre. I offered RADAR as a host for the outputs of this; there will be over 100 educational resources when finished in July. This contains case studies and discussion starters, official documents related to the planning of the 2012 Games and other resources to promote research into the Olympics and Paralympics including a range of Routledge publications.</p>