

Summary of JISC response to the recommendations in the 2007 report 'Web 2.0 for Content for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education', by Tom Franklin and Mark van Harmelen¹.

Neil Jacobs <n.jacobs@jisc.ac.uk>

JISC welcomes this timely and well-researched report, which offers some useful pointers in a rapidly emerging field. Some of the recommendations bearing on advice and guidance to the sector are being addressed by a JISC briefing paper to be published very shortly. This document outlines some responses by JISC to the recommendations in the report, and has been written both to let the community know what JISC is doing and planning in this area, and to stimulate further discussion. In each case, JISC's response (if any) is given in *italic* after the appropriate recommendation. For easy access, recommendation numbering refers to recommendation ordering in the report.

Recommendation 1: Guidelines should not be so prescriptive as to stifle the experimentation that is needed with Web 2.0 and learning and teaching that is necessary to take full advantage of the possibilities offered by this new technology.

JISC endorses this approach.

Content

Recommendation 4: JISC should consider funding work looking at long-term access to student created content once they have left the university with the aim of developing good practice guides.

JISC is currently funding a survey of institutional retention policies in HE and FE², with respect to elearning materials. Any further JISC work specifically on student-created content would build on the report from that survey, which is due September 2007.

Recommendation 6: JISC should consider funding a study to look at how repositories can be used to provide end-user (i.e. referrer) archiving services for material that is referenced in academic published material, including Internet journal papers. Part of this consideration should extend to copyright issues.

This is an ambitious goal bearing in mind, for example, the technical and legal challenges. JISC has funded some work that may lay the foundations for this goal, such as a project to identify the significant properties³ of elearning materials (what needs to be preserved for them to remain useful), and has a stake in the UK Web Archiving Consortium⁴. JISC Legal⁵ can offer advice on the copyright issues. As the report notes, wikis offer reasonable versioning and roll-back functionality.

Recommendation 17: JISC should consider commissioning studies to explore i) the accessibility issues of various commonly used Web 2.0 technologies, and how any limits can be overcome, and ii) case studies on how Web 2.0 technologies can enhance accessibility.

JISC and TechDis⁶ are in discussions relating to guidance for the sector in this area.

¹ Web 2.0 for Content for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education': http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_digital_repositories/project_web2_and_policy.aspx

² Retention of learning materials: a survey of institutional policies and practice: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_digital_repositories/retentionlearningmaterials.aspx

³ See the INSPECT project: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_rep_pres/inspect.aspx

⁴ UK Web Archiving Consortium: <http://www.webarchive.org.uk/>

⁵ JISC Legal: <http://www.jisclegal.ac.uk/>

⁶ TechDis: <http://www.techdis.ac.uk/>

Learning and teaching

Recommendation 2: JISC should consider funding projects investigating how institutional repositories can be made more accessible for learning and teaching through the use of Web 2.0 technologies, including tagging, folksonomies and social software.

JISC endorses this ambition, has included relevant sections in recent calls for proposals, as a result has funded projects in this area (for example, SPIRE⁷, Rich Tags⁸, PROWE⁹), and will continue to do so.

Recommendation 10: JISC should consider funding experiments with new forms of teaching that utilise Web 2.0 systems, and should consider funding the development of new Web 2.0 tools specifically for the educational domain, including those that allow pedagogic experimentation.

JISC endorses this approach, and will hope to take forward work in this area within the 'e-learning'¹⁰ and 'Users and Innovation'¹¹ programmes.

Recommendation 11: JISC should consider funding research, and build up a bank of case studies, on how Web 2.0 impacts pedagogy. This should include the impact of implementing these technologies on institutions, teaching staff, support staff and students.

Relevant work has already been undertaken (for example, in the Digital Libraries in the Classroom programme¹² and in the Learner Experiences studies¹³), and more will follow. However, there might also be value in assessing how case studies are effectively used to inform and promote change in institutions. Furthermore, any case studies involving Web2.0 technologies should be commissioned and treated in the same way as other case studies, focusing on the pedagogic practice rather than the technology. Case study outputs from JISC-funded projects should be deposited in Jorum to ensure ongoing wide availability.

Recommendation 12: JISC should urgently consider funding work that looks in detail at problems in the assessment of group work that uses Web 2.0 tools.

Relevant work may be in scope under future calls for proposals in the e-learning programme, but may need to recognise that the focus would be on established questions and practices relating to pedagogy and assessment, rather than specifically on Web2.0 technologies. Such questions include those of plagiarism and attribution, and the definition and presentation of the student work.

Recommendation 14: JISC should consider funding projects to develop a range of assessment methods suitable for application in the context of developing Web 2.0 pedagogies. This might be in the context of a larger programme encompassing pedagogies, assessment methods and Web 2.0 tools for learning, teaching and assessment.

See (12), above.

Recommendation 18: JISC, possibly in conjunction with the Higher Education Academy and QAA, should produce briefings and advice for validating bodies on the implications of Web 2.0 for learning, teaching and especially for assessment that can inform their work. This advice would have to be kept up to date.

JISC will consider this further, although the principles of good practice are the same regardless of technology.

⁷ SPIRE project:

http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_digital_repositories/project_spire.aspx

⁸ Rich Tags project: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_rep_pres/rich_tags.aspx

⁹ PROWE project:

http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_digital_repositories/project_prowe.aspx

¹⁰ JISC e-learning strategic theme: <http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/themes/elearning.aspx>

¹¹ Users & innovation programme: personalising technologies:

http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_users_and_innovation.aspx

¹² Digital Libraries in the Classroom programme:

http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/programmes/programme_dlitc.aspx

¹³ JISC Learner Experience studies: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/elp_learnerexperience

Policy

Recommendation 3: JISC should consider funding work looking at the legal aspects of ownership and IPR, including responsibility for infringements in terms of IPR, with the aim of developing good practice guides to support open creation and re-use of material.

There is a good basis already built for this work, such as proposed, current and recent projects undertaken by JISC Legal and the JISC IPR Consultancy¹⁴, for example focusing on student-created content. Further work has now been commissioned looking specifically at IPR and copyright issues.

Recommendation 5: JISC should consider organising a workshop to look at forms of moderation (including peer moderation) and control of Web 2.0 content, with the aim of providing institutions with practical advice and examples of good practice.

There is good advice on this topic already (for example, see Gilly Salmon's book 'E-moderating: The key to teaching and learning online'). Further work will certainly review and update this in the light of developments.

Recommendation 7: JISC should consider funding work to look at how widespread the use of "googling" candidates as part of selection procedures is, and consider producing advice and guidance to institutions and staff and students on the potentially permanent nature of postings.

Some survey work has already been done, for example by Poolia¹⁵. Further work in the education sector may well be justified.

Recommendation 8: JISC should consider funding studies looking at the risks to the institution associated with internally and externally hosted Web 2.0 services, and ways in which the risks can be controlled and mitigated. This could be done within the wider context of examining risks associated with Web 2.0, web services and Service Oriented Architectures.

The report itself has begun this work, which will be continued within various JISC programmes including the e-learning programme (Technology Enhanced Learning Environments), work within the organisational support area, the e-Framework for education and research¹⁶ and elsewhere. However, it is worth noting that the UK Web Focus initiative run by Brian Kelly at UKOLN has already begun to address this area¹⁷.

Recommendation 15: JISC should ask the JISC Plagiarism Advisory Service to produce guidance on Web 2.0 and its implications for plagiarism that supports the use of Web 2.0 in learning, teaching and assessment.

The issues with respect to plagiarism are likely to be independent of the technologies, and so the advice currently offered by the JISC Plagiarism Advisory Service¹⁸ is probably sufficient. However, this report does offer some pointers that the JISC Plagiarism Advisory Service will find useful in planning future advice and guidance.

Recommendation 16: Universities should actively monitor practice and law over control of content in a Web 2.0 environment, and update their policies accordingly.

Universities will be doing this as a part of their routine scanning and policy development activities, and – for example – will be reviewing the terms and conditions of use of popular Web2.0 services to ensure that they do not pose a risk to either the institution or its members. Advice from JISC and JISC Legal will help in this area.

¹⁴ JISC Development IPR Consultancy: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/whatwedo/projects/ipr_consultancy.aspx

¹⁵ Poolia: 'Employers make the most of Internet networking sites to find out more about their prospective employees': http://www.poolia.co.uk/cms/about/pr_ir?news_id=57

¹⁶ e-Framework for education and research: <http://www.e-framework.org/>

¹⁷ UK Web Focus: Risk Assessment For Use Of Third Party Web 2.0 Services:

<http://ukwebfocus.wordpress.com/2006/11/17/risk-assessment-for-use-of-third-party-web-20-services/>

¹⁸ JISC Plagiarism Advisory Service: <http://www.jiscpas.ac.uk/>

Recommendation 19: JISC should consider organising workshops on the implications for personal security of the use of Web 2.0 technologies for learning and teaching, with the aim of producing guidance to the community.

The JISC is considering this.

Recommendation 20: JISC, together with other interested groups such as Becta, the NHS and TTA, should develop model policies on personal security that universities can adapt to meet their own needs.

The JISC is considering this.

Recommendation 21: JISC should consider funding a workshop to consider current practice and determine how best to balance the issues of openness of safety, with the aim of producing guidance to the community.

The JISC is considering this.

Technology

Recommendation 9: JISC should consider funding projects or case studies that look at different methods for integrating Web 2.0 into the overall university information and information technology environment while retaining flexibility of use across teaching, learning, administration and other areas of university activity.

This area of work is already in scope for JISC development programmes in the e-learning, information environment and users and innovation areas. The challenges are considerable, and cross organisational, cultural, legal and technological boundaries.

Recommendation 13: JISC should consider funding projects to develop web-based tools to assist in ongoing monitoring of group process and in the assessment of group work, taking into account individual effort within the group.

The underlying issue of group work and assessment is technology-neutral. Where group assessment is prevalent – where group-based or problem-based learning is widespread – then appropriate tools will be in scope for work within some areas of the e-learning programme, and this work is likely to raise challenges and opportunities of wider interest. However, online summative assessment should not necessarily include more monitoring of group processes than conventional summative assessment.