

HEFCE/JISC/Academy Open Educational Resources Grant Funding

<b>Cover Sheet for Proposals</b> <i>(All sections must be completed)</i>		<b>JISC/Academy Open Educational Resources Programme</b>			
<b>Name of Initiative:</b>		<b>Open Educational Resources</b>			
<b>Programme bid to:</b>	<b>Individual</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Institutional</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<b>Subject area</b>
<b>Name of Lead Institution:</b>		<b>Coventry University</b>			
<b>Name of individual:</b>					
<b>Subject area:</b>					
<b>Name of Proposed Project:</b>		<b>Open Content Employability Project (OCEP)</b>			
<b>Name(s) of Project Partner(s):</b>		<b>None</b>			
<b>Full Contact Details for Primary Contact:</b>					
Name:	Professor David Morris				
Position:	Director of Higher Education Development				
Email:	d.morris@coventry.ac.uk				
Tel:	07974 984023				
Address:	Coventry University, Coventry, CV1 5FB				
<b>Length of Project:</b>		<b>12 Months</b>			
<b>Project Start Date:</b>	<b>1 April 2009</b>	<b>Project End Date:</b>	<b>31 March 2010</b>		
<b>Total Funding Requested from JISC/Academy:</b>		<b>£248,107</b>			
<b>Total Institutional Contributions:</b>		<b>£248,107</b>			
<b>Outline Project Description</b>					
<p>OCEP will deliver a minimum of 360 CATS points of undergraduate open education resources. Coventry University is a <b>business-facing institution</b> and OCEP will deliver content in the general area of employability, which fits squarely with the university's mission and strategic plans. "Employability" affects every area of the university's activity and curriculum and content will be drawn from across all areas of the university, particularly the Add+Vantage scheme which is part of all the university's undergraduate programmes and focuses on employability, preparation for employment, entrepreneurship, creativity, preparing for professional practice and a wide range of other topics, both generically and within the context of particular disciplines and subject areas.</p> <p>The choice of an employability theme allows the project to choose from over 2500 CATS points worth of diverse content types from Second Life machinima to the more usual handouts and PowerPoints. It is our eventual aim to make the vast majority of this material available as open content and OCEP will allow us to develop the experience, policies and processes on which to build an open content culture within the university.</p> <p>OCEP builds on the CURVE project which established a fully operational and embedded institutional repository at the university. OCEP outputs will be made freely available via CURVE, JorumOpen and other means as appropriate.</p>					

<b>I have looked at the example FOI form at Appendix A and included an FOI form in the attached bid (Tick Box)</b>	✓	
<b>I have read the Funding Call and associated Terms and Conditions of Grant at Appendix B (Tick Box)</b>	✓	

## A proposal submitted to the JISC by Coventry University in response to JISC Circular 14/08

### The Challenge

1. Outsiders looking at higher education practice would potentially be amazed at the inherent contradictions within the fundamental activity of teaching. They would probably be reassured by the level of agreement around what the core of the curriculum should be; a consensus which is hard debated in conferences, HEA Subject Centres and elsewhere and evidenced in lectures, textbooks and course outlines. They would be surprised by the lack of sharing and common use of learning and teaching content (other than textbooks) and the rather strange practice of thousands of teaching staff seemingly all producing their own versions of materials on the same topic areas. This feeling would be compounded by the observation that some of these materials would be very much better than others, due to differences in access to resources, experience or time given to produce them.

2. The roots of these contradictions have been debated long and hard in recent times<sup>1</sup>, and include:
- The argument that most materials are contextualised within specific courses for use with particular groups of students at a given moment in time<sup>2</sup>. In order to be useful in other situations they must either be decontextualised (which might remove a lot of their richness) or recontextualised (which may be more costly than creating new materials);
  - Many materials cannot simply be re-used as they stand; they are only useful if re-purposed. However this puts costs on the end user<sup>3</sup>. Converting existing materials into open content may well be challenging and resource intensive;
  - Individual staff “design” content for their own use in closed surroundings where presentation is usually face-to-face; not all such content is cleared for IPR (particularly copyright and licensing) issues, nor will it comply with standards such as IMS or in terms of accessibility or have metadata or other descriptions added to it. Usability is also likely to be an issue<sup>4</sup>. Asking staff to bear these issues in mind when creating content may be the source of disincentives to sharing; if these issues are not managed then there will be significant inbuilt barriers to re-use of content;
  - Whilst it is fairly clear what the economic argument for open content is at the national, institutional, subject or even departmental level it is hard to see what the incentives are at the individual level. There is a need to generate models which align individual incentives with collective benefits;
  - Content ownership may be vested in the university (as employer) but for individual members of staff there is often a gap between what is contractually the case and what is “felt”<sup>5</sup>;
  - Lecturers may defend a “not invented here” view by arguing that they add value by giving their unique “take” on subject matter, or, more subtly, may believe that students’ conceptions of value are based on the supposedly unique contribution which academic staff make in their teaching by using their “own” content.

3. The challenge is to create a culture where academic staff share materials openly and freely; where institutions value and reward staff who create innovative and re-usable content which students want; where the value teaching staff bring is seen to be in interpreting, contextualising and exploiting existing content rather than creating new; and where all parties (universities, departments and individuals) understand that they will be net importers of content and the system will only develop if everyone contributes to the pool of high quality content.

### Issues to be addressed in this project

4. The open content movement is a catalyst that is surfacing “a wide range of issues relating not just to “content” but to individual practice, institutional culture and the current paradigm of higher education in general.”<sup>6</sup> Thus the move towards open content brings with it a number of major issues:

---

<sup>1</sup> For example in the Intrallect Report, “Good Intentions” <http://ie-repository.jisc.ac.uk/265>

<sup>2</sup> This argument has been pursued in a recent paper; see David Morris (2009). “Modularization, course architectures and content re-use”. Available at: <https://curve.coventry.ac.uk/cu/access/item.do?method=list&group=myitems&filterId=191>

<sup>3</sup> The SURF Project has explored some implications of this. See <http://www.staffs.ac.uk/COSE/X4L/>

<sup>4</sup> See the TechDis Report “Creation of Learning Content” at <http://www.techdis.ac.uk/print.php?p=20>

<sup>5</sup> Coventry University employment contracts contain a specific clause stating the institution owns the content created by staff in the course of their employment, but the project does not intend to rely on this for its success.

- *Standards:* What technical standards, architectures and tools would be required to make teaching and learning resources searchable (discoverable), reusable and freely accessible globally? Is there anything we can do simply and cheaply with commonly-used authoring tools to help?
- *Legal:* How can we make sure that content is legally ok to share? What do depositors and users need to know about different licences? Who should be responsible for checking the copyright, performance rights, data protection etc of the video clip they are about to publish? What should the role of institutions be? What kind of policy in the area of IPR and innovative approaches to copyright could facilitate the growth of OER?
- *Institutional Engagement:* Why do institutions engage (or not engage) in Open Educational Resource (OER) initiatives? Why do academics use web2.0 content sharing services like YouTube, Flickr and Slideshare, and how does that relate to their jobs? How does OER change the existing methods and models for teaching and learning?
- *Sustainability:* What are the existing business models for sustainable open educational content projects? To what extent are the institutional model and community models for OER initiatives compatible and to what extent do they compete? Are there other business models within the institutional approach that could be of interest?
- *Quality assurance:* How do we quality assure open teaching and learning materials, pedagogical issues and accreditation, the importance (or not) of knowing what is happening to content once it is “out there” etc.

### **Coventry University’s record**

5. Coventry University is a third-stream intensive HE institution. This is clearly reflected in our vision, recognised by government and HEFCE, and is at heart of our curriculum, staff development and “authority to teach”<sup>7</sup>. A major test for us is to prepare students more effectively for employment or establishing new ventures by instilling in them the creativity, knowledge, skills and experiences demanded by a wide range of work alternatives including self-employment, entrepreneurship and social enterprise. As shorthand we will refer to this as “employability” although the acid test is whether or not our students find graduate jobs.

6. Coventry University is the HE partner in the Innovation University Enterprise Network (UEN), one of the first three such networks announced in November 2008. The selection of Coventry was based on its clear desire to become an “Entrepreneurial University”.

7. We have significant experience of the issues surrounding open (learning and teaching) content. In particular we have benefited from three projects funded under the ReProduce programme<sup>8</sup> and a major Repositories Enhancement project<sup>9</sup>. For example, our experience from a ReProduce project suggests that it may be useful to publish the learning design as part of the content package. This project will build on our experience from these JISC projects as well as from that gained via our engagement with the CIPeL (Centre for Inter-Professional e-Learning) and Sigma (mathematics support) CETL’s. University staff are also actively involved in the work of a number of HEA Subject Centres (including those for mathematics, economics, business and management, tourism and leisure, design and the performing arts).

### **Institutional strategy and open content business model**

8. Coventry University is committed to open educational content. Our curriculum design principles are based on the notion that students will gain from the national and international communities within which the university and students themselves operate. Like all universities we use more content than we are capable of producing and it is in our interests to build communities which share high quality content free of charge. The university gains from having better learning and teaching materials at its disposal, being able to deploy its scarce and expensive teaching staff on higher value generating activities than repetitive content generation, improved student satisfaction and the positive effects of having its wares on show. Our business

---

<sup>6</sup> <http://blogs.cetis.ac.uk/lmc/2008/11/13/oer-programme-scoping-session-at-cetis-conference/>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.coventry.ac.uk/missionstatement>

<sup>8</sup> See <http://cuba.coventry.ac.uk/reproduce>

<sup>9</sup> <http://cuba.coventry.ac.uk/curve>

model is therefore to make excellent content freely available to be able to benefit from content similarly provided by others, as a publicity and marketing stance which attracts students and enhances our reputation with business and the community and which results in improved student satisfaction and retention.

### Aims

9. OCEP aims to:

- Create a significant (greater than 360 CATS points) corpus of high quality, credit-bearing, diverse and re-usable open learning and teaching content in the area of “employability” based on our existing resources;
- Develop, test and implement institutional processes, policies and incentive structures to embed the practices of an open resource culture and open content release;
- Develop a model for building open content release considerations into the educational resource creation cycle particularly at the (critical) module approval stage;
- Add significantly to the content available in our own institutional repository, CURVE, by establishing a specific “employability” collection;
- Create exemplars of open content which will inspire academic staff to develop and release their learning and teaching resources;
- Build the capacity and expertise to support open content development across the university;
- Develop an economic, effective and sustainable model for developing and managing open content;
- Help improve the evidence base in support of sharing learning and teaching materials on an open basis;
- Lay the foundations for a sustained release of open content by Coventry University.

### The Content<sup>10</sup>

10. Apart from the clear alignment of the chosen content area with the university’s mission there are a number of benefits from focusing on this area, including:

- Coherence of the university’s content contribution to the wider community;
- The involvement of all areas of the university (faculties, careers and welfare staff, CETLs, lifelong learning centres etc.) around a common theme;
- The availability of a large corpus of existing content to choose from, much of which has been collectively developed and is not the “property” of individual members of staff;
- The diversity of types of content available (text-based notes and guidance, presentations, podcasts, videos, PDP activities, captured lectures, workshop materials, virtual word machinima, student generated experiences, complex online learning objects, collaborative activities, assessments etc);
- The potential ability of the content to be re-used in a wide range of settings and subject areas rather than being designed for specific discipline settings;
- The publicity and marketing benefits which the university will gain from exposing a collection of high quality content in its “signature” area of expertise.

11. The content will be drawn from a number of areas in the university as shown in the table below.

Origin	Description	Type
Add+Vantage	Cross university scheme to give academic credit for students studying outside their own subjects.	Over 180 different 10 credit modules covering all aspects of employability from general and specific (discipline, professional or sectoral) aspects.
Centre for Inter-professional e-Learning	Seven objects in Interpersonal Skills for Transition to Employment	Flash videos and animated PowerPoint supported by lecture notes and user guides. Total of 12 CATS points.
Faculty of Business, Environment and Society	Placement support package.	Online support materials, podcasts, video-casts, model learning contracts and associated advice, handouts, PowerPoints. 40 CATS

<sup>10</sup> In general terms we define “content” as anything which has a structure and is described in a way that enables others to make use of it. This, of course, includes making it available under open standards.

Learning Innovation Research Group	Second Life objects and media which can be used across courses and media.	points. Re-usable machinima (eg presentation boards, video screens etc). About 60 objects are involved.
Institute of Applied Entrepreneurship	Specialist cross-university undergraduate programme to help students start their own businesses.	420 CATS points (with options) of undergraduate modules from the BA/BSc in Enterprise and Entrepreneurship.
Faculty of Engineering and Computing	Engineering and Computing Employability	40 credit professional training module

12. This content represents a substantial release, as required by the call for proposals, of content for use and repurposing by other academics. We estimate that the content currently available (from which we would select a minimum of 360 CATS points worth) is equivalent to over 2500<sup>11</sup> CATS points. Through evangelising and embedding activities within the institution we would expect to raise this amount in the lifetime of the project, and continue with sustained release after April 2010.

13. As described in our work plan, below, we will ensure maximum visibility for the content through a combined release in JorumOpen, and our open repository CURVE, and through tagging adequate for web 2.0 services.

#### **How we will benefit from JISC funding**

14. JISC funding will markedly accelerate our progress towards embedding an open content strategy within the university. The project will be a catalyst for experimentation, piloting potential approaches, developing policies and processes and focusing institutional attention on the benefits of embracing the open content movement. These are the bases on which we will build cultural change within the university.

15. We will also benefit from full engagement with JISC programme activities, the support project and the expertise of JISC and HEA centres. The time taken to both benefit from and contribute to programme activities is recognised by an indicative time allocation of ten days a year split between the Project Director and the Project Manager<sup>12</sup>. Membership of a wider community involved in similar projects is also a major positive for us. We will also ensure that our project evaluator and project manager work closely with the programme level evaluation.

#### **Project outline**

16. The project is divided into three main phases; although some of the activities may overlap and should not be regarded as strictly sequential. The first phase may be characterised as *experimentation*. At this stage we will begin to identify the content which we want to include in the collection. Whilst this choice will be tempered by the pragmatism of time constraints and ease of availability, we will also identify criteria such as quality, coherence and integrity of the collection, potential usefulness to others, range of types etc. We will select a sample of materials with which to experiment, test out and refine the processes which we will then apply to developing the collection as a whole.

17. The second phase is *establishing the collection*. Here we will brief and train depositors in what open content means for them, the potential IPR and other issues, the benefits of open deposit for them and how they might improve their content. Depositors will be given help in modifying content to meet open standards, enhancing usability, online pedagogy and creating greater interest for students.

<sup>11</sup> We aim to deposit over the minimum of the 360 CATS points worth of materials during the project. The university is committed to moving all its learning and teaching materials to CURVE by September 2010. We would anticipate that a large corpus of these would be open.

<sup>12</sup> Although we recognise that it may be beneficial for other members of the project team to take part in these activities as well and they will be supported in doing so.

18. The third phase is *evangelising and embedding*. This includes institutional policy and process development, developing ways of incentivising staff to deposit materials<sup>13</sup>, evaluating the benefits from deposit, dissemination activities and profile raising, both internally and externally. This phase will also involve the tracking of the volume and use of the resources accessed through the CURVE repository. We hope to compare this to similar measures from JorumOpen.

### **Project Management**

19. Project management will track activities and milestones. Regular contact with team members will check progress, and the planned monthly team meetings will address risks and budgets in detail. It will be the responsibility of each workpackage leader to keep a detailed record of tasks undertaken and to agree tasks and priorities with the project manager. These will be confirmed with a simple actions and tasks sheet linked to the workpackage. This will make it possible to maintain close control over the project's progress and take speedy intervention to ensure that deviations from the plan are corrected. In addition the project will be managed according to JISC Project Management Guidelines.

### **Workpackage 1: Project Management; led by Gita Devi. Months 1-12**

20. This work package will act to manage and coordinate the activities of the partners, prepare documents and reports as required, and assess risks and opportunities as the project progresses. This will include drafting and finalising a project plan with the project partners.

#### *Tasks*

- Develop a detailed work plan with timescales, deliverables, and milestones (1-2)
- Monitor progress and ensure that the project maintains its schedule (1-12)
- Participate in project meetings with the Steering Committee and other committees (*as required*)
- Prepare periodic reports for the JISC (*as necessary*)
- Identify critical roles and individuals/groups to carry out repository promotion activities (*as required*)
- Maintain project risk register (1-12)

The deliverables include the detailed work plan; progress and risk assessment reports as required; a final report as well as website and blog oversight and the delivery of promotion and dissemination activities.

### **Workpackage 2: Content selection; led by Andrew Turner. Months 1-3**

21. This workpackage forms the first phase of the project. It is designed to pilot the processes and activities which will be applied to the collection as a whole.

#### *Tasks*

- Prepare detailed list of potential content for inclusion from the sources identified in this bid (1-2)
- Audit content for suitability and identify any potential areas of difficulty (1-3)
- Agree parameters of substantive collection based on content audit and sustainability potential (2-3).

*Deliverables* will be an agreed collection specification and a detailed assessment of potential areas of difficulty.

### **Workpackage 3: Sample testing; led by Amanda Hardy, Months 4-5**

22. Here we will select a small number learning objects for inclusion in the repository and put them through the process of getting them ready for deposit.

#### *Tasks (all months 4-5)*

- Identify a small but representative sample of materials from those which it is intended to include in the collection.

---

<sup>13</sup> One very tangible result of the CURVE Project was to persuade the university that teaching objects deposited in CURVE for shared use would count as outputs for development and performance review purposes alongside research publications, books, consultancy reports etc.

- Assess user needs, for example formats required, tagging options, adaptation possibilities, version controls etc.,
- Submit them to all the processes it is intended to apply to objects in the major phase of the project.
- Document any issues that arise and the solutions adopted.
- Develop depositor workshop materials and examples.
- Train research assistants to assist with preparing content for deposit.

The *deliverable* will be a set of exemplar objects to use throughout the rest of the project.

#### **Workpackage 4: Depositor workshops; led by Amanda Hardy. Month 6**

23. At this stage we will brief and train the originators of the materials selected for deposit. Topics to be covered will include the nature of open content, maintaining content, rights over content, IPR and rights clearance, versioning, metadata, tagging usability, accessibility etc. These are awareness sessions rather full briefings.

*Tasks (during month 6)*

- Deliver workshops.
- Ensure workshop materials are available in CURVE.
- Expose workshop materials on the project website.

*Deliverables* are workshops and associated materials.

#### **Workpackage 5: Develop collection; led by Juliet Hinrichsen. Months 6-11.**

24. This workpackage comprises the core of the project. We have allowed five months to prepare, check and modify content for deposit. Juliet will be assisted by a trained team of research assistants (see Workpackage 3) who are familiar with CURVE and the deposit workflows. Jo Marsh and Ann Dickinson will take responsibility for aspects of the workpackage within their particular expertise (see Annex B). The content originators will also take part in this workpackage and their time input is recognised in the budget.

*Tasks (all months 6-11)*

- Check content for IPR issues etc.
- Obtain rights clearance where feasible.
- Assess content for accessibility and usability.
- Check QA processes applied to content.
- Add metadata, tags etc as needed
- Modify content to aid transferability if needed.

The *deliverable* will be the substantive collection of content, tagged appropriately.

#### **Workpackage 6: Policy development; led by David Morris. Months 3-12**

25. Policy development is an ongoing process which needs to be actively pursued through the University's deliberative and executive processes and structures.

*Tasks*

- Identify areas where policy changes are needed to promote open content practices (3-4).
- Prepare draft policies (based where possible on good practices from elsewhere, JISC advice etc) for consideration by university committees etc (5-8).
- Map existing processes for education content development and identify where open content considerations need to be brought to the fore (eg module approval) (6-9).
- Identify barriers to open content deposit and use and devise strategies for overcoming them (9-12).

The *deliverable* will be an integrated set of policies and processes designed to promote a culture of developing and using open educational resources within the university.

### **Workpackage 7: Spreading the message; led by David Morris. Months 1-12**

26. Internal marketing of the project and keeping staff and students informed of developments is vital to changing the culture.

#### *Tasks (all months 1-12 as required)*

- Deliver workshops and briefing sessions to staff on the benefits of open content.
- Develop online materials, podcasts, mini case studies etc to help staff.
- Ensure major project presence at major university events related to learning and teaching (eg the university's annual teaching and learning conference/exhibition, ELATE; the iPED conference, faculty-based events etc).

The *deliverables* will be a series of profile-raising activities.

### **Workpackage 8: Evaluation; led by Andrew Rothwell. Months 1-12**

27. Evaluation will be a continuous process throughout the project. More information on our approach is given in paragraphs 31-33 below. We will also contribute to the programme wide evaluation.

#### *Tasks*

- Develop, with the project team, a detailed evaluation plan (1-2).
- Identify, with help from the JISC support project, metrics and tracking approaches to measure content use and impact<sup>14</sup> (1-4).
- Run student focus groups to help evaluate content and gather information on how they use it (3-6)
- *Analyse monitoring and tracking use data (6-11)*
- Prepare and deliver reports to the Project Team meetings (*as required; final evaluation report by month 12*).

*Deliverables* will be an evaluation plan, reports as required, evaluation events, use monitoring and tracking data.

### **Project Team**

28. The project team is entirely drawn from existing Coventry University staff. The core of the team worked on the CURVE project and is familiar with both JISC projects and content management concepts and issues. The Project Director will be David Morris. David has led a number of successful JISC and other projects in the field of education development, including the CURVE project. The Project Manager will be Gita Devi. Gita works in the university's business development support office and also manages the ELTAC project funded under the JISC Institutional Exemplars programme. Each workpackage will be led by a designated leader drawn from Coventry University staff. Brief cvs of project team members are included as Annex B.

### **Risk Analysis**

29. The risk analysis for the project is shown in the table below. This will provide the baseline for developing the risk register which will be maintained throughout the life of the project.

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Likelihood 1-5</b>	<b>Severity 1-5</b>	<b>Risk</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Academic staff resistant to allowing "their" content to be included	3	4	12	Stress the positives. Seek to allay fears by helping staff improve content. Work closely with course teams and other groups rather than isolate individuals.
Poor quality content which could damage Coventry University's reputation	2	4	8	Make sure content is properly screened. Offer help to staff to improve content quality.
Hidden IPR issues	2	3	6	Audit content before release. Brief and train staff

<sup>14</sup> CURVE has a facility which permits users to rate and comment on objects, which will be deployed in this project.

Rights clearance slow and delays project	2	2	4	in IPR issues. Use Casper tools and advice to identify potential areas of risk. We have a lot of content to choose from and so avoid materials where this is likely to be a major issue.
Poor user engagement in project	1	5	5	Make sure internal dissemination of project aims, benefits and activities is ongoing.
Staff do not use the content.	2	4	8	Stress the positives for staff (better prepared students, fewer assessment failures etc.) Provide supportive training.
Students and people external to the university do not know about the content.	1	4	4	Expose collection to search engines and deploy tools for search engine optimisation. Pay attention to tags, feeds and metadata to promote discoverability.
Staff loss	2	3	6	Use current university staff. If project staff leave or become unavailable other members of the group can pick up the work.

Note: 1 is low; 5 is high. Risk Score = severity times likelihood.

### Stakeholder Analysis

30. The table below shows a stakeholder analysis for OCEP.

Stakeholder	Perspective and Interest	Importance	Engagement
Coventry University CU academic departments	Support essential to ensure that all appropriate academic content is deposited; will require instruction on how to deposit	High	Hold department specific workshops and develop subject specific documentation and training; link to other JISC/HEA subject based projects
Individual staff	Support essential as users need to be convinced about OER; will require access to easy to understand information about how to deposit and use content	High	Hold workshops for users; develop documentation and training aimed at users and depositors
CU students	Will benefit from more stimulating teaching; greater chance of graduate employment	High	Student feedback on materials. Direct involvement in project. In terms of user needs this will also aid the rest of the HE community
JISC/ HEA	Funders; interest in successful result to pilot programme	High	Regular reports. Active engagement with JISC events, projects and evaluation.
UEN	Promoting regional innovation and business growth; Will require easy access to straightforward summaries about new developments	Medium	News updates; presentations by project team to board.
HE community	Support not essential, but will ultimately be the users of the open access repository; will require information about tools and content comprising new repository integrations and developments	Medium	Develop straightforward summary documents regarding developments of interest to HE community; hold workshops as appropriate; make project team members available for dissemination as appropriate

### Evaluation

31. All projects present challenges in terms of evaluation, but these are probably tougher in this arena than in many. What would be appropriate measures of success? What changes would we expect to see as a result of the project? How would we know if these changes were illusory in the sense of being “bought” by the project or genuinely long-term? How do we ensure that the process of content release is a dynamic one rather a series of static initiatives?

32. Evaluation at the project start phase will include agreeing the specific objectives, activities, deliverables and milestones required to meet the overall aims and objectives stated in this bid. The assessment/evaluation of the project processes phase will encompass planning, communication, resourcing,

quality assessment and budgeting; while the project finish and implementation phase will focus on the outputs (e.g. training courses/programmes, toolkits) and outcomes (e.g. changes in work practices, attitudes/values, change in organisational structure/processes, etc.) from the project. However the most important elements will be to assess what has been learnt and how that learning has been transformed into actions which result in tangible and identifiable benefits for stakeholders.

33. We will also involve students in the evaluation. We will provide incentives for them to comment on content via the CURVE facility for “rating” assets, recruit them to focus groups to “clinic” materials and include appropriate questions in module evaluation questionnaires.

### **Policy, management and legal issues**

34. All content which results from the project will be released via deposit with JorumOpen and via our own institutional repository, CURVE under a JISC Open Education UK license. All content will be rights cleared

### **Hosting Content**

35. All content will be hosted in CURVE and will be managed by the CURVE Repository Manager (Joanne Marsh). The Repository Manager post is a long-term commitment within the university library budget. Jo will also be responsible for creating and maintain all external links, including to JorumOpen. A major advantage of the Equella software (on which CURVE is based) is that each repository asset has its own unique URL enabling easy linking to web services. Equella also provides a comprehensive range of configurable feeds. John Tutchings, the e-Learning Technical Specialist within the e-Learning Unit, will ensure that assets are exposed to search engines and advise on approaches to search engine optimisation. Where possible and appropriate content will be stored in a number of different industry-standard formats to promote ease of re-use.

### **Technical Considerations**

36. Our work on the CURVE project has allowed us to become familiar with most of the technical and content management issues which we would expect to encounter in the course of this project. This includes experience of running repository management software (Equella), digitisation, streaming, storage and archiving on the ICT side and rights clearance, IPR issues, workflow management etc on the administrative side. However participation in this programme will bring new skills to develop. In particular open content will require greater attention to a number of areas; these include:

- Open standards: IMS; MS Word; Adobe pdf; Quicktime; MS PowerPoint; rtf etc.
- Metadata capture and creation; metadata will need to satisfy a number of requirements, those of the project, JorumOpen, the JISC licence, CURVE schema (which includes Dublin Core). We will adhere to the JISC metadata guidelines for the programme once it is released.
- Tags; we will need to ensure appropriate tags (eg “ukoer”) are added for web2.0 use (eg Flickr, YouTube, Slideshare, iTunes U etc.)
- Feeds: we must be able to generate RSS, Atom and other feeds

Whilst we do not anticipate that these will cause any major difficulties, they will need to be borne in mind.

### **Sustainability**

37. The most important element in ensuring sustainability is our business model; this does not rely on generating direct income from content and is not, therefore, vulnerable to shifts in willingness to pay by users. In addition the funding for maintaining CURVE (including hardware infrastructure, software licenses and professional staff to manage the system) is explicitly included in relevant university budgets. We will also thoroughly document the policies, procedures and technical information needed to insulate CURVE maintenance and development from issues arising from staff changes. The university has also adopted a policy that all learning and teaching content will be managed in CURVE from 2010. Whilst simply identifying and moving content will be the aim by then, we will aim to make the content open when transfer has been completed.

## Budget

38. The budget table is shown below. A budgetary provision for hosting is not included as CURVE is now fully supported by the university.

Directly Incurred Staff	April 09 – Mar 10 £	Total £
None	0	0
<b>Total Directly Incurred Staff</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Non-Staff</b>		
Rights clearance	10000	10000
Travel and subsistence	5000	5000
<b>Total Directly Incurred Non-Staff</b>	<b>15000</b>	<b>15000</b>
<b>Directly Incurred Total</b>	<b>15000</b>	<b>15000</b>
<b>Directly Allocated (Coventry University)</b>		
Project Director and WP 6/7 Leader		
Project Manager		
Project Administrator		
WP 2 Leader		
WP 3/4 Leader		
WP 5 Leader		
WP 8 Leader		
CURVE Repository Manager		
Instructional Designer		
Faculty based academic staff		
Research Assistance		
Estates	70351	70351
<b>Directly Allocated Total (Coventry University)</b>	<b>305183</b>	<b>305183</b>
<b>Indirect Costs (Coventry University)</b>	<b>176031</b>	<b>176031</b>
<b>Total Project Cost</b>	<b>496214</b>	<b>496214</b>
<b>Amount Requested from JISC</b>	<b>248107</b>	<b>248107</b>
<b>Institutional Contributions</b>	<b>248107</b>	<b>248107</b>
<b>Percentage Contributions over the life of the project</b>	<b>Coventry University 50%; JISC 50%</b>	<b>Total 100%</b>
<b>No. FTEs Used to calculate indirect and estates charges, and staff included</b>	<b>No FTEs</b>	
<i>All staff as identified in rows above.</i>		

**Annex 1**

**FOI Withheld Information Form**

<b>Section / Paragraph No.</b>	<b>Relevant exemption from disclosure under FOI</b>	<b>Justification</b>
Budget Table Paragraph 38	s.43 Commercial Interests	Commercial in confidence, budget information refers directly to individual salaries

## Annex 2

### Brief cv's of project team members.

1. **Susan Adcock** is Administrative Assistant within the Centre for Study of Higher Education. She has worked on many recent projects arranging and servicing meetings, including ensuring follow-up.
2. **Ben Baker** has worked on the e-Learning Unit "Flying Squad" for over two years providing front-line support to staff and student users of all e-learning technologies deployed at Coventry University, including CURVE. Ben has also worked on a number of JISC projects as a Research Assistant. Ben holds a masters degree in psychology.
3. **Michelle Barrett** is the longest-serving member of the Flying Squad. She holds a Masters Degree in languages. Michelle has worked as a Research Assistant on previous JISC projects and on e-learning initiatives shared between the e-Learning Unit and the faculties, including a significant contribution to the Add+Vantage scheme.
4. **Andrew Brooks** is Learning Technologist in CIPeL. He graduated with an MA in Media Arts and has been a freelance video maker. Since joining CIPeL he has produced a large number of learning objects and online resources for them. Andrew manages CIPeL's CURVE collection.
5. **Lynn Clouder** is Director of the Centre for Inter-Professional e-Learning and teaches in the Faculty of Health and Life Sciences at Coventry University. She was recently seconded to the Centre for Studies in Higher Education where she worked on the development of communities of practice.
6. **Kathy Courtney** is a Senior Lecturer in the Centre for the Study of Higher Education at Coventry and active in the iPED Pedagogic Research Network. Her role is to support academic staff in the use of online teaching and learning and in developing innovative teaching practices. She has a particular expertise in the design of online briefing and training materials to help staff use e-learning systems.
7. **Gita Devi** will be the Project Manager. She joined Coventry University in 2003 from Barclays Bank. Part of her responsibility was to manage project budgets and maintain project records as well as submitting monthly reports and claims. This also involved overseeing the audit process and completing project forecasts. Over the last 18 months she has worked across several projects, ensuring the contractual obligations were met and all claims and reports were submitted within agreed time scales. This involved setting up all the appropriate systems and processes to monitor financial and output information, as well as ensuring a audit trail is kept. As part of this Gita has also been responsible for the development of a new web based project monitoring and tracking system, to help track project progress for a £8 million project over 2 years. Gita is a fully qualified Prince2 project manager.
8. **Hannelie Du Plessis** is Senior Lecturer in the Faculty of Business, Environment and Society. She has taught on a wide range of courses, particularly in human resource management. She now works in the faculties Employability Unit and leads on the development of learning materials.
9. **Paul Grove** is a Learning Technologist in the e-Learning Unit. Paul is just completing a doctorate in e-learning. He has worked in close partnership with a number of groups in the university helping them with the development of a wide range of e-learning objects. In particular he has contributed significantly to the work of CIPeL.
10. **Amanda Hardy** came to Coventry from Boise State University's Academic Technologies department. For over three years there she advised instructors on online lesson design and implementation of e-learning. She also extensively supported and trained staff members and students with the use of the

Blackboard virtual learning environment. Amanda holds an undergraduate degree in Sociology and Social Sciences Education and a Master's in Educational Technology.

11. **Juliet Hinrichsen** is an Instructional Designer within the e-Learning Unit. Juliet has been working on collaborative course development projects with CIPeL (Centre for Inter-professional e-Learning) and HDTI (Health Design Technology Institute), two of the major users of CURVE. This work has resulted in a number of innovative new courses being successfully approved which are now being delivered. As a workpackage leader Juliet will call on the learning technologists from contributing faculties and departments.
12. **Gideon Maas** is Director of the Institute of Applied Entrepreneurship which is the base for all enterprise and entrepreneurship activities at the university. Apart from the BA/BSc course the institute helps a wide range of students in the activities of setting up their own businesses. The means include mentoring programmes, start-up grants, the Start-Up Cafe, business clubs and business support.
13. **Joanne Marsh** is the CURVE Repository Manager. Joanne is a professionally qualified librarian, who came to Coventry from the Higher Education Academy's Subject Centre in Information Sciences, based at Loughborough University, where amongst other things, she managed the Centre's 'open access' electronic journal.
14. **David Morris** was the Founding Dean of Coventry Business School (now the Business, Environment and Society Faculty) at Coventry University. He is now Director of Higher Education Development at the University. He has published widely on education matters and has advised and acted as a consultant to a large number of educational organisations nationally and internationally. He has directed a number of EU, JISC and HEA funded projects. David is a Member of the JISC Learning and Teaching Committee and will be Project Director.
15. **Karen Quinn** manages the Add+Vantage scheme. She works very closely with the faculties and CSHE and will coordinate the Add+Vantage contributions to the project.
16. **Andrew Rothwell** is a Principal Lecturer in Higher Education Research and Development at Coventry University's Centre for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE). He is programme leader for a suite of MA programmes related to Higher Education, including MA Higher Education, MA Learning & Technology, MA Academic Leadership. His main current areas of professional expertise are learning and teaching innovation, learning in international and inter-cultural contexts, continuing professional development (CPD), and employability. He also has over twenty years experience of teaching, leadership, curriculum innovation, and academic development.
17. **Amritpal Slaich** is the Industrial Placements Coordinator for the Faculty of Engineering and Computing, role he combines with teaching quantitative methods in the Department of Engineering and Knowledge Management.
18. **Cathy Tombs** is a Research Assistant in the Learning Innovation Research Group. Cathy has a Masters degree in computer science and is currently working on developing transferable learning materials within the context of immersive worlds.
19. **Andrew Turner** is a Principal Lecturer in CSHE. Andrew leads the team of Teaching Development Fellows who have joint appointments between CSHE and the faculties and are responsible for promoting transformational change in learning and teaching across the university. Andrew's work places him in regular contact with all areas of the university and he is ideally placed to coordinate the prioritisation of the content for inclusion in the project.

**Coventry University**  
Priory Street  
Coventry CV1 5FB  
Telephone 024 7688 7688

**Professor Madeleine Atkins**  
Vice-Chancellor



JISC,  
Northavon House,  
Coldharbour Lane,  
Bristol,  
BS16 1QD

JIS2502SMKL03

25<sup>th</sup> February 2009

Dear Sirs,

**Call 14/08: Open Education Resources Programme**

I am pleased to support our bid under Call 14/08.

Coventry University is committed to the principle of open educational resources. Participation in this programme will give us the chance to begin turning that commitment into reality. Our previous, highly successful, work with JISC has been critical in the development of our institutional repository, CURVE. The OER Programme is an exciting tool to build on this work by helping to change the culture within the University to encourage staff to develop and deposit learning and teaching materials and, equally importantly, to exploit the resources produced and deposited by others.

Coventry is a business-facing University. Our choice to concentrate our efforts on education resources which help promote graduate employment and entrepreneurship is a reflection of our vision for the future. The University's curriculum, across all faculties and supporting departments, is being reinvigorated with employment and entrepreneurship aims to the fore. This bid not only reflects our mission and strategy but will also involve and benefit all areas of the University.

Yours faithfully,

**Professor Madeleine Atkins**  
**Vice-Chancellor**



THE QUEEN'S  
ANNIVERSARY PRIZES  
FOR HIGHER AND FURTHER EDUCATION

2007

**Vice-Chancellor's Office**  
Direct Line 024 7688 8212  
Fax 024 7688 8638

[www.coventry.ac.uk](http://www.coventry.ac.uk)