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Executive summary

*Bridging the gap: Teaching adaptations across the disciplines and sharing content for curriculum renewal* (The Adapt Project) aimed to enhance learning and teaching in the field of Adaptation studies by developing a Community of Practice of Adaptations scholars around the sharing of Open Educational Resources (OER). Adaptation studies is an emerging field that combines insights from literary, film, TV, media and cultural studies, but also modern language studies, history, fine art, philosophy, classics and new media. It is used to focus almost exclusively on the process of adapting literature to screen or theatre, but has expanded to look at all forms of textual exchange (a fuller definition is provided on page 10 of this document). This report provides an overview of the project.

The one-year project was led by staff from the University of Tasmania (UTAS), in collaboration with project partners from Monash University, The University of Queensland, and The University of Western Australia. In addition, external consultants from Creative Commons Australia and Southampton University were utilised for their expertise in the legal aspects of the sharing of resources under open content licences and the evaluation of Open Educational Resources projects.

The Project outcomes are a fledgling community of practice based around the collaborative sharing of learning and teaching resources in the interdisciplinary field of Adaptation studies. This community is supported by an Open Educational Resources repository that enables the sharing of learning and teaching resources in the field. The Toolkit (Good Practice Guide) provides guidance on copyright matters for Open Educational resources in Australia and provides a template for further projects to build upon. Both of these resources can be accessed at the Adapt Project website <www.adapt.edu.au>.

The Teaching Adaptations Symposium was held on 4-5 February 2013. The symposium was hosted by the University of Tasmania and included delegates from Australia, New Zealand, Belgium, the USA, and China as well as plenary speakers from the UK and Turkey. This event acted as a showcase for the project and an opportunity to grow the community of practice through discussion of the benefits of Open Educational Practice and learning and teaching.

The Adapt Project has also acted as a pilot for the development of Open Educational Practice at the University of Tasmania, and both the repository and toolkit have formed the basis of further developments in Open Educational practice at an institutional level. The ongoing management of the repository has been a consideration during the project, and workflows and processes have been designed to ensure that the repository and web presence of the project can continue with the support of the University of Tasmania.

The External Evaluator’s report (Appendix C) on the project indicates that the project was generally successful in meeting its goals; however delays related to technical issues did hinder, but not prevent, the project’s progress in a number of areas.
Recommendations

The project report includes several recommendations. These are:

1. The Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) is encouraged to think further about how the two central elements of this project can be taken forward strategically at a national level. These being how subject-based communities are encouraged, especially in the adoption of innovative approaches to learning and teaching, and secondly (and in a related manner) how Australia might be competitive internationally in the area of Open Educational Resources.

2. The OLT is encouraged to explore how best to facilitate emergent areas of study and link dispersed and possibly atomised scholars across institutional boundaries including through the evaluation of the effectiveness of Community of Practice (CoP) methodologies.

3. The OLT and other bodies are encouraged to recognise how Open Educational Resources can facilitate greater collaboration in teaching among academics. Establishing wider Communities of Practice through the embedding of OERs in the working practices of academics will provide a means for enhancing teaching in Australia through collaborative and reflective practice.

4. The OLT is encouraged to promote review of the legal issues associated with OER in Australia which would be beneficial, in particular further work on exceptions in existing copyright law which could be used by OER repositories.

5. The OLT is encouraged to use the findings of this project and the related project from UNE, Massey and USQ, and especially its Feasibility Protocol, to encourage Australian tertiary institutions to ensure provisions designed to allow the sharing of learning and teaching materials in Intellectual Property policies.

6. The OLT is encouraged to explore greater collaboration in OER repository development and management which will be beneficial to the sector and could take the form of national or transnational repositories. This would provide impetus for greater adoption of OER among Australian tertiary institutions.
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1. Introduction and background

This report provides an overview of the Adapt Project, an Open Educational Resources (OER) Project that aimed to enhance learning and teaching in the field of Adaptation studies by facilitating the development of a community of practice of scholars who would share their resources freely among themselves and with the online world. The project was funded by the Australian Government Office for Learning and Teaching, and led by staff from the University of Tasmania, with project partners from Monash University, the University of Queensland, and the University of Western Australia.

The project developed a repository and accompanying toolkit to provide guidance on legal and other issues in order to facilitate the community of practice and also planned a symposium for Adaptations scholars, to be held after the end of the project, which will function as a networking opportunity for scholars to share their own examples of good practice in learning and teaching in the field as well as enabling them to self-identify as a significant cross-disciplinary community of practice. The project and repository will be showcased as part of the symposium proceedings.

This document begins by providing some background on OER, Adaptation studies, and communities of practice. It will then go on to provide an overview of the project, including outcomes, approach and methodology, an evaluation of the success of the project and an analysis of the issues behind the project’s key challenges.

1.1 Open Educational Resources

Although there is no universally used definition of what counts as an Open Educational resource, OER Commons provides a practical and widely-used definition:

Open Education Resources (OER) are teaching and learning materials that are freely available online for everyone to use, whether you are an instructor, student, or self-learner. Examples of OER include: full courses, course modules, syllabi, lectures, homework assignments, quizzes, lab and classroom activities, pedagogical materials, games, simulations, and many more resources contained in digital media collections from around the world.

The UNESCO Paris Declaration on OER provides a slightly different definition from an earlier UNESCO conference that emphasises the importance of OER being made available under licences that provide for re-use and remixing:

teaching, learning and research materials in any medium, digital or otherwise, that reside in the public domain or have been released under an open license that permits no-cost access, use, adaptation and redistribution by others with no or limited restrictions. Open licensing is built within the existing framework of intellectual property rights as defined by relevant international conventions and respects the authorship of the work.

These definitions describe OER as accessible, free resources useful for learners and teachers. The ability to re-use and remix those resources is also a critical component according to the UNESCO Paris Declaration.

Some confusion exists about the differences between Massively Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and Open Educational Resources. There are varying understandings of what a MOOC is, but in practice MOOCs are aimed solely at learners and do not always allow for the download and re-use and remixing of the learning and teaching resources. The emphasis on sharing, re-using and remixing of resources means that OER repositories generally target academic staff involved in learning and teaching, but are also open for students to access and use resources.
Benefits of sharing learning and teaching materials as OER

For educators the use and creation of OER has several potential benefits. In using OER from other scholars there is much potential benefit in being exposed to different approaches to a discipline and to wider issues of learning and teaching, as well as potential time savings in adapting existing resources instead of creating new resources from scratch. In sharing learning and teaching resources the scholar has an opportunity to further enhance their own reputation in the field by providing high quality resources to peers and colleagues, and to expose their resources to peer review, which may lead to reflection and enhancement of resources. This also opens up opportunities for collaboration and the creation of resources that would not have occurred without initial sharing and peer review. In addition, the sharing of resources in a subject based repository can lead to informal communities of practice, where individuals share resources and reflect on learning and teaching issues in the field, to the wider benefit of the scholarly community.

For students, greater access to learning and teaching resources can provide enormous benefits, both for those engaged in formal study, and for students who may not have the ability to participate in traditional forms of tertiary education, whether for financial, geographical or other reasons. OERs provide additional resources to those students encounter in their own units, and can inspire future independent projects.

Australian context, previous OLT projects

It has been noted that Australian universities have been relatively slow in adopting Open Educational Resources (Bossu 2010). Open Educational content is a global movement and in the USA and the UK recent initiatives have injected both resources and momentum towards OER. UK and US funding bodies have placed priority on the development of OER and have achieved significant success in establishing the creation and use of OER as a high profile activity.

The OLT-funded, project Adoption, use and management of Open Educational Resources (OERs) to enhance teaching and learning in Australia, led by the University of New England, and completed in 2012, aimed to develop a feasibility protocol to facilitate the development of OER in Australia. A copy of the report from this project was received during the final weeks of the Adapt Project and is referred to here. This, coupled with the Adapt project, signal the potential for further development and integration of OER initiatives in the Australian tertiary system.

1.2 Adaptations

When putting together the initial project proposal, the authors were mindful that while there may be virtues in promoting an OER across disciplines in order to improve a generalised culture of sharing, some specific advantage might be gained by inviting content in ‘adaptation studies’. As neither a stand-alone discipline nor recognized ‘area’ study, adaptations is a hybrid study, once found most commonly in literary studies, but becoming more widespread in film, cultural studies, creative writing, history, performance, modern languages, classics, area studies and music. The study of adaptation, which focuses on the adaptation, reuse and refunctioning of narrative across different forms of media, is in many ways highly compatible with the underlying philosophy of OERs.

Those who teach Adaptations do not always identify their own work in those terms, which makes the range of scholarship potentially available for sharing difficult to gauge. For this reason Adaptation studies makes a perfect candidate for OER activities, even though definitions of this area of study and where its boundaries lie are diverse. The repository makes no disciplinary distinctions or groupings for uploaded artefacts: rather the keywords submitted by the author create the first stage in making connections across lecture notes, unit outlines, assessment guidelines and other learning and teaching resources.
For the purposes of this project, the following definition was posted on the ADAPT blog:

‘Put simply, adaptation studies is the analysis of a text and its adaptation, whether that ‘text’ is a novel, film, dance, play, comic strip, musical score, sculpture, video game, etc. The adaptation might be in the same narrative form, but is often in another.

This area of enquiry became very popular in literary studies with novel-to-film criticism, and George Bluestone’s highly influential work, Novels into Film was published in 1957. For several decades after, it wasn’t always clear what people were teaching when they were teaching novels into film, or why they were teaching it. In the classroom it is acknowledged that watching the film of a novel, play or story can make the understanding of that text easier, particularly if the original work is perceived to be difficult because of its age, use of language or form. Many teachers found that watching films of books made students better readers and that they were able to read more attentively and better understand form and structure. This finding is obviously contrary to the popular view that viewing kills reading.

As academic interest in this area of study grew, so emerged the understanding that the relationship between a text and its adaptation is one of cross-fertilisation and exchange, rather than, as articulated by critics in the early twentieth century such as Virginia Woolf, one of parasitism where the original text becomes a shadow of its former brilliant self. There are terrible adaptations and there are some which make one forget or ignore the original; some adaptations reignite interest in a long forgotten story; and some texts such as Charles Dickens’ Great Expectations, can never be adapted enough. A personal favourite of mine is the ‘Great Expectations Boat Ride’ at Dickens World in Kent, UK.

Adaptation studies is now less about which is the better, the original or the adaptation, and more about engaging with the process and understanding the motivations for an adaptation – whether it be explanation, homage, revision, critique, pure exploitation or something else. Adaptation studies facilitates an understanding of social change, narrative form, cultural difference, commercial imperatives, power relationships and so much more. As I hinted in my first paragraph, the subject of adaptation studies has moved far beyond the realm of novels and literary studies, even though literature on screen approaches still dominate. A thorny question one might now ask is ‘when is an adaptation not an adaptation?’ Luckily no one agrees on the answer.

Adaptation studies is taught by scholars in universities and teachers in schools, sometimes unconsciously. A historian showing students Gallipoli (1981) is looking at an adaptation. Those involved in teaching the Classics might be simultaneously thrilled and bemused by the explosion of recent film adaptations of Homer. Victorianists in literary studies must feel overwhelmed by the current trend for neo-Victorian novels.

There is a community of scholars out there with interests in adaptation who would benefit from knowing what others are talking about in their classes or adding to their curriculum. University students may find in adaptations studies an answer to their interdisciplinary yearnings or simply a new way of approaching old questions and developing new directions in knowledge.

This project is about inviting the community to identify itself via Adapt. To share materials, which can then be read, adapted and reused in quite other ways. I shall blog about what it means to ‘share’ in this way at a later date; and even later when the project is in full swing there will be a chance to browse materials and upload your own.’
The intention here was to offer a definition that could be seen as inclusive, but which also raised some questions about how adaptation studies might be framed both in disciplines and beyond them as an area of scholarly enquiry which reflects on the contemporary fascination with adapting, appropriating, retelling and re-functioning, particularly in the transformation from one narrative platform to another. Tutors new to the area are amazed at how much students enjoy the topic and how flexible it is in the classroom, often used to promote critical judgments via creative practices and other innovative forms of assessment.

The responses to the Symposium call for papers, and the range of papers to be presented suggests success in attracting scholars from across the Arts and Humanities and in this way advancing the ambition to establish an adaptations-related Community of Practice. It is also clear that while some teach a unit or suite of units in the area, others use adaptation studies as a pathway within a broader topic. In each case there are clear benefits for academics in having access to a repository that makes teaching materials accessible, reusable and which also opens up the possibility of direct exchange of ideas (through peer review and online discussion).

1.3 Communities of Practice

The ambition to gather scholars with shared interests in adaptation but who may be scattered across departments and faculties is rooted in Etienne Wenger’s highly influential concept of Communities of Practice. Wenger (1998) outlines four interlocked learning processes in the Community of Practice concept that inform our understanding of the intentions and outcomes of the Adapt project – meaning (as experience), practice (as doing), community (as belonging) and identity (as becoming). In Wenger’s view, communities can arise from both formal and informal networks within and beyond an educational setting. A CoP is therefore defined broadly as ‘groups of people who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise on an ongoing basis’ (2002:4).

It is of course possible for individuals to feel isolated in their own discipline areas, so shared concerns and the desire to deepen knowledge and expertise are the cornerstone of the Adapt project. The ‘community’ philosophy is also deployed to override concerns about sharing materials, particularly concerns that sharing might amount to simple plagiarism or academic laziness. Entering into the community implies a relationship of trust which is cemented by the professionalism and enthusiasm of the group as a whole, which itself is underpinned by the principles of Creative Commons licensing. The virtual nature of the repository breaks down barriers to contact and communication, allows the collection and accumulation of materials, which in time should provide a significant resource for those who teach in adaptation studies. There are no hard and fast rules about how those resources are used (beyond the basic premises of Creative Commons), and the community, by their submissions, determine the shape of adaptation content available.
2. The Adapt Project

This chapter provides an overview of the Adapt Project, including a description of the project rationale, goals and outcomes, and discussion of the project management approach. Dissemination activities, including social media activities and the Teaching Adaptations Symposium are detailed, and the final section provides information on the outcomes and the evaluation of the project.

The Adapt Project was funded for one year and work was started in January 2012. The key aim of the project was to promote the curricular enhancement of the study of Adaptations and associated program development from a cross-disciplinary perspective (involving mainly the disciplines of English, Media, Film and TV, Communication and Cultural Studies, but also Area Studies, Modern Language and Theatre Studies).

This was to be achieved through the creation of a community of practice of academics across a number of disciplinary areas that utilised Adaptation studies course components as part of their curriculum. The creation of an accessible and navigable repository of open learning and teaching resources for students and scholars in the area was at the core of the project.

In support of this, the project had two closely aligned deliverables. These were the development of an openly accessible online repository to support the sharing of learning and teaching resources and a toolkit and user guide to accompany this and provide guidance on legal and other issues likely to be encountered by users of the repository.

The repository was to function as the hub for the development of a community of practice. This would facilitate the sharing, re-use and remixing of open Educational Resources, with a means to enhance learning and teaching resources while building connections between individual members and institutions.

In addition to these deliverables, the project also organised the Teaching Adaptations Symposium, to be held during February 2013, after the completion of the project. The symposium will act as a showcase for the Adapt Open Educational Resources Repository and will encourage discussion about the philosophy of sharing via open educational resources and its advantages in locating a much broader adaptation studies teaching and research community. The first event of its kind in Australia, this project and its outcomes has and will continue to attract international attention and aligned it with other ground-breaking practices in learning and teaching across the world. This will be the key to broadening and establishing a sustainable community of practice.
2.1 Project structure

This section describes the organisational structure of the project, including descriptions of significant individual and group roles.

Project leader

The Project Leader was responsible for the project’s overall direction and oversaw its management and progress. As an internationally-renowned scholar of adaptation studies, she identified a high-quality project team and made contact with scholars in Australia, New Zealand, and the rest of the world. The Project Leader worked closely with the Project Officer in the management of the project and held overall responsibility for project activities.

Project officer

A Project Officer was employed full time for the duration of the project. The Project Officer was responsible for day-to-day work on the project, including coordinating technical efforts, project management and documentation activities, and development of legal and policy documents. The Project Officer worked closely with, and reported to, the Project Leader and has a substantial role in the production of the final report and the organisation of the Symposium.

Project team

The Project team consisted of academics from the University of Tasmania, Monash University, the University of Queensland, and the University of Western Australia. The project team consisted of:

- Professor Imelda Whelehan, Professor, Faculty of Arts, University of Tasmania.
- Professor David Sadler, Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students and Education), University of Tasmania,
- Dr Christopher Worth, Senior Lecturer, School of English and Communication and Performance Studies, Faculty of Arts, Monash University,
- Lisa Fletcher, Lecturer, School of English, Journalism and European Languages, University of Tasmania,
- Frances Bonner, Associate Professor of Television and Popular Culture and Deputy Head of the English, Media Studies and Art History School at The University of Queensland,
- Jason Jacobs, Reader in Cultural History in the School of English, Media Studies and Art History, The University of Queensland,
- Hila Shachar is an Honorary Research Fellow within the Department of English and Cultural Studies at The University of Western Australia.

All but one of those listed above teach and/or research in adaptations related aspects of the Humanities and were chosen to reflect a range of disciplinary interests and levels of academic seniority and experience. Professor Sadler is an expert in Learning and Teaching of international standing. A UK National Teaching Fellow, and former director of the UK Higher Education Academy, he is now on the Strategic Advisory Board of the OLT. He designed and led the UK OER programme.
The project team included a designated Lead Peer Reviewer, Dr Christopher Worth. This role provided leadership on peer review for the project team by producing guidelines for and a set of exemplar reviews of items in the repository. The report of the lead peer reviewer is attached as Appendix A.

Project Reference Group

The Project Reference Group consisted of members of the project team, as well as others with specific expertise and interest in the project. The Project Reference Group met four times over the course of the project, with three meetings via teleconference, and one face-to-face meeting held in Melbourne in mid April.

The Project Reference Group had an advisory, and evaluative role for the project. The terms of reference included the following:

- Provide advice to guide decision making on key project issues,
- Evaluate project deliverables and provide related advice to the Project Leader and Project Officer,
- Approve or make recommendations for changes to key project documents,
- Receive highlight reports prepared by the project officer to monitor the progress of the project, including the project budget,
- Meet to review progress as required through the life of the project.

Membership

The Project Reference Group included the members of the project team, and several additional members who contributed relevant expertise and experience. The additional members were:

- Luke Padgett, Copyright Officer, University of Tasmania
- Jane Long, Director, Library, University of Tasmania
- Professor Gilly Salmon, Pro Vice-Chancellor Learning Transformations, Swinburne University of Technology
- Dr Gary Williams, co-Head of the Tasmanian Institute of Learning and Teaching (TILT) at The University of Tasmania.

Professor Gilly Salmon is widely recognised as an expert on innovation in learning and teaching, having published widely on technology in higher education. UTAS based members of the group provided significant additional expertise in legal and cultural issues associated with OER, and also provided linkages between relevant UTAS work areas and the project.

Meeting summaries

The group met four times over the course of the project. Professor David Sadler chaired meetings and minutes were kept by the Project Officer, shared on the project wiki and confirmed at subsequent meetings. Full minutes of the meetings of the Project Reference Group are attached as Appendix B.

Meeting One

The first meeting was held on January 24th and approved several important
documents for the project including the terms of reference for the reference group and other project documentation.

Meeting Two

The second meeting of the group was held in Melbourne on April 20th and was the first opportunity for the group to meet in person together. Several documents were approved at this meeting, including the communication plan and evaluation plan. The impact of copyright was the main issue for discussion, with a presentation by the project officer and UTAS copyright officer and reference group member Luke Padgett leading the group through the issues associated with copyright and licencing of OER in an Australian context. The outcomes of this meeting included a shared understanding of the complexities of copyright and a decision on the use of creative commons licencing for all items in the repository.

Meeting Three

The third meeting was held by teleconference on July 16th and consisted mainly of progress reports against the deliverables for the project. The projects communication strategy was also discussed, in particular opportunities for members of the group to promote the project among their colleagues and at conferences they might attend.

Meeting Four

The final meeting was held by teleconference in mid November. The main item for discussion was ongoing management of the repository as well as opportunities for further projects or research based on the project.

Technical development

University of Tasmania staff carried out technical work related to the development of the repository. These staff were from the team responsible for managing the implementation of the Desire2Learn Learning Management System, recently adopted by the University, which included the software used to support the Adapt Repository. UTAS staff from relevant sections also completed additional work, including the design aspects of the project, such as developing a logo, typography, colour themes and web design.

External project consultants

Professor Anne Fitzgerald from Creative Commons Australia and Queensland University of Technology provided legal advice for the project. Professor Fitzgerald has a wealth of experience working with intellectual property law and in particular the legal aspects of providing open access repositories. Additional assistance with copyright and legal aspects of the project was also received from Luke Padgett, University of Tasmania copyright officer.

Alison Dickens from Southampton University was the External Evaluator for the project. Details of the project evaluation are included in section 2.3. The report of the external evaluator is included as Appendix C.
2.2 Project approach and methodology

The project tackled the development of a legal approach and a repository simultaneously. Both of these outcomes were designed to facilitate the development of a community of practice and were closely aligned to ensure technical and legal workflows were consistent and clear to the end user.

Because the repository was to be hosted and managed by UTAS, approval for the legal aspects of the project had to be gained from the University’s office of Legal and Governance. This involved liaison with the Legal and Governance Office while the legal documents were in the process of being drafted, and the submission of the completed documentation for scrutiny once this was complete. Minor changes were recommended, and these were incorporated into the final version of the legal documents.

Memorandum of Understanding

During the course of the project all partner institutions signed a memorandum of understanding in its early phase. This memorandum allowed for sharing of University intellectual property under open licences between the institutions and within the repository.

Community of practice

The facilitation of a community of practice (CoP) was a primary goal of the project, aligned closely with the development of the repository and toolkit. The project team formed the initial core of the community of practice and the project aimed to expand membership of the repository, and therefore the community.

The symposium will provide the opportunity to expand the scope of the repository beyond the project team. Further detail on the symposium is available in section 2.6.

Peer review

Peer review is a valuable element of a CoP insofar as it encourages two-way dialogue and also reflection for both the reviewer and reviewed and effects changes in practice. Peer review, thorough the use of OERs, is a concept relatively unused in teaching but very widespread in research. Our project therefore breaks new ground in this practice in teaching.

Peer review of the Open Educational Resources shared in the Adapt Repository was encouraged through the inclusion of a Lead Peer reviewer role in the project Team. Dr Christopher Worth from Monash University filled this role, and produced the guide for peer review and report included as Appendix A.

Peer review is an important aspect of the repository and the community of practice and provides a greater emphasis on the community aspect of the repository and also provides a means for resources to be enhanced through constructive criticism. Peer review of items in the repository was not intended purely as a means of quality assurance, rather it was intended as a means for constructive feedback on items and the related teaching practice to be shared.

The guide for peer review is based around three questions for those providing peer review:

1. **How would you describe the potential quality of the resources as a learning experience?**

2. **How would you assess the opportunities to share and re-use this resource?**

3. **What further information or editing of the resources or its entry in Adapt would enhance its ‘shareability’?**
Sub-questions for each question provide greater detail on suggested feedback and help to
guide the peer review towards the provision of information that will enhance the value of
the resources rather than simply providing criticism or ratings for items. The questions
provoke a reflective response to the item and on the teaching practice of associated with it,
by the person leaving the comment and by other users who read the comments.

The Repository also provides a threaded discussion forum that can be used by members of
the repository to discuss issues related to Open Educational Resources and learning and
teaching in Adaptations. This provides a secondary avenue for discussion related to items
uploaded into the repository in addition to the peer review commenting system, although
this is an incremental process as cultural constraints around sharing teaching materials
slowly reduce.

Development of the toolkit.

The toolkit for the project was intended as a guide for users of the site in legal and other
issues. The toolkit, or Good Practice Guide, as it was subsequently named, was developed in
consultation with the University of Tasmania’s Copyright Officer, Luke Padgett and Professor
Anne Fitzgerald from Creative Commons Australia and Queensland University of Technology.
The Project Officer liaised closely with both Mr Padgett and Professor Fitzgerald in creating
the guide, some sections of which were adapted, with attribution, from existing resources
and some of which were created specifically for the project. The guide was revised based on
feedback from the Project Reference Group and the Project Leader and will remain a living
document that is subject to revisions based on issues arising that require the guide to be
edited.

The toolkit was created as a series of web pages within the repository, which can be
exported as static PDF documents for distribution beyond the repository. This allows for
ease of editing and a continuously developing document, as well as the ease of distribution
associated with PDF documents. The toolkit is openly accessible and is available for re-use
under a creative commons licence, which encourages its use by other institutions in the
preparation of similar approaches.

Further information on the legal approach and the associated toolkit (Good Practice Guide)
is available in section 2.6, and it is attached to the report as Appendix B.

Development of the repository

The first step in the development of the repository was to create a document describing the
functionality and other requirements of the repository. The evaluation of software was
limited to two software packages which were in use at UTAS and which could provide
repository functionality. These requirements are further detailed in section 2.7 and are
attached as Appendix D.

The decision was made early in the project to use the Desire2Learn learning management
system (LMS) as the basis for the repository. The repository functionality associated with
the LMS fulfilled many of the requirements of the repository and importantly had the
advantage of a large, locally based support team who were already working on its
development. The use of this key system to support the repository also had the advantage
that support for the system would be provided over the longer term, making the
sustainability and ongoing management of the project’s outcomes easier to manage.

As UTAS considered the Adapt Project as an important strategic project for the development
of an institutional approach to OER, support for the use of Desire2Learn as the repository
for the project was readily available within the institution. The Desire2Learn Learning
management System is a remotely hosted system, which is physically based on servers in
Melbourne.
The potential challenges for using the Desire2Learn system lay primarily in the fact that it had only recently been acquired by the University and was in the process of being embedded to replace a former learning management system. Therefore the Adapt project was required to work to the timetable of a larger and strategically more important project (the implementation of a new LMS for the University), which depended upon technology hosted off site. Delays in the implementation of the system, and in providing solutions to problems encountered meant that the timetable of the Adapt Project had to be adjusted, and this has had some impact on the timing of key milestones.

Whilst the project has successfully completed the goals initially set, the delay in making the repository public has meant that the numbers of items in the repository remain low at the project’s end, and fewer people have registered to become a part of the Adapt community than had been anticipated at this stage. As was noted (Bossu, Brown & Bull 2012) there is an uneven understanding about and usage of OERs in Australian universities, meaning that in some ways this project is acting as an important pilot in this area and its full benefit may only be realised beyond its funded term. Given the undertaking by the University of Tasmania to maintain the Adapt repository beyond the OLT funding period, it is hoped that interest and engagement will increase as understanding and support for OER usage expands in Australia. UTAS strategy for Open Education will strengthen the Adapt repository as UTAS seeks bilateral and multilateral partnerships, nationally and globally, and on subject bases, to populate the overall repository.
2.3 Communication and Dissemination

This section outlines the communication strategies used by the project to reach external stakeholders, and to manage internal communications.

Internal communication

Several means of internal communication were used to ensure that the project team and internal stakeholders were aware of progress and able to participate in discussions throughout the project term. The following list outlines the various means of communication and what each was used to achieve.

Wiki

A wiki was used for the storage of project documentation. This allowed all members of the project team to access project documents such as minutes of meetings, and to edit pages on the wiki to contribute information. The wiki provided a useful interface for the storage of documents in an accessible format, but did not end up being used for collaborative document editing as feedback on documents created for the project was largely from versions circulated by email, due to the preferences of the team. The Wiki was hosted at UTAS and was built using the Confluence platform.

Skype / teleconference

As the project team was geographically dispersed conversations were largely held over Skype or teleconferences. These provided cheap and easy to use means of communication within Australia and, in the case of the external evaluator, internationally.

Email

Email was used for most communication between the members of the project team. Email provides a simple and easy to useful way to share important information across the project team and to communicate with other individuals and stakeholders.

Documentation of meetings

Documentation from the project was stored on a wiki, including information relating to meetings, including minutes of the reference group meetings as well as notes from meetings between the project officer and technical staff and stakeholders.

External communication

External communication efforts were designed to facilitate awareness of the project and the project utilised a variety of means to achieve this. The following list outlines these approaches and identifies the reasons for their use.

Brand and identity

The Adapt identity was created early in the course of the project and provided a brand for the project’s activities. The design was completed by staff from the University of Tasmania, and included a full style guide for the projects communications. The name Adapt came from a shortening of Adaptations: and as well as referring to this shortening evokes the verb, which could be seen as referring to the change in practice that OER represents. The typeface-based logo with a simple icon was used on all project promotional materials and in the online presence for the project.

Email

An email distribution list was created for the purpose of making contact with academics in
Australia and Internationally and garner early interest in the project. This was made by gathering email addresses from the web sites of schools and faculties of relevant tertiary institutions in Australia and internationally and by access to the mailing list of the Association of Adaptation Studies.

**Blog**

The project blog allowed information about the project, including announcements and other items of interest to be published quickly and easily online. All members of the project team were able to publish items to the blog, with most members contributing at least one post. In addition to being a place for announcements the blog provided a platform for reflection by individual members of the team. The blog will remain accessible to members of the project team beyond the end of the project and may be used for further promotion of activities related to the symposium or the repository.

**Social Media**

Social media provided another means to communicate information about the project to interested parties. Twitter and Facebook were both used and provided communication channels which reached different stakeholders and interested parties. Although the numbers of followers were modest for these social networking channels, they required little effort to establish and did provide those interested in the project to keep up to date with developments.

Twitter provides a service that allows individuals or organisations to ‘tweet’ short messages to their followers. The Twitter presence of the project (@adapt_oer) gained twenty-eight followers and was used primarily for the announcement of project news.

Facebook is a social network that allows individuals or organisations to establish a page and share messages with those who ‘Like’ the page. The Facebook page for the project had 56 Likes over the course of the project.

**Other online channels**

The Academia.edu profile of the project leader, Professor Imelda Whelehan was also to promote the project’s online presence. So far this profile has had over 2,500 views. As Trustee of the international Association of Adaptation Studies the Project Leader was also able to promote the project directly to Association members.

**Poster presentation**

The project officer attended the November meeting of the Promoting Excellence Network Tasmania/Victoria to present a poster showcasing the Adapt Project. The meeting was focussed on networking and OLT grant applications, and there was significant interest in the project from attendees.

**Mini cards**

Mini cards with basic details about the project were created and shared with members of the project team and reference group, who distributed them among colleagues and at conferences and other events that they attended. The mini card included the logo of the project, a short text description of the goals of the project and the web address and contact details for the project. The mini card design is reproduced in Appendix F.

**Flyers**

Printed flyers advertising the symposium and the project were distributed to relevant faculties and schools nationally. Members of the project reference group also distributed
these while attending conferences nationally and internationally. The flyer is reproduced in Appendix F.

**Promotion of the Project at Events**

Members of the project reference group and project team also promoted the project to their personal networks and at professional events. Flyers were also distributed by mail to relevant schools and faculties around Australia. Professors Sadler and Whelehan were able to promote the project at several national and international events over the course of 2012. These included:

- OER Conference, University of Otago, NZ - Keynote Speaker on OER (D. Sadler, 28/06/2012)
- Learning and Teaching Conference, Massey University Wellington, NZ - Keynote Speaker, D. Sadler. 29/06/2012)
- Learning and Teaching Conference, Massey University, Palmerston North, NZ - Keynote Speaker (D. Sadler, 02/07/2012)
- National OER Symposium, Sydney - Keynote (D. Sadler, 31/08/2012)
2.4 Cultural Issues

This section explores the cultural issues associated with usage and sharing of Open Educational Resources in the Adapt Project.

OER Internationally

Anecdotally there appears to be little formal sharing of learning and teaching resources between academics from different Australian tertiary institutions. This lack of precedent partly explains a perceived inertia in the sector in relation to the late development of OER practice in comparison with other comparable regions. This inertia is in part a result of lack of understanding of OER and its applicability to learning and teaching and the absence of a culture of sharing and peer reviewing in teaching (in opposition to developed practices in research).

In the USA large-scale OER Projects from individual universities and cross-institutional organisations have achieved high visibility and high levels of government support. Pioneering efforts such as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Open Courseware project have received widespread international praise for opening up resources that would normally be inaccessible to learners and teachers around the world.

OER has also gained widespread acceptance and understanding in the United Kingdom and Europe, where cross-institutional projects and internationally cooperative efforts from organisations such as JISC and the Higher Education Academy have led the development of OER.

OER in Australia

The recent OLT funded project, Adoption, use and management of Open Educational Resources (OERs) to enhance teaching and learning in Australia provides greater background on the development of OER in Australia and outlines some of the barriers which have prevented the adoption of creation and use of OER being as widespread as in other comparable regions. Anecdotal evidence from the project team suggest that copyright limitations, lack of clear direction from institutions in relation to intellectual property issues in sharing learning and teaching resources, and lack of precedent in cross-institution sharing of resources contribute to the comparably low rate of creation of OER in Australian tertiary institutions.

Australian copyright law does not include the same provisions for fair use as other comparable jurisdictions such as the United States. Evidence from this project suggests that this may be a factor in the lack of development of OER in Australia. In developing the legal approach to sharing, it was necessary to exclude any third party copyright material that was not licenced under a Creative Commons Licence. This barrier to sharing is likely to limit the range and possibly the amount of Australian learning and teaching materials that can be made available as OER.

Recommendations

1. The OLT is encouraged to think further about how the two central elements of this project can be taken forward strategically at a national level. These being how subject-based communities are encouraged, especially in the adoption of innovative approaches to learning and teaching, and secondly (and in a related manner) how Australia might be competitive internationally in the area of Open Educational Resources.

2. The OLT is encouraged to explore how best to facilitate emergent areas of study and link dispersed and possibly atomised scholars across institutional boundaries including through the evaluation of the effectiveness of Community of Practice (CoP).
3. The OLT and other bodies are encouraged to recognise how Open Educational Resources can facilitate greater collaboration in teaching among academics. Establishing wider Communities of Practice through the embedding of OERs in the working practices of academics will provide a means for enhancing teaching in Australia through collaborative and reflective practice.
2.5 Teaching Adaptations Symposium

The two-day Teaching Adaptations symposium was held in Hobart, Tasmania from 4-5 February 2013. While the Adapt repository was showcased at this event, the main aim of the symposium was to enhance the sense of community among adaptation studies scholars and prompt debate about the status of adaptation studies in the Arts and Humanities today and share innovative approaches to learning and teaching in the field.

The call for papers emphasised diversity of approach and the event resulted in a deeper awareness of what teaching adaptations involves and where such teaching occurs. Keynote speakers for the symposium was be Deborah Cartmell from De Montfort University (UK) and Laurence Raw from Baskent University (Turkey). Professor Cartmell is a UK Higher Education Academy National Teaching Fellow in the field, and Dr Raw has published widely on teaching in Adaptation studies. Other presenters came from a range of universities across the Australian sector and also include delegates from New Zealand, UK, Belgium, China and the USA. The scheduled of presentations for the Symposium is attached as Appendix G.

The symposium explored adaptation studies as a growing inter- and cross-disciplinary activity with international reach. Delegates reflected on teaching adaptation studies in existing disciplines, what is taught under this banner, and whether disciplinary methodologies affect learning and teaching in different areas of study.

Discussion of learning and teaching issues related to Adaptations among a group of scholars from diverse disciplinary backgrounds will contribute to the development of a community of practice among attendees. While this area has gone from strength to strength as a research area (with the creation of two new scholarly journals in recent years), its status as a widespread pedagogical approach in the Arts and Humanities has yet to be more broadly explored. As well as providing a showcase for the project, presentations encouraged delegates to browse, and register to share, in the repository. It also promoted discussion about the philosophy of sharing via open education resources and its advantages for learning and teaching.
2.6 Legal Issues

This section outlines the approach to legal issues associated with Open Educational Resources that was used by the Adapt Project and the challenges that were encountered. These primarily relate to the use of copyright materials in learning and teaching resources, ownership of intellectual property by universities, and the licencing of learning and teaching resources as OERs. Developing a coherent legal approach meant balancing the requirement to comply with strong protection for copyright works with the desire to release resources under open licences allowing reuse and remixing.

Developing a Legal Framework for Open Educational Resources

The Adapt project sought to establish a working repository during a one-year project in an area where direct precedents operating in the same legal jurisdiction were not available. This meant that some approaches were borrowed from projects facilitating open access in the research sector, and other elements were tailored to provide for the desired outcomes based on advice to the project. The copyright and licencing approaches adopted by the project aimed to deliver a robust and workable approach which balanced the necessity of protecting the rights of copyright holders with the need to make resources available under licences which enabled re-use and remixing of resources.

The project benefitted from the significant expertise of Professor Anne Fitzgerald, from Creative Commons Australia and Queensland University of Technology Faculty of Law, who provided crucial advice on the use of creative commons licences and the management of risk in an open access repository. University of Tasmania copyright Officer Luke Padgett also provided important advice related to the development of a robust legal framework to facilitate the completion of project goals.

The legal framework which was developed for the Adapt project relied as much as possible on existing approaches to licencing and management of intellectual property which were developed in support of open access to research resources. Learning and Teaching resources however have quite different requirements, and many aspects of the existing legal framework could not simply be adopted by the project.

Managing Legal Risk

The management of of risk was an important element in the creation of a legal approach to the repository. Legal risks associated with copyright were identified early in the project as a potentially serious issue to be managed and were considered of primary importance in the development of the legal approach for the repository. The legal approaches used by the Adapt Project were built around an approach based on minimising risk wherever possible while also minimising administrative workload for project staff. The major risks to be minimised were in the publication of third party copyright material in the repository, and the associated possibilities for expensive legal action associated with this.

The nature of the Adaptations discipline meant that academics would be likely to use a significant number of in-copyright resources in their learning and teaching resources. Education on the legal issues associated with this provided legally robust workflows for the repository.

Overview of Copyright in Australia

Copyright in Australia is governed by the Copyright Act 1968. The Copyright Act provides copyright owners with exclusive rights to copy, publish, adapt, perform in public and to communicate their copyright material. Where such activities occur in another country then the copyright laws of that country apply. Copyright protects literary (including computer software), dramatic, musical and artistic works, performances, published editions, sound recordings, films and broadcasts.
Copyright management for learning and teaching in Australian Universities

The use of third party copyright material in learning and teaching resources in Australia is common. The use of these copyright protected works is allowed under paid statutory licences that are administered by statutory licencing bodies. These licences allow for use by staff and students of the University only, which means that any learning and teaching resource which includes content which is reproduced under one of these statutory licences cannot be provided as an open educational resource.

Ownership of copyright in learning and teaching materials

Australian University employment contracts generally include provisions that give the University ownership of the copyright in works created during employment, including learning and teaching materials. This ownership is usually detailed in University intellectual property policies, however these generally focus on research and commercialisation activities rather than learning and teaching resources and do not usually provide for the release of such materials under open content licences or provide detail on procedures for obtaining permission from the institution to achieve this.

In addition to the University claiming ownership, anecdotal evidence suggests that the ownership of many learning and teaching resources in use in Australian institutions may not be clear. Academics who take up a position in a University other than the one in which they developed a particular resource will commonly reuse that resource as part of the curriculum at their new place of employment. This, and the informal sharing and adaptation of learning and teaching resources, means that ownership in some resources may be difficult to discern.

However, it is clear that in most institutions an academic wanting to share the learning and teaching material that they have developed during their employment would need to receive permission for this from the University. This presents a barrier to the sharing of learning and teaching resources as open educational resources, resources which, unlike research outputs, do not generally have any sale value outside the institution and which could provide great benefit if they were shared openly.

Licencing for Open Access

The goal of an Open Educational Resources repository is to provide freely accessible resources that can be reused, remixed and shared without further permission being required. Under copyright law in Australia these acts are limited to copyright owners unless the items are made available under a licence that provides permission. The most commonly used examples of such licences are those provided by Creative Commons Australia.

Creative Commons Licencing

Creative Commons licences are internationally recognised and provide clear, widely understood licences which allow a spectrum of reuse or remixing of resources to take place without further permission from the copyright holder. In Australia, as in other jurisdictions, Creative Commons licences have become the standard mechanism for organisations and individuals to provide for a wider range of uses of their copyright material than is allowed under copyright law. Many Australian government agencies release publications or data under Creative Commons licences with the view to facilitating public use without requiring specific permission, as would be the case for items released under standard copyright.

Creative Commons licences include a suite of six standard licences; each provides a particular set of permissions for the end user and allow the licensor to provide some granularity in the permissions that they grant to the end user. Each licence is made up of several elements that are combined to form clear sets of permissions.
Adoption of Creative Commons Licences

In establishing the licencing framework for the repository, the issue of whether to provide a single broad licence for every item within the repository, or allow a choice from one of the available Creative Commons licences was discussed. These issues were outlined to the Project Reference Group, which recommended a choice of licence for academics publishing items into the repository. This was to provide for individual choice of permissions in whether to allow commercial re-use or not. All content published on the repository is required to be licenced under one of the six standard licences which Creative Commons Australia makes available, with the default being the simple attribution licence.

The requirement that items be made available under a Creative Commons licence has the effect of ensuring that further permissions are not required for re-use, and in most cases remixing; however it also has the effect of excluding learning and teaching materials which include material that cannot be made available under that licence. While this limitation presents a barrier to the sharing of much material in the repository, the project’s goal is to provide material that can be freely re-used within current Australian copyright restrictions.

Overview of the legal framework adopted by the project

The clearest way to illustrate the legal framework that was developed and adopted by the project is to look at the workflow that leads to the sharing of items into the repository. The workflow diagrams below provides a basic overview of the steps in registering an account, publishing and item, and that item becoming available for download by users of the repository, who are not required to log in to access items in the repository.

**Description of registration workflow for a new user**

The first step for a new user who wishes to share items in the repository is to register to create an account. Registration is available from the repository’s public facing login page, which is linked to from the project website (www.adapt.edu.au). Registration is a simple process for a new user and just requires them to provide a minimal amount of identifying information and to agree to the repository deposit agreement and the terms and conditions of use. The terms and conditions and deposit agreement (Appendix H) are legally binding, and set out the relationship between the repository and the user.
Registration

Registration requires depositors to agree to the deposit agreement and terms and conditions of use, which includes the requirement to make items available under a creative commons licence. This agreement also requires the depositor to warrant that they will not include any third party copyright material unless it was available under a creative commons licence, and that they will obtain permission from their institution for the sharing of learning and teaching resources, if this is required.

This approach does introduce an element of risk, as it cannot be guaranteed that all depositors will fully understand and abide by the agreement that they have agreed to. However it is impossible to eliminate all risk from an open repository and the provision of educational resources in the form of the legal toolkit (Good Practice Guide) do mean that all users of the repository have access to clear and easy to understand information explaining the legal issues involved. This is also supported by institutional scrutiny and a clear ‘take-down’ policy.

Figure 1 Registration process diagram for new repository user
Registration is managed by a repository administrator who checks the details of each registration to ensure that the person registering has included the appropriate information and can either approve the registration or make contact with the person seeking registration to resolve any issues that may arise. Once a user is registered the system assigns them a temporary password that they can use to log in (requiring them to change it as part of the initial log in process) and access the repository.

The deposit agreement was based on an agreement drafted by the Anne Fitzgerald, Kylie Pappalardo and Anthony Austin, and made available for free use under a Creative Commons Licence.

**Publication**

![Figure 2 Process diagram detailing steps in publication](image)

When a user has an account they are able to share items in the repository quickly and easily. Once the user is logged in to their account they can click ‘publish’ and the publication dialogue is opened. This involves the selection of a file, addition of standard metadata and selection of a licence to apply, and after clicking again, the item is available for download from the repository.

Only registered users are able to publish items to the repository or leave peer review comments on other items. This, and manual checking of identities from registration limit the possibilities for spam comments or deliberately offensive or otherwise illegal content being published from the repository.
Search and Retrieval

Search of the repository is available from the website of the project or for a logged in user, from the repository. Both searches allow for free download of files from the repository. Search can be based on name, title details or other keyword metadata assigned during the publication process.

Use of the items downloaded is subject to the Creative Commons licences that are applied to them. Information on the licences is displayed next to the results in a search. Further detail can be found by clicking the link and reading the description of the licence at the Creative Commons Australia website.

Legal Toolkit (Good Practice Guide)

The development of a toolkit was a core deliverable of the project. The name Good Practice Guide was applied to provide a clearer description of the purpose of the document. It acts as both a copyright toolkit and a technical help document for users of the repository. The full Good Practice Guide is appended to this report (Appendix B). This section describes the development of the Good Practice Guide.

Legal Information

As the legal approach was developed during the project, information on how to apply this for an individual interested in uploading items to the repository or understanding the issues associated with using the resources was added to the toolkit. The use of technical language and complex legal jargon was avoided wherever possible, however as copyright is a somewhat complex legal topic it was necessary to include some complexity to avoid misleading end-users about the nature of the copyright issues.

Technical Help

The technical help sections were developed by the Project Officer and describe the basic functionality of the repository using text descriptions and screen-capture images from the interface to assist users who are unfamiliar with the repository. The repository interface provides a user-friendly environment, with clear navigation and easy to understand workflows for publishing items. Because of this the technical help sections are direct and do not provide in-depth instruction.

Recommendations

4. The OLT is encouraged to promote review of the legal issues associated with OER in
Australia which would be beneficial, in particular further work on exceptions in existing copyright law which could be used by OER repositories.

5. The OLT is encouraged to use the findings of this project and the related project from UNE, Massey and USQ, and especially its Feasibility Protocol to encourage Australian tertiary institutions to ensure provisions designed to allow the sharing of learning and teaching materials in Intellectual Property policies.
2.7 Technical development and interoperability

This section outlines the process used to select and implement the technical aspects of the Adapt project and provides some recommendations for establishing a new OER repository based on this experience. Some relevant standards for interoperability are highlighted, as are recommendations for further development in Australia.

The repository was a core deliverable of the project, and provided the scaffolding for the development of all other aspects. The project has worked through a process of evaluation, selection, and implementation and the repository was opened to the project team in early July. The selection of software for the repository was driven by three factors; the functionality required, the need for ongoing support beyond the life of the project and the limited timeframe for implementation. The system that provides the best fit with these requirements is the Desire2Learn Learning Object Repository.

Selection of repository software

The Project Officer, in collaboration with the Project Leader, created a document outlining the functional requirements of a repository system for the project, included as Appendix D. This document outlines in broad terms the expected workflow, standards compatibility and other functionality required of the system, although not all functionality was considered critical. In addition to these functional requirements, consideration was given to software support, skills available to the project at UTAS, costs of possible systems as well as future development of the system.

The legal approach described in the functional requirements document differs significantly from the approach developed and used by the project, most notably in describing an intermediate stage between the upload of an item to the repository and it being made publicly accessible in the repository. This stage was initially envisioned as being a review stage, for both quality and legal efficacy of the published items, however as this would have represented a significant workload on an ongoing basis a legal approach was developed which provided a means to minimise this risk and is facilitated by the Good Practice Guide (Appendix B), however some risk is borne by the University of Tasmania in hosting the repository. The level of risk is minimal and was deemed acceptable by University lawyers during the course of the project.

Standards

It is important that repositories are interoperable and adhere to relevant international standards (Commonwealth of Learning 2012). This provides for important federated searching and for interoperability between repositories.

The informal review of available systems conducted as part of the process of selection of repository software indicated that standards are adhered to in most available repository software, and it is not, in general, an issue that recommends one system over another.

Relevant standards include the Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH) standard that allows repositories communicate using a standard set of protocols. This can also enable federated searching across repositories, or the harvesting of content from one repository to another. The Dublin Core metadata standards and IEEE LOM metadata standards provide standardised descriptors for items held in repositories. The Adapt repository adopted the Dublin core metadata standards as the basis for its metadata schema due to the lowered barrier to entry of metadata descriptors by repository users.

Implementation

The Desire2Learn learning management system is being implemented as the learning management system for the University of Tasmania. The Learning Object Repository is a...
component of this larger software package, and will be used by the University for the storage of learning resources for internal use, as the basis for the Adapt repository and for future OER initiatives. UTAS has provided significant in-kind support for the project through the allocation of staff resources to support repository development and the purchase and negotiation of software licences.

The use of the Desire2Learn system did mean that certain functionality could not be delivered within the project’s short timeframe, for example the display of the names of academics who published a particular item to the repository was not possible within the current version of the system (although it is currently possible to browse the site by author name). However, the ongoing use of the Desire2Learn software and the high level of support for the system due to its importance as a critical institutional system means that functionality will improve and the repository will not require additional skills or significant extra time to manage on an ongoing basis and is therefore more sustainable for the University. For the University this alignment also provides greater opportunity to integrate OER into learning and teaching practices beyond Adapt. The ongoing management of any alternative system would have required significant extra investment in staff resources and potentially financial outlay, for support and management of the system and its sustainability would have been compromised.

The selection of software to provide OER repository functionality requires technical requirements to be met as well as requirements for interoperability and maintenance and support. Interoperability with other institutional systems such as the Learning Management System (LMS) has the potential to enhance use of OER in an institution and should be considered significant in any evaluation of prospective systems.

Recommendations

6. The OLT is encouraged to explore greater collaboration in OER repository development and management which will be beneficial to the sector and could take the form of national or transnational repositories. This would provide impetus for greater adoption of OER among Australian tertiary institutions.
2.8 Sustainability and ongoing management

Funding from the Office of Learning and Teaching for the project was for one year and for the establishment of the repository and development of the community of practice and toolkit. The ongoing management of the repository and other project activities was an important concern during the design of the processes and workflows.

Institutional management and legal issues

The UTAS Learning and Teaching Strategic Plan 2012-14 identified Open Educational Resources as a priority for the institution and stated that the University should:

*Establish Open Education Resource (OER) production and use as a central part of the learning and teaching culture*

The Adapt project has acted as a pilot for the institution in adopting OER and during the course of the project UTAS had created a new position of **OER Project Leader (Copyright & Engagement)** to lead development of OER at UTAS including policy and legal issues. The position holder has liaised closely with the Project Officer for the Adapt Project, and will assume responsibility for legal aspects of OER related to the Adapt Project.

Policies for information use, takedown notification and procedure, and registration are in place and it is not anticipated that these will require amendment in the short term.

Technical

The repository is managed both by staff from UTAS responsible for the management of the associated learning management system and by staff from the Desire2Learn company who provide technical support for the system. The Adapt website registration and hosting is managed by UTAS web service staff and will continue under this arrangement on an ongoing basis.

Community

The Adapt Project has facilitated the creation of a fledgling community of practice focused on sharing learning and teaching resources for Adaptation studies. The Teaching Adaptations Symposium, to be held in February 2013, will expose a wider audience to the repository and showcase it as a hub for Open Education Practice in Adaptations. Some of its papers, in particular sound recordings of the plenary lectures, will be available to share on the repository. The management of the website and repository will facilitate the ongoing development of the community, which does not require active management other than approval for registration of new members and other minor administrative tasks. The repository workflows and processes have been designed to minimise the need for ongoing management of publication and other processes.
2.9 Project Evaluation

The appointment of an external evaluator and the collaborative development of an evaluation plan were accomplished early in the project. The evaluation plan outlined success factors and proposed methods to measure the success of the project against these.

The evaluation of the project was characterised by both formative and summative strategies. Formative aspects of the project evaluation included regular Skype meetings of the Project Leader, Project Officer and the External Evaluator who acted in part as a ‘critical friend’ for key decisions and provided an additional external perspective on issues arising during the project.

The report of the external evaluator was based on the summative evaluation of the project, which involved the External Evaluator conducting individual in-depth interviews with members of the project team and an anonymous survey for members of the project team. The survey instrument is included in the evaluation report (Appendix E).

The evaluation report for the project concluded that ‘for a small-scale project the ambitions were considerable and the achievements commendable’. Technical issues, including delays in the implementation of the repository, which were outside the control of the project team, have resulted in the repository being launched late in the project and the project coming to an end with a limited number of repository users and items available for download. The Symposium was identified as an important event for the project, as it could enable much greater use of the repository and further development of the community of practice of Adaptation Scholars.

As well as technical factors, limitations in Australian copyright law were identified as a barrier to sharing by project team members in the evaluation interviews; both because of the limitations placed upon the use of copyright material as well as perceived risk among institutions involved in the repository. This finding correlates with the findings of the only other OER focussed OLT project in Australia, which also found that copyright issues present a significant barrier to adoption of OER in Australia (Bossu, Brown & Bull 2012 p. 7).

The opportunity for collaboration and sharing of teaching resources across institutions was highlighted by the report of the External Evaluator as a major benefit identified by individual participants. The sharing of research is an established practice that is seen as being beneficial and important, and participant comments suggested that the ability to share their own, and to access others teaching resources offers significant benefits. Although participant knowledge and understanding of OER varied at the beginning of the project, there was agreement that this sharing offered value and the potential to enhance teaching practice.

Key recommendations of the evaluation report were to maintain, and if possible extend, the collaborative relationships developed during the course of the project, to continue the promotion of OER through the repository and community of practice and to consider ways that the repository might gain status as a trusted source for adaptations teaching. The Teaching Adaptations Symposium will provide an excellent opportunity to build on the existing community and increase the number of participating institutions.

Technical recommendations included some suggested changes to the repository interface, including clearer display of the author of items, which is currently not displayed next to items in the repository. This will be addressed in a future version of the repository software.

The report of the External Evaluator provides a valuable analysis of the progress made towards the goals and can be used to enhance technical aspects of the repository and to assist in further developing the community of practice.
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ADAPT! Site Peer Review

Chris Worth, Monash University, October 2012

The peer review process is intended to encourage the continuing development of the repository as a live and interesting resource and to improve the quality of the materials in the repository through constructive comment. Although in the case of Adapt! the initial comments are being made by members of the project reference group, in general peer review is intended to be part of the general openness of the repository, part of the wider interactivity of the site. So at this stage one of the key aims of peer review is to be educative and to model what might be done in the way of constructive comment for those who are interested in the repository and the use of its materials.

Attached is a guide for peer review comments derived by Imelda and Felix from the discussion of peer reviewing which took place at a conference supporting HumBox, the UK humanities open repository -- a discussion moderated by Alison Dickens and others. The idea is to have something like this document up on the Adapt! web site to guide users who wish to comment on the materials (complementing the existing Good Practice Guide for uploaders and users). In my examples of comments I have followed the suggestions of the guide – but I am strongly against converting this very useful set of suggestions into some kind of form, template or required structure. I've made a few changes myself to the draft guide sent to me – I am sure others in the group would be able to develop it further.

General Comments on the Repository

I have some general comments which are really related to the presentation of the site rather than to examples of resource materials. These comments are based on my approaching the site as a user, thinking about what as a visitor I might feel about the repository.

The Site

The ‘look and feel’ is rather stark – perhaps even off-putting. It seems to me that the first page that confronts a user should have some discussion of the potential uses of the site, some encouragement to use it, some examples of the sort s of things that are in it – and at least one suggestion of a way to start using it. I recognise that technical issues and the need to keep the landing page as simple and clear as possible play a role in how it is constructed, but I do think we might do better.

The big question underlying this is: How can we make the site maximally interesting and useful for visitors? Especially for target audiences, including students? [NB note the importance in HumBox of materials which explicitly use OER resources as part of a student-centred university subject – see OpenLines.]

Should we perhaps suggest on the front page some keywords to use and search for? The issue of how to get uploaders to use helpful, specific and shared keywords is a major issue for OERs generally.

I’d like the site to include timings of audio and film components, since this affects both downloading and the amount of time that a visitor might need to spend.

Although each piece of material is ‘authored’ and can be searched for by author, once the
material is served up there is no indication of the author or originator on the material, which seems to me to encourage bad practices amongst users. Is there some way of ensuring that each piece does have some information about its source (and date) attached to it?

Materials

At the date (30th Oct) I went through all the materials on the site, the characteristics of the material were as follows:

- 2 audio files (lectures)
- 2 articles
- 2 PowerPoint files (lectures)
- 17 other pedagogic materials (Word or PDF files)

[And my apologies for not uploading the segmentations I have ready – but haven’t had time to reframe taking into account my own comments about other people’s materials!]

There are some general issues with these materials:

- The effect of self-censorship of copyright material is noticeable (missing pictures and video examples from the lectures most obviously)
- There’s a need to encourage some editing of materials before they are put up – e.g., the course guides in the materials are very useful in all sorts of ways, but the detailed instructions about how and where to submit essays, etc. need to be removed. **The unobtrusive education of uploaders is a key part of peer review.**
- Taking the lead on this, I think for legal and editorial reasons, every uploaded piece should be given at least one early peer review, perhaps by someone from a ‘continuing’ project group – partly to defuse problems, but mainly to encourage sensible practices.
- Uploaders need to be encouraged to pay attention to the titles of their files and materials (below I have used what actually is visible to a user on the site). Some titles are a little mysterious, others rather too specific. Given that the materials can also be downloaded it would perhaps be sensible to encourage participants to read advice on naming the actual uploaded files, assuming that no one is going to come in to regularise them.

The site is intended as a pedagogic resource, but it seems to me that acknowledging the importance of research materials and incorporating them into it would be good – for many visitors what will be most exciting in the material will be the demonstration of the relation of research to pedagogy (something of course that all universities are strongly promulgating)

Use of the Site

Obviously the actual usage of the site is at the moment negligible, so it’s not possible to comment on that.

Publicity for the site through the internet community will be a key issue, but difficult.

It seems to me that the most important task for a ‘continuing’ project group in relation to
the site is to encourage and build a community of practice through interactivity and peer review.

Specific Reviews

I read, watched and listened to and made notes about all the materials on the site available to me at the end of October. The following specific reviews are intended to cover a range of types of material – they are longer than I would want to encourage reviews to be on site, but I thought I’d try to be as explicit as possible.

1. #11 ‘Lecture Recording, UTAS: From Emma to Clueless’ (audio) (Lisa Fletcher).
   Excellent example of the material we like to share, a really good lecture, carefully prepared. Students would learn a lot from this, provided they responded to traditional modes of presentation and illustration of critical arguments. Like all good lectures this offers further sources of reading, poses problems for students and asks for thoughts about the viewpoint presented. But it’s difficult to see how it asks the student to actively engage in the lecture itself. NB The illustrative material (pieces from films, PP slides) has been removed to avoid copyright or technical issues; the lecture actually makes good sense without them but again listeners to the argument are deprived of a way to involve themselves further. I could certainly conceive of ways in which this lecture could be used to extend the knowledge and challenge the assumptions of my students in both ‘Adaptation to Film’ and in ‘Narrative’. A set of references and useful web sites would enhance the usefulness of the lecture (of the kind probably provided in the PowerPoint slides that would have accompanied this lecture). The description of the lecture is very clear, but perhaps rather formal and too much like a UTas handbook entry - what’s done in it could be presented much more excitingly. The keywords ‘film’ and ‘literature’ are perhaps too general to be useful – better the phrase ‘film and literature’, if this were available?

2. #4 ‘ENGL2243: Australian Literature: Fiction into Film, 2010, Course Guide’ (print) (Alison Bartlett). The great thing about this course guide is that it offers a model for academic staff building a subject in the area as well as obviously being useful for students! Like many of the other excellent subject guides and teaching materials on the site, it presupposes a face-to-face teaching/learning environment, which perhaps limits its usefulness as an OER resource. As a group these materials (especially from Western Australia and Tasmania) represent a generous sharing of creative and effective pedagogy and they contribute directly towards building a confident and constructive academic community in the disciplinary (or interdisciplinary!) area. [NB I suppose that UWA and UTas might consider that course materials are in fact the copyright of the universities not the staff. This is not an issue immediately since the materials are covered by the Project agreements – but possibly external contributors to the site might need to be encouraged to offer such materials with institutional affiliation downplayed and the idea of a contribution to pedagogic method emphasised.]
3. #12 ‘Revision Worksheet’ (PowerPoint slide) (Imelda Whelehan– but name not visible on actual material) and #16 ‘Screening Report’ (print) (Lisa Fletcher – but name not visible on actual material). Two great, simple aids to teaching an adaptation subject – the sort of material that to my mind works well in the repository because it offers a way of spreading knowledge about creative and effective teaching methods and useful approaches to learning without implying shared critical perspectives or normative assessment objectives. Also usable by students as well as staff. Some other great teaching tools, like the assessment ideas in #17, ‘Assessment model – the box set essay’ (print) (Imelda Whelehan) and #19 ‘Development of the first exercise in Adaptation’ (print) (Frances Bonner) have the same value, although perhaps a little more oriented towards the mentoring of other academic staff involved in teaching adaptation subjects. Keywords for most of these materials are not helpful enough for someone trying to negotiate the site.

4. #23 ‘Student Perceptions of the Study of Film in English Courses’ (print) (Hila Shachar) and #2 ‘Sex and the Single Girl York’ (print) (?). I suppose that as an OER, Adapt! is being thought of primarily as working in the pedagogic area. But both these pieces which incorporate significant research seem to me to enhance the value of the site greatly. If we are to take seriously the notion that a distinctive feature of university learning is that it is research-led, then examples of how to do critical and theoretical analysis of adaptations and examples of how to investigate what actually happens in the classroom when students confront ideas about adaptation seem to me to be enormously valuable. These are focussed pieces which are also clearly able to be ‘repurposed’. Students could easily be encouraged to replicate or extend some of the methods and ideas in these pieces. I’d certainly imagine doing this in my subjects. Some suggestions about how students or staff could this would add to the value of the material.
Outline for Peer Review Comments

The following headings identify three main areas of consideration when completing a peer review comment on a resource. You are encouraged to consider the headings and questions listed beneath (as applicable), when commenting on the material. Your honest and constructive reactions will help others to assess and use Adapt! resources in their teaching.

How would you describe the potential quality of the resource as a learning experience?

- Look at the creative, effective or innovative nature of the resource in terms of learning, pedagogy, presentation, concept.
- Does the resource provide an opportunity to actively engage a visitor to the site in the material: for instance with skills practice or user interactivity?
- Consider what the resource adds to current knowledge on the topic
- Does it include an appropriate form of evaluation or assessment for users to interact with?

How would you assess the opportunities to share and re-use this resource?

- Are there any potential copyright/IPR infringements in the resource?
- Has an unusual file format been used?
- Could the format or content of this resource be used outside its core subject discipline? Give details.
- Have you used, or could you use this resource in your teaching or learning in any way? Give brief details of your ideas

What further information or editing of the resource, or its entry in Adapt!, would enhance its ‘shareability’?

- Does the item contain links to further resources?

Felix sent me, but I have not changed the content significantly. What other suggestions do people have about this outline, were it to go up on the repository site alongside the Good Practice Guide?

The outline focuses some attention on the audience we imagine looking at the site – it seems to me that the language used should be open enough to make academics and teachers comfortable without excluding students or a more general, interested population.

Chris Worth
Appendix B Good Practice Guide (Toolkit)

Note: formatting of original document modified for addition as appendix.

Good Practice Guide to the Adapt Open Educational Resources Repository

This guide contains information about making use of the repository, whether you are publishing items, want to learn more about creative commons licensing, or want to understand what you can do with the items in the repository. Each section of the guide provides advice about different aspects of the repository.

If you have any questions about the guide or the repository, please ask.

You can contact repository staff by email: adapt.project@utas.edu.au, or by using the discussion forum. Open Educational Resources

Why share teaching resources?

By sharing your teaching materials in the Adapt Repository you are contributing to an open collection of resources that can be used by learners and teachers from all over the world to enhance learning and teaching. You are also joining a community of adaptations scholars who use, adapt, share, and provide peer review of learning and teaching resources in the repository.

What to share in the repository

OER Commons provides a good definition of Open Educational Resources as:

‘teaching and learning materials that are freely available online for everyone to use, whether you are an instructor, student or self-learner. Examples of OER include: full courses, course modules, syllabi, lectures, homework assignments, quizzes, lab and classroom activities, pedagogical materials, games, simulations, and many more resources contained in digital media collections from around the world’

http://www.oercommons.org/about#what-are-open-educational-resources-oer

- Materials that you create for students in the classroom or online could useful to others who teach similar subjects.

- Curricula and other planning documents may also be of interest to teachers when developing their own lessons and courses.

- Recordings of lectures you have given to students may be beneficial for other teachers, or to students and interested others.

When considering what to share, don’t worry too much about quality or formatting (although can be important), but do consider what you and your colleagues or students have found useful.

Peer review of resources in the repository is also encouraged and can provide helpful information to those considering using a resource, and also to the person who created the resource.
Adapting and using Open Educational Resources

The resources available in the Adapt repository are available to you to re-use, adapt, and share. They have been licenced under creative commons licences that allow you to do this without infringing copyright.

You must give credit to the original creator and comply with any other conditions in the licence. The End User (Creative Commons) licencing section of this guide has more information on licences.

As well as using items in the repository to create new teaching resources you might also use the resources to supplement your existing teaching resources, for example assigning a lecture on a related topic as an extra resource for your students.

How to: publish a new item

How to publish a new item into the repository

Publishing a new item to the repository is quick and simple. There are two screens with several options. Please ensure that you are familiar with the copyright and licencing information in the guide before publishing items to the repository.

1. Add the file

Upload the file from your computer by using the Browse option. You may also use a file that is already available on the Internet.

Please leave the visibility options as they are so that others may find and use your files.

If you have not already done so, you should add such as your name and organisation to the document before uploading it. For example if you are uploading a word document, you should add your name, organisation name, date, and the licence you intend to apply to the footer of the document so that others who download and use the document will have this information.

2. Choose a creative commons licence

The rights selection dialogue allows you to select your preferred Creative Commons licence. Each option will licence your work in a different way, from least restrictive to most restrictive.

Please leave the Associate Creative Commons licence with Learning Object ticked and do not use the Do not allow modifications option as this will not allow others to use your work in their teaching without requesting permission from you and the goal of the repository is to allow re-use and adaptation of learning and teaching resources.

Click Next at the bottom of the screen to upload the file and continue.

3. Add metadata

The next screen requires you to enter some descriptive data (metadata) about the file. This
allows others to more easily identify useful resources and find files in a search.

**Title**: add a descriptive title

**Creator**: Add your name, in the format *Surname, First Name*.

**Subject Keywords**: Add some descriptive keywords about the item, for example the name of a text it relates to, the purpose of the file (eg. Exam, presentation, lecture).

**Description**: add a short description of the file, this should provide somebody reading it with a good understanding of what to expect when they open the file. You might also add the name of the institution and the course or unit that the file was prepared for.

**Resource type**: select from the drop down list the most appropriate format.

**Format**: eg. MS Word .doc, Powerpoint file etc.

**Language**: eg. english

**Licence**: leave the existing text

When you click Publish the file will be published to the repository. You have several options from the next screen, you can share the resource you have just published on your social network, publish another resource, or return to the home screen.

**How to: Search and Browse**

**Search**

You can search the repository easily and quickly using the search box on the home screen, or click on the search option to access the search screen.

If you don't type anything into the search box and click search, you will retrieve all the items in the repository.

In the results display you can use the keywords on the left side of the screen to narrow your results.

Click on the title of an item to view the full details, or simply click 'Show details' in the item listing screen.

Search by author is not available in this version of the repository software.

Advanced search is available and offers many options to create a very focussed search. This option is linked from the search screen.

**Browse**

You can browse the repository contents and identify items published by particular authors using the browse function.

**How to: use the discussion forum**

The discussion forum allows you to communicate with other members of the Adapt community.

You can ask questions, share ideas about learning and teaching or make suggestions for
others. Using the discussion forum is simple.
Click 'Discussions' in the green menu bar at the top of the screen to access the discussions page.
When you are on the discussions page, click the name of a discussion thread to read or comment.
To start a new discussion thread click 'Compose'.
To reply to an existing comment, click 'Reply' and then click 'Post' to finish writing and make your post available.

How to: Peer review
This section demonstrates the technical process of publishing a peer review of an item in the repository. Guidance on providing peer review of items in the repository is available in the next module, Providing Peer Review.
To leave a review on an item, first go to the item page in the repository. Click on 'More Actions', and select 'Reviews'.
Next, click on 'Add Review' and you will see the review interface.
Add your comment, leaving a star rating is optional. Once you have finished, click 'Save Review' and your review will be available.

Providing Peer Review
Providing peer review of items in the repository adds value for anyone who uses the repository, it allows others to benefit from your experience with the resource and potentially to improve it based on your experience and commentary.
The following headings identify three main areas of consideration when completing a peer review comment on a resource. You are encouraged to consider the headings and questions listed beneath (as applicable), when commenting on the material. Your honest and constructive reactions will help others to assess and use resources in their teaching.

How would you describe the potential quality of the resource as a learning experience?
• Look at the creative, effective or innovative nature of the resource in terms of learning, pedagogy, presentation, concept.
• Does the resource provide an opportunity to actively engage a visitor to the site in the material: for instance with skills practice or user interactivity?
• Consider what the resource adds to current knowledge on the topic
• Does it include an appropriate form of evaluation or assessment for users to interact with?

How would you assess the opportunities to share and re-use this resource?
• Are there any potential copyright/IPR infringements in the resource?
• Has an unusual file format been used?
• Could the format or content of this resource be used outside its core subject discipline? Give details.
• Have you used, or could you use this resource in your teaching or learning in any way? Give brief details of your ideas.
What further information or editing of the resource, or its description, would enhance its ‘shareability’?

- Does the item contain links to further resources?
- Could the keyword tagging or descriptive information about the resource be enhanced?
- Does it give advice to users (perhaps on emerging areas of discussion or research on this topic)?
- Could the resource be formatted in a different way to enhance the delivery of its content or enable repurposing?

Understanding copyright

Understanding copyright is important for using the repository, whether you are contributing items or downloading and using items in your teaching.

Copyright in Australia is governed by the Copyright Act 1968 (The Act).

The Act provides copyright owners with exclusive rights to copy, publish, adapt, perform in public and to communicate their copyright material. Where such activities occur in another country then the copyright laws of that country apply. Copyright protects literary (including computer software), dramatic, musical and artistic works, performances, published editions, sound recordings, films and broadcasts.

For more information on copyright law in Australia, see the website of the Australian copyright council at http://www.copyright.org.au/

Even if you are not located within Australia you will still need to comply with Australian copyright law as the repository is located within Australia.

Managing Copyright

Preparing to share

Before you upload any files to the repository you will be asked to warrant that you have the necessary legal permissions. The following questions will help you to consider whether you can agree to this.

1. Do you have permission to share your teaching materials?

Most universities in Australia have intellectual property policies and related employment contracts which mean that they, not employees, own the copyright to material produced in the course of work. If this is the case, you will need permission to share your work from your employing institution.

How to find out if you have the right to share your teaching resources

If you aren’t sure whether what rights the intellectual property policy at your institution provides, you can contact your university’s copyright officer.

If your institution owns intellectual property created in the course of your duties, you will need to receive permission to share it under a creative commons licence in the repository.

How to get permission to release your teaching resources

The head of your school or administrative unit will normally be the best person to approach about permission to share your learning and teaching materials in the Adapt Repository.

Make contact with this person and include some basic information about the repository and what you see as the benefits of sharing your learning and teaching resources.
Follow up the initial contact with a phone call or meeting to discuss:

- Copyright ownership details, including the institutions intellectual property policy, employment status of the creator of the work, and any other contributors to the work;
- Any contractual arrangements that may preclude or limit the use of the material in the repository;
- Any other legal considerations such as privacy that should be considered;
- Proposed licencing of the material under a CC licence and discussion of the choice of licence
- Legal effects of licencing the material under a Creative Commons licence.

If you are able to get the agreement of your institution to share the teaching resources that you have created under a Creative Commons licence, then you can start publishing your resources in the repository.

Adapt project staff are able to provide limited advice on issues related to intellectual property. Please email adapt.project@utas.edu.au if you would like to discuss contributing to the repository.

Adapt project team members have already obtained permission as part of the process of project membership.

2. Does your work include copyright materials owned by someone else?

Teaching and learning resources often include images, text or other content that is copyright to others. This is often called ‘third party’ material.

What can be included?

Using short textual quotations, whether spoken and recorded by you, or included as text is acceptable and does not require permission, although it is good practice to acknowledge the source with a citation.

Any images, video or sound that you use in your teaching resources will need to be available under a creative commons licence or another licence that allows the material to be re-used, redistributed, and if required remixed.

Options if your work includes third party material

- If your work includes other people’s copyright material, you may be able to remove it and replace it with content that is available under a creative commons licence. Further information on finding Creative Commons licenced materials is available below.
- Another option is to find similar material on the web that you can link to, or embed in, your teaching materials. Further information on linking and embedding is provided below.
- Consider revising your work so that third party copyright material is no longer required.
- If someone else’s copyright material is critical to the teaching resource and removing it would make the resource unusable, then it may be best not to include the resource in the repository.
Embedding or linking to other people’s content

You may be able to provide an embedded link rather than copying the item. For example, there is an implied licence to embed a YouTube video on another website where the uploader provides an embed script. However, an uploader may disable this functionality and in such cases embedding is discouraged. More information about embedding YouTube content is available on the YouTube website. Other websites such as Flickr may also allow embedding of content. The downside of this approach is that the original file may be moved or changed which will result in your work changing without your knowledge.

You may provide links to openly accessible Internet material provided that the material is not "knowingly" infringing. If you are aware or have reason to suspect that the material is infringing (for example it is a Disney Movie from www.stolen-movies.com) you should not link to it.

Finding Creative Commons Licenced materials

There are many sources of Creative Commons licenced materials that may be available for you to use in your teaching resources.

The photo sharing website Flickr allows you to search for images that are available under Creative Commons licences.

Video sharing website YouTube also allows you to search for videos that are available under Creative Commons licences.

Other Open Educational Resources repositories including HumBox, and MIT Open Courseware also contain resources that can be used under Creative Commons licences.

The website for Creative Commons contains links to more Open Educational Resources available under a Creative Commons licence.

End user (Creative Commons) License

Creative Commons Licencing

When you publish materials into the repository you will be asked to apply one of the Creative Commons licences. Applying a creative commons licence allows others to use it in certain ways. Before uploading items you should understand what these licences mean and which licence you will use. The descriptions below will assist you in deciding.

The default licence is the first in the list, the attribution licence. This licence is the least restrictive of the four licences and therefore allows the widest range of uses.

Further information is available from the Creative Commons Australia website: http://creativecommons.org.au/learn-more/licences

Attribution: CC BY

This licence lets others distribute, remix and build upon a work, even commercially, as long as they credit the original creator/s (and any other nominated parties). This is the most accommodating of the licences in terms of what others can do with the work.

View Australian Licence Deed | View Australian Legal Code
Attribution-Share Alike: CC BY-SA

This licence lets others distribute, remix and build upon the work, even for commercial purposes, as long as they credit the original creator/s (and any other nominated parties) and license any new creations based on the work under the same terms. All new derivative works will carry the same licence, so will also allow commercial use.

In other words, you agree to share your materials with others, if they will share their new works in return. This licence is often compared to the free software licences, known as ‘copyleft.’

View Australian Licence Deed | View Australian Legal Code

Attribution-Noncommercial: CC BY-NC

This licence lets others distribute, remix and build upon the work, but only if it is for non-commercial purposes and they credit the original creator/s (and any other nominated parties). They don’t have to license their derivative works on the same terms.

View Australian Licence Deed | View Australian Legal Code

Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike: CC BY-NC-SA

This licence lets others distribute, remix and build upon the work, but only if it is for non-commercial purposes, they credit the original creator/s (and any other nominated parties) and they license their derivative works under the same terms.

View Australian Licence Deed | View Australian Legal Code

Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike: CC BY-NC-SA

This licence lets others distribute, remix and build upon the work, but only if it is for non-commercial purposes, they credit the original creator/s (and any other nominated parties) and they license their derivative works under the same terms.

View Australian Licence Deed | View Australian Legal Code

Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivatives: CC BY-NC-ND

This licence is the most restrictive of the six main licences, allowing redistribution of the work in its current form only. This licence is often called the ‘free advertising’ licence because it allows others to download and share the work as long as they credit the original creator/s (and any other nominated parties), they don’t change the material in any way and they don’t use it commercially.

View Australian Licence Deed | View Australian Legal Code

Further information

If you would like to know more, Creative Commons provides a Frequently Asked Questions section on their wiki at: http://wiki.creativecommons.org/Frequently_Asked_Questions

Copyright checklist

This checklist provides a simple means to make sure that you have completed all the necessary checks before uploading any materials into the repository.

You will need to ensure that:
☐ You have the right to share your material where it was created in the course of your employment.
☐ You have not included someone else’s material that you do not have the right to share.
☐ You have decided which of the creative commons licences you will apply to your work.
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Adapt Project Evaluation

Project Title: Bridging the Gap: Teaching Adaptations Across the Disciplines and Sharing Content for Curriculum Renewal (Adapt Project)

Author: Alison Dickens

Date: December 2012

With grateful thanks to the project team for their time and comments.

1. Introduction

This document provides an evaluative report on the Adapt Project which has been funded under the ALTC Innovation and Development Grants Programme (Curriculum Renewal). The project has been led by the University of Tasmania (UTAS) and carried out in partnership with Monash University, the University of Queensland and the University of the West of Australia. The project ran from January 2012 to December 2012.

The purpose of this evaluation is to reflect on the project process and outcomes from the perspective of the project partners; to review anticipated and actual outcomes; to measure progress against the success indicators outlined in the project evaluation plan. The results reported here are based on the outcomes of a series of interviews with project partners in all four institutions supported by a written questionnaire, also completed by the partners.

The key aim of the Adapt project was to “promote the curricular enhancement of the study of adaptations and associated program development from a cross-disciplinary perspective” which was to be achieved by the following activities:

1. The creation of a community of practice of academics across a number of disciplinary areas who deploy adaptation course components as part of their curriculum (interdisciplinary and inter-institutional collaboration)

2. The creation of an accessible and navigable repository of open teaching resources for students and scholars in the area (sharing of teaching resources through a lasting resource, variety of resources and media, student familiarity with open resources/adapatation studies)
3. Resolution of usability and intellectual property questions (toolkit, creative commons licences)

The anticipated outputs of this project were:

1. A toolkit addressing legal and technical questions
2. Quality enhanced teaching materials
3. An easy to use repository
4. A sustainable community of practice
5. A case study/test bed for OER strategies in institutions

2. Method

The evaluation has been put together through a series of interviews (average 60 minutes) with 5 members of the project team across all 4 partner institutions. These interviews were intended to capture individual experiences of the project process, reflection on the project achievements and evaluation of the project outputs. The interviews were semi-structured and guided by a series of questions (see Appendix 1) relating to the anticipated outcomes and success indicators outlined in the project bid and evaluation plan. The interviews were conducted via Skype or phone and recorded by the evaluator. The results of the interviews were then grouped using a keyword coding system based on the topics covered in the questions and interviewee responses. This summary of the main findings from the interviews was then used to inform and reflect on the key successes and other outcomes of the project. The live interview data was also supported by a structured (online) questionnaire which was completed by the interviewees (see Appendix 2).

This approach was taken to reflect the fact that much of the work of this project was process-oriented involving the initiation of culture change, the building of a community of practice in the field of adaptation studies and the resolution of a range of issues relating to open sharing, such as understanding of open educational resources (OER), legal constraints for open sharing and technological development. Although the project had a strong technological focus in the creation of the Adapt repository, this aspect was looked after entirely by the lead institution and was not the main focus for rest of the project team. As a consequence many of the anticipated outcomes of the project related to the ways in which this project might be expected to have an impact on a range of groups or stakeholders (teaching staff, adaptation studies academics, students and universities): support for the teaching of adaptation studies; increased collaboration across institutions; greater awareness of the field of adaptation studies; skills development for online learning; access to new ideas; help in understanding copyright and licensing issues; supplementary resources for students. This provided the main focus of the evaluation rather than a technical evaluation of the Adapt Repository itself, thus all comments on the technical developments made in the project are based on the comments of the interviewees themselves rather than an objective or outside view of the repository. A key additional reason for this approach was the fact that the repository was only launched as a live (open) site after the interviews took place and as this report was being compiled.

A total of five interviews and six written surveys (one person was not available for interview) were conducted with project partners who had a range of specialisms (teaching and/or research) relating to adaptations studies including film & TV, literature, English, gender studies, film studies, nineteenth-century literature and culture, screen studies, romanticism, romance fiction, television studies.
3. Summary of Results

3.1 Copyright/IPR

The Adapt project has raised awareness of copyright and IPR issues when sharing teaching resources openly online. This has been reported as being a very useful aspect of the project, and one of the main topics of discussion for the project team. For the field of adaptation studies, which relies heavily on making reference to published works such as films, plays, books etc. this was seen as being of particular concern and in need of being addressed for resource sharing. As a consequence this has also been a source of some frustration for partners in that some materials have had to be severely edited in order to exclude copyrighted works. This has been reported by at least one partner as being the result of institutional caution rather than real risk as most of the extracts are highly contextualised (within a lecture) and could be seen as a copyright exception, but that universities would be unwilling to test this. Although some work has been done on using creative commons licences not everyone was entirely confident that they had fully understood this. That said there have been many positive aspects to this emphasis on licensing shared materials appropriately and respectfully and the lead partner has now recruited an OER officer whose role it will be to look after these issues for the Adapt repository in the future.

3.2 Inter-institutional collaboration/community of practice.

A key driver for this project was to connect scholars working in disciplines for which adaptation is a central, potential or emerging concern. The project team has really appreciated the opportunity to work together across institutions and there was a feeling that this represented something of a culture shift both in respect of inter-institutional working and in relation to the traditions in Humanities for solo-working. It was felt that this was no longer a sustainable or desirable model and that to attract funding greater collaboration would be the best way forward. In addition it was noted that students are more linked up in today’s world, therefore universities themselves should be much better connected with each other. There was also great appreciation for the opportunity to share teaching rather than research (which is the more usual place where collaboration and sharing happens) and it was felt that the experience of adaptations and the resulting repository provides a template for the ways in which communities of practice can be brought together to collaborate and share. Most respondents had been motivated to join the project through their interest (research as well as teaching) in the field of adaptation studies and appreciated the insights they had gained into their colleagues’ teaching styles and ideas, not least the discovery that other colleagues were using the same core texts. Indeed one interviewee expressed the view that using the repository is like having a discussion with one’s colleagues but that it offers the opportunity to connect to a greater number colleagues. The bringing together of adaptations scholars at a symposium (planned for February 2013) was particularly welcomed and it is here that much further networking and collaboration for the future is anticipated. It was felt that having face-to-face networking opportunities was still very important in a digital age as it allows connections made through virtual networks to be consolidated face-to-face.

3.3 Students

There was a lot more caution in respect of opening up the repository to students, although most respondents welcomed the idea of students becoming more engaged with OER. In the course of the interviews several interesting ideas emerged about how students could
become more engaged in online learning using OERs. One thought was to use the repository to encourage students to build their own curriculum. This would, it was felt, only be effective when a sufficient body of content had been uploaded to the repository (not the case at present). Another reflection on how students could be engaged with the resources centred around the use of the commenting function in the repository. This idea was inspired by a lecture currently in the repository in which the lecturer invites students to challenge or debate the analysis presented in the lecture. It was felt that this would be unlikely to happen in a face-to-face context but that students might feel more empowered to comment through the repository, especially when they didn't personally know the lecturer. Another observation was that the repository could showcase student work from which other lecturers as well as students could benefit. The interviewee had observed how students were using online resources and sites (facebook) to organise and discuss their work and that these techniques would be of interest to others. However, there was some concern about the potential for students to misuse the repository, mainly through lack of awareness of copyright and referencing practices, although it was observed that even in closed repositories (VLEs) once students have access to materials teacher control is minimal. In general it was felt that it might be too soon to have students as account holders in the repository but it was generally thought that there was great potential for students to have more direct engagement as the repository becomes more established.

3.4 Adaptations as a field of study

A key driver for the project was to raise awareness of the field of adaptation studies which is a relatively young but fast growing field of study. To date it seems the profile of the field has been built through research so this project created a welcome opportunity for colleagues to explore adaptations pedagogy through the sharing of teaching materials and ideas. Indeed for some interviewees engaging in a reflection on the teaching of adaptations has helped expand their notion of what the field can offer pedagogically finding examples from their teaching which reflected adaptations, but was not directly teaching it. The project was partly initiated to discover and bring together scholars and teachers who might not initially identify themselves as adaptations scholars as well as those who already do. This drive to expand the field which is interdisciplinary in nature has been seen by the partners as very beneficial, particularly the opportunities to connect across sectors, with school teachers who might be using adapted works to supplement or even replace reading of source texts. It was felt that some support for teachers in the judicious and appropriate use of adaptations might be a very valuable outcome for the project. However, there were some reservations that it might not be a large enough field to produce a critical mass of materials for the Adapt repository and that copyright issues might deter adaptations scholars from sharing materials owing to the fact that much of the material used in teaching derives from commercially published works.

3.5 Online learning & digital literacy

The lead partner was very consciously building OER and the Adapt repository into a much larger university strategy to create greater opportunities for online learning for its students and this has been very helpful for this project. Indeed, it was generally thought that the repository would provide a useful additional tool for online learning and the view was expressed that it had advantages over a VLE as it might allow more control over uploading and accessing learning resources as it hasn’t been devised for one set of users (as an institutional VLE might be). In respect of digital literacy a range of issues were raised. These included, making conscious decisions about what materials are shared – to select what you want people to see and to hold back materials which might be needed for publication elsewhere. It was also felt that there was still a great need to educate people (academics and students) on what the ‘open repository world’ would be, what is OER adding to other resources which are online – quality, authority, some measure of control or moderation.
Where the control should lie in respect of the Adapt repository was still a question to be answered, for example a controlled vocabulary is not currently being used so when resources are uploaded there is a free choice of keywords. So far this has not been problematic but as only a small number of items have been uploaded it is probably too early to make a judgement on this. Again, the issue of students making appropriate use of the repository (if they were to become registered users) was felt to be potentially problematic as there was concern that they may not differentiate their behaviour between a site such as Adapt and more open and free social networking sites such as Facebook or Youtube. In terms of their own skills development opinion was divided with some respondents reporting that the project had helped them develop new skills while others did not feel that they had made any significant advances in their digital skills. Having said this most participants felt that the project had afforded them some professional development benefits.

3.6 Attitudes to OER/sharing

Most colleagues did not come into the project as practitioners of open practice/resource sharing. Some had not really come across the concept before and it took some time for them to appreciate its purpose and value. Others were experienced in online sharing through blogging and online publishing and saw OER as an integral part of what they were already doing, and in line with the direction of travel in e-learning. It was generally the case that partners felt that they were working in institutions which were committed to the idea (if not always the practice) of OER. However it was not always the case that their immediate colleagues, or indeed they themselves, were fully committed to the idea of openly sharing their materials online. Indeed this was reflected by a lack of confidence in their understanding of OER among some respondents and reservations about their ability to engage others with OER. On the other hand, for one interviewee OER was simply an extension of other online activities aimed at presenting and discussing research and teaching such as blogging or using a research repository. The view here was that judicious sharing was very beneficial and part of the routine work of the academic. For other colleagues this was not the case and using online means for communicating and sharing work was less familiar. For the repository what was chosen to be shared created some interesting debates, with some colleagues sharing their lectures while others preferred to share their teaching ideas. One view expressed was that resources needed to be contextualised – that is to be accompanied by a commentary relating to how, where and with whom they were used together with notes on assessment activities. It was noted, however, that care was needed when materials were uploaded unedited as some of the contextual information included in them (which was institutional and context specific) was left undeleted which gave an impression of lack of care on the part of the uploader. Another view was that the repository (and OER) acts as a kind of library in which teachers can put copies of their work for others to view. All those interviewed seemed comfortable with the notion of OER but there still seemed to be some questions remaining about how far they or their colleagues might wish to pursue OER in their practice. Much of this probably relates to the fact that the repository is still very young and the number of resources within it quite small which makes it difficult to engage colleagues or to see the potential for the use and reuse of resources within it. The Adaptations Symposium was viewed as an important way of helping to increase engagement with OER and the repository.

3.7 Dissemination and engagement

Even among the project partners there has been some hesitation about uploading materials to the repository and as a consequence there are very few items available to view. This is not particularly the result of lack of engagement with the repository but more a slight uncertainty about what resources are most appropriate to upload, what resources they and therefore their colleagues might find most useful as well as more practical issues such as technical delays with the repository. As a result of this few had done much in the way of
disseminating the repository or encouraging colleagues to get involved. This was something which partners planned to do once the repository had been launched and at the Symposium and did see this as a way of engaging with colleagues beyond their ‘little disciplines’, both at home and internationally, and broadening the scope of the pedagogic discussions which mostly take place with their immediate colleagues.

3.8 Peer review/quality enhancement

For this project the quality of the resources uploaded to the repository was seen as very important, which explains, in part, the measured approach to uploading resources. Partners were concerned that what was uploaded should represent quality, good practice and really add value to adaptation studies teaching. When partners had talked to their colleagues about the repository they had been asked what sort of things should be uploaded and whether they would be judged as good enough. One response was to suggest that anything they considered useful would be appropriate, that if the item passed their personal quality control then that should be fine. For the project one member of the team was given the role of peer reviewing the items uploaded and was still in the process of finalising this at the time of the interview. In essence the review process (which drew on other previous OER projects in the UK) was seen to be not about judging whether an item was good or not, but evaluating its potential for reuse—how would a colleague be able to use the resource, was it well contextualised, how would it encourage further sharing, how technically accessible was it? This view seemed to be generally shared by the project team, although it hadn’t yet been formally discussed by the group (the final interview was conducted on the day that this discussion took place). This may explain why some partners were still not confident in the peer review process. The peer review report (submitted to the evaluator after the interviews took place) was intended to give an overview of the range of materials in the repository, issues arising, (e.g. the devastating effect of having to remove copyrighted material from lectures) and consideration of what benefits potential users might gain from the resources, (e.g. being able to reuse exam questions, gain insights into the ways in which colleagues shape their teaching). What seemed to give rise to most concern was that peer review implied the need for monitoring of the repository so the question remained as to who would be responsible for peer review once the project was over. The peer review report published by the partner from Monash suggests that “every uploaded piece should be given at least one early peer review, perhaps by someone from a ‘continuing’ project group - partly to defuse problems, but mainly to encourage sensible practices.” This would form part of what the report terms “The unobtrusive education of uploaders.” As the repository is being hosted and maintained by the lead partner responsibility for this was generally seen by interviewees as falling on the shoulders of the host institution but it was not seen as desirable that this should take the form of a peer review gatekeeper for the repository. However, once the repository is more widely used it is not clear how the proposed model for “early peer review” will be maintained. A very useful one page document is included in the peer review report which gives some simple guidance on how to formulate peer review comments so this will be helpful when it comes to engaging the wider community in the peer review process which might be a more practical way forward as the repository grows. In addition the peer review report includes four reviews of the materials so far uploaded to the repository (grouped by type: lecture recording, course guide, revision and assessment and research) and with some editing these would be very helpful examples of how to create descriptions of and comments on resources which will also serve as guidance to other repository users.

3.9 Linking research and teaching

Several interviewees commented that they were much more used to collaborating and sharing in the area of research and that doing this in relation to their teaching was a more unfamiliar but welcome experience. There was some doubt about how research might
feature in the repository, some partners had uploaded research articles but others felt that this was not the most relevant material for the repository, rather research might be referenced as the basis (context) for the teaching materials being shared.

3.10 Sustainability and the future

In terms of the continued hosting of the repository this has already been put in place at the lead institution which has appointed staff to manage OER and the other partners all seem very happy with this arrangement. The repository has also been built alongside (and integrated into) the institutional VLE for the lead partner so it is seen as being part of a larger project to which the institution is committed. In terms of the continued use of the repository some respondents felt that it was still too young to have become embedded (again the Symposium and future dissemination work was seen as critical to this). There was also some concern that the field of adaptation studies might be too small for the repository to acquire a critical mass of resources in order to make a sustained impact. The idea of this being a pilot for something larger was mentioned and this was repeated when issues of sustainability were discussed. The idea of the Adapt repository becoming part of a meta repository at national or international level aimed at a wider audience was proposed. However, in the short-term it seems that the openness of the repository to non-academics/students will be restricted to downloading of resources rather than to membership of the community of practice and uploading resources which will remain restricted to those in an academic/tertiary education post. On a personal level most interviewees were intending to remain engaged with the community of practice and the repository although OER was not universally seen as something with which there was, as yet, a full commitment. Questions still seemed unresolved as to what materials should be included in the repository and what their potential for reuse might be.

3.11 Technical

For many of the partners the technical aspects of the project were not commented on although the late delivery of the final repository did have an impact on the uploading of materials and potential for wider use of the repository during the project term. While the project benefitted greatly from having funding and support for the development of the repository as part of a larger VLE project at the lead partner institution it was acknowledged that the work needed to adapt a repository function that was not originally intended for external users of the VLE did create some difficulties in the short-term. It was, however, felt that as a long-term solution it was a sensible choice to work with a well-supported, institutional system rather than to use a version of a pre-existing standalone repository, e.g. eprints or HumBox which may not be so well-supported in the long-term. At least one interviewee suggested that using such a repository as an interim solution while waiting for the final repository may have been a good option in terms of creating a bigger pool of resources and having something to illustrate the concepts of OER in practice for potential users. Other comments on the technical aspects of the repository related more to the actual features of the repository itself. Most felt that it was easy to use and intuitive and did not foresee difficulties in using it for themselves or their colleagues. However, in terms of design there were some comments about the front end which was felt to be rather uninviting and didn’t signal very clearly the repository contents. Better signposting at entry to the repository and more publicity for the contents was suggested. A similar comment was made in relation to the ‘browse’ function as it was felt that users were being invited to browse something with rather non-specific content which makes it hard to choose or identify search options. It was also felt that the site wasn’t very appealing to a younger user but that didn’t mean it needed to mimic social networking sites such as twitter. Rather, it was felt that it needed to show that it is managed and edited in some way, that it has academic authority and this would greatly be helped by having author information more clearly visible in the system (at present author details and profiles are not attached to resources). Good features
identified were the easy workflow for uploading, the one click downloading and the information included on licensing and other functional help for the repository. It was also felt that feedback from the project to the software company will have been useful for future developments of VLE technology (which will require greater external access) such as the creation of MOOCs.

4. Analysis

It is clear from the comments made by the project team that this project has afforded a range of benefits (large and small) for the building of a subject community, enhanced pedagogic practice and technical support for teaching. For a small-scale project the ambitions were considerable and the achievements commendable. It was notable that, on reflection, partners discovered aspects and learnings that they hadn’t considered during the project which is testament to the impact of the project process on those involved. In retrospect it might be argued that the development of a repository in tandem with a community of practice may have inhibited progress in creating a wider community of colleagues engaged with and participating in OER sharing and reuse. The tension between technical development and pedagogy is ever-present in the area of e-learning and it is easy for the balance to tip towards the technical, especially in the early stages. Having said this the progress towards a wider community of adaptations scholars is very satisfying for the project team, who were strongly motivated to join the project by this aspect, and will be further realised when the Adaptations Symposium takes place in February 2013. This, in itself, gives some reassurance that the work of the project will be sustained and extended once the meeting has taken place and the repository and its underlying OER philosophy is presented to a wider audience. Having said this the small number of resources currently in the repository and the limitations of reach for what is a relatively small field of study will need to be considered in the future. Many interviewees saw this project as a pilot and the field of adaptation studies as a model for future OER work on a larger-scale so it may be, as one partner suggested, that the Adapt repository becomes a subset of a larger entity in the future. Reviewing the interview data against the success indicators given for the project it can be seen that the bar for this project was set quite high but that it has achieved a range of outcomes which have achieved or are working towards achieving its goals. In summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Success Indicator</th>
<th>Extent met</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All participating institutions contribute items to the repository</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>All partners report that they have uploaded some of their own or their colleagues resources to the repository, however this is restricted mainly to a small number of items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The peer review process leads to increased quality of resources for use in learning and teaching in the field</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>So far resources have been carefully selected by project team and evaluated. All partners consider that they are of good quality as a result of being considered for this project. It is not yet clear how this good practice will extend to a wider group of users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased collaboration between the participating institutions</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>The inter-institutional collaboration has been one of the aspects of the project most welcomed by the project partners and it is hoped will be sustained and further enhanced at and beyond the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness of adaptations as a field of HE study in Australia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not included in this evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academics from a range of discipline areas are involved in the use and development of OER</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Not included in this evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of Open Educational Resources (OER) among relevant academic staff is increased</td>
<td>Partially met</td>
<td>Some colleagues already had a good understanding of OER but others have developed these as part of the project. Interviewees had begun to consider how OER could be useful in their own teaching, e.g. for assessment and teaching ideas, gaining insights into other teaching styles, finding out about course/curriculum content. However, there is scope for further discussion (probably stimulated by a wider range of resources) on the ways in which OER as a practice could become more embedded in the way colleagues think about the student learning experience, e.g. as creators as well as users of OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A community of practice of adaptations academics emerges, and will be supported by an established resource base (the repository)</td>
<td>Partially met (fledgling community of practice)</td>
<td>There was very much a feeling that this project has been beneficial to the field of adaptation studies and that there is the potential to reach out to colleagues who may do work relevant to the field but for whom adaptations research/teaching is not a primary activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The toolkit should be easy to navigate and use, and will explain legal issues and technical procedures in clear, direct language</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>All partners have found the discussions and resources relating to copyright and IPR very helpful and feel that this is essential for the field of adaptation studies and for the sharing of teaching materials in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The repository interface for depositors will be simple to navigate and feature clear and easy to understand information related to the process of depositing items</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>All interviewees report that they have found the repository easy to use and navigate. However, author information would be welcomed alongside the resource which could also be linked to the author profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The repository interface for users will be simple to navigate and feature clear</td>
<td>To be tested</td>
<td>There is no external user data currently available, however partners have suggested that there could be more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusions and recommendations

As has already been stated this was an ambitious project born of a desire to promote and extend awareness of the teaching of adaptation studies through the sharing and reuse of OERs. This was to be achieved by working collaboratively across four Australian universities to build a community of practice for adaptation studies, to discover and discuss teaching resources for adaptation studies and to develop a repository through which those resources could be shared. In all these ambitions this project has been successful despite a number of issues such as timescale, technical delays and some lack of clarity among the project team as to the role of OER within the project. In this respect, therefore, the project has been more successful in some areas than others and has some of its key activities which fall outside of the project timescale. A major community building initiative (the Adapt Symposium) which was needed to create greater engagement with the repository beyond the project partners has been scheduled to take place after the end of the project which has meant that currently the main users of the project outputs are the project team itself. This, together with delays in making the repository open and live has meant that the aims of creating greater awareness and use of OERs for adaptation studies has only been relatively modest (among the partners and some of their immediate colleagues) rather than extended to the wider community which is necessary for creating a viable repository and a critical mass of users. That said, it is impressive that this project has made so much progress in the short time available and provided the partners continue to support and promote OER, the repository and the community of practice the outcomes to date should provide the basis for building on those achievements. Based on the information collected to date the following recommendations can be made:

**The community**

- Maintain the collaborative relationships between partner universities
- Extend inter-institutional collaboration to other universities within and beyond Australia
- Continue to promote OER, the Adapt repository and the community of practice
• Continue to upload resources to the repository and encourage others to do so
• Consider ways in which the repository might gain status as a trusted source for adaptations teaching

**The learner (students and others)**

• Consider ways of engaging students more fully with OER and the repository (including what might make it look more appealing to students)
• Add comments to resources in the repository
• Keep reviewing the nature, format and range of resources in the repository
• Ensure descriptions and other metadata are relevant, accessible and targeted at a full range of users

**The repository**

• Add more information about the purpose and contents of the repository at login
• Review the ways in which authorship of resources is presented in the repository
• Review the browse function to ensure it is clear what is being browsed and how keywords are presented
• Monitor use of the repository
Appendix C.1

Adapt interview questions:

Advise that this should take no more than an hour and will be recorded to assist with notes.

Start by describing your role in the Adapt Project

1. What have been the major outcomes/benefits for you of being involved in the project?
2. Do you feel that there is a common understanding of OER among the project team?
3. What kinds of challenges have you faced when engaging with open practice in this project?
4. Have any issues arisen in terms of publishing teaching resources online for yourself or others in this project?
5. What would you say characterises the peer review process for the repository/project?
6. Are there any quality issues that have arisen in respect of OER?
7. Have you received feedback from others about the teaching resources you or others have published as OERS? What kind of feedback?
8. Have there been any issues in using the Adapt repository, e.g. technical?
9. What kind of impact do you think engaging with open practice through the Adapt project has had on professional practice in your discipline (think about your own practice as well as that of others)?
10. In your opinion has the project had an impact on your colleagues’/institutions’ attitudes to OER?
11. Will you continue to publish your resources openly in the future?
12. Will you be more willing to use material published openly by others?
13. What would you like to see happen to Adapt in the future? How will the project/repository be sustained?
14. Would you do anything differently if you were to run the project again?
15. Any other comments?
Appendix C.2

Adapt Partner Questionnaire

Please answer the questions below:

Subject(s) taught 

Academic Role 

Please indicate your opinions about each of the statements below by indicating the number (with a tick) that best describes how much you believe you are able to do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all much</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am capable of creating digital resources for teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am capable of creating an online profile in the Adapt repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am capable of publishing my teaching resources as OERs using the Adapt repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I feel positive about sharing my resources as open content in the Adapt Repository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can understand issues of copyright when publishing teaching resources as OERs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I can understand issues of Intellectual Property Rights when publishing teaching resources as OERS (e.g. who owns the materials that you create)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am capable of understanding what creative commons licenses are and how to use them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I am capable of ensuring that others understand how to use the teaching resources that I publish as OER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I am capable of evaluating OERs developed by others (peer review)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I am capable of dealing with most challenges that I may face in publishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I feel that I have learnt new skills as a result of engaging with open practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I feel confident about continuing to engage with OER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>My involvement in the Adapt Project has enhanced my professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my ability to understand OER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my ability to engage with OER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my ability to engage others with OER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am able to collaborate with others more effectively since engaging with this project and sharing teaching resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I feel that my engagement with the Adapt project has raised awareness of OER in the sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>What kinds of benefits have you experienced as a result of your involvement with OER and the Adapt project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Are there any issues which have arisen for you in respect of OER?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>How have these been addressed or resolved by the project?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Teaching Adaptations Symposium 4-5 February 2013

Monday 4 February

9.00-10.00 – Registration
10.00 Welcome and Introduction

10.15 Opening Plenary: Deborah Cartmell: ‘Teaching Adaptations through Marketing: Adaptations and the Language of Advertising in the 1930s

11.15-11.30 Morning Tea

11.30 – 13.00
Pedagogies, disciplines and practices of teaching adaptation studies

‘Teaching Television Formats as Adaptations’, Frances Bonner and Jason Jacobs (University of Queensland)

‘Bridging the Streams: Adaptation Studies in the New Humanities—Flinders University: a Case Study’, Giselle Bastin (Flinders University)

‘Reverse Adaptation – Spinning Pictures into Words and Beyond’ Annabelle Murphy, (Victorian College of the Arts, University of Melbourne)

13.00-13.45 Lunch

13.45- 15.15
Texts and their Adaptive Afterlives

‘The Afterlife of the Canon: The Pedagogic Centrality of Adaptation’, Rosie Miles (University of Wolverhampton, UK)

‘Teaching Wuthering Heights Though Adaptations’, Hila Shachar (University of Western Australia)

‘Adaptation or Variation: Fitzgerald and Fincher’s Benjamin Button’, Joan Zhang (Fudan University, Shanghai, China)
15.15-15.30 – Afternoon Tea

15.30-17.00
Adaptation, Narration, Affect

‘Adaptation and the Theft of Subjectivity: Brian Selznick’s *The Invention of Hugo Cabret* and Martin Scorsese’s *Hugo*’, Mark Macleod (Charles Sturt University)

‘Oblivious to the Obvious: Point-of-View blindness in an undergraduate literature/film adaptation course’, Joy McEntee (University of Adelaide)

‘Indulging in Shakespeare: Teaching *The Tempest* in the Twenty-first Century’ Kathy Kasapidis (La Trobe)

17.00 Adapt Repository Presentation
Imelda Whelehan, David Sadler, Felix Wilson

Followed by Drinks Reception and informal networking

19.00 Symposium Dinner – Blue Skies Restaurant (this is a prepaid event)

Tuesday 5 February

9.00-10.30
Engaging students and relocating adaptation studies

‘Bridging the Gap? Adapting Greek Mythology for the Modern Classroom and Beyond’, Nikolai Endres (Western Kentucky University, USA)

‘When Atticus met Eminen and Ennis met Obi-Wan: Enabling Learning through the use of Film Adaptation’, Joyleen Christensen (University of Newcastle)

‘Playing with Cinematic Formalism: Adapting Formalist Approaches from Film Studies to Teaching Videogame Form’, Scott Knight, (Bond University)

10.30-11.00 - Morning Tea

11.00 – 12.30
Adaptation and practice-based learning and teaching

‘Tell it How You Feel it’ Encouraging Emotion in the Process of Adaptation’, Craig Batty (RMIT University)
‘Beyond the Books: A practice-based approach to Teaching Film Adaptation’, Liam Burke (Swinburne University of Technology)

‘Sherlockology: Teaching Sherlock Holmes,’ Camilla Nelson (University of Notre Dame)

12.30-13.00 Lunch

13.00 - 14.30 Adaptation in Performance

‘Reading Jane Eyre through Stanislavsky on the Shared Experience Stage’, Rebecca Waese (La Trobe University)

‘Meyerhold’s Postdramatic Camille, or Documenting Analogies by Teaching Stage Adaptations’, Christophe Collard (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium)

‘Knowingness’ and Unknowingness in Peter Brook’s Film of Marat/Sade’ Christopher Worth (Monash University)

14.30-16.00

Engaging learners, disrupting canons

“‘I love how the content stimulates and encourages me to want to continue to learn French”, or, How Teaching Literary Adaptations Makes for Better Students’, Ben McCann and John West-Sooby (University of Adelaide)

‘Adapting “Sansho Dayu”: Teaching Power and Privilege in pre- and post-war Japan’, Barbara Hartley (University of Tasmania)

‘The Worse it is the Better: on teaching sub-par film adaptations’ Christian B. Long (University of Canterbury)

16.00- 16.30 Afternoon Tea

16.30- 17.30 Closing Plenary

Laurence Raw: "Adaptation Studies and 21st Century Learning"

Closing Remarks
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Adapt Repository Deposit Licence and Terms of Use

This work is licensed under an Australian Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Licence

http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/au/


BACKGROUND

A. The Depositor is the owner of copyright in the teaching resource/s that is being deposited into the digital repository or has been authorised by the owner/s of copyright to deposit the teaching resource/s into the digital repository and to make it available under this Licence.

B. The Repository agrees to store the teaching resource/s in the digital repository and to make it available for access by other persons on the terms set out in this Licence.

C. The repository will be governed by the Terms of use set out in the appendix to this agreement.

D. The Repository agrees to make the teaching resource/s available for access and viewing in the digital repository and any additional uses permitted by the Repository Distribution (End-User) Agreement.

E. The teaching resource/s is/are deposited into the digital repository under one of the Creative Commons licences, as specified by the Depositor. If a particular Creative Commons licence is not specified by the Depositor the teaching resource/s is/are deposited under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence.

F. By entering into this Licence and depositing the teaching resource/s into the digital repository, the Depositor does not thereby assign copyright in the teaching resource/s.

G. The owner of copyright in the teaching resource/s reserves the right to make the teaching resource/s available in other locations and media.

Interpretation

1. End-User means a person accessing the Item made available by the Repository in the digital repository. Item means the teaching resource/s provided by the Depositor to the Repository for inclusion in the digital repository, including any metadata describing the teaching resource/s, and which is subject to the terms of this Licence.
Licence means this Repository Deposit Licence. Repository Distribution (End-User) Agreement means the licence provided to End-Users under Clause 11(2) of this Licence.

Term of Licence

2. This Licence commences on the day on which it is agreed to by the parties and continues for the duration of copyright in the Item or until terminated in accordance with the terms of this Licence.

Depositor’s Declaration

3. The Depositor declares that the Depositor:

   (i) is the owner of copyright in the Item;
   
   (ii) has the permission of the owner/s of copyright to grant to the Repository and End-Users the rights granted by this Licence.

Depositor’s Representations and Warranties

4. (1) The Depositor represents and warrants that:

   (a) the Item, to the best of the Depositor’s knowledge, does not infringe any third party’s copyright;
   
   (b) if the Item contains material for which the Depositor does not own the copyright, the Depositor has:
       
       (i) obtained all necessary permissions from the copyright owner/s to:
           1. include the material in the Item;
           2. provide the Item and End-Users the rights given under this Licence; and
       
       (ii) clearly identified and acknowledged all third-party content or metadata of the Item.

   (2) The Depositor warrants that the Item does not contain any defamatory, offensive or unlawful matter and makes no improper invasion of the privacy of any Depositor of its obligations under this Licence will cause the Depositor to be in breach of any agreement to which the Depositor is a party or is subject.

   (3) The Depositor warrants that neither the execution of this Licence nor Depositor represents that the Depositor has fulfilled any right of review or other obligation required of the Depositor under the contract or agreement with that agency or organisation.

Grant of Rights by Depositor to Repository

Copyright in consideration of the Repository storing and making the Item available through the digital repository, the Depositor grants to the Repository the non-exclusive right to reproduce, adapt, publish, communicate and distribute the Item for the purpose of:

Depositor’s Rights
(a) making the Item available in the digital repository for End-Users to:

. access and view

and

. make such additional uses of the Item as permitted by the terms of the Distribution (End-User) Agreement set out in Clause 11(2);

(b) modifying the Item as required for the technical operation or organisation repository; and

(c) making and keeping copies of the Item for use by the Repository for security, back preservation.

6. (1) The Depositor reserves the right to use the Item and future versions in other ways, locations and media.

(2) To avoid doubt, the parties acknowledge that by entering into this Licence and depositing the Item into the digital repository, the Depositor does not assign copyright in the Item, in whole or in part, to the Repository.

**Repository’s Warranties and Obligations**

7. (1) The Repository undertakes that it will not alter or deal with the Item except as permitted by this Licence.

**Repository’s Limitation of Liability**

8. (1) The Repository is not responsible for any mistakes, omissions, or legal infringement. It is obliged to undertake legal action on the Depositor’s behalf in respect of the Item.

**Assignment of Depositor’s Rights to a Third Party**

9. (1) of the

[(2) [(3)

**Termination**

10. (1) Subject to clauses 9(2) and 9(3), the Depositor may assign all or any Depositor’s rights in the Item under this Licence. Upon assignment of the assignment and provide to the Repository detailed contact information to facilitate the Repository making contact with the assignee.

The Depositor agrees that in the event of assigning copyright in the Item to a third party, the Depositor shall use its best endeavours to secure from the third party assignee all necessary rights to enable the Depositor to continue the operation of this Licence on the basis of:

. (a) the Depositor being a licensee of the copyright owner in the Item; and

. (b) with a view to continuing unaltered the operation of this Licence.

(2) [(3)

[(4)

The Repository may at any time immediately and without notice terminate this Licence upon the occurrence of
any of the following events:

  (a) where it is discovered that the Item contains or describes material that has been produced as a result of fraudulent or deceptive actions by any person;

  (b) where the Item infringes the legal rights of any third party;

  (c) where the Item contains defamatory, offensive, confidential or culturally sensitive material that necessitates removal of the Item from the digital repository; or

  (d) where it is discovered that the Depositor is not the owner of copyright or does not have permission of the owner/s of copyright in the Item to deposit it into the digital repository under this Licence.

The Repository shall, upon demand being made by the Depositor, promptly remove the Item from the digital repository. The Repository will, however, the metadata describing the Item will be retained and a copy of the Item will be archived by the Repository but will not be publicly accessible.

Where copyright in the Item has been assigned to another party and the Depositor has been unable, despite its best endeavors in accordance with Clause 9(3), to secure the rights necessary to enable the continuing operation of this Licence, this Licence shall automatically terminate.

Repository Distribution (End-User) Agreement

11. (1) The Depositor authorises the Repository to make each Item provided by the Depositor to the Repository available for access by End-Users for viewing in the digital repository.

   (2) (a) The Depositor further authorises the Repository to make each Item provided by the Depositor to the Repository available for use by End-Users in accordance with the terms of one of the Creative Commons licences, as specified by the Depositor when providing the Item to the Repository.

   (b) If the Depositor does not specify a particular Creative Commons licence when providing the Item to the Repository, the Item will be provided by the Depositor to the Repository for use by End-Users in accordance with the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence.

   (c) All references to Creative Commons licences in this Clause 11(2) refer to licences in the suite of Creative Commons licences published by Creative Commons Australia, in the version current at the time the Item is provided by the Depositor to the Repository.

   (3) The Repository will take all reasonable steps to ensure that the terms of this Licence, including the terms of the Repository Distribution (End-User) Agreement applicable under Clause 11(2), are brought to the attention of End-Users accessing the Item in the digital repository.

   (4) To avoid doubt, this Licence does not extinguish any rights available to End-Users under the Copyright Act 1968, including but not limited to fair dealing for personal research or study.

Governing Law

12. This Licence is governed by the law of the State of Tasmania.

Depositor’s Indemnity

13. The Depositor indemnifies the Repository against any claim that may arise regarding the Item, Repository’s use of the Item and any breach by the Depositor of its obligations, representations and warranties under this Licence.
**Adapt Repository Terms of Use**

The Adapt Repository provides a service for sharing Creative Commons licenced Open Educational Resources that relate to adaptations.

Access to the items in the repository is available to all.

You will ensure that you comply with copyright restrictions and only publish items where you have the correct permissions and licences.

Items that are offensive, illegal or otherwise inappropriate will be removed from the repository.

When reviewing items in the repository you will be courteous and provide useful feedback for others.

You may remove your resources from the repository.

Your personal information will only be used for the purposes of administering the repository and will not be shared.

You may share your resources freely outside the repository, and you retain copyright to items you publish, under the terms of a Creative Commons licence.
Appendix F Technical specifications documents

Provided as an accompanying PDF format document.
Appendix G Promotional Materials

Provided as an accompanying PDF format document.
Functional Requirements for an Open Educational Resources Repository

This document outlines functional requirements of an Open Educational Resources (OER) repository for the Project *Bridging the gap: teaching adaptations across the disciplines and sharing content for curriculum renewal.*

Each section deals with a particular aspect of the repository and includes criteria for use in the evaluation of repository software.
1. Description of the publication workflow
The publication process should be simple and clear for academics. Once an academic has an account they should be able to log in to the system and begin adding items to the repository.

Account creation
An academic who is interested in contributing to the repository should be able to complete a short web form that includes details to be included in their profile page. Once they have submitted the form, an administrator should evaluate this before their account is made live.

Items and learning objects
The term item as used in this document indicates learning object composed of a single file, or a learning object consisting of several files.

Depositing items and adding metadata
The form for adding items should be clear and easy to understand. The addition of metadata should be as simple as possible and the page should include a link to the toolkit for information related to copyright requirements and open content licenses. Fields for the addition of metadata should indicate required fields, and submission should not proceed without appropriate fields being filled in to requirements.

Upload
The academic should be able to browse to a file on their computer for the upload process. Once an item has been uploaded the academic should be able to edit it, before it is published. Once it is published they can edit the item, and it is resubmitted to the review process.

File Support
A wide range of files should be supported by the repository, including commonly used office document formats plus open source equivalents, standard video and audio files, PDF files as images in various formats.

Review
After an item is uploaded the item enters the review process, where it is not visible to the public. Metadata and copyright detail is checked for accuracy. If there are issues, then the repository officer will contact the publishing academic to discuss them. Items and metadata may be modified, or deleted in this stage.

Publication
Once an item is cleared it is made accessible in the repository, and is displayed on the academics profile page. It is available for searching, viewing and files may be downloaded. The clearing process should include the addition of metadata to the item indicating the date and identity of the person who authorised the publication. This information should be accessible for administrators only.
Criteria for the publishing workflow

1.1 The form for academics to use for uploading of individual items (or groups of items), the addition of metadata, including copyright information and selection of open content licence should be simple and clear.

1.2 Support for a process where items are uploaded into a review, where administrative staff may view items, metadata and add or amend metadata as required.
1.3 Workflow allows administrative staff to publish items to the live repository after checking. This process should be simple, with minimum input required for items, which meet quality and legal expectations.

1.4 Addition of some metadata fields should be automated, with administrative control over which fields these are. For example, an author should not have to enter their name, institution, date and other common details each time, but should have the option to do so.

1.5 Once an item is published an administrator should be able to remove it from public access and return it to the review stage, where it is not available to non-administrators.

1.6 Input forms should use some form of ‘Captcha’ system in order to minimise spam. These systems protect against automated systems submitting web forms by requiring a user to recognise a word or phrase and type that phrase into a text field.

1.7 The system should support stable, publicly accessible URLs for individual learning objects, or items, as well as for academic profile pages.

1.8 Metadata schemas and management should be flexible and able to be managed by the repository administrator.

1.9 The repository should be able to use standard metadata schemas such as Dublin Core and the IEEE LOM standards (see section 8 for links to relevant standards).

1.10 The web form for the creation of an account should be simple and clear. This form should create an account in the system, which can be made live once the administrator approves this.

1.11 The administrator should receive alerts when there are actions required that relate to the repository such as approving new contributors, or reviewing items.

2. Description of Search and discoverability requirements

The repository must be able to be searched from a publicly accessible web page. It must also allow harvesting and indexing by Google and other search engines, and also by other repositories using the Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH).
Criteria for search and discoverability

2.1 The repository search interface should be publicly accessible and allow basic keyword searches, as well as keyword searches across specific metadata fields.
2.2 The interface should also allow browse functionality, where a user may click on a list of authors, or other metadata fields to see a listing of available content.
2.3 The display of search results should be clear and should display basic metadata such as author, title, file type/s, and licence type.
2.4 The repository content should be discoverable using standard web searches, such as Google.com. This depends upon Google being able to index and harvest metadata from the repository.
2.5 The repository architecture should be structured in order to maximise the ranking of the content in relevant Google searches, in order to maximise discoverability.
2.6 The repository should be accessible for other repositories to index and harvest metadata, using OAI-PMH.

3. Description of peer review of items

Peer review of learning objects is important to the goals of the project. By reviewing, making suggestions for use, and suggestions for changes to learning objects in the repository academics contribute directly to improvements in teaching practice and encourage the use of Open Educational Resources.
Academics with publishing access to the system should be able to review items, both a simple star based system and also to leave detailed comments relating to both positive and negative aspects of the repository.

Figure 3: item reviews (relational)

Criteria for peer review of items
3.1 There system should support the reviewing of items by academics who have accounts.
3.2 Academics who have not published items may review items, after creating an account.
3.3 Reviews should feature a star (or similar) based system and comments. Comments should allow for lengthy (ten lines plus).
3.4 There should be a response functionality, whereby academics may display a response to a review of an item they have published.
3.5 Reviews should be able to be edited, or removed from view by administrators.
3.6 Reviews should display prominently on item pages, including the name of the reviewer (which should be a link to that persons public profile page within the system.
3.7 There should be support for multiple reviews of each item.

4. Description of academic profile pages
By providing profile pages for all contributing staff the system will engage other academic staff, provide landing pages, which can be linked to by contributing staff for promotional purposes, and reinforce the social aspects of the Community of Practice, which the project aims to develop around the teaching of adaptations.
Criteria for academic profile pages

4.1 Academics who are interested in contributing should be able to complete a simple web based form in order to create an account. This should create a record for this user.
4.2 The creation of a live account should be subject to approval by an administrator.
4.3 Once approved, the users profile page should be live
4.4 The profile page should be able to be edited by the academic when necessary
4.5 The academic profile page should be able to be edited by repository administrators
4.6 The profile page should include the ability for hypertext links to the academics home institution, and other web addresses such as social networking profiles.
4.7 The minimum amount of information for public profile page should be a name and home institution. Other information should be optional depending on what information an academic wants to make public. The control of what information is available on a profile page should be under the control of the academic.

5. Description of requirements for repository statistics

The repository should be able to collect basic statistics about the use of the repository; number of downloads of items and produce reports. The statistics should also be able to display on pages linked from the individual item pages.
Criteria for repository statistics
5.1 The repository should provide for the collection and display of statistical information relating to individual items, collections and authors
5.2 Statistical information should be accessible to the public, and linked from, or displayed directly on the relevant page.
5.3 It should be possible for a page with dynamically generated ‘most popular items’ to be displayed

6. Descriptions of identity and customisation requirements
The repository interface pages should be customisable and allow for the creation of an identity for the repository through the use of customised images, colour schemes and other graphic elements.

Colour schemes should be customisable and able to be applied throughout the repository to create a consistent identity for the repository. The edition of custom banner image should be possible, and this should be applied throughout the repository to provide a consistent look and feel for users.

The Uniform Resource Locator (URL) or web address is an important aspect of the identity of any web site, and it would be desirable to locate the repository and associated pages at a non-UTAS domain. This would comply with UTAS Web Publishing Guidelines, as the site would be considered a category 3 website and therefore could be located at a non-UTAS domain.

Criteria for identity and customisation
6.1 Colour and graphic elements for web pages related to the repository should be highly customisable.
6.2 The repository should be able to be located at a URL outside the utas.edu.au domain.
6.3 Colour and graphic elements should be able to be consistent throughout the repository
6.4 The repository should allow for the addition of the logos of all participating institutions and also any display requirements of the Office of Learning and teaching (OLT, formerly ALTC).
6.5 It should be possible embed links to social sharing and social networking services within pages to facilitate sharing and reuse of items and awareness of the repository.

7. Accessibility and usability
Accessibility and usability requirements are an important consideration for any content published on the web. The repository interface should comply with requirements of the UTAS Web Publishing guidelines. This document uses World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 (WCAG 2.0) as the basis for defining accessibility standards.
In addition to accessibility, user friendliness of the site is important. The repository site should enable clear navigational choices, minimal clicks to accomplish simple tasks and offer consistent user experience throughout.

**Criteria for accessibility and usability**

7.1 Repository web pages should comply with UTAS Web Publishing Guidelines relating to accessibility

7.2 Navigation in the site should be clear and direct. Links to relevant sections and a navigation path should be visible and easy to understand.

**8. Relevant policies, guidelines, and standards**

The following policies, guidelines and standards are relevant to the development of the repository and related web pages.

IEEE Learning Object Metadata (LOM) Standard

Dublin Core Metadata
http://dublincore.org/documents/dces/

Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH)
http://www.openarchives.org/pmh/

UTAS Web Publishing Guidelines

W3C Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 (WCAG 2.0)
http://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG20/
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Help us build an open community for learning and teaching in adaptations

www.adapt.edu.au
adapt.project@utas.edu.au
Teaching Adaptations

A Symposium exploring learning and teaching in contemporary Adaptations

Hobart, February 4 & 5 2013

www.adapt.edu.au
Teaching Adaptations Symposium

Join us in Hobart, February 4-5 2013 for the Teaching Adaptations Symposium. We will explore adaptation studies as a growing inter- and cross-disciplinary activity with international reach. We will reflect on why we teach adaptation studies in existing disciplines, what we teach under this banner, and whether disciplinary methodologies affect how we teach in different areas of study. Keynote speakers include Deborah Cartmell (UK) and Laurence Raw (Turkey). Visit the Adapt Project website for further information and registration details. The Teaching Adaptations Symposium is part of the Adapt Project.

The Adapt Project

The Adapt project aims to build a community of practice of Adaptations Scholars around an Open Educational Resources (OER) Repository to facilitate sharing of learning and teaching resources. The Adapt Repository is open for new registrations and can be accessed at the Adapt Project website.

The project is led by staff from the University of Tasmania, in partnership with Monash University, The University of Queensland and The University of Western Australia and is funded by the Australian Government’s Office for Learning and Teaching.

www.adapt.edu.au
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