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THIRD MEETING (WORKSHOP) OF THE INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE - MINUTES

Thursday 12th December 2013 at the Media and Learning Conference (Flemish Ministry of Education), Brussels

Attendance - IAC members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stefania Bocconi</td>
<td>Institute for Educational Technology, National Research Council, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laia Canals</td>
<td>PAU Education, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Devine</td>
<td>DEVINE Policy, Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Dima</td>
<td>University Politechnica, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorote Górecka</td>
<td>The Modern Poland Foundation, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ene Koitla</td>
<td>HITSA, Estonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petra Newrly</td>
<td>MFG Baden-Württemberg, Innovation Agency for IT &amp; Media, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yves Punie</td>
<td>IPTS, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andreia Santos</td>
<td>IPTS, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthippi Tokmakdou</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, Greece</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attendance - Project Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bacsich</td>
<td>Sero Consulting Ltd, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles Pepler</td>
<td>Sero Consulting Ltd, UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Welcome and introductions

Giles Pepler and Paul Bacsich welcomed everyone to the workshop and asked them to introduce themselves briefly to the group.

2. Purpose of the workshop

Giles Pepler and Paul Bacsich indicated that the POERUP project team wanted to take advantage of the wisdom of policy and media experts and Ministry representatives attending the Media and Learning conference to gather their views on the EU-wide policy recommendations for promoting the uptake of OER.
3. Presentation of POERUP aims, objectives and achievements and draft policy recommendations

Giles Pepler gave a brief outline to the aims and objectives of POERUP and summarised the main achievements to date.

The project had compiled an inventory of over 400 OER initiatives worldwide and identified 125 of these as ‘notable initiatives’. Seven initiatives had been selected for detailed analysis through case studies aimed at identifying the key features of the communities involved in the OER initiatives through social network analysis.

The project team had analysed existing national policy documents on OER (of which there were few), together with EU policy documents and initiatives, notably Rethinking Education, Opening Up Education and a range of policy initiatives in the field of VET, and drawing together this research, had produced separate OER policy recommendations for higher education, VET and schools. These three papers had been deliberately written without consultation between the authors, to see how far each had come to the same conclusions. The policy recommendations for each sector had been summarized and mapped against the key transformative actions proposed by the Commission in Opening Up Education.

4. Discussion of policy recommendations

The policy recommendations had been grouped under eight headings:

- Communication and awareness raising
- Funding mechanisms and copyright / licensing issues
- Quality issues
- Teacher training and continuous professional development
- Infrastructure issues
- Further research
- Certification and accreditation
- Regulation

Since there was insufficient time to discuss each of these groupings, the meeting was asked to select those they wished to comment on and the two areas selected were Teacher training and continuous professional development and Certification and Accreditation.
4.1 Teacher training and continuous professional development

The following main comments were made:

- We should think how teachers could most effectively use OER
- The need to train teachers to identify OER and integrate their use into practice
- Should the recommendations be realistic or aspirational?
- It should be possible to define standards for teachers as professionals in digital pedagogy
- We should identify the competences required in teacher training
- Why not integrate OER training into existing training programmes?
- The wording on initial teacher training should be strengthened
- All of the recommendations are already part of the training programme in Greece – but there may be a gap between recommendation and implementation
- There is a danger of recommendations becoming outdated as the contexts change: there is a need for consistent development and flexibility
- Find a balance between mentioning OER and not mentioning them!

And, very pertinently – whose desk(s) will the recommendations land on?

4.2 Certification and accreditation

- Is the first VET recommendation too broad?
- Where is the link between OER and EQF? Does this need substantiating?
- Emphasise the need to move towards outcomes-based education
- There is an active movement in Romania to accredit informal and online learning
- Have we thought about the granularity of OER? This is not really represented in the quality issues recommendations
- Emphasise the need to measure APL credits
- Change credit exchange systems
- Certification issues shouldn’t just be focussed on APL

4.3 Other comment and next steps

Although there was insufficient time to discuss funding issues, it was noted that these could usefully be linked to resource based management.
The next steps would be for the POERUP team to take these comments on board, publish the full draft papers on the Open Education Europa portal and invite further comments up to 31st January 2014, after which the papers would be finalised.

5. Thanks and links

Paul and Giles thanked those present for their very useful contributions. The full current drafts may be viewed and downloaded from ... http://openeducationeuropa.eu/en/news/your-input-needed-policy-recommendations-oer-uptake