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1. Executive summary

In order to nurture the international policy-making process and propose a set of recommendations for the uptake of OER in less used languages as well as to provide expertise in cross-country studies on OER, ICDE organized:

- two international seminars in Oslo in April 2014 and in October 2014
- an open session on 25 April at the OCWC Global Conference in Ljubljana, Slovenia in partnership with the Open CourseWare Consortium, OCWC, (later Open Education Consortium, OEC).

Using the State of the Art report and its annex (WP2, #10), ICDE identified challenges and opportunities arising from OER in less used languages and did formulate policy recommendations for governments and educational institutions (#13).

Consultations with experts in languages, Open Educational Resources, policy-making and education in general took place (virtual and F2F) to discuss and produce input for drafting the working policy paper. The international expert consultation was organized in three separate events:

The first international workshop on policy for OER and less used languages took place in Oslo, Norway, on the morning of 28 April 2014. It was broadcast through the video-conferencing system Adobe Connect which maximized impact of the expert consultation.

The second expert consultation took place in Ljubljana, Slovenia at the OCWC Global Conference. The workshop was coordinated by Gard Titlestad, Secretary General ICDE who made a presentation. The outcome was summarised by Mary Lou Forward, Executive Director OCWC and is presented in the annex.

The third consultation Oslo, Norway on October 14 and was again broadcast through the Adobe-Connect system. On that occasion, a working policy brief was presented for discussion and comments to the project partners and to the experts consulted during the drafting process.

In these consultations, European and international experts were invited to discuss the uptake of OER in less used languages and give their input to the working policy paper with the aim of presenting the policy paper by December 2014 (deliverable #14).
2. Introduction

The expert consultations held on 28 April and on 14 October 2014 in Oslo, Norway, brought together respectively 26 and 16 participants plus a further 23 and 6 who joined the event online. The events were widely promoted through the ICDE and partner networks, though the exclusivity of the events was maintained by keeping an invitation only policy. The status of the first consultation was boosted by its alignment with the annual Oslo meeting of ICDE’s Executive Committee, which consisted of eminent institutional leaders and experts from open, distance and online learning around the world. The status of the second was boosted by its alignment with the second LangOER project management meeting, eminent experts in languages.

The first workshop was organized in partnership with the Nordic OER network http://nordicoer.org, which helped to generate considerable interest and participation from the Nordic region. The Nordic OER network also provided and operated the video conferencing facility which secured the involvement – both as speakers and participants - of experts from around the world. Gothenburg University provided the video conferencing facility for the second workshop.

A key challenge was to secure the active participation of each of the experts in a very limited timeframe, while simultaneously allowing for questions, spontaneous remarks and discussion. Through careful organization and guidance given to the speakers, the event achieved a dynamic model for providing input to the policy discussion.

The second workshop held in Oslo was part of a more general event: the LangOER project management meeting. The key challenge was to have the working policy brief ready to be presented with a set of first comments made by different contributors. The event was successful: 16 experts provided their input to the draft ranging from very general to very detailed comments and from positive to less positive feedback. A thorough analysis of the comments was undertaken, the draft was revisited in its form(editing and referencing) but not its content and was re-submitted to the participants.

Concerning the Open session at the OCWC conference, participants were international experts in Open Education and Open Education Resources. Approximately 15 participants from most regions of the world took part in the workshop and gave their input to ICDE’s work on the policy paper (policy brief) on OER in Less used Languages.

The workshop participants were divided into 5 small groups discussing questions posted by Gard Titlestad in his intervention and was organized in two buzz-sessions. The summary and outcomes were summarised by Mary Lou Forward.
3. Invitations and promotion of the workshops organized by ICDE

3.1. Workshops organized by ICDE in Oslo

In consultation with partners, one proposed invitation list was created for each event, encompassing experts in OER from these networks, ICDE’s member institutions, and the political and policy environment for both education and languages in the Nordic countries.

The invitation letter, which was distributed as personalized emails, defined OER and less used languages, described the scope of the investigation being carried out through Lang OER, and presented participation as an opportunity both to influence the debate on policy, but also to broaden personal networks.

The events were presented so as to underline its exclusive, invitation only status, and also to emphasize that key invitees would be given a visible role as presenter, while the demand made of them – to hold a 5-minute presentation was not so great (first workshop only).

The process of inviting participants:

For the first expert consultation, the process was greatly aided by the prior commit of the members of ICDE’s Executive Committee members and certain other highly regarded individuals to participate. In addition, the invitation letter stated that representatives of the following groups were invited:

- UNESCO
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research
- Norwegian Parliament
- Norwegian MOOC Commission
- The Nordic Council
- Norwegian and Swedish Development Agencies
- Norwegian and Swedish Associations for Higher Education
- Norwegian Digital Learning Arena
- The Language Council of Norway
- U Nordic network

Invitations were distributed on Monday 17 March and already by 19 March there was sufficient commitment for ICDE to publish a news article on its website to advertise the event: [http://icde.org/b7C_wRnGXi.pps](http://icde.org/b7C_wRnGXi.pps).

This article was updated on a regular basis in order to keep a public record of which individuals had committed to take part in the event, and allowing those experts active on social media to promote and help drive interest in the initiative. The article also invited interested parties to contact ICDE in order to register an interest in participating in the meeting online.

The article was viewed in total 700 times, testament to the interest in the event.

For the second expert consultation, 48 personal invitations were sent welcoming experts to give their feedback on the policy brief and/or attend the workshop. The letter included a tentative programme, the draft policy brief as well as a literature reference list (ref: Outputs). 22 accepted the invitation, 10 were interested in the workshop but could not make it on that day. The event’s popularity put more light on the great interest for the project and OER issues in less used languages.

Among the institutions that were approached in addition to the ones involved directly in the LangOER project:

- Nordland County Council, Norway
- PoerUP
ICDE received comments from 16 experts from all over the world from the Language community but also from the educational sector and policy makers in addition to comments from the LangOER community.

Comments were analysed and singled out. A summary was sent to all participants to the workshop as well as to the LangOER projects members. These comments together with the discussions and findings from the two expert consultations will be evaluated for further input in the final policy brief to be delivered in December 2014.
3.2: Open Session organized at the OCWC Global Conference in Ljubljana, Slovenia

Invitation

Invitation:

International workshop on policy for OER and less used languages

ICDE and the LangOER network in partnership with the OCWC are organizing a workshop to be held as an open session 13:30 – 15:00 on Friday, 25 April:

How can OER enhance the position of less used languages on a global scale?

The event will deliver input to the assessment of the situation for open educational resource around the globe with particular reference to less used languages.

Definitions

Less used languages are languages such as Norwegian, Swedish, Slovenian, Xhosa and Zulu which find themselves needing to contend with a fast evolving educational landscape currently dominated by English. Less used languages also include regional and minority languages.

Open Educational Resources (OERs) are defined by UNESCO as any type of educational materials in the public domain or with an open licence. The nature of these open materials means that anyone can legally and freely copy, use, adapt and re-share them.

Scope

Focus on:

- What is the situation when it comes to OER and less used languages?
- What issues arise from that situation - and how could they be met?

Also with reference to:

- How can OER enhance the position of less used languages on a global scale?
- What policies are favourable to the uptake of quality OER and quality open educational practices in less used language communities?

The workshop will provide input to a working policy paper on OER and challenges and opportunities for less used languages in a global, European, Nordic and national perspective.

Participants

Participants invited to give a short intervention in the workshop should be prepared for a 2 – 5 minutes presentation describing the situation for OER in less used languages in his/her country or region, and suggest which issues that arises from that situation.

Practical information
- 13:30 -15:00, Friday, 25 April 2014
- The workshop will consist of a series of prepared interventions of 2-5 minutes each, followed by discussions
- The language of the workshop is English

Organizers

The workshop is organized by ICDE and the LangOER network in partnership with the OCWC.

More information on LangOER, supported by the European Commission Lifelong Learning Programme, OER and less used languages:

More information on LangOER: [http://langoer.eun.org/about](http://langoer.eun.org/about)

Workshop coordinator: Gard Titlestad, ICDE and LangOER, Titlestad@icde.org

The LangOER project is funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Gard Titlestad
Secretary General
International Council for Open and Distance Education

Mary Lou Forward
Executive Director
OpenCourseWare Consortium
4. Participants

Oslo, April 2014

26 participants were at the event in Oslo, while a further 23 registered to take part online. In total, 23 countries were represented.

Participants in Oslo:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Marta Mena</td>
<td>National Technological University</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>ICDE EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Maxim Jean-Louis</td>
<td>Contact North</td>
<td>Contact Nord</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Yang Zhijian</td>
<td>The Open University of China</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>ICDE EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Yang Yongbo</td>
<td>The Open University of China</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>ICDE EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Christian Hjort Lund</td>
<td>Basidia</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>NordicOER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Tian Belawati</td>
<td>The Indonesian Open University</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>ICDE EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Tora Aasland</td>
<td>Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Arnfinn Muruvik Vonen</td>
<td>The Language Council of Norway</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Gard Titlestad</td>
<td>International Council for Open and Distance Education</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>ICDE Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Øivind Høines</td>
<td>NDLA Open Educational Resources For Secondary Schools</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>NordicOER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Tore Hoel</td>
<td>Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>NordicOER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Tanja Kristine Hegge</td>
<td>Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Monique Udnaes</td>
<td>ICDE</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>ICDE Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Vibeke Hoffmann</td>
<td>ICDE</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>ICDE Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Nick Moe-Pryce</td>
<td>ICDE</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>ICDE Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Morten Flate Paulsen</td>
<td>Campus NooA</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lars Utstøl</td>
<td>Studiesenteret.no</td>
<td>U Nordic</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 June M. Breivik</td>
<td>The Norwegian Business School BI; member of the Norwegian Government MOOC Commission</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mandla S. Makhanya</td>
<td>The University of South Africa (Unisa)</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>ICDE EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Gunnar Wettergren</td>
<td>Stockholm University</td>
<td>U Nordic</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Sylvi Vigmo</td>
<td>University of Gothenburg</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>LangOER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Marianne Granfelt</td>
<td>The Association of Swedish Higher Education</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Ebba Ossiannilsson</td>
<td>Lund University, Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>NordicOER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Göran Melin</td>
<td>Technopolis</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Alan Tait</td>
<td>The Open University</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>ICDE EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Ebba Køber</td>
<td>Flexible Education Norway</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Participants online:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Anne-Christin Tannhäuser</td>
<td>EFQUEL</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Lang OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Valentina Garoia</td>
<td>EUN Partnership AISBL</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>Lang OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Anne-Mette Persdotter</td>
<td>The Nordic Council Secretariat</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Olavur Ellefsen</td>
<td>NExT, a Schlumberger Company</td>
<td>Faroe Islands</td>
<td>NordicOER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Petri Lounaskorpi</td>
<td>Didactec</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Nordic OE Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Tapio Varis</td>
<td>UNESCO Chair in Global E-Learning / University of Tampere</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Nordic OE Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Abel Caine</td>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Giulia Torresin</td>
<td>Web2learn</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Lang OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Katerina Zourou</td>
<td>Web2learn</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>Lang OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sigurbjörg Jóhannesdóttir</td>
<td>Reykjavik University</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Hemlata Chari</td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Vaiva Zuzevičiūtė</td>
<td>Mykolas Romeris University</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Lang OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Wayne Mackintosh</td>
<td>UNESCO/ COL/ ICDE Chair in OER / The Open Education Resource Foundation – the Open Educational Resource universitas (OERu)</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Torhild Slåtto</td>
<td>Flexible Education Norway</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Øystein Johannessen</td>
<td>ICDE</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>ICDE Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Alastair Creelman</td>
<td>Linnaeus University, Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Lang OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Cor van der Meer</td>
<td>Fryske Akademy</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Lang OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Marit Bijlsma</td>
<td>Fryske Akademy</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Lang OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Dimitar Poposki</td>
<td>PhD candidate at Open University of Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Mansoor Al Awar</td>
<td>Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Andrea-Ximena Castaño</td>
<td>PhD candidate, Rovira i Virgili University</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Ulf Sandström</td>
<td>Swedish Association for Distance Education</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Gosia Kurek</td>
<td>Jan Dlugosz University</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Erison Huruba</td>
<td>World Education Inc</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OCWE Open Session, April 2015:

Approximately 15 participants from most regions of the world took part in the workshop and gave their input to the LangOER project and more specifically to the policy brief.
Oslo, October 2014

List of participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bacsich</td>
<td>Project Manager for the PoerUP project and the VISCED review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebba Ossiannilsson</td>
<td>Project Manager, Lund University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Pradeep Kumar Misra</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Faculty of Education and Allied Sciences, M.J.P. Rohilkhand University, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øystein Johannessen</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Education, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Udnaes</td>
<td>Senior Advisor, ICDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibeke Hoffmann</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator, ICDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Klotz</td>
<td>Information and Communication Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiva Zuzeviciute</td>
<td>Professor at the Department of humanities at MRU (Mykols Romeris University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor Van der Meer</td>
<td>Researcher. Member of the Consortium Poligloti4.eu project and of the management team for the Mercator Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning. Fryske Akademy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioannis Lefkos</td>
<td>Specialist in the use of ICT in Education, Web2learn (private company specialized in e-learning solutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanita Lazdina</td>
<td>Rēzekne Higher Educational Institution (RHEI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentina Garoia</td>
<td>EUN partnership AISBL, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marit Bijlsma</td>
<td>Fryske Akademiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosia Kurek</td>
<td>Jan Dlugosz University, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Skrowron</td>
<td>Jan Dlugosz University, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astrid Høgmo</td>
<td>Director LeadandLive, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvi Vigmo</td>
<td>Director of studies for the linCS-DSES Doctoral School in Educational Sciences and at the Department of Education, Communication and Learning. Goteburg University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rory Mc Greal</td>
<td>UNESCO/COL Chair Holder in OER, Canada ICDE Chair Holder in OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcella Matou</td>
<td>Expert, Ministry of Education, e-learning engineer, Lyon, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk. R. Person</td>
<td>Director of International Affairs, SIL International, Mainland SouthEast Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Christin Tannhauser</td>
<td>EFQUEL, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerina Zourou</td>
<td>LangOER Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Programme and logistics

Workshop’s programme, April 2014:

By the first days of April, it seemed clear that the event would meet its target of securing approximately 20 speakers. All had been informed that presentation times would be limited to no more than 5 minutes, but it was clear that interventions would need to be precise and to the point.

The broad scope of the consultation was to focus on the situation for OER and less used languages, and the issues that arise from that situation and how could they be met. Speakers were also invited to refer to how OER can enhance the position of less used languages on a global scale, and which policies they saw as favourable to the uptake of quality OER and quality open educational practices in less used language communities. On 8 April, each confirmed speaker was sent a suggested title.

The aim for the programme was to begin with political perspectives on the questions of OER and less used languages. The morning should then alternate between two further sessions on international experiences, one on Norwegian realities, and a session on the wider Nordic experience with OER from the perspective of less-used language.

See appendix 1: Workshop programme and participant list

Logistics: On 24 April, a further communication was sent to all speakers reminding them to send their PowerPoint slides, and to distribute speaker biographies (appendix 2), the programme and a background document (appendix 3). These documents were also uploaded to the website article.

Tore Hoel, a member of the Nordic OER network provided access to the Adobe Connect tool for the meeting, and Nick Moe-Pryce from ICDE and he made a visit to the venue – Grand Hotel in Oslo – to discuss technical requirements with the staff there. The available PowerPoint presentations were also uploaded in the Adobe Connect system.

The technical facilities worked well, with presentations being shown in the workshop room and simultaneously for online viewers who were able to take part in a chat stream (appendix 4).

Three presenters held their presentations online and could be clearly heard in the workshop room. Speakers in Oslo could also be heard well throughout the workshop due to the use of microphones. The length of presentations was generally kept within the allotted time limits, aided by an incentive – a decorative luggage tag for all who managed this – and a visual aid in the form of a countdown clock with green, amber and red lights.

During the session, the Chairs, Gard Tittlestad and Tian Belawati, summed up comments from the online participants in the chat stream and a Twitter conversation took place.

The last half-hour of the session was dedicated to buzz groups where participants were asked to work on summarizing their conclusions from the workshop. These were then presented by one member of each group in plenum.

Open session at the OCWE conference, April 2015:

The session took place 13:30 -15:00 on Friday, 25 April 2014. It consisted of a series of prepared interventions of 2-5 minutes each, followed by discussions. The working language was English.

A background note was sent to the participants prior to the Session:
Background note:

International workshop on policy for OER and less used languages

We are in the beginning of a process to survey, analyse, define and suggest what should be done regarding Open Educational Resources – OER, and less used languages.

Why?

There are great expectations to OER, for example:

“OERs have the potential to solve the global education crisis and contribute to sustainable economic growth”

Sir John Daniel, former CEO of the Commonwealth of Learning and David Killion, US ambassador to UNESCO, The Guardian newspaper, July 2012:

http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2012/jul/04/open-educational-resources-and-economic-growth

This statement came just a few weeks after the UNESCO led Open Educational Resources Congress had passed its historic declaration on OER, that calls on governments worldwide to openly license publicly funded educational materials for public use.

UNESCO believes that universal access to high quality education is key to the building of peace, sustainable social and economic development, and intercultural dialogue. Open Educational Resources provide a strategic opportunity to improve the quality of education as well as facilitate policy dialogue, knowledge sharing and capacity building.

The European Commission launched the initiative Opening up Education in September last year. The main goal is to stimulate ways of learning and teaching through ICT and digital content, mainly through the development and availability of OER.

One seeks solutions for open technologies that grant access to education for everyone and allow:

- students to build knowledge from open and free sources other than their teachers and institutions, and with different methods;
- everyone to engage in learning/study groups, thus creating learning communities beyond their classrooms;
- make personalisation and customisation of education a much easier task;
- teachers to create communities of practice to exchange teaching materials and best practices;
- provide access to a wider range of educational resources across borders and languages.

The recent developments in MOOCs, Massive Open Online Courses, issued as free quality online education from prestigious American universities such as Harvard, MIT and Stanford, have put focus on the great opportunities inherent in Open Education.

The reality is different, at least for less used languages:

“Concerning OER open for adaptation and innovation regarding less used languages, the emerging landscape seems rather static and OER are scarce.”

Sylvi Vigmo, Director of Studies, Department of Education, Communication and Learning, University of Gothenburg – findings to be presented 28 April 2014.

To shed light on this, to map the situation, consequences and analyse possible future perspectives ICDE and the LangOER network in partnership with the Nordic OER network are arranging this workshop to discuss:
What is the situation when it comes to OER and less used languages?
What issues arise from that situation - and how could they be met?
How can OER enhance the position of less used languages on a global scale?

The event will deliver input to the assessment of the situation for open educational resource around the globe, in Europe and the Nordic countries with particular reference to less used languages.

Definitions

Less used languages are languages such as Norwegian, Swedish, Slovenian, Xhosa and Zulu which find themselves needing to contend with a fast evolving educational landscape currently dominated by English. Less used languages also include regional and minority languages.

http://icde.org/b7C_wRnGXT.ips

Open Educational Resources (OERs) are defined by UNESCO as any type of educational materials in the public domain or with an open licence. The nature of these open materials means that anyone can legally and freely copy, use, adapt and re-share them. OERs range from textbooks to curricula, syllabi, lecture notes, assignments, tests, projects, audio, video and animation.

http://unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/access-to-knowledge/open-educational-resources/what-are-open-educational-resources-oers

The OER phenomenon also embodies the underlying open, creative, cooperative process itself, one that enables continuous rapid improvement in the quality of both learning and teaching.


Languages and the Internet – the threat from a digital disease leading to mass mortality? Or an opportunity? Policies as a force for breaking the cycle?

“Of the approximately 7,000 languages spoken today, some 2,500 are generally considered endangered. Here we argue that this consensus figure vastly underestimates the danger of digital language death, in that less than 5% of all languages can still ascend to the digital realm. We present evidence of a massive die-off caused by the digital divide.”

“A typical example is Piedmontese, still spoken by some 2–3 m people in the Torino region, and even recognized as having official status by the regional administration of Piedmont, but without any significant digital presence. More closed communities perhaps have a better chance: Faroese, with less than 50 k speakers, but with a high quality Wikipedia, could be an example. There are glimmers of hope, for example reported 40,000 downloads for a smartphone app to learn West Flemish dialect words and expressions, but on the whole, the chances of digital survival for those languages that participate in widespread bilingualism with a thriving alternative, in particular the chances of any minority language of the British Isles, are rather slim.”


However, in a 2009 UNESCO publication on measuring linguistic diversity on the Internet, it is stated that:

“Given the current situation of the planet, the lack of policy for protection against a reduction in biological diversity could harm the collective future. The same question could be asked for cultural diversity, and warrants the team attention. The table (see table at the end of this note) explicates the implications of exposure to and presence on the Internet for each language category. “

Furthermore:

“The main message arising from this table is the need for language policies to be established”.

The latest (2011) statistics of Internet users per language is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Internet Users by Language</th>
<th>Internet Penetration by Language</th>
<th>Growth in Internet (2000 - 2011)</th>
<th>Internet Users % of Total</th>
<th>World Population for this Language (2011 Estimate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>565,004,126</td>
<td>43.4 %</td>
<td>301.4 %</td>
<td>26.8 %</td>
<td>1,302,275,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>509,965,013</td>
<td>37.2 %</td>
<td>1,478.7 %</td>
<td>24.2 %</td>
<td>1,372,226,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>164,968,742</td>
<td>30.0 %</td>
<td>807.4 %</td>
<td>7.8 %</td>
<td>423,085,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>99,192,000</td>
<td>76.4 %</td>
<td>110.7 %</td>
<td>4.7 %</td>
<td>126,475,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>82,586,660</td>
<td>32.5 %</td>
<td>990.1 %</td>
<td>3.9 %</td>
<td>253,947,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>75,422,674</td>
<td>79.5 %</td>
<td>174.1 %</td>
<td>3.6 %</td>
<td>94,842,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>65,365,409</td>
<td>16.8 %</td>
<td>2,501.2 %</td>
<td>3.3 %</td>
<td>347,002,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>59,779,525</td>
<td>17.2 %</td>
<td>398.2 %</td>
<td>3.0 %</td>
<td>347,932,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>59,700,000</td>
<td>42.8 %</td>
<td>1,625.8 %</td>
<td>3.0 %</td>
<td>139,390,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>39,440,000</td>
<td>55.2 %</td>
<td>107.1 %</td>
<td>2.0 %</td>
<td>71,393,343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP 10 LANGUAGES</td>
<td>1,615,957,333</td>
<td>36.4 %</td>
<td>421.2 %</td>
<td>82.2 %</td>
<td>4,442,056,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rest of the Languages</td>
<td>356,557,483</td>
<td>14.6 %</td>
<td>588.5 %</td>
<td>17.8 %</td>
<td>2,403,553,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD TOTAL</td>
<td>2,092,514,816</td>
<td>30.3 %</td>
<td>491.7 %</td>
<td>100.0 %</td>
<td>6,995,855,954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Languages and education

The importance of offering education in a nation’s mother tongue language/s cannot be overestimated in our time. This is why for example the Nordic countries have agreed on a declaration promoting “parallelspråklighet” in higher education. “Parallelspråk policy” basically means to treat for example English and Danish as equal languages without one of them dominating the other.


**OER**

We have no statistics or clear overview of the production and uptake of OER and Open Educational Practices (OEP).

However, we have some indications, for example illustrated by the map below, which illustrate the impact of OER. It is maintained by the OER Research Hub project. The purpose is to help people understand the impact of OER.

The map indicates an overwhelming over-representation of OER produced in English.

All project collaborations address two key hypotheses:

- Use of OER leads to improvement in student performance and satisfaction.
- The open aspect of OER creates different usage and adoption patterns than other online resources
Yellow indicates verification of the hypotheses.

Source: [http://oerresearchhub.org/evidence/oer-impact](http://oerresearchhub.org/evidence/oer-impact)

The same picture is provided by the OER Policy Registry, which shows an overwhelming over-representation in policies from the US and UK: [http://wiki.creativecommons.org/OER_Policy_Registry](http://wiki.creativecommons.org/OER_Policy_Registry)

**The situation for OER and less used languages in Europe - LangOER**

LangOER has surveyed the situation and finds that less used languages face the risk of being linguistically and culturally marginalized. For learning languages and culture, there are few OER available. On the other hand some languages spoken by a great number of people, being quite widespread, still have few OERs.

The overall picture emerging of national approaches to OER is characterized by diversity; incentives for initiatives and explicit connections to ministries and national educational agencies seem uncommon. Some national approaches are connected to online spaces such as blogs and thus signal engagement in OER for less used languages as driven by communities. An OECD Working Paper from 2012 indicates that the emergence of OER is evenly distributed across educational levels. There are few examples of national strategies or policies comprising OER.

Source: [http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/open-educational-resources_5k990rjhtlv-en](http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/open-educational-resources_5k990rjhtlv-en)

Strictly following UNESCO’s definition of OER, reveals that what is referred to as OER, is to a great extent characterised by typical language learning resources such as dictionaries, online books in digital libraries, repositories, course material on-line, audio and video material, publications about OER, and resources targeting practice of specific linguistic items in exercises.

The framing of OER is generally contextualised together with open education, open learning, access and creative commons licensing. Concerning OER open for adaptation and innovation regarding less used languages, the emerging landscape seems rather static and OER are scarce.
Main findings indicate we lack common ground, the licensing issue is not always made explicit, which restricts uptake. Moreover, OER are connected to open learning, and accessibility as an implicit subcategory. Few national incentives paired with communities’ engagement point to the challenge of a shared enterprise focusing on less used languages. In particular, the scope for less used languages indicates a restricted approach regarding the innovative potential of OER.

Future challenges point to language as contextual and cultural, and for explicit national incentives to have an impact. In particular, sustainability and quality for OER for less used languages need be extensively addressed to enable uptake and development. For innovation and for targeting pedagogical challenges, educators’ involvement is indicated as integral.

The LangOER network, consisting of 9 partners, is a three-year long project (2014-2016) funded by the European Commission (LifeLong Learning Programme). The partners represent linguistic expertise in the following languages: Frisian, Dutch, Greek, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, and French. Additional European languages are: Icelandic, Norwegian, Danish, Estonian, Welsh, Italian, Swedish, English, German and Finnish are being mapped to increase our understanding of the OER landscape.

Organizers

The workshop is organized by ICDE and the LangOER network in partnership with OCW Consortium.

More information on LangOER, supported by the European Commission Lifelong Learning Programme: http://langoer.eun.org/about

More information on ICDE: http://www.icde.org/en/about/

More information on the OCW Consortium: http://www.openedconsortium.org/

The LangOER project is funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.
### Table 1: Categorization of languages for cyberspace policies requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main spoken languages¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official languages covering more than one developed country (like Italian or Dutch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official languages spoken in only one developed country (like Norwegian, Greek, Danish or Japanese)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local languages of developed countries (like Sardinian, Galician, Welsh, or Frisian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingua franca of speakers of some developing countries (like Hausa, Quechua, Pulaar or Swahili)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages of a developing country, that actually cover more than one country, but are only used by native speakers (like Aymara, Guarani or creoles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official languages of a unique developing country (like Slovenian or Albanian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local languages of developing countries (like Chibbacano, Maya or Mapuche)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages at risk of disappearing (like Ainu.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages very seriously at risk of disappearing (like Yagan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOES THE INTERNET HERALD AN OPPORTUNITY?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Internet could increase the online presence of these languages, especially during a transition period when the repartition of Internet users by language is not even due to the digital divide. Note: the thesis here is that this transitory period has been over for the English language as of a few years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an opportunity to be seized in the virtual world. The “international” status of these languages shall facilitate trust between speakers to create easy cross-border relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for a vigorous virtual linguistic policy to support a presence in the virtual world comparable or stronger than that in the real world. Despite having a sense of longevity in relation to the place of such a language in the world, its speakers may feel a barrier for international relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These languages are threatened by pressure from both English and their respective national languages. The diagnostic is uncertain without a virtual linguistic policy. Each case varies and depends on specificities, although the case of Catalan is to be followed as a success story, both at virtual and non-virtual level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A positive future shall be possible where the digital divide is really overcome and virtual linguistic policies are defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretically, a positive future should be possible where the digital divide is really overcome. However, there is presently a correlation between lack of access to computers and the issue of belonging to indigenous communities, which does not give any sign of changing any time soon. The case of Paraguay where Guarani is given resources following its declared status as an official language is to be followed with interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are under strong pressure from both English and respective powerful regional languages, which could trigger negative prospects in the absence of a virtual policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the language is provided with the appropriate linguistic tools (and first a normalized and stable system for writing and grammar), a linguistic policy focusing the production of local content could help. However there are not many examples today of this kind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Internet could, at worst, become a formidable tool to for conservation of the written or oral patrimony; or at best, accelerator of policies for language adaptation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The Internet could at least allow preservation of the patrimony of that language, if digitalization is undertaken soon enough.
Workshop’s programme, October 2014

The expert consultation organized on the morning of 14 October (8:30-12:30) had three momentum:

- A presentation of the working policy paper (draft policy brief) including a summary of the challenges and opportunities for OER in less used languages, of the methodology used to reach a consensus on a set of three main recommendations described in the working policy brief.

- An open dialogue with experts in the field of OER and languages. The invited guests commented on the brief and added some perspective to the draft by deepening in their own area of research/expertise: Searching OERs by language, quality policy on OER in Lul and overview of the situation in a multilingual country: India.

- Working groups were organized to discuss four different issues all related to the draft policy brief: the policy brief in the Nordic context, the three most important recommendations, the use of the draft policy brief and the draft policy brief as a whole: strengths, possible issues and areas for improvement. A rapporteur was designated in each group and did report at the plenum on their findings and recommendations.

The session was rounded up before lunch with the guests (virtually and F2F) and with the LangOER project members after lunch. The seminar received positive and supportive feedback: well-organized both technically and logistically, the content was rich and the dialogue open and constructive thanks to very dedicated and collaborative professionals.

**Logistics:** All speakers sent their PowerPoint slides to ICDE Communication Coordinator, David Klotz, who in his turn organized them in their presentation order making sure that they were legible. Participants received the programme, a partially revised policy draft (referencing and editing only) and a summary of the comments received by the deadline, Oct.6.

Gothenburg University kindly provided access to the Adobe Connect tool for the meeting, and David from ICDE in liaison with Sylvi Vigmo, Gothenburg University discussed the technical requirements needed to install the system with the conference centre. The available PowerPoint presentations were also uploaded in the Adobe Connect system.

The technical facilities worked well despite the hectic internet connection at the conference centre, with presentations being shown in the workshop room and simultaneously for online viewers who were able to take part in a chat stream. For technical reasons, Dr. Misra from India had to deliver his speech through Skype as his audio system did not seem to work. The quality of his presentation was not affected and his comments and intervention were well received. (output 11).
6. Outputs

The main output of this activity is the working policy brief drafted by three ICDE staff members and reviewed by 16 external and internal experts. The draft is based on the findings from the in-depth analysis made in work package 2 summarized in the State of the Art Report, the workshop co-organized by ICDE and …. In Slovenia and the two international workshops that took place in Oslo in April and October 2014.

The following outputs are now available:

**Workshop 1:**

1. Summary article on ICDE website: [http://icde.org/b7C_wRnMWm.ips](http://icde.org/b7C_wRnMWm.ips)
2. Recording of workshop: [https://connect.uninett.no/p28ti11hrci](https://connect.uninett.no/p28ti11hrci)
3. All PowerPoint presentations: [http://icde.org/?module=Files;action=File.getFile;ID=3302](http://icde.org/?module=Files;action=File getFile;ID=3302)
6. Photos: [https://www.dropbox.com/sh/rx1oi465uv2g6mz/fwYGgNVV1k](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/rx1oi465uv2g6mz/fwYGgNVV1k) and [https://www.dropbox.com/sh/9k68nr2ots6hm9j/pCwFsi5Lhd](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/9k68nr2ots6hm9j/pCwFsi5Lhd)
8. Highlights from the workshop on Storify: [https://storify.com/eu_schoolnet/workshop-on-policy-for-oer-and-less-used-languages?utm_content=storify-pingback&awesm=sfy.co_sUdG&utm_medium=sfy.co-twitter&utm_campaign=&utm_source=t.co](https://storify.com/eu_schoolnet/workshop-on-policy-for-oer-and-less-used-languages)

**Workshop 2**

1. Summary of the discussions by Mary Lou Forward, Executive Director OCWC
2. News article

---

**Open Education for a Multicultural World**

The Open Courseware Consortium launched its new name, The Open Education Consortium, at its recent Global Conference held in Ljubljana, Slovenia.

ICDE, together with the Consortium arranged a workshop at the conference on the theme "How can OER enhance the position of less used languages on a global scale?".

ICDE’s open access scientific journal, Open Praxis, has also published key papers from the event in its latest issue.

---

Rory McGreal, ICDE Chair in OER; Mary Lou Forward, Executive Director OCWC, Inés Gil Jaurena, Editor Open Praxis with Gard Titlestad in Slovenia
ICDE workshop

Approximately 15 participants from most regions of the world took part in the workshop which gave input to ICDE’s involved in the LangOER partnership. See related article and links to background documents. The workshop participants delivered input to the policy-making process in two buzz-sessions and the outcome was summarized by Mary Lou Forward, Executive Director OCWC. The workshop gives, together with the wider workshop organized in Oslo 28 April, input to the drafting of a policy paper on OER and less used languages.

Workshop 3:


10) Invitation to all ICDE members to participate in the workshop http://www.icde.org/en/icde_news/Would+you+like+to+contribute+in+the+OER+in+Less+Used+Languages+workshop%3F_b7C_wRrK0R.ips


12) Photos: https://www.dropbox.com/l/XFLbXdyCxdGKdWuHrIwhr


7. Appendixes

Workshop 1, April 2014:
Appendix 1: Workshop programme and participant list
Appendix 2: Biographies of speakers
Appendix 3: Background note

Workshop 2, October 2014:
Appendix 4: Workshop programme and participant list
Appendix 5: A summary of the comments received on the draft
Appendix 6: A summary of the findings and recommendations from the Working Groups
Appendix 7: Literature list including further reading
Appendix 8: the draft policy brief: background and methodology

Open session, April 25, Ljubljana, Slovenia
Appendix 9: Slides presented at the conference
Appendix 1: Workshop programme and participant list

Time: 09.00-12.30, Monday, 28 April 2014
Place: Grand Hotel, Karl Johans gate 31, Oslo
Online: Connection via Adobe Connect: https://connect.uninett.no/langoer
(invitation only - invitation requests to icde@icde.org)

08.30 Coffee

09.00 Session 1

Welcome by Tian Belawati (Chair), Rector, Universitas Terbuka - The Indonesian Open University and ICDE President

Tora Aasland, President, Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO; Former Minister of Research and Higher Education, Norway:

What is the importance of open educational resources in your own language?

Arnfinn Muruvik Vonen, Director General, The Language Council of Norway:
OER in Norwegian seen from the language perspective

Abel Caine, Programme Specialist for Open Educational Resources, UNESCO (virtual contribution):
The UNESCO perspective on how OER can enhance the position of smaller languages

Observations and questions for session 1 speakers
Introduction by Gard Titlestad (Chair), Secretary General, International Council for Open and Distance Education

09.30 Session 2

Sylvi Vigmo, Senior Lecturer and Director of Studies, Department of Education, Communication and Learning, University of Gothenburg, Sweden; Leader of in-depth investigation of OER in 17 less used European languages, LangOER network
The situation for OER and less used languages in Europe

Wayne Mackintosh, UNESCO/ COL/ ICDE Chair in OER, The Open Education Resource Foundation – the Open Educational Resource universitas (OERu), New Zealand (virtual contribution):
A case study of OER in less used languages

Tian Belawati, Rector, Universitas Terbuka - The Indonesian Open University and ICDE President:
Reflections on OER and less used languages from South-East Asia

Marta Mena, Director of Virtual Training Program, National Technological University, Argentina:
Reflections on OER and less used languages from Argentina

Yang Zhijian, President, The Open University of China; former Deputy Director-General, Higher Education Department, Ministry of Education of China:
Reflections on OER and less used languages from the Chinese perspective

Observations and questions for session 2 speakers
10.10 Session 3

**Gunnar Wettergren**, Director of Interaction Design and Learning, the Department of Computer and Systems Sciences, Stockholm University, Sweden and U Nordic
**Lars Utstøl**, Director of Studiesenteret.no, the National Network of Study Centres in Norway and U Nordic

*The U Nordic perspective on OER and less used languages*

**June M. Breivik**, Development Manager e-learning, The Norwegian Business School BI; member of the Norwegian Government MOOC Commission

*Reflections on OER in relation to MOOCs in Norwegian*

**Øivind Høines**, CEO and Head, NDLA the National Digital Learning Arena of Norway - Open Educational Resources For Secondary Schools:

*The NDLA eco-model for sustainable OER*

**Tore Hoel**, Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, Norway;

*OER and less used languages in the Nordic countries: Norwegian, Swedish, Danish etc.*

**Observations and questions for session 3 speakers**

10.50 Session 4

**Mandla S. Makhanya**, Principal and Vice Chancellor, The University of South Africa; Deputy Chair, the South African National Commission for UNESCO:

*Reflections on OER and less used languages from South Africa*

**Alan Tait**, Director, International Development and Teacher Education, The Open University, United Kingdom

*A case study of OER in less used languages*

**Mansoor Al Awar**, Chancellor, Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University, United Arab Emirates (virtual contribution)

*Reflections on OER and less used languages from the Arab world*

**Maxim Jean-Louis**, President - Chief Executive Officer, Contact North - Ontario's Distance Education & Training Network, Canada:

*Reflections on OER and less used languages from Canada*

**Observations and questions for session 4 speakers**

11.30 Session 5

**Marianne Granfelt**, Secretary General, The Association of Swedish Higher Education

*Reflections on OER in Higher Education in Sweden*

**Christian Hjort Lund**, Founder and Director, Basidia, Denmark

*Reflections on OER and less used languages from Denmark*

**Ebba Ossiannilsson**, Project Manager, Lund University, Sweden

*Case study on OER in Swedish*

**Observations and questions for session 5 speakers**

12.00 Buzz groups and presentation of final observations

12.30 Lunch sponsored by the LangOER project
### Other participants in Oslo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization/Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yang Yongbo</td>
<td>The Open University of China</td>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanja Kristine Hegge</td>
<td>Norwegian National Commission for UNESCO</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Udnaes</td>
<td>ICDE</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibeke Hoffmann</td>
<td>ICDE</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Moe-Pryce</td>
<td>ICDE</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morten Flate Paulsen</td>
<td>Campus NooA</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Göran Melin</td>
<td>Technopolis</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other participants online

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization/Institution</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Christin Tannhäuser</td>
<td>EFQUEL</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentina Garoia</td>
<td>EUN Partnership AISBL</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Mette Persdotter</td>
<td>The Nordic Council Secretariat</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olavur Ellefsen</td>
<td>NExT, a Schlumberger Company</td>
<td>Faroe Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petri Lounaskorpi</td>
<td>Didactec</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapio Varis</td>
<td>UNESCO Chair in Global E-Learning / University of Tampere</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giulia Torresin</td>
<td>Web2learn</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerina Zourou</td>
<td>Web2learn</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigurbjörg Jóhannesdóttir</td>
<td>Reykjavik University</td>
<td>Iceland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemlata Chari</td>
<td></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiva Zuzevičiūtė</td>
<td>Mykolas Romeris University</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torhild Siåtto</td>
<td>Flexible Education Norway</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øysteinn Johannessen</td>
<td>ICDE</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea-Ximena Castaño</td>
<td>PhD candidate, Rovira i Virgili University</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alastair Creelman</td>
<td>Linnaeus University, Sweden</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulf Sandström</td>
<td>Swedish Association for Distance Education</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor van der Meer</td>
<td>Fryske Akademy</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marit Bijlsma</td>
<td>Fryske Akademy</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimitar Poposki</td>
<td>PhD candidate at Open University of Netherlands</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Biographies of speakers

Tian Belawati
Tian Belawati is Rector of Universitas Terbuka, the Indonesian Open University, with over 600,000 students, and President of the ICDE Executive Committee. Professor Belawati holds a Doctor of Philosophy in Adult Education (University of British Columbia, Canada, and a Master of Education in Management of Distance Education (Simon Fraser University, Canada). At Universitas Terbuka, she has held positions as Head of the Center for Indonesian Studies, and Vice Rector for Academic Affairs. She was also Secretary General and then President of the Asian Association of Open Universities (AAOU).

Tora Aasland
Tora Aasland is the President of the Norwegian UNESCO commission. She studied Social Work and Sociology at the University of Oslo, and was a researcher at the Institute for Social Research in Oslo. She was Secretary General in The Norwegian Non-fiction Writers Association and a member of the Norwegian Parliament from 1985-1993, sitting on the standing committee for Education and Church matters and later the standing committee for Energy and Industry. Ms Aasland became County Governor in Rogaland, before being invited to become a Member of Government and the Minister for Research and Higher education from 2007-2011.

Arnfinn Muruvik Vonen
Arnfinn Muruvik Vonen has been Director General of the Language Council of Norway, the official agency for implementing language policy under the Norwegian Ministry of Culture, since 2011. In 1994, he became dr.art. in linguistics at the University of Oslo. From 1997 to 2011, he was a professor of special needs education at the University of Oslo. He has an extensive record of international research activities and collaboration with educational institutions. Some of his main areas of interest are language policy, bilingual education, and grammatical typology.

Abel Caine
Abel Caine is Programme Specialist in the Communication and Information Sector at UNESCO and manages the UNESCO Open Educational Resources (OER) Programme. Mr Caine coordinated the World OER Congress held in June 2012 which released the Paris OER Declaration calling on Governments to openly license all educational materials produced with public funds. His work includes coordination with governments to develop national-level OER Policies.

Gard Titlestad
Gard Titlestad is Secretary General of ICDE. Prior to this he was at the Nordic Council of Ministers in Copenhagen, Denmark where he was Head of the Department for Knowledge and Welfare, and Research Counsellor for Norway in Brussels, Belgium, facilitating Norwegian participation in European cooperation, including on Information Society initiatives. He participated in the executive team of the Norwegian delegation to the European Union. He has also served as a senior official in the European Commission, Directorate General Information Society in the Information Society Project Office and later in the Department for International Affairs.

Sylvi Vigmo
Sylvi Vigmo is Senior Lecturer and Director of Studies at the Department of Education, Communication and Learning, University of Gothenburg, Sweden. She is the leader of an in-depth investigation of OER in 17 less used European languages within the LangOER network.

Wayne Mackintosh
Wayne Mackintosh is the founding director of the OER Foundation and is the UNESCO, Commonwealth of Learning and ICDE Chair in OER at Otago Polytechnic and the Foundation. He is coordinating the establishment of the OERu international innovation partnership with +30 members from five continents. The OERu aims to provide free online learning opportunities for all students worldwide with pathways for OER learners to achieve credible credentials. Previously, Wayne was Education Specialist, eLearning and ICT policy at the Commonwealth of Learning (COL), Associate
Professor and founding director of the Centre for Flexible and Distance Learning (CFDL) at the University of Auckland, New Zealand, and worked at the University of South Africa (UNISA).

Marta Mena

Marta Mena is Director of the Virtual Training Program for Researchers at the Secretariat of Science, Technology and Graduate Studies, National Technological University, Argentina, and an ICDE Executive Committee member. She was previously in charge of the E-Learning Training Programme (PROCAE) of the Argentine National Government. She has been involved in the development of extensive research in the field of Distance Education including in initiatives related to virtual training in Latin America, the Caribbean and Iberoamerica. She is Professor of Education Sciences and has held positions at universities in Spain and Argentina.

Yang Zhijian

Yang Zhijian has been President of the Open University of China (OUC) since July 2010. Prior to that, he served as Deputy Director-General of the Higher Education Department of the Ministry of Education of China. Dr Yang obtained his doctorate in education at Peking University and worked within macro management and macro policy-making from 1983 to 2010 at the Ministry of Education.

Lars Utstøl

Lars Utstøl is Director of Studiesenteret.no, the National Network of Study Centres in Norway. He is also one of the initiators of U Nordic, a Nordic network of universities, university colleges and study centres.

Gunnar Wettergren

Gunnar Wettergren is Director of Interaction Design and Learning at the Department of Computer and Systems Sciences at Stockholm University. He is also active within the U Nordic network.

June Breivik

June Breivik is Head of Development for e-learning at the Norwegian Business School BI and member of the Norwegian Government MOOC Commission. Her research interest is in the sphere of how information and communications technologies affect and change societies, organisations and education. She is a prolific blogger at junebre.blogspot.com, and has been principal at primary and secondary schools, as well as project manager for Digital School for upper secondary students.

Øivind Høines

Øivind Høines is CEO, and head of NDLA - the National Digital Learning Arena of Norway. He was one of the architects behind the initiative, and has participated strongly in the process of building up the organization. Øivind Høines has been the head of the NDLA since it first started in 2006. Øivind Høines is a firm believer in the importance and of open content and open infrastructure in modern education. He is also an advocate for new organizational models for open participation and sharing in the public sector. Before he started working with NDLA he held the position as Head of Regional ICT Development in Hordaland County, Norway. Øivind Høines has an academic background from Information Science, Sociology and Public Administration.

Tore Hoel

Tore Hoel is affiliated with the Learning Centre and Library at Oslo and Akershus University College of Applied Sciences, and has been working within the learning technology standardisation community for more than ten years. Since 2007 he has been co-chairing CEN Workshop on Learning Technologies and also served as a national expert to ISO/IEC JTC 1/SC36. He started his career in higher education as a director of communication at Oslo University College, and has the last ten years participated in a number of national and European projects. Hoel has a background in journalism, publishing (founder of a number of professional journals), ICT consultancy, public relations and information management, as well as in ICT and learning, and standardisation.

Mandla S. Makhanya
Mandla Makhanya is Principal and Vice Chancellor at The University of South Africa (Unisa) and member of the ICDE Executive Committee. He was previously Unisa’s Pro Vice-Chancellor, Executive Dean of the College of Human Sciences and Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. He is the Deputy Chair of the South African National Commission for UNESCO, as well as the Chair of the Culture Sector of South African National Commission for UNESCO. Prof Makhanya holds a BA and BA (Hons) in Sociology from the University of Fort Hare, a Master’s degree in Industrial Sociology from the University of Natal and a DPhil from the University of Pretoria.

Alan Tait

Alan Tait is Director for International Development and Teacher Education at the Open University (OU), UK and member of the ICDE Executive Committee. He was formerly Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and Dean of the Faculty of Education and Language Studies at the OU. His academic career has been in practitioner and scholarly support of distance and e-learning and he has served as President of the European Distance and E-Learning Network (EDEN). Professor Tait has published extensively in the field of open and distance learning, in particular in learner support, and is current Editor in Chief of the Commonwealth of Learning's Journal of Learning for Development.

Mansoor Al Awar

Mansoor Al Awar is the Chancellor and founder of Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University in the United Arab Emirates. Dr Al Awar was the founder of the first Total Quality Management (TQM) Department in Dubai Police Force. At Hamdan Bin Mohammed Smart University, he has established the Juran Chair in TQM at HBMSU, as well as the Middle East e-Learning association (MEEA).

Maxim Jean-Louis

Maxim Jean-Louis is President – Chief Executive Officer of Contact North | Contact Nord, Ontario’s Distance Education & Training Network of 24 public colleges and 22 public universities. Prior to this he worked in senior management roles for over 15 years at Athabasca University, Canada’s open university. In 2011, Maxim served as Special Advisor to Ontario’s Minister of Training, Colleges and Universities for an Ontario Online Institute.

Marianne Granfelt

Marianne Granfelt is Secretary General of the Association of Swedish Higher Education. She obtained her PhD in Physical Chemistry from Lund University and taught at universities in Sweden and Australia where she was Post-doctoral fellow at the Ian Wark Research Institute at the University of South Australia, in Adelaide. Coming back to Sweden she occupied different positions at Linköping University and Lund University before to become Secretary General of the Association of Swedish Higher Education (SUHF) in 2012. Dr Granfelt is a member of the board of the International Association of Universities (IAU) and the Nordic University Association (NUS).

Christian Hjorth Lund

Christian Hjorth Lund is founder and director of Basidia, Denmark, a non-profit organization that through strategy, software development and partnerships within the fields of OER and Edtech works to improve and democratize education. Mr Hjorth Lund is current product lead on the biggest Danish book and online courses self-publishing platform, co-founder of Coding Pirates (an NGO advocating programming for kids), co-organizer of Startup Weekend Education in Copenhagen and former ICT advisor to the Danish Minister of Education.

Ebba Ossiannilsson

Ebba Ossiannilsson is a Project Manager at Lund University in Sweden. Dr Ossiannilsson works with strategic issues on e-learning, online learning, distance learning, OER and MOOCs especially concerning benchmarking and quality issues, which also is her research interest. She earned her PhD from Oulu University, Finland, and with a dissertation on international benchmarking, and quality enhancement on e-learning in Higher Education. Dr Ossiannilsson serves as reviewer and expert in UNIque ECB Check (EFQUEL) and Epprobate (LANETO), E-xcellence (EADTU). She was also the founder (together with LANETO) and course leader for both Epprobate and OER Practitioner Services. She is a board member in several national and international associations, and serves on the editorial board of two journals.
Appendix 3: Background note:

Background note:

International workshop on policy for OER and less used languages

We are in the beginning of a process to survey, analyse, define and suggest what should be done regarding Open Educational Resources – OER, and less used languages.

Why?

There are great expectations to OER, for example:

“OERs have the potential to solve the global education crisis and contribute to sustainable economic growth”

Sir John Daniel, former CEO of the Commonwealth of Learning and David Killion, US ambassador to UNESCO, The Guardian newspaper, July 2012:

http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2012/jul/04/open-educational-resources-and-economic-growth

This statement came just a few weeks after the UNESCO led Open Educational Resources Congress had passed its historic declaration on OER, that calls on governments worldwide to openly license publicly funded educational materials for public use.

UNESCO believes that universal access to high quality education is key to the building of peace, sustainable social and economic development, and intercultural dialogue. Open Educational Resources provide a strategic opportunity to improve the quality of education as well as facilitate policy dialogue, knowledge sharing and capacity building.

The European Commission launched the initiative Opening up Education in September last year. The main goal is to stimulate ways of learning and teaching through ICT and digital content, mainly through the development and availability of OER.

One seeks solutions for open technologies that grant access to education for everyone and allow:

- students to build knowledge from open and free sources other than their teachers and institutions, and with different methods;
- everyone to engage in learning/study groups, thus creating learning communities beyond their classrooms;
- make personalisation and customisation of education a much easier task;
- teachers to create communities of practice to exchange teaching materials and best practices;
- provide access to a wider range of educational resources across borders and languages.

The recent developments in MOOCs, Massive Open Online Courses, issued as free quality online education from prestigious American universities such as Harvard, MIT and Stanford, have put focus on the great opportunities inherent in Open Education.

The reality is different, at least for less used languages:

“Concerning OER open for adaptation and innovation regarding less used languages, the emerging landscape seems rather static and OER are scarce.”

Sylvi Vigmo, Director of Studies, Department of Education, Communication and Learning, University of Gothenburg – findings presented for the workshop 28 April 2014.

To shed light on this, to map the situation, consequences and analyse possible future perspectives ICDE and the LangOER network in partnership with the Nordic OER network are arranging this workshop to discuss:
What is the situation when it comes to OER and less used languages?
What issues arise from that situation - and how could they be met?
How can OER enhance the position of less used languages on a global scale?

The event will deliver input to the assessment of the situation for open educational resource around the globe, in Europe and the Nordic countries with particular reference to less used languages.

Definitions

Less used languages are languages such as Norwegian, Swedish, Slovenian, Xhosa and Zulu which find themselves needing to contend with a fast evolving educational landscape currently dominated by English. Less used languages also include regional and minority languages.

http://icde.org/b7C_wRnGXT.ips

Open Educational Resources (OERs) are defined by UNESCO as any type of educational materials in the public domain or with an open licence. The nature of these open materials means that anyone can legally and freely copy, use, adapt and re-share them. OERs range from textbooks to curricula, syllabi, lecture notes, assignments, tests, projects, audio, video and animation.

http://unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/access-to-knowledge/open-educational-resources/what-are-open-educational-resources-oers

The OER phenomenon also embodies the underlying open, creative, cooperative process itself, one that enables continuous rapid improvement in the quality of both learning and teaching.


Languages and the Internet – the threat from a digital disease leading to mass mortality? Or an opportunity? Policies as a force for breaking the cycle?

“Of the approximately 7,000 languages spoken today, some 2,500 are generally considered endangered. Here we argue that this consensus figure vastly underestimates the danger of digital language death, in that less than 5% of all languages can still ascend to the digital realm. We present evidence of a massive die-off caused by the digital divide.”

“A typical example is Piedmontese, still spoken by some 2–3 m people in the Torino region, and even recognized as having official status by the regional administration of Piedmont, but without any significant digital presence. More closed communities perhaps have a better chance: Faroese, with less than 50 k speakers, but with a high quality Wikipedia, could be an example. There are glimmers of hope, for example reported 40,000 downloads for a smartphone app to learn West Flemish dialect words and expressions, but on the whole, the chances of digital survival for those languages that participate in widespread bilingualism with a thriving alternative, in particular the chances of any minority language of the British Isles, are rather slim.”


However, in a 2009 UNESCO publication on measuring linguistic diversity on the Internet, it is stated that:

“Given the current situation of the planet, the lack of policy for protection against a reduction in biological diversity could harm the collective future. The same question could be asked for cultural diversity, and warrants the team attention. The table (see table at the end of this note) explicates the implications of exposure to and presence on the Internet for each language category. “

Furthermore:

“The main message arising from this table is the need for language policies to be established”.


The latest (2011) statistics of Internet users per language is shown in the table below.


**Languages and education**

The importance of offering education in a nation’s mother tongue language/s cannot be overestimated in our time. This is why for example the Nordic countries have agreed on a declaration promoting “parallelspråklighet” in higher education. “Parallelspåk policy” basically means to treat for example English and Danish as equal languages without one of them dominating the other.


**OER**

We have no statistics or clear overview of the production and uptake of OER and Open Educational Practices (OEP).

However, we have some indications, for example illustrated by the map below, which illustrate the impact of OER. It is maintained by the OER Research Hub project. The purpose is to help people understand the impact of OER.

The map indicates an overwhelming over-representation of OER produced in English.

All project collaborations address two key hypotheses:

- Use of OER leads to improvement in student performance and satisfaction.
- The open aspect of OER creates different usage and adoption patterns than other online resources

Yellow indicates verification of the hypotheses.

Source: http://oerresearchhub.org/evidence/oer-impact

The same picture is provided by the OER Policy Registry, which shows an overwhelming over-representation in policies from the US and UK: http://wiki.creativecommons.org/OER_Policy_Registry

**The situation for OER and less used languages in Europe - LangOER**

LangOER has surveyed the situation and finds that less used languages face the risk of being linguistically and culturally marginalized. For learning languages and culture, there are few OER available. On the other hand some languages spoken by a great number of people, being quite widespread, still have few OERs.

The overall picture emerging of national approaches to OER is characterized by diversity; incentives for initiatives and explicit connections to ministries and national educational agencies seem uncommon. Some national approaches are connected to online spaces such as blogs and thus signal engagement in OER for less used languages as driven by communities. An OECD Working Paper from 2012 indicates that the emergence of OER is evenly distributed across educational levels. There are few examples of national strategies or policies comprising OER.

Source: http://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/open-educational-resources_5k990rjhvtlv-en

Strictly following UNESCO’s definition of OER, reveals that what is referred to as OER, is to a great extent characterised by typical language learning resources such as dictionaries, online books in digital libraries, repositories, course material on-line, audio and video material, publications about OER, and resources targeting practice of specific linguistic items in exercises.
The framing of OER is generally contextualised together with open education, open learning, access and creative commons licensing. Concerning OER open for adaptation and innovation regarding less used languages, the emerging landscape seems rather static and OER are scarce.

Main findings indicate we lack common ground, the licensing issue is not always made explicit, which restricts uptake. Moreover, OER are connected to open learning, and accessibility as an implicit subcategory. Few national incentives paired with communities’ engagement point to the challenge of a shared enterprise focusing on less used languages. In particular, the scope for less used languages indicates a restricted approach regarding the innovative potential of OER.

Future challenges point to language as contextual and cultural, and for explicit national incentives to have an impact. In particular, sustainability and quality for OER for less used languages need be extensively addressed to enable uptake and development. For innovation and for targeting pedagogical challenges, educators’ involvement is indicated as integral.

The LangOER network, consisting of 9 partners, is a three-year long project (2014-2016) funded by the European Commission (LifeLong Learning Programme). The partners represent linguistic expertise in the following languages: Frisian, Dutch, Greek, Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, and French. Additional European languages are: Icelandic, Norwegian, Danish, Estonian, Welsh, Italian, Swedish, English, German and Finnish are being mapped to increase our understanding of the OER landscape.

Organizers

The workshop is organized by ICDE and the LangOER network in partnership with NordicOER

More information on LangOER, supported by the European Commission Lifelong Learning Programme: http://langoer.eun.org/about

More information on ICDE: http://www.icde.org/en/about/

More information on the Nordic OER network: http://nordicoer.org/

The LangOER project is funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

For reflection:

Ref: Daniel Pimienta, Daniel Prado and Álvaro Blanco (2009), Twelve years of measuring linguistic diversity in the Internet: balance and perspectives:

Appendix 4: Workshop programme and participant list

**Time:** 08.30-12.30, Tuesday, 14 October 2014  
**Place:** Anker Conference center, Storgata 55, Oslo, Norway.  
**Online:** Connection via Adobe Connect: [https://connect.sunet.se/oer_less_used_languages](https://connect.sunet.se/oer_less_used_languages) (invitation only - invitation requests to icde@icde.org)

08.30-09.00 Registration, Coffee/tea

09.00: 09.15 Opening by Øystein Johannessen, Deputy Director of Education, Nordland County Council, Norway.

09.15-09.40 Presentation of the Policy Brief “Open educational resources in your own language, your own way”, issues and possible solutions by Monique Udnaes, Senior Advisor, ICDE.

09.40-09.50: Paul Bacsich, project manager POERUP. General reflections and introduction to “Searching OER by language”

09.50-10.00 Ebba Ossiannilsson, project Manager, Lund University. General reflections on quality issues related to public policy on OER in Lul.

10:00-10:10 Dr. Pradeep Kumar Misra, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education and Allied Sciences, M.J.P. Rohilkhand University, India.

Tea/Coffee break

10:20-11:20 Pre selected Working groups (3 to 5) on selected issues

11:25-11:45 Highlights from the Working Groups. Presentation of final observations (5 minutes/group)

11:45 -12:25 Discussions and Summary (Øystein and Monique)

12:25-12:30: Closing

**Working groups:**

Working Group 1: The draft policy brief as a whole: strengths, possible issues and areas for improvement

Working Group 2: The use of the draft policy brief

Working Group 3: The policy brief in a Nordic Context

Working Group 4: The three most important recommendations

After lunch: Summary with the project team and final process for having the brief published by end 2014
# List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul Bacsich</td>
<td>Project Manager for the PoerUP project and the VISCED review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebba Ossiannilsson</td>
<td>Project Manager, Lund University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Pradeep Kumar Misra</td>
<td>Associate Professor, Faculty of Education and Allied Sciences, M.J.P. Rohilkhand University, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Øystein Johannessen</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Education, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Udnaes</td>
<td>Senior Advisor, ICDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibeke Hoffmann</td>
<td>Administrative Coordinator, ICDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Klotz</td>
<td>Information and Communication Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaiva Zuzeviciute</td>
<td>Professor at the Department of humanities at MRU (Mykolas Romeris University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cor Van der Meer</td>
<td>Researcher. Member of the Consortium Poliglotti4.eu project and of the management team for the Mercator Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning. Fryske Akademy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioannis Lefkos</td>
<td>Specialist in the use of ICT in Education, Web2learn (private company specialized in e-learning solutions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanita Lazdina</td>
<td>Rēzekne Higher Educational Institution (RHEI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentina Garoia</td>
<td>EUN partnership AISBL, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marit Bijlsma</td>
<td>Fryske Akademiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gosia Kurek</td>
<td>Jan Długosz University, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Skrowron</td>
<td>Jan Długosz University, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astrid Høgmo</td>
<td>Director LeaDandLive, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylví Vigmo</td>
<td>Director of studies for the linCS-DSES Doctoral School in Educational Sciences and at the Department of Education, Communication and Learning, Göteborg University.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Virtual Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rory Mc Greal</td>
<td>UNESCO/COL Chair Holder in OER, Canada ICDE Chair Holder in OER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcella Matou</td>
<td>Expert, Ministry of Education, e-learning engineer, Lyon, France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk. R. Person</td>
<td>Director of International Affairs, SIL International, Mainland SouthEast Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Christin Tannhauser</td>
<td>EFQUEL, Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katerina Zourou</td>
<td>LangOER Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: A summary of the comments received on the draft

General comments: all comments have been taken into consideration. We have received feedback from 10 persons ranging from project partners (4) to external experts (6) invited in the drafting process.

The document is described as “extensive”, “strong”, “very interesting”, “appropriate and directly relevant to policy makers”, “have come far”.

Others described it as “not clear, of too little focus, a pastiche of quotes, bad referencing”, “too general”, “not correlated with EU aspects” but “focus on UNESCO”, “under-referenced”, “too long”

Specific comments:

- A number of people admitted that they were not familiar with the policy making discourse and the drafting of a policy brief.

A separate information mail was sent to the partners on Friday, Oct 3 with a link to a webpage on definitions and examples of policy briefs.

- Definitions and agreement on definitions have to be clarified: OER, LuL, Mother tongue, OE and OEP. Will give our position at the workshop

- Under-Referencing was an issue: In a policy brief, it is important to keep the reader focused on the recommendations. Will do our best to reference all quotes and citations keeping in mind that a policy brief is not a scientific paper.

Issues raised that need clarification (c), action (a) or an answer (an):

1) The target group (c): Policy makers in Education at all levels (Longlife learning) and in all sectors (ICT, languages, Research, etc.)

2) Top- down or bottom-up approach? (an) Enough to throw the hot potato to each other! Action is needed at all levels. OER are at the intersection between the two approaches and we need to address them both. However, our strategy with the policy brief is to address the policy makers and to lift the OER a level up.

3) Form of the policy brief (a): needs an executive summary, a crisp call to action, to be shorter.

4) Content needs (?):  
   - to be adjusted to be more concise (a),
   - to include references to Opening Up Education and the OPAL project (a),
   - a more business like approach to OER (c/a),
   - reference to OEP in the text ? ref. to Open Translation ?(c/a)
   - reference to the social media in supporting LuL educators ? (c/a)
   - Should the recommendations be accompanied by a plan of action? (c/a)
Appendix 6: A summary of the findings and recommendations from the Working Groups

Expert consultation, Oslo, October 2014

LangOER project: work package 3 “Nurture the international policy making-process by stimulating the debate on challenges that face less used languages.

The expert consultation organized on the morning of 14 October (8:30-12:30) had three momentum:

- A presentation of the working policy paper (draft policy brief) including a summary of the challenges and opportunities for OER in less used languages, of the methodology used to reach a consensus on a set of three main recommendations described in the working policy brief.

- An open dialogue with experts in the field of OER and languages. The invited guests commented on the brief and added some perspective to the draft by deepening in their own area of research/expertise: Searching OERs by language, quality policy on OER in Lul and overview of the situation in a multilingual country: India.

- Working groups were organized to discuss four different issues all related to the draft policy brief: the policy brief in the Nordic context, the three most important recommendations, the use of the draft policy brief and the draft policy brief as a whole: strengths, possible issues and areas for improvement. A rapporteur was designated in each group and did report at the plenum on their findings and recommendations.

Concerning the third part of the meeting, discussion panels were organized from 10:20 to 11:20 in and outside the conference room around a cup of coffee/tea. The participants were divided into 4 groups and each group was given a topic/an issue to discuss. A rapporteur was designated and folders composed of paper, pencils and the questions were handed out. Participants were assigned to a group taking into consideration their field of expertise, interest and the tasks to be achieved.

Hereunder are the pre-determined topics open for discussion:

Group 1: the draft policy brief as a whole: strengths, possible issues and areas for improvement

Group 2: The use of the Policy draft

Group 3: The policy brief in the Nordic context

Group 4: The three most important recommendations

Hereafter are the findings and the recommendations of the consultation:

- The word “policy” may have a negative connotation in some environments. Should we reconsider its use in the brief?
- It is difficult to find a balance between a top-down and bottom-up approach although it has to be found if results in terms of quality and sustainability are to be achieved. Both are catalysts and exert pull-up and pull-down effects that help reach an equilibrium favourable for the uptake of OER in LuL.
- There is a huge difference between OER policies and OER initiatives. Should not be mixed up as their number and scope differ considerably.
- The brief addresses mostly the OER issues and is not specific enough to LuL.
- The target group needs to be defined more precisely: is it meant for policy makers who are convinced about the use of OER in HE or for those who do not know about their existence yet, or those who know and would like to engage more? All in one or not appropriate?
- Multilingual translation and multilingualism are important in Europe. Need to be more stressed?
The brief is relevant for the Nordic countries. They already know about it but they need an action plan rather than a set of recommendations.

The Nordic countries could take the leadership as they are ahead right now. We do not have to invent the wheel again.

Point 2: add Less used languages after OER

The sustainability component is important. It is included in the eco-model that ICDE urges governments to adapt. Norway has the NDLA model to offer to the community. It actually won the Boltic Award for innovation in 2014. It is a success story but is an initiative and not a policy.

The importance of including the private sector in the negotiations was highlighted.

The definition of LuL should be correlated to regional and national policies as well as top-down and bottom-up approaches

The three recommendations proposed in the policy brief were qualified as relevant, pertinent but should be more precise and crispy.

The draft as a whole was too long and needs concision.

The policy brief was the appropriate, common and effective written communication tool to be used in a political debate.
Appendix 7: Literature list including further reading

Additional literature and web links to the Policy Brief - Open Educational Resources in Your Own Language, in Your Own Way


Facts about the Norwegian National Digital Learning Arena (NDLA) [http://om.ndla.no/fakta-om-ndla](http://om.ndla.no/fakta-om-ndla)


POERUP project (2014). *Country reports.*

UNESCO also has a policymakers toolkit for ICT in education [http://www.infodev.org/en/Project.11.html](http://www.infodev.org/en/Project.11.html)


OER Research Hub [http://oerresearchhub.org](http://oerresearchhub.org)

Catalan initiative: [http://www1.euskadi.net/euskaralinguia/PDF/Kataluna/Ingles/CA_IN_PO.pdf](http://www1.euskadi.net/euskaralinguia/PDF/Kataluna/Ingles/CA_IN_PO.pdf)


Wales Declaration of Intent: [http://www.hew.ac.uk/wales-signs-declaration-of-intent-to-lead-the-way-on-the-use-of-online-education-resources](http://www.hew.ac.uk/wales-signs-declaration-of-intent-to-lead-the-way-on-the-use-of-online-education-resources)

http://www.oecd.org/about-oecd/

UNISA OER Policy: http://www.unisa.ac.za/default.asp?Cmd=ViewContent&ContentID=27755

OER at Open University: http://www.open.ac.uk/about/open-educational-resources/

http://langoer.eun.org

http://www.poerup.info/index.html

Appendix 8: the draft policy brief: background and methodology

Background and methodology

Background

The LangOER project, consisting of a consortium with 9 partners, is a three-year project (2014-2016) funded by the European Commission. It is focused on enhancing the linguistic and cultural components of Open Educational Resources and Open Educational Practices. The network addresses many challenges, and targets the needs of three main groups: educators, policy makers and researchers.

ICDE is responsible for Work Package 3 (policy brief), and the objective is to nurture the international policy making process by stimulating the debate on challenges for Less Used Languages. It targets the policy makers and proposes to identify the main challenges and opportunities arising from OER for Less Used Languages. It also formulates policy recommendations for governments and educational institutions.

Methodology

The draft policy brief has been modeled step-by-step and has taken input from several different sources:

1) Workshops and conferences
   - The workshop organized by ICDE and LangOER in cooperation with the Open Education Consortium held in Ljubljana (Slovenia), 25 April 2014
   - The international workshop organized by ICDE and LangOER in partnership with the NordicOER network in Oslo, 28 April 2014, for OER and Less Used Languages

2) Literature research - this includes The State of the Art Report published in August 2014, which provides an in-depth investigation of OER more than 20 Less Used Languages.

3) F2F and virtual discussions have also been engaged with selected experts (e.g. Martin Weller, an OER expert from The Open University) on the main issues.

The draft policy brief is now available for internal review and suggestions until 6 October. Following these discussions, the recommendations and suggestions will be summarized and issues identified. These will be discussed further at the workshop taking place in Oslo on 14 October.

As a follow-up to the workshop, the draft policy brief will be revised and the final policy brief version 1.0 will be issued by the end of December 2014.

The Draft Policy Brief

Open Educational Resources in your Own Language, in your Way

Summary

While open access to knowledge and open education is moving higher on the educational agenda all over the world and in Europe under the slogan “Opening up Education”, Open Educational Resources (OER) are mostly offered in the dominant world languages, in particular English. This puts Less Used Languages (LUL) under pressure, and reduces the chances for smaller countries to reap the opportunities from OER.

The overall picture emerging from national approaches to OER in Europe is characterized by diversity and fragmentation. The landscape for most countries surveyed for quality OER in LUL is bleak.
Policy decisions, opening up areas and marketplaces for educational resources and safeguarding interoperability, are key issues for governments and institutions to take the leadership for Open Educational Resources in Less Used Languages.

Several problems do prevent stakeholders from grasping the benefits and opportunities that OER offers but the solutions to overcome these challenges are plentiful and within reach.

Decisions to speed up the changes to more Open Education Resources in own languages will only be possible through policy reform and open collaborative joint efforts inviting the public and private sector in the debate.

Open Educational Resources in own languages do offer true opportunities, not only in terms of education, but also in terms of cultural and linguistic identity, employability, sustainability and mobility. Information and Communication Technology (ICT) in education is a huge asset to create collaborations and international communities for OER. Governments should take the leadership in promoting and facilitating interoperability of OER within and between countries, cultures and languages.

2. Introduction

2.1. The situation

Open access to knowledge and open education is moving on the educational agenda all over the world, including Europe, under the slogan “Opening Up Education”. However, Open Educational Resources are mostly offered in English, which challenge learning in countries with Less Used Languages and challenge Less Used Languages in itself.

2.2. Definitions and scope

Open Educational Resources (OER) as stipulated in the 2012 Paris OER Declaration (UNESCO) are “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” OERs range from textbooks to curricula, syllabi, lecture notes, assignments, tests, projects, audio, video and animation.

A key component of the 2012 Paris OER Declaration is to encourage the open licensing of educational materials produced with public funds.

OER is a core component of Open Education but not synonymous. Open Education is a much broader and a more vague concept with several slightly different definitions:

- Open University, UK, defines its mission is to be open to people, places, methods and ideas.
- Wikipedia says Open Education is a collective term to describe institutional practices and programmatic initiatives that broaden access to the learning and training traditionally offered through formal education systems.
- Open Education Consortium says that Open Education encompasses resources, tools and practices that employ a framework of open sharing to improve educational access and effectiveness worldwide.
- Open Source says that proponents of Open Education believe everyone in the world should have access to high-quality educational experiences and resources, and they work to eliminate barriers to this goal.

The European Commission took the “Opening Up Education” initiative to stimulate ways of learning and teaching through ICT and digital content, mainly through the development and availability of OER.

In this brief, Less Used Languages (LUL) refer to: languages, which are either spoken by a limited number of people or dominated by more commonly used languages. Less Used Languages include both regional and minority languages and (small) state languages. In practice, most countries in Europe can regard their national language as “less used” when comparing with the world languages of
English, Spanish and French. Approximately 50 million people in Europe speak a regional or minority language, representing 10% of Europe’s population. Many terms are used to refer to “smaller languages” and the linguistic diversity in Europe, making it complex to give a single definition of LUL.

The paper focuses on a situation where the take-up of OER in a countries’ native language is poor, and what can be done to significantly improve the situation. Although the focus is on LUL, countries and cultures with native languages that are not considered LUL will still find the reflections and recommendations of this brief useful.

Policy for OER in LUL is in a crossroad of policies including:

- Language and the use of mother tongue
- OER in Education
- OER in Open Education
- Information and Communication Technologies in Education

These policies have to be considered when suggesting policies for how to significantly improve the take-up and use of OER in LUL.

2.3 Why focus on OER in less used languages?

2.3.1: Importance of mother tongue in education

Mother tongue is a prerequisite for development and learning. It plays a tremendously useful role in the education of a child as a medium of expression and communication. It brings about emotional and intellectual development. Therefore, mother tongue has great importance in education and in the curriculum. Research has proved that learners do perform better if they are taught in their mother tongue. It also helps them build their cultural and linguistic identity, as well as empower them.

This is underpinned by findings in a study of the higher education sector in Norway where 70%-almost 100% of all protected (not OER) educational materials are in Norwegian, only for scientific papers the majority is in English.

A paradox for Less Used Languages is that while the Internet offers huge opportunities for learning, less than five per cent of current languages in the world are in-use online. (Kornai) The Internet may be helping the other 95 per cent to their graves, in particular if they are not there.

2.3.2: Importance of Open Educational Resources in Education

Open Education Resources offer an exclusive advantage when compared to educational resources. They allow legal extensive use of the resources free of charge, and offer in exchange greater openness in access to education, increased quality, innovation, creativity and sustainable use.

A key message in the 2012 Paris OER Declaration is paragraph:

“j. Encourage the open licensing of educational materials produced with public funds.

Governments/competent authorities can create substantial benefits for their citizens by ensuring that educational materials developed with public funds be made available under open licenses (with any restrictions they deem necessary) in order to maximize the impact of the investment.”

In this brief, we have adopted an understanding of OER that emphasizes the public funding and open licensing component.

In light of the recently adopted Declaration, Sir John Daniel, former CEO of the Commonwealth of Learning and David Killion, US ambassador to UNESCO, wrote in the Guardian newspaper, July 2012:

“OERs have the potential to solve the global education crisis and contribute to sustainable economic growth”

2.3.3: Importance of Open Educational Resources in Open Education
OER has a key role in the European Commission initiative for Opening Up Education. However, not all initiatives for Open Education have OER in its core. Whether Open is really Open is not always obvious. When several elite universities in the US launched Massive Open and Online Courses (MOOCs), most of what was declared Open was in reality protected and "closed", example: Coursera. Most of these MOOCs were not based on OER, but the courses were open in the meaning of free access. However, the content was not free to (Wiley, Green & Soares, 2012):

- Retain – i.e. no digital rights management restrictions (DRM), the content is yours to keep, whether you’re the author, instructor or student.
- Reuse – you are free to use materials in a wide variety of ways without expressly asking permission of the copyright holder.
- Revise – as an educator, you can adapt, adjust, or modify the content to suit specific purposes and make the materials more relevant to your students. This means making it available in a number of different formats and including source files, where possible.
- Remix – you or your students can pull together a number of different resources to create something new.
- Redistribute – you are free to share with others, so they can reuse, remix, improve upon, correct, review or otherwise enjoy your work.

"For the first time in human history we have the tools to enable everyone to attain all the education they desire." (Wiley, Green, & Soares, 2012).

To label what is really Open and what the users rights are might be a first step to avoid the confusion of so called Open offerings that, for example, Coursera provides.

2.3.4: Importance of Information and Communication Technology in Education

UNESCO states that “the use of technology for online and distance learning will become a critical component in the provision of quality education”.

Policies for ICT in education have evolved over the last few decades. In the early stages of policy formulation, access and infrastructure issues were at the heart of ICT in education policymaking. As access gradually has improved, other topics have come to the forefront, amongst them capacity building among teachers and school leaders, digital content, innovation and research. Some countries have dedicated ICT policies for education, while other countries choose to embed ICT in education policy at large.

There are multiple rationales for governments investing in and developing ICT in education policies. According to Kozma, policy rationales span from supporting economic growth and social development via advancing educational reform to supporting educational management. ICT as a lever for better learning strategies and learning outcomes also has an important role for ICT in education policies.

2.3.5: Importance of Open Educational Resources in Less Used Languages

The UNESCO OER community acknowledges that huge potential (language preservation and revitalization, education and development for poverty alleviation) lies in local language OERs. Until now, there has been a striking omission of any discourse around language diversity, translation or multilingualism within the OER movement largely dominated by English. However, 4.9 billion people out of a global population of 6.7 billion people do not speak English as either a first or second language.

The overall picture emerging from national approaches to OER is characterized by diversity (Welsh, Catalan, Flemish and Estonian initiatives) and fragmentation (regional languages could be well represented despite a limited capacity in investment and size of population). The existence of OER in LUL is diverse, ranging from considerable resources (Welsh) to none (Frisian). OERs in Less Used Languages are being linguistically and culturally marginalized and are not well spread throughout the education system, putting the quality of education and learning processes at risk.

The establishment of functional national and institutional OER policies in Less Used Languages that encompass and serve education, technology, linguistics, mobility and culture is needed.
3. Challenges for grasping the benefits of OERs in LUL and opportunities offered when hindrances are overcome

The overall picture today displays the lack of explicit national investment (human resources, funding, technical and regulatory frameworks), on policy at ministry level. The lack of open licensed OER in LUL in Europe is striking. However, there are some good examples of less used languages which are distinguished by policy making at a national level (e.g. Wales, Poland, Estonia and Norway/NDLA). However, even these good examples do not cover the whole educational sector in the countries considered...only parts.

3.1 What are the potential benefits for policy makers in the educational sector in adopting, promoting and incentivizing Open Education Resources in Less Used Languages?

3.1.1. Increased efficiency of the educational system and community

Open sharing speeds up the development of new learning resources, stimulates internal improvement, innovation and reuse. Networking leads to increased efficiency (e.g. Welsh: few committed universities but very efficient). Efficiency will spread throughout the education system from primary schools to research (OERs are right now centered around the upper-secondary sector). Lifelong OER platforms will attract informal learners and will serve as a gateway from informal learning to formal educational programs. Still concerning efficiency, ICT may help conserve the written and oral patrimony through digitalization of the language.

3.1.2. Improved quality of learning and teaching as well as researching

OER can allow teachers to re-mix learning resources, i.e. make the resources fit for pedagogical purpose. The use of OERs in LUL encourages educators and learners to engage in critical reflection and in pedagogical debates that will improve the quality of learning and teaching. Reusable and remixable resources can underpin the importance of teachers as critical human capital for development and curation of learning resources.

Education in mother tongue gives better results and the apprenticeship of other languages is eased when one masters their own/one language first. The sharing of knowledge not only reinforces the content and methodology of the learning/teaching, but also the understanding and acceptance of the cultural, linguistic and religious diversity.

3.1.3. Cost efficiency

Joint efforts at the national and international level will not only enrich education, but will also make it possible to share the burden of education among the nations. The open use of the educational resources will avoid duplication and will lower the cost of production. OER reuse will enhance sustainability if ecological and economically viable models are designed and used.

3.1.4 Innovative potential

OERs in Less Used Languages are the tools necessary to answer the call for global leadership and contextualization of resources. Mobile learning can help overcome the digital divide. The education ecosystem is changing, enabling new business models. Mash Books, which are the result of mixing various educational assets (book chapters, videos, audio, charts and so forth) into material used for instructional purpose are becoming more popular. However, changes will only happen if mindsets shift from competition to sharing.

It is understood that benefits go hand in hand with challenges, especially if we adopt an understanding of OER that emphasizes the open licensing component. Gaining competitive advantage in the Education Ecosystem requires going beyond mere infrastructure (internal) to exostructure (external).

3.2 What are the main challenges for policy makers in the educational sector in adopting, promoting and incentivizing Open Education Resources in Less Used Languages?

3.2.1. The lack of policies, models and frameworks are the key barriers

Almost no European countries with LUL as its national language have a defined policy for OER. Decision of policy is the critical success factor number 1 for OER in LUL. There is no functioning...
market for OER and resistance from existing players (e.g. publishers). Outside of Europe, the policy uptake seems to be moving faster. Examples are India (national policy), UNISA South Africa and Open University UK (institutional policy), the African Virtual University and OER Africa (cross country initiatives) and many examples in the US, (e.g. Broward College Online that saves USD 250.000/year by OER textbooks). This is probably partly because of the immediate cost impact of OER, which is not necessarily as strong and immediate incentive compared with parts of Europe, for example the Nordic countries, where education is a public good offered for free or to low costs and the living standard is high.

3.2.2. OER existence, awareness and impact are low or lacking

There are very few OER mapping systems (like PoeurUp, OER Research Hub and LangOER projects) and little research has been conducted on their effectiveness. This hinders policy makers from properly assessing the benefits and potential impacts involved in the development and procurement of OERs in LUL. Lacking sense of ownership of the materials produced/reproduced may hinder wider acceptance of OER. In general, there is a strong need for training and “cultural change” to encourage collaboration and use of OERs. It is a paradox that while Open Access has had a relative rapid take up among Higher Education Institutions in Europe, this is not the case for OER. One reason might be that Open Access papers are peer reviewed, while one has not agreed visible, acknowledged and transparent quality assurance for OER.

3.2.3. Linguistic hindrances to the use and reuse of OER

This is confirmed by a recent study showing that 35% of the users would rather use material produced in their own language and 21% say a main barrier is resources in English only.

The OER practices are more static than open for adoption and innovation. In order to reach multilingual communities across Europe and communities of Less Used Languages, resources must “travel well” and be transferable and adapted to be used in a cultural and linguistic context different from their origin. Translation of OER is only the second best option. Relying on translation of learning material only undermines building the knowledge capacity within your own cultural context. If Open Educational Resources are not offered in Less Used Languages, learners and educators will turn to dominant languages, which in turn will weaken the OERs and LULs.

3.2.4. Gap between policy and practice

Existing gaps can be met with incentives and specific policies. Budget and resources in education are limited, highlighting the need to share and recycle. Low numbers of learners and speakers in LUL is considered as a barrier to the development of OERs and the resources allocated. This limits the speed and intensity of development in comparison to dominant languages. Initiatives are scarce and often initiated at the grassroots’ level. There is an urgent need to recognize and scale up these initiatives from local platforms to global connections. Software and hardware exist. However, they need to be customized (software available in national languages, keyboards adapted to alphabets, etc.) and interoperable at the same time. Small markets for OER can be a challenge, but the strong Welsh and Catalan communities show that OER can thrive and grow despite of small markets.

3.2.5. Lack of models that work

A life cycle or value added ecological approach to OER might be useful, particularly in smaller countries and communities. Fragmentation, fear for low quality, lack of incentives, weak market etc. can be met by an ecological approach that can address all issues and value added steps in creating and using quality OER. It should be ecologically (follow the lifecycle), economically, pedagogically and technically feasible and sustainable. Norway has developed such a model for uppers secondary education (NDLA) and Poland is following in its footsteps. The model builds on that education is a public good and public funds should be used to develop educational materials. This allows for releasing the material under a Creative Commons license and therefore to be open for use, reuse, remix, readaptation and redistribution.

3.2.6 Existing models brake

The knowledge from the print world is being transferred to the digital world while it requires expansion. OERs are still perceived as a threat by the publishing sector. The culture of sharing is not yet
understood, accepted and anchored in the education system. There is also a lack of awareness that multilingualism can enrich cyberspace and education. Languages are often considered as barriers rather than assets, and Less Used Languages could find a second life in OER. The language acceptability is not being met in OER efforts to date, as there exist inequities in access to information.

4. Policy recommendations

To create a more favourable environment for having quality OER in LUL, it is suggested that:

- Governments should develop and decide national policies for OER.
- Governments and stakeholders in private, public and the education sector should collaborate to facilitate and contribute to an open area for OER.
- Governments should take up leadership in promoting and facilitating interoperability of OER within and between countries, cultures and languages.

Addressing these three recommendations should deliver a sufficient focused and holistic approach to enable more rapid growth and harvesting from OER, in particular in smaller countries, regions and communities.

Several players have delivered policy oriented papers that can be used for inspiration in building national policies for OER. E.g. UNESCO’s OER declaration, OECD on OER, the European project POERUP and the UNESCO IITE report “Open Educational Resources in France: Overview, Perspectives and Recommendations”.

4.1. Governments should develop and decide national policies for OER

To grasp the full benefits from OER and learning in the context of the country’s own language(s), governments should develop a holistic and coherent policy for development and use of OER in their own languages. Policies should address critical issues such as funding, capacity building and sharing, as well as possible regulatory issues. Incentives, monitoring and assessment mechanisms should be included in national and institutional policies.

While decision of national policy is the focus of our recommendation, regional, community and institutional policy decision are also of crucial value for take up and use of OER.

Policy decisions for open licensed OER in LUL is regarded as the critical success factor number 1 for take up and benefitting from OER.

Box 1. Example national policy decision: India

In India, the government has recently (2014) approved an open license policy to bring all the new digital learning resources as OER under BY-SA licenses. This shows the commitment of the government of India to sharing knowledge resources in the commons and to propelling further reuse, remix and growth of knowledge. It is expected that the content developed will be available as to facilitate localization and adaptation to local requirements all over the country and elsewhere.

www.col.org/blog177

Box 2. Example Open Text books: British Columbia OpenED, Canada

In October 2012, the B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education announced its support for the creation of open textbooks for the 40 highest-enrolled first and second year subject areas in the province's public post-secondary system. In May 2014 the initiative received funds for a further 20 open textbooks for skills training and technical programs to support the priorities in B.C.’s Skills for Jobs Blueprint.

http://open.bccampus.ca/about-2

4.2. Governments and stakeholders in private, public and the education sector should collaborate to facilitate and contribute to an open area for OER
The OER community and stakeholders with a potential interest in OERs is fragmented and have few arenas that could act as a meeting place for collaboration, funding and development. On national level, governments and national agencies could consider incentives for networks that can act as catalysts for increased collaboration and innovation in OERs. Collaboration should include the possibility of private-public partnerships.

When considering models and concepts for arenas and marketplaces, one should consider building on existing structures, like in the Norwegian example NDLA.

Quality is a key issue for OER, and need a label, a process behind and transparency, like peer review is for Open Access papers. To have Quality Assurance clear and visible into the life-cycle and value chain for OER is a way to address this issue.

Facilitating arenas, areas and marketplaces for OER could build on models that address all steps in the OER lifecycle to stimulate and have incentives including:

- Inclusion of faculty, teachers and the education sector in the lifecycle
- Creation and production of OER
- Use of public and or institutional procurement when relevant
- Quality assurance
- Storing
- User-friendly access
- Identifying new needs for OER

Box 3. Example on a national working eco-model for OER: The National Digital Learning Arena (NDLA) Norway

In 2006, the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research put forward a suggested resource allocation of NOK 50 million for digital learning resources in upper secondary education. The county councils were given, by a change in legislation, the responsibility for printed and digital learning resources. The county councils initiated a cooperation to deliver open digital learning resources. This cooperation is today NDLA.

NDLA is a public partnership, co-owned by 18 (out of 19) county councils in Norway. The goal is to cover all subjects at upper secondary level with open digital learning resources (OER) of high quality. NDLA involves the market, the teachers and students in the processes. The current operating annual budget is approximately 8 million EUR.

NDLA is set up as a virtual organization. The administrative resources are pooled from the counties in order to keep the cost at a minimum.

66% of the funding of NDLA is used for acquisition of technology services and digital learning resources from the ICT and content industries.

Today, NDLA covers 45 different subjects. The long-term ambition is to offer resources within all subjects. Statistics show a substantial increase in traffic on the NDLA website (ndla.no), and the awareness among key constituents is near 100%.
4.3. Governments should take up leadership in promoting and facilitating interoperability of OER within and between countries, cultures and languages

The full potential of OER is attained when users can choose and deliver OERs within the richness of OER, cultures and languages, as well as within and across communities, regions, countries, cultures and languages.

To have full interoperability on all levels, one has to address the following issues:

- Translation: the availability and richness of OER in the large world languages, in particular English, do not hinder. Instead, they provide great opportunities for the development of OER in LUL.
- Cultural adaptation: Licensed OERs can offer the full opportunity for cultural adaptation when necessary.
- Semantics and metadata: Repositories that offer access to OER need to have catalogued OER according to national and international standards, so that OER can be easily recognised and accessed across institutions, countries and languages.
- Platform interoperability: Tools that use OER(e.g. platforms for MOOCs) should offer full interoperability. For example, through standardised import and export facilities for the OER to avoid “lock in” of the resource.
- Accessibility across institutions, nations and marketplaces: OER should be openly available in repositories to be identified, accessed, used and stored in an easy and user-friendly way. Independent of the model for storage, users should have access as if OER in LUL was represented in one repository.

This is a more long-term policy recommendation, which needs to be addressed early by intergovernmental organizations and actors as UNESCO, the EU and others.
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How can OER enhance the position of less used languages on a global scale?

Workshop
The OCW Consortium global conference, Ljubljana 25 April 2014
Gard Titlestad
Secretary General
International Council For Open and Distance Education, ICDE

ICDE and OER

• Partnership on OER with UNESCO
• ICDE Chairs on OER – global network
  – Fred Mulder, Rory Mcgreal, Wayne Macintosh
  – + 2 more soon
• Partnership on open education with OCWC (ex. Open Praxis at this conference), European Commission and others
• Prepares global monitoring together with partners
• BERTA: Bringing Educational Resources to Teachers in Africa (OER as OCW - online)
• Participate in concrete projects
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Tentative title: "Challenges and opportunities for less used languages, A global and European perspective. Recommendations for governments and educational institutions"
Participants next WS 28 April in Oslo:

- Tora Aasland, President, Norwegian Regional Government (WS), Stavanger, Norway
- Marcella S. Mathew, Principal and Vice Chancellor, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
- Marie W. Østergaard, Director General, The Open University of Norway, Oslo, Norway
- Tora Birkeland, President, The Norwegian Open University
- Anja Grønmo, Government Manager in Learning, The Norwegian Business School, Director of the e-Learning and Innovation Program
- Randi Gjertsen, Programme Director for Open Educational Resources, UNIBO
- Håkan Sjöblom, Secretary General, The Association of Swedish Higher Education Institutions, Stockholm, Sweden
- Tom Fred, Senior Advisor, Oslo and Akershus University, College of Applied Sciences, Norway
- Anja Brattberg, Norwegian Digital Learning Alliance, Ministry of Education and Research, Oslo, Norway
- Heiner Jean-Claude, President - Chief Executive Officer, European Distance Education and Training Network, Canada
- René Mantzka, UNESCO, OER Office, OER, The Open Educational Resources Conference - The Open Educational Resources conference, 2014 in Vancouver, British Columbia
- Maria Attey, Director of Visual Learning Programs, Royal Technology University of Singapore
- Jordan Morten Hjorth, Director General, The Norwegian Council for Education
- Ari Skjerven, Head of Language Development, Ministry of Education and Research, Oslo, Norway
- Lars Grøndahl & Sverre Heim, Tromsø
- Sylvi Agger, Senior content and Director of Studies, Department of Manager, Commonwealth of Learning and Learning, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
- Carolien van der Meulen, Director, European Language, Lang ER network
- Fang Zhao, President, The Open University of China

Vision for OER

“For the first time in human history we have the tools to enable everyone to attain all the education they desire.”

(Wiley, Green, & Soares, 2012)

Dramatically bringing down the cost of education with OER: How open education resources unlock the door to free learning.

Expectations to OER

“OERs have the potential to solve the global education crisis and contribute to sustainable economic growth”


And......reality

- “Concerning OER open for adaptation and innovation regarding less use languages, the emerging landscape seems rather static and OER are scarce.”

– Sylvi Viggo, Director of Studies, Department of Education, Communication and Learning, University of Gothenburg – fi ng s to be presented 28 April 2014.
Definition

- Less used languages are languages such as Norwegian, Swedish, Slovenian, Xhosa and Zulu which find themselves needing to contend with a fast evolving educational landscape currently dominated by English. Less used languages also include regional and minority languages.

Internet and languages

- “Of the approximately 7,000 languages spoken today, some 2,500 are generally considered endangered. Here we argue that this consensus figure vastly underestimates the danger of digital language death, in that less than 5% of all languages can still ascend to the digital realm. We present evidence of a massive die-off caused by the digital divide.”


Size does not (necessarily) matter!

- The example of some 2–3 million still spoken by Torino region
- And Faroese, with less than 50k speakers, but with a high quality Wikipedia


Content languages for websites

as of 12 March 2014

Ref: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Languages_used_on_the_Internet
Internet users by language 2011

Ref: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Languages_used_on_the_Internet

OER Impact map

The same picture...

The same picture is provided by the OER Policy Registry, which shows an overwhelming over-representation in policies from the US and UK

http://wiki.creativecommons.org/OER_Policy_Registry
What are the consequences?

• What are the consequences for education if the OER-base in less used languages is relative weak?
• And consequences for languages?
• Other consequences? (E.g. for innovation etc.)

Preliminary:
Main findings
1. Lacking common ground – interpretation to open
2. Creative Commons (CC) and Open Licensing (OL) – less explicit
3. OER linked to “open” and “accessible”
4. Engagement from grass-root level to Ministries and Agencies of Education – but few national incentives
5. Restricted innovative scope of OER and language use

Ref: Sylvi Vigmo, Gothenburg University, WP2 leader

Questions

• What are your observations regarding OER and less used languages?
• Which issues would you suggest arise from those observations?
• Any suggestions for future policy recommendations?