Notes

1) areas defined as challenging
highly debated subjects that relate directly to reuse (but also to sharing)

2) Windle et al 2010
Windle advocates for quality assurance to be ascertain at the point of release.

3) Wiley & Gurrell 2009
The authors advocate that quality has only meaning in the context of reuse where user “meets” the resource

4) what’s new? debate
discussions revolving around the added value over other materials available on the web

5) Wiley, OER 101 Theory and Practice
Added value OER lies in its reuse: “if you can’t make revisions to your materials were necessary, you are limited in your ability to get better at what you do over time”

6) Greaves et al 2010
benefit of CC over Free and Linkable evidenced in a case study:
Academic Phrasebank (free web based resource from the university of Manchester) was used as supplementary material for students. Based on the feedback from students authors decided to get permission to redesign this resources to better suit students’ needs

7) OECD 2007
RLOs with CC are only one part of OERs

8) Windle et al. 2010
Windle lists CC licencing among the main drivers for the world-wide reuse of SONET OER materials (feedback from users collected via surveys)

9) Robertson blogpost
Robertson provides an explanation on how RLOs differ from OER from the technical perspective: RLOs as intentionally designed for sharing, context neutral, rich metadata, packaged, stored in repositories, media rich. First made by specialists, than with tools like GLO maker - lowered technical barriers. = creating sth with intention to share
OERs - any edu resource, of any format that some thought of as being valuable to share. = sharing sth that sb is doing with an open licence. OERs can but not necessarily have to be context neutral, rich in metadata, media rich, packaged etc.
So and RLO can be OER but not all OERs are RLO (form the tech perspective)
“People sharing what they’re doing vs. people creating particular stuff to share”
Robertson also refers to big and small OERs. The difference relevant to REMIXING - small OERs are created by individuals (like teachers), low cost production, web native = easier to reuse and remix BUT reputation, quality and location issues

10) Levine, comment to Robertson blogpost
Levine approaches the problem from a different perspective concentrating rather on the similarities than differences: intention to share the content that was created for learning.
He also argues that the differences between RLOs and OERs have to be seen in the context of times: RLOs arose in times of Web1.0 and with tools limitations (such that would enable anyone to mess around and remix)
“The difference is now I guess that it is left to us, the finders of OERs to assemble or link.”

11) who shares is more likely to reuse and vice versa
Robertson provides an explanation on how RLOs differ from OER from the technical perspective: RLOs as intentionally designed for sharing, context neutral, rich metadata, packaged, stored in repositories, media rich. First made by specialists, then with tools like GLO maker - lowered technical barriers. = creating sth with intention to share.

OERs - any edu resource, of any format that some though of as being valuable to share. = sharing sth that sb is doing with an open licence. OERs can but not necessarily have to be context neutral, rich in metadata, media rich, packaged etc.

So and RLO can be OER but not all OERs are RLO (form the tech perspective)

"People sharing what they’re doing vs. people creating particular stuff to share"

Robertson also refers to big and small OERs. The difference relevant to REMIXING - small OERs are created by individuals (like teachers), low cost production, web native = easier to reuse and remix BUT reputation, quality and location issues

12) Windle et al., 2010 after Windle et al. 2007
"Evidence suggests that those who feel empowered to reuse are more likely themselves to share and vice versa

13) does not apply to research-led universities?
"Our previous work suggests that faculty in research university environments

14) specific mentality that goes with openness?
Many barriers that are relevant to sharing seem to be also relevant to reuse even if the angle of looking at the barrier is slightly different. Therefore we should keep an eye on what literature and stakeholders have to say on sharing.

15) OER types and development models
different types = different benefits to different audiences/for different purposes/in different contexts

16) Amber Thomas post
About little OER: a by-product of their teaching. Openness as a way of working (=mindset): we shouldn't try to enforce models; let the by-product be by-product

17) Lane 2008
Lane 2008 describes 4 types of support build into OU Programmes, first 3 of which are built into OpenLearn materials as much as possible: 1) pedagogic support 2) personal support 3) peer support 4) professional support (page 156)

18) OECD 2007 after Margulies, 2005
OECD report (after Margulies, 2005): OER can be tools, content, implementation resources

19) Boyle&Cook 2004, Learning Objects, Pedagogy and Reuse

20) Gurell, Kuo, Walker 2010

21) Gourley&Lane 2009
surveys and observations (OpenLearn, Learning Space and LabSpace)

22) Johansen 2009

23) voices advocating for shift from supply-side to demand-side
A considerable amount of authors highlight that understanding the user and reuse is important. Efforts are being made to develop tools and approaches that will help to understand "why" and "what for" the materials are being downloaded
24) what attributes of OERs determine their usefulness (evidence-based)
this question was dropped and therefore not in scope of our literature search.

25) Leslie comment to Robertson blogpost
Scott advocates for trying to look for models and metaphors from the perspective of users.

26) perceived benefits & barriers/attitudes
data collected form interviewees and focus groups with academics and learners

27) D’Antoni 2009

28) Windle et al. 2010
two definitions of the word "reusibility": something is made available for others to reuse vs. something is designed with intention to support reuse.
There is also a third strand where reuse is seen more broadly - in this strand getting inspiration from one material to create another is already understood as reuse.

29) Wiley 2009
impact of Lego metaphor on the understanding of the word "reuse" => reuse is understood as assambling because: "you don't melt lego down, cut them into two etc."

30) Boyle&Cook 2003, Learning Objects, Pedagogy and Reuse

31) Wiley blogpost
According to Wiley for a resources to be OER it must be 4R (only 3 CC licences!) and must use technology that does not interfere with 4R! Example: you publish a scanned material under 4R - how can others easily remix it?

32) Amber Thomas blogpost
"How important is the edibility of OER? Is use good enough?" We have to collect more evidence on how OER is used - reused - repurposed (all three metter, not only the last one)

33) Robertson blogpost
Robertson provides a short summary of OER models and metaphors in use by the research community