

Globethics Repository



Open educational practice : caveat emptor

This page was generated automatically upon download from the Globethics Repository. More information on Globethics see <https://www.globethics.net>. Data and content policy of Globethics Repository see <https://repository.globethics.net/pages/policy>.

Item Type	Book chapter
Authors	Naidu, Som
Publisher	Globethics.net
Rights	Creative Commons Copyright (CC 2.5)
Download date	2026-09-25 14:55:28
Link to Item	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12424/164357

OPEN EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE: CAVEAT EMPTOR

Som Naidu

17.1 Introduction

The case for *open educational resources* and *massive open online courses* is clearest and strongest when seen within the broader conversation around *open educational practice*. This comprises open access to educational opportunity, and alternative modes of learning as well as engagement with open scholarship. While the case for access to educational opportunity and approaches to various modes of open learning are now widely recognized and accepted, the case for engagement with open scholarship is not entirely clear and convincing. This chapter explores the major confounds around the case for open scholarship to separate the hype from the facts, and shed light on ethical and moral issues surrounding engagement with open educational practices. Implications of these practices for the roles, responsibilities and commitments of universities as well as other educational institutions in society, and the framing of a values driven and future-proofed curriculum for them are outlined and discussed.

17.2 The Case for Open Educational Resources

Few developments in the open and online education space have rattled the *Zeitgeist* of educational practice and caused as much interest in, as well as controversy over its form and function, as has been the case for *open educational resources* (OER) and *massive, open and online courses* (MOOCs) (see Jona & Naidu, 2014). Among other things, these developments highlight issues to do with the roles and responsibilities of educational institutions around equity and access to educational opportunity, as well as opportunities and challenges for change and innovation in educational curricula and its pedagogy.

The socio-political imperatives for the adoption of OER by educational institutions are clearly justifiable and defensible, especially as a credible response to meeting relevant targets of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals agenda around reducing inequality, and in providing an inclusive and equitable quality education, and lifelong learning opportunities for all. But the educational and economic arguments for their widespread adoption are still not entirely clear and convincing (see Naidu, 2016).

Let's consider the assumptions of the educational argument first. The educational imperative suggests that content ought to be released and with permissions to enable them to be used and manipulated in ways that are not possible with conventional proprietary material. There can be advantages for users in being able to do this (i.e., revise, remix, and redistribute educational resources) with freedom and impunity. But it is not always necessary to revise and remix a resource before it is usable (see Naidu, 2016). Neither learners nor teachers want to always rip apart an educational resource before it is of any use to them (see Allen, & Seaman, 2014; see also Wiley, 2016). Besides, this may not be always advisable. Most educational resources will have a level of integrity that is determined by its authors or developers which they would want to

protect and for good reason. Altering this in different ways can run the risk of misinterpretation and misrepresentation of the essence of the original resource (Baggaley & James, 2016).

Educational resources are often selected for their overall suitability and relevance for a set of learning outcomes, and not for their exposure to being able to be modified by users. Some will be more suitable than others, and few will ever come exactly fit for purpose. The imperative for educational resources to be able to be revised and remixed for effective use suggests furthermore, a perspective on teaching that is subject matter content-focused, suggesting that the content is the primary object of an educational transaction and it is that which needs to be taught and learned. Whereas conventional wisdom plus a growing body of literature on learning experience design suggests that the focus of the learning and teaching transaction ought to be, not on teaching the subject matter content, but squarely on the design of appropriate and relevant learning experiences for learners (i.e., the learning activities) and only then selecting appropriate and relevant educational resources, or parts of them to fuel this learning engine (see Goodyear & Carvalho, 2013; Naidu, & Karunanayaka, 2014).

Given this perspective on learning and teaching, being able to revise and remix an educational resource is not that important. What is important is how an educational resource or parts of it are used and integrated in a learning activity or experience. If a user of a resource were to have a significant contribution to make on a subject, there is always the opportunity of being able to do it without having to infuse it into an existing resource. The adoption of OER will improve access to educational resources of course, but OER by themselves, no matter how modifiable, will not necessarily improve educational practice any more than any other comparable educational resource (see Smith, 2016). For it to be educationally effective and efficient, OER like any other educational resource will require careful integration into the learning

and teaching transactions. For attempts at demonstrating how this kind of integration of OER in educational practice is achievable see Naidu and Karunanayaka (2014).

Let's now consider the assumptions of the economic arguments in favor of OER. These are based on the premise that educational resources or outputs developed with the support of the public purse ought to be released free of cost, and with permissions for their retention, reuse, revision, repurposing and redistribution (see <http://opencontent.org/blog/archives/3221>). The reasons why one should be able to reuse, revise, remix and repurpose a resource at no cost are contentious at least in two significant ways.

First it posits an *a priori* condition of what is meant by cost free (i.e., that which is supported with public funds), and with a range of permissions (i.e., from most to least open). But it does not make clear for whom and where. Does it mean that educational resources published with funding from a particular jurisdiction is made available cost free to all other jurisdictions? If so, then how is this justifiable and implemented across jurisdictions, other than relying on the goodwill and reciprocity of participants in the process, as there will surely be a few who will very likely want to opt out of such an arrangement? Moreover, there will be always costs associated with the development, production and distribution of content such as textbooks and peer-reviewed journal articles that are not usually supported by the public purse. How this expense is met under a cost-free regime is still unclear.

The second significant sticking point with the economic arguments for open content has to do with the derivatives of the permissions being sought by proponents (see <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>). How was the creative commons licensing scheme and its attendant permissions structure developed to serve as an alternative to the conventional proprietary system (i.e., what processes or research methods were followed in the development of the scheme)? How were

these categories derived? And furthermore, how does the new licensing scheme propose to protect the integrity of the original piece of work from misinterpretation, misrepresentation, plagiarism and poaching if they were to be subjected to revision and remixing by anyone with freedom and impunity. Surely, a good place to start such a conversation would have been to examine how resources are often and best used in educational settings, and only then embarking on developing a model of permissions for such use (see Smith, 2016).

17.3 The Case for Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs)

MOOCs appeared on our radar in much the same way, rather incidentally, and without foremost, a careful consideration of what a massive open online course might look like, let alone why we might need and want to develop such courses (Naidu, 2013a). Around 2008 two educators, George Siemens and Stephen Downes were offering a graduate seminar online on “connectivism and connective knowledge” for about 25 students at University of Manitoba in Saskatchewan, Canada, when it dawned upon them to open up this course to anyone and everyone with an internet connection. So they did, lo and behold, around 2,200 others from the general public took up the invitation to join without having to pay anything for the experience (see Siemens & Downes, 2011). What do you call such a course that has suddenly gone from attracting 25 to 2,000 participants and is open to anyone at no cost, and without any prior knowledge of the subject matter? Their collaborators, Dave Cormier and Bryan Alexander, called it a “massive, open, online course”. The term stuck and an idea was born (see <http://bit.ly/1k50ijB>).

Incidentally, the subject matter of the online seminar that George Siemens and Stephen Downes were offering was about knowledge

building in a connected world (see Downes, 2008; Siemens, 2008). Therefore the first round of MOOCs were propelled by the belief that knowledge and understanding was best developed by participants engaging in an open discussion, debate and exploration of the subject matter content and its context to arrive at their own individual and collective understandings. This reflected a constructivist approach to learning and teaching (although Siemens and Downes would suggest a *connectivist* approach), and these courses were dubbed cMOOCs. Another category of MOOCs mostly emanating from Ivy League colleges in the USA, were more heavily reliant on presentation of the subject matter content and its discussion in short video clips which was supported by multiple choice type quizzes that were moderated and marked by graduate teaching assistants reflecting the learning and teaching *modus operandi* of these campus-based operations. These variants began to be called xMOOCs (see Daniel, 2012; Adams, Yin, Madriz, & Mullen, 2014).

Type of MOOCs notwithstanding, *educators* saw in this development benefits for attracting large numbers of students, especially to graduate seminars with dwindling intakes (Baggaley, 2014). At the operational level, educators saw benefits for them in the anytime, any pace and anywhere flexibility afforded by the approach in terms of scheduling their teaching, research and other commitments (Naidu, 2013a; Peach & Bieber, 2015). Moreover, the use of online learning technologies which were now robust enough could be adopted to support *participatory pedagogies* which promoted a view of learning and teaching that suggested that knowledge and understanding is best developed through *connection, collaboration, cooperation* and *co-creation* among relevant participants (Andersen, & Ponti, 2014; Downes, 2008).

Educational administrators saw in this initiative, an opportunity to showcase and promote their brand with the help of star performers such

as Nobel Laureates or high profile teachers and researchers if they had them on staff, on subjects of their particular strengths, and in specialist areas. Much like a bargain sale, or one for the price of two used by entrepreneurs to lure shoppers through their doors, these slim pickings from an organization's course offering served as digital shopfronts, or taster courses as pathways and forays into the global market for potential highly motivated and high achieving students who might want to consider joining the organization for fulltime study (Jona, & Naidu, 2014; Yuan, & Powell, 2013).

Entrepreneurs and venture capitalists saw in this initiative a golden opportunity for profiteering in the education industry (Wolfson, 2013). The technology was now available and reliable enough to be used to offer a high standard of education (a product from a largely English speaking and more developed world) to the masses of students (mostly resident in the less developed world where the market was for this kind of education), and who were hungry for any such educational opportunity, no matter how poor in quality. Anything was better than nothing for students in such educational settings who were eager for further education, and better still, if it came with a foreign and western educational badge or qualification. And if it were from an Ivy League institution, then no questions were asked (see Wolfson, 2013).

17.4 The Case for Open Educational Practices

Despite their rather chequered trajectory, as outlined in the above, the case for *open educational resources* and *massive open online courses* has a solid pedigree in the tradition of *open educational practice*. There are three critical attributes to the concept of open educational practice: 1) *open access* which means inclusive and equal access to educational opportunities without barriers such as prior knowledge and entry qualifications, and ability to pay; 2) *open learning*

which is the opportunity to study and learn at anytime, anywhere and at any pace, as well as anyhow irrespective of one's physical location; and 3) *open scholarship* which means the release of educational resources under an open license scheme which permits no-cost access, use, reuse, adaptation, retention and redistribution to others.

The concept of *open access* is deeply grounded in a socio-economic and political agenda which seeks education for all as the path to real freedom and justice (see Sen, 1999). For without education, as Sen argues, one cannot really be part of the mainstream conversation and therefore unable to compete equitably. At the operational level this means not just equal, but equitable access from a position of disadvantage to educational opportunities without having to meet the usual barriers such as prior knowledge and qualifications and ability to pay. In the absence of this, there can be no real freedom and therefore no justice (i.e., not simply political freedom, but freedom to choose as one wishes to).

The concept of *open access* is perhaps best embodied in the development of opportunities for *open, flexible and distance learning* which enables learning at anytime, anywhere and at any pace, as well as anyhow. The classic case for this has been the establishment of the United Kingdom Open University and many similar organizations world over subsequently (The Open University, <http://bit.ly/1n2w72l>). This type of educational opportunity also involved making available educational resources at no, or a reduced cost to learners especially in resource poor and developing regions of the world. This could be considered a precursor to the current conceptions of *open scholarship* which is regulated release of educational resources under an open license scheme that permits no-cost access, and allows permissions to adopt, adapt, retain and redistribute such resources freely and with appropriate restrictions.

The case for *open, flexible and distance learning* provision has clearly been won as is clear from the growth of open and distance learning educational institutions, as well as practices all over the world and in relation to the value they are adding to socio-economic and political development of societies especially in the developing regions. However, the case for *open scholarship* which comprises the adoption and use of artefacts such as open educational resources and the provision of massive open online courses is not all that clear, and actually far from won (see Weller, 2014).

The key sticking points in relation to this battle have to do with the ethical and moral implications of open educational practices especially in relation to assuring quality of educational provision with integrity, and a duty of care of students as well as staff. And this is the focus of the rest of this chapter.

17.5 Assuring Quality of Educational Provision

But before we explore any of that, let's make clear upfront that open educational practice is a good thing. And there are many good reasons for it which are adequately articulated in this chapter as well as others in this volume. It's good for the students, the teachers and educational organizations. But let's make clear also that engagement with open educational practices (and especially the adoption of OER and MOOCs) will not necessarily improve or assure a high quality of educational provision without careful thought to their integration into educational practice (see Smith, 2016). Furthermore, open educational resources may not be necessarily of any better quality than any other educational resource, just as MOOCs may not be inherently any better than any other type of course (Lowenthal & Hodges, 2015). How a high quality learning experience can be assured in an open educational context needs careful consideration.

Let's think through the confounding issues. In most educational settings, the educational organization assumes a responsibility for providing the best, or at least a high quality educational experience to students who choose to join it. In most cases this responsibility is articulated in a variety of ways including organizational mission and goals, strategic plans and processes, and commitments to teaching and the provision of related academic as well as administrative support services. Students and their parents will often make their choices to enrol and undertake to pay for these services based on these promises. And upon registration, they will be right to expect these services and all other commitments that were made, just as educational organizations would expect from students their best foot forward (Hil, 2016).

A problem arises when either party fails to keep its promise without due cause. For instance, students will run the risk of failure and expulsion from the organization expeditiously in the case of their inability to meet and fulfil the requirements of their academic program or in the case of academic or any other kind of misconduct. But while educational institutions will make all manner of claims about their international reputation and ranking, the high quality of their research staff, and the quality of teaching and related resources, repercussions for failure to deliver on these claims and promises are never as clearly articulated.

There are many reasons for this lack of clarity on the implications of failure to deliver on its promises by educational institutions. For instance, the levels of recruitment and retention of popular or highly qualified staff are never as explicitly linked to the promises the organization will have made to its students about the strength and reputation of its staffing. More often than not, and especially in higher education, the curriculum and its pedagogy is often determined and influenced by individual faculty members or a few people and arbitrary processes including political influences (e.g., State Government of

Victoria, Australia, <http://bit.ly/1UW5acZ>). Students will have little prior knowledge of what they are going to get in a course and what exactly they will be paying for. In their defence, organizations will argue that the determination of the curriculum and its pedagogy is the domain of experts, and that they are the experts, not novice students who are there to learn. And even though organizations will insist that they have processes in place for it to occur, attempts to seek student feedback on teaching is often so flawed that most efforts fail to allow any meaningful student input into what is included in the curriculum, let alone how it is taught and learned. It is arguable that such below par educational practices amount to a failure on the part of educational institutions to meet their commitments to their students, and as such a neglect of duty of care (see Marshall, 2014).

17.6 Assuring Quality in the Adoption of OER

The case for the adoption of open educational resources at the institutional level is a good example of this kind of arbitrary posturing and the failure of its protagonists and educational institutions to keep their promises about the quality of educational provision. The key point made in favor of the adoption of OER is the ability to mitigate the rising costs of commercially published textbooks and similar educational materials. Yet providing educational resources cheaply to students is rarely proposed as an institutional imperative, and how are open educational resources going to make a student's learning experience any better apart from reducing costs is never made really clear (DeRosa, 2015). Besides, if the reduction of the costs of education for the student were the endgame for an institution, then surely there are many more expedient ways of achieving this like closing down recreational and other non-essential services.

Yet teachers and students are expected to be hunting for and adopting open educational resources, which are valid and reliable without any clear help and assistance with what they are looking for in the first place, or how to be able to recognize them, and evaluate their quality and educational potential before using them. Besides, the implications of this expectation for students and teachers without access to the Internet are not questioned, and those in the non-English speaking world are rarely considered. As most of the OER, currently, seems to be in the English language and most easily portable over the Internet. Protagonists of OER and educational institutions are quite happy to pass this role on to novice teachers and students, after having argued vehemently that the determination of the content of a curriculum was their role and responsibility, and not that of students who are there to learn.

But none of this may be inherently a bad thing as there is much learning going on, on the part of students as well as teachers when they are being encouraged and expected to search for and evaluate educational resources that they can adopt and adapt for their respective needs. The contentious issue has to do with the ethics of these expectations for students and teachers. Placing students and teachers into an uncharted and unsupported learning and teaching environment amounts to a serious dereliction of responsibility by the institution in relation to the quality of educational provision, and as such a neglect of the duty of care of both the students and the staff (see Marshall, 2014). Open content, nor more and more content, in and of itself, will not make for good teaching. What will make for good teaching is the design of relevant, suitable and authentic learning experiences and then selecting appropriate (open) content to support these learning experiences (see Naidu, & Karunanayaka, 2014).

17.7 Assuring Quality in the Adoption of MOOCs

The case for MOOCs is just as problematic if not more, in relation to the quality of educational provision (see Bates, 2012). The strongest points in favour of MOOCs are that they open up access to learning opportunities for a much larger audience, in fact an indefinite number of takers. That is certainly true. MOOCs make it possible for any number of learners from the remotest regions of the world to access content from the best educational organizations without leaving their home or workplace, and listen and learn from the most reputable of experts at no real cost except for their own access to the Internet. Yet these are the key sticking points with MOOCs (see Granger, 2013).

MOOCs are only accessible to those with reliable access to the Internet. And MOOC protagonists will be quick to argue that the goal of MOOCs is to make education openly and freely accessible and furthermore, that this is the future of higher education and indeed education more generally (see Adams, Yin, Madriz, & Mullen, 2014; Coursera, 2013; Koller, & Ng, 2013; Wolfson, 2013; Universities UK, 2013). But what kind and quality of education they are talking about is never made clear? Just because the current crop of MOOCs are emerging from research intensive and Ivy League institutions does not mean that they come with a high quality curriculum and pedagogy (Granger, 2013). In fact, most of the current iterations of MOOCs simply replicate what happens in face-to-face classrooms generally, and many are actually rather poor reflections of common classroom pedagogy, despite Siemens' and Downes' exhortations of MOOCs as participatory learning spaces (see Anderson, 2013). Most contemporary MOOCs tend to simply record a live lecture *in situ* (without much attention to sound quality and movement of the presenter), chunk it and post it online, along with short quizzes to assess learning achievement.

Surely this amounts to a serious neglect of academic responsibility in relation to quality of educational provision. But doing any more, and especially for an infinite number of potential students would obviously require a lot more time, effort, resources, as well as systems and processes for course design and development. In most cases, these implications have not been thought through or made available and were not taken into account. And not because this kind of knowledge and expertise is rare but because the starting point of the development of MOOCs has been the delivery technology which is supposed to carry it through. The long history of learning and teaching in the open, flexible, distance and online mode using a wide range and mixture of media by open and distance learning institutions world over wasn't even considered as a possible source of inspiration and guidance on best practices.

And some of the weakest links in relation to contemporary MOOC pedagogy are *assessment*, *feedback* and *accreditation* (see Naidu, 2013b; Naidu, & Barberà, 2015). Assessment of learning achievement in most MOOCs is undertaken with the help of multiple choice type questions. Of course there can be robust multiple choice type questions for assessing all types and levels of knowledge and understanding, but they are surely inadequate as the only or primary approach. Moreover, timely and relevant feedback is essential in supporting and promoting learning. There are no shortcuts to this. Good feedback will always require time and effort. Relegating this to a few automated comments on the right or wrong response to multiple choice type questions is inadequate and grossly unfair to students. Furthermore passing this responsibility on to student peers, especially without much supervision and guidance including accreditation and award of badges based on this kind of limited-overs pedagogy, is even more problematic (Norton, 2013, p.27).

Contemporary approaches to MOOC pedagogy may be defensible on the grounds that they serve a variety of purposes and students (see Kizilcec, Piech, & Schneider, 2013). For some takers they offer a top-up on relevant concepts or subject matter, and an uncomplicated quick and easy refresher course might be all they are looking for. For others, it might fulfil the professional development requirements of their workplace and employment (Laurillard, 2016). So a scant offering might not be such a bad thing if it meets its purpose. It is also arguable that the quality of a MOOC is really irrelevant as long as learners on the other end of the line have access to opportunities, that they will never be able to access or afford, and which have the potential to help improve their situation somewhat, never mind by how much. Having access to something is clearly better than having nothing at all. And institutions could rightly argue that if this kind of work is worth doing, then it is worth doing however poorly (see Chesterton, 2007).

But if this were the true motivation and intentions of MOOCs, then one would have expected that the adoption of the print medium (which can be made truly accessible to all) would have been the medium of choice as opposed to the internet and the web. Ah but the print medium is not as nearly as attractive. Therefore, there is no doubt that the technology is a key driver of developments, yet few MOOC promoters are acknowledging the real drivers of MOOC mania. And that's where the purported rationale for MOOCs as a liberating force comes unstuck and the real hidden agenda is revealed.

So what is the real agenda? Organizations see MOOCs as a shop front where potential students can browse at no cost, but if they wanted to buy (i.e., acquire the credit), then either they would have to register, pay for it and take the course of study, or pay to take the assessment and achieve the credit. In this manner MOOCs offer a new pathway to student recruitment. And for that reason, it doesn't matter how many students do not start or drop out from a MOOC, just as it does not matter

how many shoppers walk into the store after watching the window display, as even a few more than the usual would be a good outcome (Granger, 2013). MOOCs also offer institutions an avenue to promote their brand, which is why most MOOCs are originating from reputable and research-intensive universities as they are the ones who have something to showcase. However, very few of these institutions are acknowledging the real drivers and motivations of their interest in, and engagement with offering MOOCs on their campuses.

17.8 Integrity and Duty of Care of Students and Staff

Another very important factor that research-intensive and Ivy League institutions are compromising on in their dogged pursuit of even greater prominence and visibility in a globalized economy is research integrity which is a cornerstone of their existence (see Marshall, 2014). While purporting to provide open and free access to educational content and the expertise of publically funded organizations for the common good is laudable, many of these organizations will also acknowledge the use of MOOCs as a way of testing the student market and learning about the business of online education without adopting the usual safeguards such as seeking ethics clearance in order to do so (see Granger, 2013).

Universities will go on *ad nauseam* about their insistence on academic and research integrity, yet they are themselves grossly out of line and guilty of failing to pursue the same high levels of rigor in using real students, real courses, in the name of learning analytics for research and experimentation with their approaches to teaching and learning. Informed consent from students as key stakeholders regarding educational provision, and in this case their use for commercial exploitation is rarely sought, if not ignored (Norton, 2013). Surely, there is a duty of care of the student by the institution that is being compromised here. A student, and especially the freshman type, is a lot

more than a client of a product or service. It is arguable that when an institution accepts a student, it undertakes a commitment to educate, nurture and care for that individual both academically and socially. And many institutions, especially those with religious foundations, rightly commit to offering this kind of pastoral care in their mission and goals.

The treatment of staff and institutional expectations for them to engage in open educational practices, including open scholarship, is equally unreasonable and unfair. Like all credible educational resources, there are costs associated with their development and dissemination, and someone has to cover these costs. Passing on these costs to the creators of the content in case of open access publishing for instance, runs the risk of once again, perpetuating inequality by setting up barriers against those without the required funding (usually junior researchers and faculty members), to be able to participate equitably in such open educational practices.

Moreover, many who are asked to, or those who put up their hand to develop MOOCs have no prior experience with the development of such courses, let alone online courses or even components of these courses. Many will be expected to work with no support with online learning experience design, nor any help with the effective and efficient use of the technology that will be used to carry the course (see Bolliger, & Wasilik, 2009). It is no surprise then that most MOOCs mirror what happens in the face-to-face classroom because that is what most MOOC developers are familiar with and know best despite knowing, that teaching online and in the face-to-face mode is not simply about old wine in new bottles. What works in the face-to-face mode will not necessarily work well in the online learning space (Inglis, 2005).

Furthermore, with the adoption of open educational practices, teaching at universities today has become a lot about being able to work with a wide range of technologies in and outside of the classroom as opposed to simply barking from a lectern. It is about supporting learning

in a media and an information-rich learning environment, and it is also about coordinating the work of casual teachers and tutors who will be teaching in a course. So it is about managing and coordinating teams. Yet the requirements for the preparation of staff for teaching at the university has not kept pace with these developments in the workplace. Recent reports are suggesting that a PhD is no longer an adequate preparation for teaching at a university (see Ross, 2016). It will be for doing research, but not for teaching because the contemporary teaching environment has moved along so much from when teaching was about communicating one's research. Yet the conventional PhD, which is an increasingly inadequate qualification for teaching at a university, remains an essential criteria for appointment to academe (Group of Eight, 2013). Universities have commitments and responsibilities towards the professional development of their staff in relation to teaching quality enhancement, but few address this responsibility rigorously and systemically.

17.9 Concluding Remarks

Education is a public good. For without education there is no real freedom to be able to make informed decisions, to take advantage of learning opportunities and make meaningful choices that impact our daily lives. In the absence of money or some such privilege, education is the greatest leveler, for it affords us the wherewithal to be able to compete equitably, especially from a position of disadvantage. And without being able to compete openly and fairly, there can be no real justice. So the more widely and openly accessible education is, the better are our chances for meeting goals such as those set by the United Nations in relation to its millennium development and sustainable development agenda, particularly in relation to providing an inclusive and a high quality education and lifelong learning opportunities for all.

The adoption for *open educational practices* is integral to meeting these agenda. It includes access to learning opportunities, anytime, anywhere and at any pace, as well as the release of educational resources at no cost to the user, and with permissions for adaptation to local conditions. Apart from these preconditions, open educational resources and learning opportunities such as MOOCs are not inherently any different from any other educational resource or practice. And educational resources and learning opportunities, however open and flexible, will not, by themselves ensure a high quality learning experience. So regardless of the hype and hysteria around the case for all things open and cost free, open educational resources and MOOCs will not save the day for us. What will save the day for us and ensure a high quality learning experience is the effective, and efficient integration of open educational practices (as well as open educational practices) in the design of productive pedagogies and learning experiences for our students (see Gore, Griffiths, & Ladwig, 2004; Naidu, 2013c).

17.10 Chapter References

Adams, C., Yin, Y., Madriz, L. F. V., & Mullen, C. S. (2014): A phenomenology of learning large: the tutorial sphere of xMOOC video lectures, *Distance Education*, 35(2), 1-15. doi: 10.1080/01587919.2014.917701.

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2014): *Opening the curriculum: Open educational resources in U.S. higher education, 2014*. Oakland, CA: Babson Survey Research Group. Retrieved from <http://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/oer.html>.

Andersen, R., & Ponti, M. (2014): Participatory pedagogy in an open educational course: challenges and opportunities, *Distance Education*, 35(2), 1-16. doi: 10.1080/01587919.2014.917703.

Anderson, T. (2013): Promise and/or peril: MOOCs and open and distance education. *Commonwealth of Learning*. Retrieved from <http://www.ethicalforum.be/sites/default/files/MOOCsPromisePeril.pdf>

Baggaley, J. (2014): MOOCs: digesting the facts, *Distance Education*, 35(2), 1-5. doi: 10.1080/01587919.2014.919710.

Baggaley, J., & James, S. (2016): The fog of online learning, *Distance Education* (37)1, 121-129, doi: 10.1080/01587919.2016.1153962.

Bates, T. (2012): What's right and what's wrong about Coursera-style MOOCs. Online learning and distance education resources moderated by Tony Bates, August 5, 2012, <http://www.tonybates.ca/2012/08/05/whats-right-and-whats-wrong-about-coursera-style-moocs/>.

Bolliger, D.U., & Wasilik, O. (2009): Factors influencing faculty satisfaction with online teaching and learning in higher education. *Distance Education*, 30(1), 103-116, doi: 10.1080/01587910902845949.

Coursera (2013): About Coursera, <https://www.coursera.org/about>.

Chesterton, G. K. (2007): What's Wrong with the World? Dover Publications (first published 1900).

Daniel, J. S. (2012): Making Sense of MOOCs: Musings in a maze of myth, paradox and possibility, *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, <http://jime.open.ac.uk/articles/10.5334/2012-18/>.

DeRosa, R. (2015, January 9): Beyond the buck: An expanded vision of open access, <http://bit.ly/1VhZVET>.

Downes, S. (2008): Places to Go: Connectivism & Connective Knowledge, <http://bit.ly/1iyM0I0>.

Goodyear, P., Carvalho, L. (2013): The Analysis of Complex Learning Environments, in H. Beetham & R. Sharpe (Eds.), *Rethinking Pedagogy*

for a Digital Age: Designing for 21st Century Learning 2nd Edition, New York: Routledge, 49-63.

Gore, J. M., Griffiths, T., & Ladwig, J. G. (2004): Towards better teaching: productive pedagogy as a framework for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, (20)4, 375–387.

Granger, B. (2013): *Introduction to MOOCs: Avalanche, Illusion or Augmentation?* Policy Briefs published by the UNESCO Institute for Information Technologies in Education, 8 Kedrova St., Bldg. 3, Moscow, 117292, Russian Federation.

Group of Eight (2013, March): The Changing PhD: Discussion paper. The Group of Eight Group of Eight House Level 2, 101 Northbourne Avenue Turner ACT 2612 www.go8.edu.au.

https://go8.edu.au/sites/default/files/docs/the-changing-phd_final.pdf

Hil, R. (2016): Against the Neoliberal University. *Arena: The Australian Magazine of Left Political, Social and Cultural Commentary*, No. 140, 12-14. Arena Printing and Publishing Pty Ltd. Fitzroy, Melbourne, Australia.

History of the Open University, The Open University, <http://bit.ly/1n2w72l>.

Inglis, A. (2005): Quality improvement, quality assurance, and benchmarking: comparing two frameworks for managing quality processes in open and distance learning. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 6 (1), 1-13, <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/221/867>.

Jona, K., & Naidu, S. (2014): *MOOCs: emerging research*. *Distance Education*, 35(2), 141-144. doi:10.1080/01587919.2014.928970.

Kizilcec, R. F., Piech, C. & Schneider, E. (2013): Deconstructing Disengagement: Analyzing Learner Subpopulations in Massive Open

Online Courses, <http://rene.kizilcec.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Kizilcec-Piech-Schneider-2013->

Koller, D., & Ng, A. (2013): The Online Revolution: Report from Year 1, presented at Coursera Partners' Conference, University of Pennsylvania.

Laurillard, D. (2016): The educational problem that MOOCs could solve: professional development for teachers of disadvantaged students, *Research in Learning Technology* 2016, 24, <http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/rlt.v24>.

Lowenthal, P. R., & Hodges, C. B. (2015): In Search of Quality: Using Quality Matters to Analyze the Quality of Massive, Open, Online Courses (MOOCs). *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, Volume 16(5), 83-101, <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/2348/3435>.

Marshall, S. (2014): Exploring the ethical implications of MOOCs, *Distance Education*, 35(2), 1-13. doi: 10.1080/01587919.2014.917706.

Naidu, S. & Karunanayaka, S. (2014): Engines of Education: Integrating OER in Learning and Teaching. In: S. Karunanayaka & S. Naidu (Eds.). *Integrating OER in Educational Practice: Practitioner Stories*. The Open University of Sri Lanka, 3-22.

Naidu, S. (2013a): Transforming MOOCs and MOORFAPs into MOOLOs, *Distance Education*, 34(3), 253-255, doi: 10.1080/01587919.2013.842524.

Naidu, S. (2013b): *Foreword*. In *Assessment and evaluation of time factors in online teaching and learning*, edited by Elena Barberà and Peter Reimann, New York, Idea Group.

Naidu, S. (2013c): Instructional design models for optimal learning. In Moore, M.G. (Ed.), *The Handbook of Distance Education*, 3rd edition, New York, Routledge, 268-281.

Naidu, S. (2016): The case for open educational practice, *Distance Education*, 37(1), 1-3. DOI: 10.1080/01587919.2016.1157010.

Naidu, S., & Barberà, E. (2015): Editorial: The Weakest Link -- Assessment and Accreditation in MOOCs, *Special Themed Issue: Assessment and Accreditation in MOOCs*. Digital Education Review - Number 25, June 2014- <http://greav.ub.edu/der/>.

Norton, A. (April 2013). *The online evolution: when technology meets tradition in higher education*, Grattan Institute, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia, http://grattan.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/186_online_higher_education.pdf.

Peach, H.G., & Bieber, J.P. (2015). *Faculty and Online Education as a Mechanism of Power*. *Distance Education*, 36(1), 26-40. doi: 10.1080/01587919.2015.1019971.

Ross, J. (2016): PhDs failing to make the grade with uni employers. *The Australian (Higher Education Segment)*. March 30th.

Sen, A. (1999): *Development as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Siemens, G. (2008): Learning and knowing in networks: Changing roles for educators and designers, <http://bit.ly/1hJynVC>.

Siemens, G., & Downes S. (2011): Connectivism and connective knowledge (course: CCK11). University of Manitoba, <http://cck11.mooc.ca/>.

Smith, M. (2016): *Feature: open is as open does*, <http://roer4d.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/ROER4D-Newsletter-February-March-2016.pdf>.