Project acronym: OPAL

Project title: Open Educational Quality Initiative

OPAL
OPEN EDUCATIONAL QUALITY INITIATIVE

Work package 7

Deliverable 7.1
Conceptual Framework for the OPAL Awards

Due date of deliverable: 15.02.2011
Actual submission date: 14.12.11

Start date of project: 01/01/2010   Duration: 24 months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: International Council for
Open and Distance Education (ICDE)

Education and Culture DG
Lifelong Learning Programme

EACEA
Education, Audiovisual & Culture
Executive Agency

Education
and
Training

Project co-funded by the European Commission		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	
RE	Restricted	x
CO	Confidential	

Deliverable Fact Sheet

Deliverable Version:	5
Deliverable Type:	
Current Release Status:	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium
Final Release Status:	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium
Work package:	WP7
Organisation Responsible:	International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE)
Primary Contributor:	Nick Moe-Pryce
Deliverable reviewers:	

Change Log

No.	Date	Sections	Change	Author/ Editor
1	07.05.10	11	Table of contents and division of tasks	Nick Moe-Pryce
2	10.07.10	3-7	Concept paper distributed for comments	Nick Moe-Pryce
3	04.10.10	3-7	Revised concept paper for comments	Nick Moe-Pryce
4	05.04.11	2-11	First draft for comments	Nick Moe-Pryce
5	14.12.11	All	Final draft	Nick Moe-Pryce
6	20.01.11	All	Final review	Thomas Richter

Actual Date of Delivery	14 December 2011
Audience	☐ public ☒ restricted

Date	
Status	☐ draft ☐ WP leader accepted ☐ Quality checked X Project coordinator accepted
Action requested	☐ to be revised by partner in charge of the deliverable ☐ to be reviewed by the appointed partners ☐ for approval of the project coordinator Deadline for action: date

Executive summary: This paper provides the framework for the OPAL Awards, and demonstrates the stages of development of the concept and discussions of this within the project group.

Table of Contents

1   Introduction

This report charts the development of the OPAL Awards. It begins with a study of best practices from 4 awards and prizes, similar in scope to the OPAL Awards and then summarizes the discussions which led to the definition of categories, number of awards, international profile of the awards, as well as marketing and technological considerations. Materials developed during this process are included in appendix.

2   Examples of best practice from other awards and prizes

In order to draw on existing experience in awards, it was determined to undertake a study of examples of best practice. Documentation was collected and interviews carried out both with project partners and external organisations with significant experience in the organisation of awards. The examples presented here are drawn from educational awards which have a well developed and tested structure. This study looks at both awards where materials and examples are submitted and evaluation carried out by a panel of judges according to specific criteria, and those of an honorary nature which seek to recognise a broader definition of achievement or merit. The following areas in particular were studied:

1. Public profile of awards
2. Description of process, terms and conditions
3. Eligibility
4. Published criteria
5. Format for submissions
6. Organisational structure
7. Jury formation
8. Communication with the jury and deliberations
9. Communication with nominees
10. Awarding process
11. Timescale

In the third column of each table, notes are made for areas of particular relevance which should be kept in mind when devising the OPAL Awards.

2.1   The Commonwealth of Learning Excellence in Distance Education Awards (COL EDEA)

The Commonwealth of Learning's Excellence in Distance Education Awards[1] have been in existence since 1998 and are awarded annually. Stated aim: recognising and honouring excellence in distance education. Awards are given for:

---

[1] http://www.col.org/edea and interview with Dave Wilson, Communications Director, COL, 24 March 2011

- Institutional excellence - reaching out to students through open and distance learning (3 awards)
- Excellence in distance education materials development (separate categories for physical and electronic format - 3 awards per category)
- Excellence in a distance learning experience (in a degree granting programme, and eLearning experience in difficult circumstances - 1 award in each category).
- Honorary fellows (nominations not sought for this category)

Area	Description	Comment
1. Public profile	Global visibility, highly developed structure	
2. Process, terms and conditions	Clear, succinct guidance online and in full detail in downloadable PDFs. Key points: • Only complete entries will be considered • Reserve right not to make awards in one or more categories • Will not exceed the maximum number of awards for each category • No prior notification of results except to winners • Decisions final and no correspondence entered into nor appeals • COL reserves right to demonstrate materials with due acknowledgement • Status of your submission not given • Coverage of travel and accommodation costs • Where presented	Keep short and succinct, but seek to answer all questions. Need for formal documents as PDFs?
3. Eligibility	Institutions must be publicly funded or not for profit. Self nomination is permitted.	
4. Published criteria	key points: Institutions • Quality of courses and programmes offered • Effectiveness of materials and learner support • Effective use of appropriate technology; • Outreach to remote, rural and marginalised communities • Relevance to Millennium Development Goals, Education for All and Commonwealth objectives Materials development: • materials design • selection and integration of appropriate media and technologies • assessment strategies and practices • evidence of learner support • evaluation mechanisms to measure impact and quality and how it informed ad-	Need to be careful not to risk giving the awards to diploma mills or institutions of questionable reputation. Importance of

	aptations and developments Distance learning experience: • Successful completion of course • Success in overcoming constraints • Impact of the learning outcomes on the learner and the organisation.	recognizing impact on learners.
5. Format for submissions	Generally documents to be submitted by email. Institutions to provide 1,000 word statement, 150 word abstract, a description of course material development, a description of learner support and letter of support from the head of the institution Materials can be in any language, but English translations must be provided. A Word document or Google spreadsheet questionnaire has to be completed including an overview (500 words), answers to 5 criteria (200 words), a conclusion and additional information. A letter of support from the head of the institution Learning experience: 500 word statement, completed learner profile questionnaire in Word format, A letter of support from the head of the institution, copy of official transcripts.	Email submission provides psychological comfort that submission has arrived/ scepticism to online submission The Google spreadsheet questionnaire was an experiment in 2010, but worked well.
6. Organisational structure	Separate secretariat for each prize. Determination of winners made by President of COL.	
7. Jury formation	President of COL appoints three-member judging panel for each award category. One of the three adjudicators is a member of the Staff or Board of COL.	Someone from OPAL partners could be involved in each jury?
8. Communication with jury	Pre-selection made by COL and overseen by COL member of Staff/ Board before being presented to rest of jury. This so as not to overwhelm them. Jury determines how to communicate - by telephone conference or by email.	
9. Communication with nominees	Only winners receive notification allowing them to make travel arrangements to the awards ceremony. Funding to attend provided only to student winners	
10. Awarding process	At awards ceremony - representatives are permitted to accept the award on behalf of another organisation/ person. Achievements are described only.	
11. Timescale	Deadline for nominations 7 months prior to awarding.	

2.2 The MEDEA awards

The aim of the annual MEDEA Awards[2] is to encourage innovation and good practice in the use of media (audio, video, graphics and animation) in education. The awards also recognise and promote excellence in the production and pedagogical design of media-rich learning resources. The MEDEA Awards have existed since 2008 and were developed as part of a European Commission funded project.

The awards are given to 2 categories:

- teachers, students, learners, parents, professors, individual or organisational representatives in higher education / adult education / vocational education and training, secondary education and primary education
- Professional companies or semi-professional production units such as a broadcaster, professional multimedia producer or publisher, professional web design company, audiovisual or media department in larger institutions or organisations such as Universities, Government Departments, Companies, multinational institutions and organisations, etc.

Applicants may also choose to apply for the Special Award for European Collaboration in the creation of Educational Media or the Special Award for Educational Media Promoting Volunteering.

Area	Description	Comment
1. Public profile	Excellent website, widespread coverage in Europe and beyond. Long list of supporting partners who promote the awards on website	Generally considered as a leading example for European awards.
2. Process, terms and conditions	Clearly and concisely given on website, with a statement of aim, description of organisation and Terms and Conditions. Key points: • Format for material • Responsibility of the entrant in relation to copyrights - necessity for documentation of how copyright issues have been resolved. • Participants are allowed to submit up to 8 entries. • Participants can only win one of the main MEDEA Awards - jury decides which award is most appropriate • Right not to award • Resubmission accepted • Absolute deadline	Very unrestrictive, all-embracing Copyright clearance should be entrant's responsibility

---

[2] http://www.medea-awards.com and interview with Sally Reynolds, ATiT, 12 April 2011

3. Eligibility	Covered in Terms and Conditions: • Multimedia material or programme from formal or informal education and/or training eligible • No restriction to target group(s) • No restriction to language(s) • Date of production • No restriction on the geographical origin, location of use or subject coverage	Seems neatest to cover eligibility in terms and conditions
4. Published criteria	Clear, succinct criteria appropriate to learning context. Key points: • materials and approaches that demonstrate original and successful use of media • achieve clearly defined educational outcomes • quality of the materials themselves • **Pedagogical quality**- clear learning objective? - good learning? • **Use of media** - used appropriately and in an exemplary fashion? • **Aesthetic quality**: style and design consistent and appropriate for target users? appealing to look at and to use? • **Usability**: the intuitiveness of the material, support, guidelines, possibility of feedback or help? • **Technical quality** - possible flaws or compatibility issues? Level of technical knowledge demanded?	
5. Format for submissions	One online form for all entries. Entrants determine which award they wish to be considered for. Customized system much like abstract management systems. Name. language, access information (4 usernames and passwords) Free text boxes for: • Description • Target students and programme study • Use in time • Pedagogical aims • Evaluation (has it already received awards?) • Format and why chosen • Use in pedagogical context • Up to 3 additional documents (max 10MB each)	Top advice - where there are difficult issues such as categorizing, self-determination is the best policy.

	• Justification for special award options	
6. Organisational structure	Clear, transparent description of organisation - organising committee manages secretariat; advisory committee identifies judges.	
7. Jury formation	Jury members invited to apply, selected by advisory committee: consists of key players and experts in the educational multimedia sector as well as representatives of higher education institutions, research centres, production houses and broadcasters specialised in the use of audio and visual material in education. Judges are advised to allocate 30 mins to each entry, and are informed that the time commitment will be 3 hours.	We could send out a call in the name of openness but systems need to be in place to administer this.
8. Communication with jury	Entries allocated to judges, no pre-selection, every judge sees 5-7 entries, and each entry is judged by at least 3 judges. Judging is 'blind' - they do not see ratings from other judges. The organising committee will only step in if entries receive an equal number of points.	
9. Communication with nominees	Feedback provided on request only - 10-15% of entrants ask for feedback	
10. Awarding process	At annual conference.	
11. Timescale	Nominations open for approximately 8 months, 2 weeks to allocate entries to judges (physical materials sent, access provided)	

2.3 UNESCO Prizes

UNESCO has a series of highly prestigious, sponsored prizes, which are conferred by the Director-General upon the recommendation of a jury. This study is based on a report from 2005 delivered to the Executive Board of UNESCO in order to develop an overall strategy for UNESCO prizes.[3]

Area	Description	Comment
1. Public profile	Prestigious, publicized through UNESCO's global channels. Prizes exist to promote the strategic objectives of UNESCO sections and enhance UNESCO's profile, prestige and impact.	
2. Process, terms and conditions	Director-General confers after recommendation by a jury. One recipient of each prize or may be shared by up to 3 recipients. Closing date for	NB How many can share an award?

---

[3] http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001388/138804e.pdf. Discussions with Zeynep Varoglu, UNESCO March- October 2011.

	nominations must be stipulated.	
3. Eligibility	Self-nomination not acceptable. Living persons or existing institutions only.	
4. Published criteria	Shall have made a significant contribution to the prize's purpose (tied up to strategic objectives). No appeals permitted. Proposals received for the prize are confidential.	
5. Format for submissions	Written recommendation describing candidate's background and achievements, summary or results of work, publications, other supporting documents, definition of candidate's contribution to the Prize's objectives	
6. Organisational structure		
7. Jury formation	Composed of personalities with a recognized reputation in the field covered. Non-payment of honoraria and involvement of both men and women specified. Representatives of the Executive Board may not be selected as jurors. The Director-General may replace members of the jury for reason. 3 or 5 independent members of different nationalities and gender. Jury should elect its own chair. Quorum of 2/3 or 3/5 required for deliberations. Member shall not take part in a vote concerning a nomination from his or her country.	Question of impartiality.
8. Communication with jury	Working language must be stipulated. A quorum of jurors must be present for deliberations to proceed. Assistance provided by designated member of the UNESCO Secretariat	
9. Communication with nominees		
10. Awarding process	An official award ceremony should be funded by the prize's sponsor. May be accepted by a designated representative in case of indisposition or unavailability. Lecture to be given. If prize is declined, jury should make a new proposal.	
11. Timescale		

2.4 World Innovation Summit for Education - WISE – Awards

These awards are linked to a summit organized for the past two years on the initiative of the Qatar Foundation. They are designed to identify, showcase and promote innovative educational projects from around the world. The winners receive a cash

prize and are given access to international exposure. The awards are issued within the theme of Transforming Educational: Investment, Innovation and Inclusion.[4]

Area	Description	Comment
1. Public profile	to identify, showcase and promote innovative educational projects from around the world.	
2. Process, terms and conditions	Preliminary stage with pre-jury evaluation of 20 finalists. Finalists complete detailed submission for jury evaluation. Winners announced prior to ceremony. English language submissions only. Calendar for key phases given. Waiver on nomination form: guaranteeing that applicant originated the project and that the organisers will not be liable for any action or claim from a third party. 6 page document with regulations including eligibility, schedule, selection criteria, juries, prize sum, communication and advertising, data protection, acceptance of rules, liability/ intellectual property, queries, governing law. One application per individual. Failure to use form, incomplete applications, submitted in other languages, received after deadline renders ineligible. Applying for Awards implies full acceptance of rules. Applicants are not permitted to use logos or trademarks belonging to the Awards Reserve right to change conditions at any time and will not be held liable if Awards are postponed or cancelled.	Consider non-liability clause
3. Eligibility	Individuals and teams working in all sectors of education and all types of organisations - for existing projects that have had a positive and transformative impact on societies. Previous recipients may not apply.	
4. Published criteria	Applicants should show how their educational activities have delivered on the following 10 criteria: 1. Educational Transformation - societal impact. 2. Sustainable Investment- ensuring its continuing viability. 3. Innovation in design and/or practice, - transforming traditional means of educational delivery.	

---

[4] http://www.wise-qatar.org/en/awards

	4. Inclusion and Diversity of beneficiaries - enhanced equality of access to education. 5. Quality of Learning - evidence of this 6. Potential to be scaled up effectively 7. Effective partnerships and participation from beneficiaries and stakeholders. 8. Monitoring and Evaluation 9. Dissemination: sharing of educational practices with other practitioners in a diversity of ways. 10. Clarity of proposal: proposal is clearly intelligible and conforms to the requirements of the application process.	
5. Format for submissions	Form in Word format with drop-down menus for size and type of organisation and education sector. Brief biography of representative (400 characters), general description (2,500 characters) including main aims, impact, organisational structure, beneficiaries, stakeholders, why it is an example of outstanding educational practice; 1,000 characters on each of the 10 submission criteria listed above; evidence of monitoring and evaluation in form of reference or URL; letter of endorsement from head of institution.	Letter of endorsement
6. Organisational structure		
7. Jury formation	Pre-jury - a team of educational experts - will select 20 finalists. Jury, composed of prominent educational figures, drawn from governments, civil society, the private sector, international organisations, universities and social entrepreneurs.	
8. Communication with jury		
9. Communication with nominees		
10. Awarding process	Reserve the right to publicise the finalists and winners by any means of communication. Contestants must be prepared to provide photos and descriptions for publication. Finalists must commit to provide updates on developments in their projects.	
11. Timescale	Submission for preliminary stage 4 months before announcement and 5 months before ceremony	

3 Educational sectors

Interest in open educational resources (OER) to date has been greatest within higher education, though it is hoped that advocacy of open educational practices (OEP) will further embed OER in this sector. The project description states, however, that the awards will recognize "outstanding achievements in the field of OEP in order to innovate and improve quality" in both higher and adult education.

The working definitions for these two sectors have been defined in deliverable D3.1 – Scope of Desk Research and Case Study Identification:

"AE ... refers largely to the segment of "ongoing, further education", but also post degree and non degree related provision... all forms of non-vocational adult learning, whether of a formal, non-formal or informal nature ... and includes also community colleges, adult learning centres, providers for professional training, and further education for adults. Adult education is also sponsored by corporations, labour unions, and private institutes. The field does not normally include degree awarding training for the professions (VET)..."

"The higher education sector includes... universities and HE institutions (private and public) offering educational programmes/ courses for students, corporations, and professional training, etc."

There is inevitably overlap between the terms, and differences between perceptions of what constitutes adult education in different contexts (email from Carl Holmberg, 5 May 2010). Indeed, within open and distance education the difference is ever more blurred as the profile of the student is often less relevant than the student's own perceived need and motivation to study.

The use of freely available resources, and achievements in providing the pre-conditions for the use of these resources is, it should be noted, not restricted to these sectors. Teachers in conventional schools, sixth-form and vocational colleges for under 18s, language colleges and kindergartens have always sought out contemporary material in order to engage their students, and have shared worksheets and lesson plans where textbooks prove inadequate or resources are limited. Many resources for these sectors are now organized in communities e.g. Free High School Science Textbook (FHSST) project http://www.fhsst.org, the Open World Learning Institute http://owli.org, or have been set up by commercial actors to promote a brand such as publisher Macmillan Education's www.onestopenglish.com.

The OPAL Initiative unequivocally covers both adult and higher education, though in the context of the Awards we contend that there is no need to differentiate between the sectors. Nominations should be accepted from both sectors and judgements made on the basis of the nominees' individual merits in relation to their context, though there should be a general aspiration to recognize achievements from within both sectors in relation to the pre-conditions, and general environment within which a nominee must operate.

The argument that the Initiative risks discriminating against, for example, adult education is dealt with below.

The OPAL Initiative seeks to be inclusive and open to contributions from all contexts. For this reason, achievements in other educational sectors must not be ignored. Ideally any context where the objective is learning should be eligible for the Awards.

It was concluded that there should be no differentiation between nominations from higher education and adult education. Nominations from all contexts should be encouraged, but it is important to ensure that the jury is sufficiently widely representative.

4 Categories

The framework for the Awards draws upon the findings of work package 4, Guidelines on Quality and Innovation. The four categories for which guidelines were produced are:

- Policy makers
- Managers
- Learning professionals
- Learners

The Awards move, however, beyond recommendations for open educational practices and should recognize concrete achievements in promoting, creating the conditions for, or implementing open educational practices. It has been suggested that research, the development of concepts and ideas around open educational practice might also be eligible for Awards. We contend, however, that an award for "practice" must indeed reflect achievements in quality and innovation which have been tested and proven effective in terms of positive learner outcomes. In relation to the maturity level within the framework currently under development for work package 4, therefore, an example of practice eligible for the Awards should have moved beyond the "Defined" stage and be at the "Optimizing" stage:

"OPTIMIZING (embedded / advanced): Process is measured and controlled, the focus on process improvement"

(WP 4 presentation, Oieras, Portugal, 7 September 2010)

A connected challenge is to whom the Awards should be presented; organizations or individuals? The Guidelines on Quality and Innovation are naturally targeted at individuals within stakeholder groups, though by its very nature, achievement of innovation is usually a team effort and open educational practices imply a successful transmission of the practice from one stakeholder group to the next. It is only through the successful implementation at the next level(s) that achievement can be assessed and validated.

What is more, the validity and stature of any Awards is dependent on the transparency of processes. By awarding team efforts, the Awards help to avoid charges of elitism or politicization, in awarding an already highly profiled and known individual politician, institutional manager or academic.

A particularly difficult question is how to recognize learners in awarding open educational practice. Learners are primarily recipients of OER, but they do play an important role in validating the practices of their teachers. We contend that the opinion and judgement of the learner is crucial in order to conclude that an example of practice is worthy of recognition. Having students involved is crucial in order to demonstrate that open educational practices follow the whole educational spectre, but also to add colour and appeal to the Awards (both among stakeholders and for the media). As it is difficult for our networks to target learners directly and to spark their interest, they must be reached via their teachers through a call to 'get your students involved', for example by requiring written student validation of the nomination (in the form of survey questions?).

The following categories (organizational environments) were therefore suggested:

1) Enabling organizations: any global, regional or national body or organization providing the political or financial conditions or resources for, or encouraging or promoting excellence in OEP through policy making, providing funding, research, lobbying or technical developments.

   (This category would thus include Foundations and funding agencies)

2) Institutions: institutions with a policy of encouraging open educational practices through the provision of resources, time allocation and support for the development of OERs, sharing of knowledge, peer review, training courses, participation in research and development, and which motivate professionals through internal recognition, and requiring standards to be adhered to in terms of openness and sharing of their work.

3) Learning contexts: learning professionals produce OER, share their work, and are actively involved in peer review, possibly also motivating and inspiring colleagues, and where they successfully incorporate student feedback and imbue their students with an understanding and appreciation of openness which involves their students reworking, repositioning and publishing their own work.

   (The recipient of the Award would thus be a learning professional and their students)

Awards should be given for a team effort, not an individual effort.

5   Number of awards

As noted above, the number of awards would be three, though for reasons including increasing the chances of inclusion of all sectors, motivating and inspiring others and increasing broader interest within education and beyond, it was recommended to have a highly commended list for each of the categories, limited to five examples per category.

6 Jury composition

The nature of the composition of the jury will be discussed in a later paper, though it is clear from the above that knowledge of and experience within all educational sectors and organizational environments must be assured within the jury. That this is achievable will be determine whether or not the Awards can be as inclusive as described in this paper.

7 International aspect

Along with ICDE, the lead partner for work package 7, both EFQUEL and UNESCO play a key role in the Awards. It is envisaged that UNESCO will support and validate the conceptual model and quality framework for the award, and that EFQUEL will work on the application and review process. All three organizations will use their networks to market their award, and all will be involved in the Awards living beyond the lifespan of the Initiative, with EFQUEL taking a lead role.

While the Awards promote the values to which EFQUEL adheres - the promotion of quality and innovation within Europe - ICDE and UNESCO have further considerations.

UNESCO requests that:

- The Awards should contain an element of promoting the world to Europe
- The Awards should relate to one of UNESCO's key values such as social inclusion, education for all, sustainable development or broadening access
- The argument be considered for testing the Awards concept in Europe before launching global Awards in subsequent years

ICDE requests that:

- The Awards should provide exposure for good educational practice from other areas of the world
- It is a significant motivating factor for ICDE that the Awards be of interest to the ICDE membership community beyond Europe
- The momentum required to lead to global awards after the project ends can only be achieved through integrating a 'beyond Europe' element - and the considerations this implies - in the initial planning of the concept and framework of the Awards

It is proposed therefore that a common concept and framework for the Awards be developed from a global perspective, and drawing upon examples from other international awards.

In recognition of UNESCO's current project: Taking OERs beyond the OER Community, and ICDE's significant membership in Asia, it was initially proposed to run two parallel processes with Awards for Europe and Awards for Asia.

This would have necessitated the formation, training and coordination of two jury panels with regional competence and understanding of regional issues and of the differing contexts within their respective regions.

The Awards for Asia could then be awarded at the ICDE World Conference on Bali in early October 2011, with the European Awards presented at Online Educa Berlin two months later.

It was proposed to find sponsorship for Asian winners to travel to Bali (project funds could be used for European winners to attend the European awards ceremony), and also for sponsorship for both the Asian and European winners to commission short films about their achievements. The films from the Asian winners could then be shown as part of the Awards ceremony at Online Educa Berlin in order to raise awareness of their achievements, as well as posting and publicizing the films online.

In return, it was proposed for UNESCO to be offered to couple the prize more closely with the goals of Education for All. It should be noted that the Awards were to draw heavily upon the quality assessment framework developed by UNESCO in work package 6, and that elements of the message of Education for All are very close to the vision of OPAL:

"A quality education is crucially dependent on the teaching/learning process as well as on the relevance of the curriculum, the availability of materials and the conditions of the learning environment.

Thus, importance is placed on providing education that is *responsive* to a learner's needs and *relevant* to their lives."

http://www.unesco.org/en/efa/the-efa-movement/10-things-to-know-about-efa/

The title "OPAL Awards for Quality and Innovation through open educational practices and towards Education for All" was proposed.

Following discussions between lead partner ICDE, and UNESCO, and unfruitful attempts to secure sponsorship, it was decided that it would not be possible to run awards for Asia. It was also felt to be inappropriate to run awards to be given at a ceremony in Europe, for which potential winners from outside Europe would not receive travel costs.

The compromise was therefore that international awards be run, with the awards ceremony to be held at Online Educa Berlin, while no travel costs would be offered to recipients. Instead, each winning entry would receive a small grant to make a video film of their open educational practices, and the focus of the awards ceremony, and subsequent dissemination would be these videos.

8   Branding of the awards

The original Description of Work had suggested that the awards would be called the "EU Award for Quality and Innovation through open educational practices" or the "OEP Innovation Award". Given that the awards would now open to international

submissions and that there would now be three categories, these changes to the branding of the award had to be effected.

Most crucially, the project group felt that it was necessary to have a name which both linked the Awards to the branding of the project (and all the work which had previously been carried out for dissemination). It was felt that the awards should be called the "OPAL Awards". The name of the project had by this stage become well-known, and - a mark of the success of OPAL - other initiatives had started to work on questions related to "open educational practices". The concept was thus not exclusive to the OPAL Initiative. The name "OPAL Awards" would both demonstrate clear ownership of the awards programme, but also would give a clearer international profile to the awards, particularly within the UNESCO and ICDE constituencies where there was considerable familiarity with the name "OPAL". The awards were further designed to help increase familiarity with the term "open educational practices" to international arenas where open educational resources are used, but perhaps the concept of practices around these had not yet gained a foothold.

9 Statement of aim

A concise, maximum one-page statement of aim was needed for the awards in order succinctly to describe the significance, relevance, eligibility for, and benefits of taking part in the process. It was also important to highlight the involvement of the 3 network organisations, UNESCO, ICDE and EFQUEL in order to build trust and underline the credibility of the process.

This statement can be found in appendix 1 below.

10 Technological environment

Research had shown that the most common method of entering submissions for international awards similar to the OPAL Awards was through sending completed forms and supporting documentation as e-mail attachments. The project group had, however, two chief concerns; first, the significant amount of manual administration required both to sort, process and communicate submissions to the juries; and second the desire to provide an online form, when submissions were expected from initiatives which themselves are exponents for innovative use of the Internet.

The OPAL website which had been built and was administered by EFQUEL using Wordpress software included sufficient functionality to make this possible. The text and instructions for the required functionality was thus prepared and implementation was carried out by EFQUEL. See appendix 2.

The key functional benefits for administration of the awards were the ability to output the submission details to Excel format for communication to the jury, and the fact that uploaded supporting documentation could remain within the website tool, with links provided to the jury members. It must be noted, however, that considerable skill was required in the use of Excel in order to put the details of submissions in an easily readable format for the jury members. These challenges will be discussed in D7.3.

11 Timeline and procedures

A table of contents to provide a structure for the OPAL Awards was developed in May 2010 (appendix 3). An initial calendar and division of tasks was developed at the same time (appendix 4). However, by late 2010, it became apparent that - as the final work package in the chronology of the OPAL Initiative - the timeline could not hold. Delays to the development of the guidelines for open educational practices, and to the launch of the OEP register and clearing house upon which the Description of Work had determined the Awards should be based, meant that the awards could not be launched before September 2011. There was therefore only a period of approximately five weeks during which submissions could be received. As discussed in D7.4, this was one of the greatest weaknesses of this process.

On the other hand, the extra time this allowed for preparations, and consultations within the OPAL consortium as a whole, made for significant opportunities continually to improve the structure and concept. The slides from the partner meetings featured in appendix 5 pay testament to this.

12 Appendices

12.1 Statement of aim

The OPAL Awards are developed by the Open Educational Quality (OPAL) Initiative.

The OPAL Initiative aims to promote open educational practices - practices which support the production, use and reuse of open educational resources (OER). Open educational practices help learners, educational professionals, organisational leaders, and policy makers improve quality in higher education and adult education and training.

The OPAL Initiative is being implemented through a consortium including the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE), the European Foundation for Quality in E-Learning (EFQUEL), and a number of European universities[5]. The Life-long Learning Programme of the European Commission is the main funding body for this initiative, which is lead by the University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany.

The OPAL Awards for quality and innovation through open educational practices (The OPAL Awards) recognise outstanding achievements in the fields of OER policy, promotion and use. They provide exposure and recognition for successful open educational practices which have resulted in the improvement of quality and innovation in educational organisations.

There are 3 categories of the OPAL Awards:

- Bodies which influence policy
- Institutions
- Learning contexts

---

[5] Aalto University, Finland; The Portuguese Catholic University; The Open University, UK; University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Each submission to the OPAL Awards will be assessed by a minimum of 3 prominent experts with significant experience from each of the categories. The identity of jury members will be made publicly available only after the announcement of Awards winners.

The winners and highly commended entries in the OPAL Awards will be announced at Online Educa Berlin, Germany, 30 November - 2 December 2011. Award winners will receive a plaque, and a contribution of EUR 300 to make a short film which will be shown at Online Educa Berlin and may be used for self-promotion. Award winners and highly commended submissions will receive significant international exposure through the OPAL Initiative website www.oer-quality.org and publications, and through the networks of each of the consortium members. They will also receive a unique logo and animated graphic for self-promotion.

The deadline for submission of entries to the OPAL Awards is midnight CET on 23 October 2011.

The OPAL Awards Secretariat is hosted by the International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE): icde@icde.org.

12.2 Specification for OPAL Awards details and submission form on OPAL website.

[Replace OEP Guide box on front page with:]
OPAL AWARDS
Recognition and exposure for quality and innovation through open educational practices.
 [Banner:]
Recognition for your best practice
The OPAL Awards
[Menu:
-> OPAL Awards
                -> Categories
                        -> Bodies which influence policy
                        -> Institutions
                        -> Learning contexts
                -> Criteria
                        -> Format for submission
                        -> Formal requirements
                -> Terms and conditions
                -> Submission form]

[OPAL Awards page]

The OPAL Awards

The OPAL Awards for quality and innovation through open educational practices (The OPAL Awards) recognise outstanding achievements in the fields of OER policy, promotion and use. They provide exposure and recognition for successful open edu-

cational practices which have resulted in the improvement of quality and innovation in educational organisations.

There are 3 categories of the OPAL Awards:

Bodies which influence policy [hyperlinks to this section of 'Categories']
Institutions [hyperlinks to this section of 'Categories']
Learning contexts [hyperlinks to this section of 'Categories']

The jury for each OPAL Award consists of a minimum of 3 prominent experts with significant experience from each of the categories. The identity of jury members will be made publicly available only after the announcement of Awards winners.

The winners and highly commended entries in the OPAL Awards will be announced at Online Educa Berlin, Germany, 30 November - 2 December 2011. Award winners will receive a contribution to make a short film which will be shown at Online Educa Berlin and will receive significant international exposure through the OPAL Initiative website and publications, and through the networks of each of the consortium members, including the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE), the European Foundation for Quality in E-Learning (EFQUEL).

The deadline for submission of entries to the OPAL Awards is midnight CET on 23 October 2011.

You are strongly advised to study the criteria and terms and conditions before beginning a submission.

For questions about the process described here, please contact the OPAL Awards Secretariat at the International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE): icde@icde.org making the subject of your email OPAL Awards.

Categories

Bodies which influence policy:

Any global, regional or national body or organization providing the political or financial conditions or resources for, or encouraging or promoting excellence in open educational practices through policy making, providing funding, research, lobbying or technical developments.

Institutions:

Institutions with a policy of encouraging open educational practices through the provision of resources, time allocation and support for the development of OERs, sharing of knowledge, peer review, training courses, participation in research and development, and which motivate professionals through internal recognition, and requiring standards to be adhered to in terms of openness and sharing of their work.

Learning contexts:

Learning professionals producing OER, sharing their work, and actively involved in peer review, possibly also motivating and inspiring colleagues, and where they successfully incorporate student feedback and imbue their students with an understanding and appreciation of openness which involves their students reworking, repositioning and publishing their own work.

Criteria

Applicants are required to provide details of how their initiative fulfils best practice criteria as defined by the Open Educational Quality Initiative. A written submission of no more than 2,000 words should be supplied covering the areas described.

Format for submission [link]

Documentary requirements [link]

Format for submission

Please note the suggested length of each section and suggested topics for inclusion. A description in general terms of the background to the organisation, institution or learning context, the particular initiative or approach submitted, and the motivation for applying for this award. (300 words)

A statement describing how the initiative embraces open educational resources (OER) and open learning architectures. (500 words) Possibly including:
- How the initiative enables or promotes the using and repurposing of OER
- Whether there is a process in place which encourages OER creation
- How OER and OER best practices are shared within and beyond the context
- How open learning architectures are promoted or used

A statement describing how the initiative creates a vision for openness and a strategy for open educational practice (OEP). (500 words) Possibly including:
- Whether policy documents or written guidelines regarding the production, sharing, use and reuse of OER are available
- Whether a strategy for the effective use of OER and promotion of OEP has been developed
- A description of how the initiative is funded
- Details of how the initiative benefits from partnerships or networks
- Whether there is a general appreciation of the value of open educational practice

A statement describing how the initiative transforms learning (500 words). Possibly including:
- A description of how open educational practices are embedded in the context
- Details of how intellectual property rights and copyright regulations are dealt with
- Incentives for individual actors within the context, motivation and how possible cultural and social barriers are overcome
- Whether digital tools are made available and support provided
- A description of quality assurance procedures.
- Details of how knowledge and skills regarding OEP are communicated

- Mention of how learner autonomy is promoted

Conclusion (200 words)

A description of how the initiative has led to improved quality and innovation

Formal requirements

Informal translations to English must be provided for all documents submitted.

Bodies which influence policy:

- Letter of support in English from the head of the organisation
- Evidence of the good standing of the organisation

Institutions:

- Letter of support in English from the head of the institution
- Registration in the OEP Register
- Evidence of the good standing of the institution

Learning contexts:

- Assessment sought through the OEP Clearing House (you must have agreed to make your answers public at each stage)
- Declarations from at least 2 learners describing how they benefit from the approach
- Evidence of the good standing of the learning context

Terms and conditions

Eligibility
1) Participation in the OPAL Awards ("the Awards") is free of charge.
2) Self nomination is acceptable.
3) Nominations must relate to higher education and adult education and training.

Number of awards
4) The number of winners and highly commended entries will be determined by the jury for each of the 3 categories: bodies which influence policy; institutions; and learning contexts.
5) The Open Educational Quality Initiative reserves the right not to present Awards in 1 or more categories.

Documentary requirements
6) Submissions must be made in English. Supporting materials in any language may be provided, though an informal translation to English is required.
7) Bodies and institutions must provide a letter of support in English from the head of the organisation.
8) Institutions must have registered in the OEP Register.

9) Entries for the Award for learning contexts must also have been submitted for assessment of their open educational practices in the OEP Clearing House, and declare their agreement for the assessment to be made public.

10) Entries for the Award for learning contexts must be accompanied by declarations from at least 2 learners describing how they benefit from the approach.

11) Entrants must provide evidence of the good standing of the organisation/ institution/ learning context nominated and must be prepared to provide further evidence upon request. The Open Educational Quality Initiative reserves the right to reject nominations where insufficient evidence is provided.

12) Incomplete entries will not be considered.

Restrictions

13) It is the responsibility of the nominator to ensure that no violation of copyright has occurred in materials submitted to the OPAL Awards. The Open Educational Quality Initiative and its partners will not be held responsible for any 3rd party action.

14) Individuals may submit no more than 3 nominations to the OPAL Awards.

Adjudication and awards presentation

15) The jury for each of the 3 Awards consists of a minimum of 3 prominent experts with significant experience from the Award category. Due to contractual requirements related to the financing of this project by the European Commission, 1 jury member for each Award will be from Europe. Other jury members will represent other world regions. The identity of the jury members will not be disclosed until after the announcement of Awards winners.

16) No prior notification of results or feedback from the jury will be given except to the winners and highly commended entries. Nominations requiring feedback are directed to the peer review service provided by the OEP Register and OEP Clearing House.

17) Award winners will receive a contribution to make a short film which will be shown when the Awards winners are announced.

18) Winning and highly commended entries commit to provide a description and pictures and/ or video clips to illustrate their practices, which may be published by the Open Educational Quality Initiative and consortium members.

Deadline and adherence to Terms and Conditions

19) The absolute deadline for submission of entries to the OPAL Awards is midnight CET on 10 September 2011.

20) Resubmission of nominations to subsequent OPAL Awards is permitted.

21) Through submitting a nomination to the OPAL Awards, the entrant agrees to abide by these Terms and Conditions and/ or has made the nominee aware of these Terms and Conditions.

Submission form

I hereby provide details of a nomination for the OPAL Award for (please select one):

[Tick box] Bodies which influence policy
[Tick box] Institutions
[Tick box] Learning contexts

Please note the name of the nominated organisation/ institution or learning context
[Text box]

Details of person completing this form:

Your name [Textbox]
Your position [Textbox]
Your organisation [Textbox]
Your email address [Textbox]

Each of the four areas below should be described. The bullet point questions provide a suggested structure for each description, but may not be relevant to every context. Describe in general terms the background to the organisation, institution or learning context, the particular initiative or approach submitted, and the motivation for applying for this award. (300 words)

[Text box]

Embracing open educational resources (OER) and open learning architectures. (500 words)
  • How does the initiative enable or promote the using and repurposing of OER?
  • Is there a process in place which encourages OER creation?
  • How are OER and OER best practices shared within and beyond the context?
  • How are open learning architectures promoted or used?

[Text box]

Creating a vision for openness and a strategy for open educational practice (OEP). (500 words)
  • Are policy documents or written guidelines regarding the production, sharing, use and reuse of OER available?
  • Has a strategy for the effective use of OER and promotion of OEP been developed?
  • How is the initiative funded?
  • How does the initiative benefit from partnerships or networks?
  • Is there a general appreciation of the value of open educational practice?

[Text box]

Transforming learning (500 words)
  • To what degree are open educational practices embedded in the context?

- How are intellectual property rights and copyright regulations dealt with?
- What are the incentives for individual actors within the context, how is motivation driven and how are possible cultural and social barriers overcome?
- Are digital tools made available and is support provided?
- Describe quality assurance procedures.
- How are knowledge and skills regarding OEP communicated?
- How is learner autonomy promoted?

[Text box]

Conclusion (200 words)
How has the initiative led to improved quality and innovation in the organisation?

[Text box]

[Upload box] Please upload evidence of the good standing of the organisation, institution or learning context (all categories)

 [Upload box] Please upload a letter of support in English from the head of the nominated organisation or institution (bodies which influence policy and institution categories only)

[Upload box] Please upload declarations from at least 2 learners describing how they benefit from the approach (learning context category only)

[Tick box] I have registered the nominated institution in the OEP Register (institution category only)

[Tick box] I have sought assessment for the nominated initiative through the OEP Clearing House and accepted that the assessment be made public (learning context category only)

Save or Submit

[Tick box] Save for Editing Later
[Tick box] Submit nomination

Once you submit the nomination, you can no longer edit this form. If you wish to work upon it more before submitting, select Save for Editing Later from the dialog above.

12.3 Table of Contents for WP 7 implementation

Abstract:

This table of contents sets out the structure of work for the final work package of the OPAL initiative, work package 7. The TOC describes how an "EU Award for Quality and Innovation through OEP" will be established and how it will exploit the results of

the previous work packages, particularly the criteria and guidelines for innovation and quality from work package 4, and the assessment framework from work package 6. The major aims and objectives of the award are described, as are implementation steps beginning with a conceptual framework, though the establishment of rules and procedures and the formation of a representative jury. The selection of candidates will be followed by presentation of the awards, and significant publicity for the winners, an evaluation process, and a handover to EFQUEL which will take the lead in running the award on a sustainable, annual basis.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

This work package aims at exploitation of the projects' results and mainstreaming and multiplication of the OPAL quality concepts. It comprises the establishment of an award, based on the criteria and guidelines for innovation and quality through work package 4 in relation to each of the following communities within both higher education and adult education; Policy Makers; Educational Organisations; Education professionals; Learners. Work package 4 draws on the cases studies and survey of governance and perceptions in relation to OEP resulting from work package 3.

This work package, work package 7, aims at establishing an "EU Award for Quality and Innovation through OEP". The award will recognise outstanding achievements in the field of OEP in order to innovate and improve quality in educational organisations. There will be two award categories, one for higher education and one for adult education. The award will be given by a jury, consisting of experts from the EU OER Consultation Group and other EU and international experts, drawing on expertise both from higher education and adult education. Within the project lifespan the award criteria in form of a maturity model will be developed and validated, the award process and assessment procedure will be developed and one instance of the award will be implemented. The award is planned to be a sustainable outcome of the project which will continue to be given away through EFQUEL in cooperation with UNESCO and ICDE on an annual basis.

2. Aims/ objectives of the OEP Award

- Establishment of an "EU Award for Quality and Innovation through OEP"
- Recognise outstanding achievements in the field of OEP
- To stimulate and award innovation and encourage improvements in quality in educational organisations
- To recognise high quality OEP in both higher education and adult education
- To recognise OEP in four separate areas in both HE and AE by establishing sub-categories: Policy Makers; Educational Organisations; Education professionals; Learners
- To promote trust in and buy-in to OEP and raise the profile and acceptance of such practices thus encouraging and motivating wider implementation of OEP through successful marketing and communication
- To present the first awards during the lifetime of the project

- To provide broad exposure of award winners in order to create inspirational examples and clear arguments in support of implementation of OEP in other institutions
- To insure the sustainability of the awards and to meet pre-conditions for awarding on an annual basis through a smooth transition of knowledge and practices to EFQUEL and ongoing involvement of UNESCO and ICDE after the project concludes.

3. Tasks to implement the OEP Award
3.1 Conceptual Framework for the Award

Deliver-able N°	Title	Lan-guage ver-sion(s)*	Tar-get Lan-guag e(s)	Deliv-ery Date*	Na-ture*	Dis-semi-nation level*
D7.1	**Conceptual Framework for the Award**	eng,		15 Feb 2011	Other	Restric-ted (PP)

The conceptual framework for the award will specify all necessary instruments, tools, processes and procedures and their functions as well as a timeframe and necessary technological environments to assess and award an organisation's practice in the field of OEP. It will be an assessment through a jury which will use a quality frame-work to position an organisation towards
i) the openness of the OEP,
ii) the quality of the OEP and
iii) the innovation potential of the organisations' OEP.

Task	Method	Aim
Digesting criteria and guidelines for innovation and quality coming from WP 4	Begin to refine criteria to make suitable structure for award. The criteria should be turned into a maturity cycle for organisations	Initial ideas for structure
Establish the award cate-gories: HE + AE; Policy Makers; Educational Or-ganisations; Education pro-fessionals; Learners		Clear framework for each of the categories
Study of similar award con-cepts	Avoid reinventing the wheel and draw on procedures from other awards, particu-larly UNESCO, ICDE, and other awards in education	To inform proposal: both self nomination AND peer nomination. In addition: List of highly commended sub-missions?
Concept of review pro-cesses	Continual validation with project partners	Buy-in and ownership from all partners to the concept
Clear statement of aim for the award	Keywords: openness, quality, potential for innova-tion	clarity over direction
Procedures	Submissions to be rated/ reviewed at least twice to	Clear, written procedures

	avoid bias	
Technological environment	Explore alternatives - extension of the OEP clearing house?	Online submission, online rating and database of submissions allowing for analysis
Jury formation	Establish criteria for jury membership. Create invitation and begin recruitment from Consultative Group, EU and international experts. Both HE and AE background	Representative of partners and community with sufficient AE background

3.2 Quality and Assessment Framework of Award

Deliverable N°	Title	Language version(s)*	Target Language(s)	Delivery Date*	Nature*	Dissemination level*
D7.2	**Quality and Assessment Framework of Award**	eng,		15 Mar 2011	Other	Restricted (PP)

Based on WP 6 results (from T6.3), a quality assessment framework for organisations will be developed in the form of a maturity cycle. The results from WP 6 will be modified in order to fit the award's purposes. All necessary documentation will be made available to the interested public in the OERWIKI.

Task	Method	Aim
Modification of results of (WP 4 and) WP 6	Dialogue with UNESCO + UDE	Final agreement on how to modify results to make better applicable to award concept
Building on the Maturity cycle which has been developed within WP 6	Paper outlining background experience, vision, way forward, and criteria for success	Formal report demonstrating the project's commitment to improvement of processes
Publication of documentation	Rules, eligibility and procedures described succinctly and attractively	Clear and transparent descriptions
Marketing plan		Form a clear marketing message and present by deadline of 15 March
Secretariat established	Contact details/ forum?	Structure which can provide answers to questions
Marketing campaign	Online/ newsletters	Create a buzz
Marketing campaign	Conference promotion	Visibility at key events through presentations and

				materials
Marketing campaign	Press campaign			Visibility through key education channels

3.3 Report on Jury formation

Deliverable N°	Title	Language version(s)*	Target Language(s)	Delivery Date*	Nature*	Dissemination level*
D7.3	**Report on Jury formation**	eng,		15 Apr 2011	Report	Restricted (PP)

A jury for assessing the candidates' submissions to the award will be formed, recruited from the EU Consultative Group and other EU and international experts. The jury will rate each submission a minimum of two times in order to avoid evaluators' biases.

Task	Method	Aim
Formal report on jury formation	Paper explaining background and criteria for jury membership, and measures to counteract bias	Demonstrate transparency in jury formation and role
Jury formation	Complete jury formation	Representative of partners and community with sufficient AE background
Jury orientation/ training/ timeframes	Online meeting	Buy-in and motivation building; understanding of procedures and role
Rating of submissions	Support and prompting	Keep within deadlines

3.4 First OEP Award and Sustainability Concept

Deliverable N°	Title	Language version(s)*	Target Language(s)	Delivery Date*	Nature*	Dissemination level*
D7.4	**First OEP Award and Sustainability Concept**	eng,		1 Dec 2011	Report	Public

One instance of the award will be given to the best EU candidate in the field of HE and AE within the projects' lifespan. An evaluation process will identify strength and weaknesses and will be taken as a basis for improvement of the concept and the realisation process. The award will then be given on an annual basis through the EFQUEL in conjunction with UNESCO and ICDE.

Task	Method	Aim
Secretariat services	Submission period starts min. 5 month prior to award. Collection of submissions. Answering enquiries and providing support to potential applicants	Encourage maximum number of submissions
Final review and selection of best HE candidate	First rating though jury. The Online meeting to decide on shortlisted candidates	In time to arrange presentation
Final review and selection of best AE candidate	Final rating though jury. The Online meeting to decide on shortlisted candidates	In time to arrange presentation
Presentation of awards and significant exposure for ceremony and winners	Online EDUCA? Significant post-ceremony marketing effort	Award winners represented by Head (and / or team) and publicity for motivating practices to inspire other institutions
Evaluation of processes	In consultation with all partners and participating actors (including an online meeting) and survey sent to all submitting institutions	report is basis for the improvement of the concept
Structure for sustainability	Informed by evaluation and providing roadmap for development of the concept	Easily implementable concept for EFQUEL in co-operation with UNESCO and ICDE

12.4 Division of tasks

Deliverable	Task	Method	Aim	ICDE days	EFQUEL days	UNESCO days	Other days	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
1	Digesting criteria and guidelines for innovation and quality through WP 4	Begin to refine criteria to make suitable structure for award. The criteria should be turned into a maturity cycle for organisations	Initial ideas for structure	1				X												
1	Establish the award categories: HE + AE; Policy Makers; Educational Organisations; Education professionals; Learners		Clear framework for each of the categories	2				X												
1	Study of similar award concepts	Avoid reinventing the wheel and draw on procedures from other awards, particularly UNESCO, ICDE, and other awards in education	To inform proposal: both self nomination AND peer nomination. In addition: List of highly commended submissions?	2	0.5			X												
1	Concept of review processes	Continual validation with project partners	Buy-in and ownership from all partners to the concept	1	2	1	4		X											
1	Clear statement of aim for the award	Keywords: openness, quality, potential for innovation	clarity over direction	3	1	1	2		X											
1	Procedures	Submissions to be rated at least twice to avoid bias	Clear, written procedures	4	1	1	1			15										
1	Technological environment	Explore alternatives - extension of clearing house on Opentrain?	Online submission, online rating and database of submissions allowing for analysis	4	0.5	0.5	1			15										
1	Jury formation	Recruit from Consultative Group, EU and international experts. Both HE and AE background	Representative of partners and community with sufficient AE background	3	0.5	0.5				15										
2	Modification of results of (WP 4 and) WP 6	Dialogue with UNESCO + UDE	Final agreement on how to modify results to make better applicable to award concept	3		1	1.5			X										
2	Building on the Maturity cycle which has been developed within WP 6	Paper outlining background experience, vision, way forward, and criteria for success	Formal report demonstrating the project's commitment to improvement of processes	3		1	1			X										
2	Publication of documentation	Rules, eligibility and procedures described succinctly and attractively	Clear and transparent descriptions	3			1				15									
2	Marketing plan		Present by deadline of 15 March	2	0.5	0.5	[1]				15									
2	Secretariat established	Contact details/ forum?	Structure which can provide answers to questions	2							X									

Deliverable	Task	Method	Aim	ICDE days	EFQUEL days	UNESCO days	Other days	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
2	Marketing campaign	Online/ newsletters	Create a buzz	6	3	2	[2]				X	X	X	X	X		X			
2	Marketing campaign	Conference promotion	Visibility at key events through presentations and materials	3	2	1					X	X	X	X	X		X	X		
2	Marketing campaign	Press campaign	Visibility through key education channels	3	2	1					X	X	X	X	X		X			
3	Formal report on jury formation	Paper explaining background and criteria for jury membership, and measures to counteract bias	Demonstrate transparency in jury formation and role	2			1													
3	Jury formation		Representative of partners and community with sufficient AE background	1								15								
3	Jury formation	Complete jury formation										15								
3	Jury orientation/ training/ timeframes	Online meeting	Buy-in and motivation building; understanding of procedures and role	4	1	0.5	2				X									
3	Rating of submissions	Support and prompting Submission period starts min. 5 month prior to award. Collection of submissions. Answering enquiries and providing support to potential applicants	Keep within deadlines	6	2	2	8				X	X	X	X	X		X	15		
4	Secretariat services		Encourage maximum number of submissions	3							X	X	X	X	X		X	15		
4	Final review and selection of best HE candidate	First rating though jury. The Online meeting to decide on shortlisted candidates	In time to arrange presentation	3	1	1	2										X		
4	Final review and selection of best AE candidate	Final rating though jury. The Online meeting to decide on shortlisted candidates	In time to arrange presentation	3	1	1	2										X		
4	Presentation of awards and significant exposure for ceremony and winners	Online EDUCA? Significant post-ceremony marketing effort	Award winners represented by Head (and / or team) and publicity for motivating practices to inspire other institutions	4	1	1	4												X
4	Evaluation of processes	In consultation with all partners (including an online meeting) and survey sent to all submittting institutions	report is basis for the improvement of the concept	4	2	1	2												X
4	Structure for sustainability	Informed by evaluation and providing roadmap for development of the concept	Easily implementable concept for EFQUEL and useful role for UNESCO and ICDE	2	2	1	0.5												X
Total days				**77**	**23**	**18**	**33**												
Control				77	23	18	33												

12.5 Slides from partner meetings

12.5.1   29 April 2010

International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE)

Award for Quality and Innovation
- concept

- Outstanding achievement
- Award innovation
- Promote trust
- Raise profile, acceptance and buy-in
- Exposure for inspirational examples

www.icde.org

Questions and considerations

- HE and AE - definitions
- 4 sub-categories – policy, management, teachers, learners (highly commended?)
- Similar award concepts
- Technological environment
- Coordination, evaluation and sustainability

www.icde.org

12.5.2   5 May 2010

Award concept

- Awards
- Outstanding achievement
- Award innovation
- Promote trust
- Raise profile, acceptance and buy-in
- Exposure for inspirational examples

OPAL
OPEN EDUCATIONAL QUALITY INITIATIVE

www.icde.org

Partner involvement

- Dependent on
  - WP 4 draft guidelines ready by OEB
  - WP 6 self-assessment framework
- Key partners
  - ICDE – management, implementation, validation
  - UNESCO – support conceptual and quality framework, marketing
  - EFQUEL – application and review process, marketing
  - Others – reviews (dissemination)

Number of awards

- Policy
  - National, federal states/ cantons?
  - Awarding a Ministry of Education?
  - No split HE/ AE?
  - Basis? Will have guidelines from WP4 but no equivalent of framework for organisations (WP6)
  - More general recognition of environment created than grounded in specifics?

Number of awards (2)

- Management - organisations
  - Links to D6.3 self assessment framework for organisations
  - Institution or consortium or virtual university?
  - Separate HE/ AE awards (what about institutions with both HE & AE?)
  - Highly commended list? How many?
- Teaching and learning
  - Link to D6.4 assessment framework for OEP??
  - WP 4: "learner's experience" – can't award for this therefore one category
  - Highly commended list? How many?

Similar award concepts

- ICDE/ UNESCO/ EFQUEL/ COL
- Access to criteria (public and internal)
- Any other awards we should look at?

Technological environment

- Recommendations for systems for submission, rating, reports (abstract management tool?)
- Linking to WP6 Clearinghouse (Register of organisations and Register of OEPs)

Jury formation and reviewers

- Aspirations for jury
  - Consultative Group - all?
  - EU and international experts – more EU?
  - HE and AE representation
  - Representation on policy and learner levels?
- Role of reviewers?

Processes and outcomes

- Exposure for award recipients
- Partner involvement and evaluation
- Division of tasks
- Sustainability

www.icde.org

12.5.3   9 December 2010

International aspect

- ICDE and UNESCO have a global remit
- Second jury formed in Asia
- Parallel process
- Awards for Asia at ICDE World Conference in Bali, October
- Mutual promotion of Asia to Europe and vice-versa through short films about achievements
- Sponsorship from UNESCO?
- Tie more closely to Education for All goals

www.icde.org

Educational sectors

- Open to submissions from all contexts
- Focus on HE and AE, but excellence in a different context could also be awarded
- Jury would need to come from a broad range of contexts
- Highly commended category to provide opportunity for broad range of contexts to be recognized

Award categories

- Enabling organizations
- Institutions
- Learning contexts

Enabling organizations

- global, regional or national body or organization
- Provides political or financial conditions or resources
- Encourages or promotes excellence in OEP
- Policy making, funding, research, lobbying or technical developments

Institutions

- Policy of encouraging open educational practices
- Provides resources, time allocation and support
- Development of OERs, sharing of knowledge, peer review, training courses, participation in research and development
- Motivate professionals through internal recognition, and requiring standards to be adhered to

Learning contexts

- Professionals produce OER, share their work, and are actively involved in peer review
- Motivating and inspiring colleagues
- Successfully incorporate learner feedback
- Give learners an understanding and appreciation of openness
- Learners adopt open practices
- Recipient: learning professional and their students

OPAL
OPEN EDUCATIONAL QUALITY INITIATIVE

www.icde.org

OEP Innovation Awards

- Conceptual framework – February
  - Processes and technological environment
  - Depends on WP 4 guidelines
- Assessment framework – March
  - Depends on WP 6 self-assessment framework
- Jury formation – April
- Open for submissions – July
- Presentation of Awards – December

OPAL
OPEN EDUCATIONAL QUALITY INITIATIVE

www.icde.org

Next steps

- Revised work plan showing partners when time contributions expected
- Study of criteria for other awards
- Technical environment/ tie in with clearing house
- Clear statement of aim
- Draft procedures and processes

12.5.4   13 April 2011

WP7 OPAL Awards

- Statement of aim
- Terms and conditions
- Criteria
- Nomination form
- Jury
- Timeline
- Presentation of awards
- Sustainability

Statement of aim

The OPAL Awards for quality and innovation through open educational practices (The OPAL Awards) recognise outstanding achievements in the fields of OER policy, promotion and use. They provide exposure and recognition for successful open educational practices which have led to the improvement of quality and innovation in educational organisations.

There are 3 categories:
1. Bodies influencing policy
2. Insititutions
3. Learning contexts

Terms and conditions

Based on study of best practice covering:

- COL Excellence in Distance Education Awards
- MEDEA Awards
- UNESCO Awards strategy
- World Innovation Summit for Education Awards
- EquNet Competition 2011 (EDEN)
- World Summit Award for e-content and creativity

Criteria

- Based on dimensions from WP6
- All criteria in one entry form – pros and cons
- Synergies (and overlap) with Register and Clearing House

Nomination form

- Within same environment as Register and Clearing House?
- Alternatively, Google spreadsheet or SurveyMonkey
- Data needs to be easily exportable to Excel for jurys

- Tick box to confirm that Terms and Conditions have been read and understood
- Upload options for letter of support or learner declarations
- Fields for URLs
- Text boxes to restrict number of words

Jury

- 3-member jury for each Award (recruit more if substantial number of quality entries)
- Nominations from Consultative Group
- One member of project consortium in each panel (pre-selection)?
- Importance of preparing jury for expected time commitment
- Blind scoring or collaborative process?

Timeline

- Coordinate with Register and Clearing House
- Launch mid-May
- Absolute deadline for launch - EDEN Conference
- Jury does not need to be in place when announced
- Deadline 4 September
- Checking, pre-selection, asking for more evidence of good standing and distribution to jury – first half of September
- Jury decision and announcment to winners – end September
- Allows 2 months to plan attendance at awards ceremony
- NB division of reponsibilities

Presentation of awards

- Presented in final workshop
- Funding of travel for 3 winners within Europe up to EUR XXX
- Description of winning initiative and jury's remarks read out
- Pictures/ video clip
- Certificate
- Logo and standard text for winners/ highly commended entries to use on their website etc.
- Jury members to be revealed and publicly thanked?

Sustainability

- Are the aim and expected outcomes of the awards sufficiently close to partners' own aims?
- Is there the motivation for continuing to present awards on an annual basis?

International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE)

WP7 OPAL Awards

- Revised terms and conditions
- Nomination form
- Jury composition
  - 3 jury panels
  - 4 jury members – 1 from consortium, max. 1 from Europe
  - Cannot judge entry from own country
  - Pre-screening, blind ranking, telephone conference
  - Standard declaration for European experts
- Criteria
- Timescale and next steps
- Award ceremony
- Sustainability

OPAL
OPEN EDUCATIONAL QUALITY INITIATIVE

www.icde.org

International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE)

WP7 OPAL Awards

- Terms and conditions; nomination form
- Synergies with Register and Clearing House
- Criteria – reduce number of words?
- Promotion
- Secretariat
- Jury members; guidance; deliberations
- Follow up – winners, highly-commended, non-winners
- Awards ceremony
- Sustainability

OPAL
OPEN EDUCATIONAL QUALITY INITIATIVE

www.icde.org