

0:06

- My name is Rajiv Jhangiani. I'm an instructor of

0:08

psychology at [Kwantlen Polytechnic University](#).

Prompt: What's wrong with the way we approach education today?

0:16

Well, I think when people ask me about what open education

0:18

... it's really good to ask about what contemporary education

0:22

looks like, and the opposite of open would be closed.

0:25

So, right now we have a situation where most of our students

0:28

don't have access to the course materials that we consider

0:30

to be required. We want to create an environment in which we

0:34

create meaningful, authentic learning experiences for them,

0:38

but we deprive them of our course materials by not thinking

0:40

about access, and accessibility. We want them to become

0:43

skillful, but yet we ask them to do things in which they do

0:47

not see the greater purpose or meaning, and create objects

0:50

that will only be seen by one person. So, I think open

0:53

education allows us to reconsider what we consider to be

0:57

normal practice in education in a way that unleashes

1:01

pedagogical innovation and student potential.

Prompt: What are the barriers that we have to overcome to pursue open educational practices?

1:10

Well, I think anytime one talks about innovation in teaching

1:14

it involves revisiting, questioning assumptions about

1:17

pedagogy about one's teaching philosophy, but there are also

1:20

structural barriers in place. You think about traditional

1:23

learning management systems where we host our courses,

1:25

and each course is completely separate like its own little

1:27

silos, like knowledge is discrete and not interdisciplinary,

1:31

and not interactive, and not cumulative. So I think the

1:34

barriers are mostly mental, are mostly psychological, and

1:38

thereby structural as well in terms of how universities are

1:41

structured, how programs are structured, and how instructors

1:45

are used to obtaining, disseminating the instructional

1:47

resources.

Prompt: So what is 'open education?'

1:54

Open education is really about intent. The philosophy of

1:58

openness is about sharing. It's about collaboration.

2:01

It's about transparency, and accountability. It's about

2:04

developing personally and as a scholar in a way that

2:08

is not hidden. Open education in its simplest form would

2:12

involve using and even producing resources that are

2:15

available to the commons, to the public, not hidden,

2:19

but it would also involve students producing resources for

2:22

the commons and not just for the instructor, and in many

2:26

ways, open education, I think, reflects a similar sentiment

2:29

that we're seeing in scholarship. The drive for open

2:33

scholarship and open science practices. Why should,

2:36

for example, the Canadian tax paying public that are funding

2:39

much of the research at our institutions... We ask [them] to pay an

2:42

additional \$45 to reap the fruits of that labor.

2:46

There's a lot of things that we do everyday that are deeply

2:49

questionable and open education starts to pull at those

2:52

threads just a little bit.

Prompt: So, how do you change things?

2:59

Well, I think practically, in my experience a lot of

3:01

instructors don't know about open education - a lot of

3:04

faculty. So, part of it is awareness-raising, and when

3:07

people start to get a sense of what is out there they start

3:10

to realize how much they haven't been questioning.

3:13

Faculty love to talk about academic freedom and we love

3:15

getting on our high horse about it, but I think when it

3:18

comes to our pedagogy, we don't think about our academic

3:22

freedom often enough. So, again, in my experience it's about

3:26

awareness, and after that, experiencing it, and I haven't

3:30

seen very few people look back once they've jumped into the

3:32

open water.

Prompt: Are open educational practice materials of the same quality as existing educational materials?

3:44

So open educational resources vary greatly in quality.

3:49

Much the same I might add, as traditional course materials.

3:53

But we do know, for example, major major surveys in the

3:56

United States, and now in British Columbia as well, that the

3:59

majority of faculty view open educational resources as the

4:04

same as or superior in quality to traditional materials,

4:08

and part of the reason why they view it as superior is

4:11

because they're not locked in a proprietary platform,

4:14

and you're able to move from doing what many of us do now,

4:17

which is, I think most instructors now bend their courses to

4:20

map onto the structure of a traditional textbook, whereas

4:22

what we ought to be doing is modifying the instructional

4:25

materials to suit, serve and suit our pedagogical in-course

4:28

course, and it's those additional permissions to revise,

4:32

to remix, to adapt, to contextualize the resources

4:34

themselves, and even involve our students in that process.

4:38

That really unleashes the potential of high-quality OER.

Prompt: Why should students care about open educational resources?

4:46

Well, I think students oddly enough have the most to gain

4:49

over here. In terms of access, tremendously. Whether it's

4:52

cost savings or portability or permanent access. Imagine if

4:56

students did not have to take out a student loan to buy

4:59

their course materials for a semester. If they didn't have

5:01

to choose between groceries and textbooks. If they didn't

5:04

feel compelled to resell their resources at the end of the

5:06

semester, if they were interested in lifelong learning,

5:09

and could keep those resources, but beyond all of that, it's

5:13

also the potential of open pedagogy for students to

5:17

participate in the creation of resources. To complete

5:21

meaningful assignments that will be seen by more than

5:23

just their instructor. For their work to truly be an

5:26

electronic portfolio that serves them and represents

5:29

who they are.

Prompt: What about ownership over open educational resources?

5:35

They're typically based on creative commons licenses,

5:37

and there's any number of them and for somebody who doesn't

5:40

know what they look like, they a bit like hieroglyphics

5:42

initially, but the nice thing is, it allows the person who

5:46

creates these resources to choose in advance how anybody

5:50

else in the future might be in track with them, whether they

5:54

are allowed to just reuse them but just give them credit

5:56

always. Whether you would permit other people to use them

5:59

even for commercial purposes, that's up to you. Whether you

6:02

wish to mandate that anyone who uses or revises or tweaks

6:06

or makes a derivative work from your resources must similar

6:09

to you share it with the public with a similar license.

6:12

With an open educational resource, it's typically the author

6:15

that holds the license, and the author that would assign a

6:18

creative commons license that they would like. Creative

6:21

commons licenses are issued in perpetuity, so you can't

6:24

revoke them if you say that it's open and anyone can use it,

6:27

it's open and anyone can use it, absolutely, but you will

6:30

always be credited as the source of that, but I think

6:34

there's many reasons why universities are doing this

6:37

more and more, whether it's MIT engaging in the production

6:40

of OpenCourseWare, or Rice University in Houston with

6:45

massive OpenStax college initiative, and I think part of it

6:49

is about universities themselves rethinking what they

6:51

stand for. It's not about the content. MIT says, "Here, take

6:56

our content because that's not what you come to MIT for.

6:59

It's not the information." Especially today, anyone with a

7:02

smartphone, and if they know where to look, has access to

7:05

everything that's in a textbook that I could possibly give

7:07

them. They come to me for something much more than content,

7:11

and I think that's part of the realization. This move away

7:15

from territoriality, and this move in terms of embracing

7:18

innovation, and giving it away without losing control.