OpenCourseWare and Open Content: Lessons for NSDL

Brandon Muramatsu
COSL
brandon.muramatsu@usu.edu

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 2.5 License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.5/)
Outline

• Motivating Questions:
  – How does the project approach open content?
  – And define its benefits/issues/risks?
• How can OCWs be sustained?
• How does OCWs differ from NSDL?
History of OpenCourseWare

• Driven by MIT Faculty Committee
  – Asked to “provide strategic guidance on how MIT should position itself in the distance/e-learning environment”
  – Give away course materials
  – Build on MIT brand, does not harm key aspects of experience, professors or certification

• Top-level institution support
  – Announced 2001, launch in 2 years
  – Some faculty needed to be “convinced”

• Launched with 500 courses by September 30, 2003
What is OpenCourseWare
Sustaining OCWs

• Organization/Institution
  – MIT model: Full institution-wide commitment, large supporting organization
  – Incremental model (USU): Housed in teaching and learning center/group, smaller team
  – Volunteer (on behalf of institution or individually)

• Movement
  – Consortium
  – Community, “myOCW”
  – Reuse, translation
What’s the difference with NSDL?

- OCWs are institutionally-driven
  - Senior administration support
  - Incremental extension of the university
  - Benefits to university
- Went “big” immediately
  - Built on MIT brand, 500 initial courses
- OCW Consortium
  - 100+ partners in consortium, as of September 2006
  - Consortium-wide 2900 courses now (49% from others), as of September 2006
What’s the difference with NSDL? (cont.)

- “Known” license that promotes use and more importantly re-use
- Lots of interest, people are using materials, re-using materials, translating materials

In September 2006:
- 640K Site Visits to MIT
- 440K Site Visits to MIT-translation partners
- 170K Site Visits to other OCWs