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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

English

The ICDE OER Advocacy Committee (OERAC) survey gathered feedback from ICDE stakeholders, members and partners about the status of the UNESCO OER Recommendation's implementation within the first seven months of adoption, and during the educational crisis caused by COVID-19. Global survey results indicate only a few countries took action towards revising their OER policies or frameworks after the UNESCO Recommendation passed. However, responses also suggest most countries already have or were in the process of developing policies for supporting OER integration, development and evaluation, likely before the Recommendation was passed. Furthermore, COVID-19 seemed to catalyze more awareness-raising of OER, and engagement with OER in all regions. OERAC recommends ICDE support research and evaluation around OER work; reinforce communication around existing OER efforts, evaluation measures and incentive structures, and how they further develop in the coming years. ICDE should also strengthen the network and practice around information sharing. When more policy makers and institutions become aware of existing (1) capacity building initiatives, (2) supportive policies, (3) examples of sustainability models, and (5) examples of monitoring and evaluation efforts, in other countries, it will be easier to adapt these efforts to local needs. Finally, ICDE should undertake a follow-up survey, once there are more implementation efforts to report.

Chinese

国际开放远程教育理事会-开放教育资源倡导委员会（OERAC）就联合国教科文组织开放教育资源建议书头七个月内，以及新冠病毒引发的教育危机期间的实施状况进行了全球调查。本报告汇集了国际开放远程教育理事会的利益攸关方、会员单位和合作伙伴提供的反馈。全球调查结果显示，仅有个别国家在联合国教科文组织建议书通过后，采取行动，对本国的开放教育资源政策或框架进行了修订。然而调查也表明，大多数国家在建议书通过之前，就已制定或正在制定支持开放教育资源融合、开发与评估的相关政策。而且，新冠病毒似乎促成了所有地区的开放教育资源意识以及参与度的提升。开放教育资源倡导委员会建议国际开放远程教育理事会支持围绕开放教育资源工作的研究与评估；现有的开放教育资源努力、评估措施、激励构架以及未来数年如何进一步发展加强沟通。国际开放远程教育理事会也应加强信息共享网络与实践。当更多的政策决定者与教育机构充分意识到其他国家已有的（1）能力建设举措，（2）支持性政策，（3）构建更公平地获得优质开放教育资源的激励机制与提议实例，（4）可持续发展模式以及（5）监管与评估的实例，相关各方才能更易于参照并构建本国的实际需求。最后，本委员会提议，一旦出现更多的实施努力，国际开放远程教育理事会应当进行后续调查。
French

L'enquête du Comité de plaidoyer de l'ICDE sur les REL (OERAC) a recueilli les commentaires des parties prenantes, des membres et des partenaires de l'ICDE sur l'état dela mise en œuvre de la recommandation de l'UNESCO sur les REL au cours des sept premiers mois suivant son adoption et pendant la crise de l'éducation provoquée par la COVID-19. Les résultats de l'enquête mondiale indiquent que seuls quelques pays ont pris des mesures pour réviser leurs politiques ou cadres REL après l'adoption de la Recommandation de l'UNESCO. Cependant, les réponses suggèrent également que la plupart des pays ont déjà élaboré ou étaient en train d'élaborer des politiques de soutien à l'intégration, au développement et à l'évaluation des REL, probablement avant l'adoption de la recommandation. En outre, la COVID-19 semble catalyser une plus grande sensibilisation aux REL et un engagement avec les REL dans toutes les régions. L'OERAC recommande que l'ICDE soutient la recherche et l'évaluation autour du travail des REL; que renforce la communication autour des efforts existants en matière de REL, des mesures d'évaluation et des structures d'incitation, et de leur évolution dans les années à venir. L'ICDE devrait également renforcer le réseau et la pratique autour du partage d'informations. Lorsque plus de décideurs et d'institutions prennent conscience desinitiatives existantes de renforcement des structures d'incitation, et d'initiatives créant un accès plus équitable à des REL de qualité, des modèles de durabilité, et exemples d'efforts de suivi et d'évaluation, dans d'autres pays, il sera plus facile d'adapter ces efforts aux besoins locaux. Enfin, l'ICDE devrait entreprendre une enquête de suivi, une fois qu'il y aura plus d'efforts de mise en œuvre à signaler.

Hindi

ICDE, OER एडवोकेटी कंसिटेट ऑफ ओपन आणि दिस्टेंस इडुकेशन (OERAC) द्वारा सर्वेक्षण और गृप्ति के आधार पर युनेस्को की सहस्थीति का अनुमान लगाते हुए कोरोना महामारी काल में पहले सात महीनों में शैक्षणिक समस्याओं से संबंधित प्रतिक्रिया एकजोड़ कर उन्हें कार्यान्वित किया गया। शैक्षिक सर्वेक्षण के परिणाम यही सूचित करते हैं कि युनेस्को द्वारा दी गई सूचनाओं के पश्चातः वह कोई न्योजनाओं को सुनिश्चित संग्रहीत करने का प्रयास किया। तथापि प्रतिक्रियाओं से यह भी अनुमान लगाया जा सकता है कि अधिकांश देश पहले से ही OER द्वारा सुनिश्चित योजनाओं का मूल्यांकन करने के लिए तैयार थे और उसी प्रक्रिया के तहत OER के प्रति एकीकरण और मूल्यांकन का समर्थन करते हुए विकास की प्रक्रिया में सहयोगी थे। इसके पश्चातः कोरोना महामारी बिश्व की अधिक जागरूकता बढ़ाने और सभी क्षेत्रों की OER से जोड़ने को उल्लूरूर करते हुए संबंधित सभी देशों में कार्यशुल्क किया गया। OERAC यही सूचना देते है कि ICDE के द्वारा अनुसंधान और मूल्यांकन प्रक्रिया में सहयोग करने हेतु OER भी कार्य करने| संचार व संग्रहको सुरक्षित करना, स्थायित्व प्रतिक्रियाओं को बढ़ावा देना, मूल्यांकन के मापदंड और प्रोत्साहन पर केंद्रित संरचनाएं अने वाले वर्षों में इन सबका विकास कैसे किया जाए? इस पर विचार करना आवश्यक है। ICDE को नेटवर्क सामर्थ्य बढ़ाने के लिए जानकारी साझा करना जारी रखना होगा। जब अधिक योजना बनाने वाले आयोग तथा संस्थाएं इस विषय पर अंग्रेजी होकर जागरूकता के साथ कार्य करने तब सहयोगी योजनाएं, प्रोत्साहन संरचनाएं और समान उपलब्धता, संबंधित की प्रतिक्रिया, संरचना के उद्देश्य, मूल्यांकन के प्रयत्न जो दूसरे देशों में आसानी से कार्यान्वित हो सके तभी वह जन सामाजिक की आवश्यकताओं की पूर्ति हो सके। अन्ततः ICDE को ऐसे प्रयास करने चाहिए जिनसे अधिक अनुभूत योजनाएं कार्यान्वित की जा सके।
A pesquisa organizada pelo Comitê que advoga Recursos Educacionais Abertos (REA) (OER Advocacy Committee - OERAC) do Conselho Internacional de Educação Aberta e Digital (International Council for Open and Distance Education - ICDE) coletou feedback de partes interessadas, membros e parceiros do ICDE sobre a situação da implementação das Recomendações da UNESCO para REA’s, nos primeiros sete meses de adoção e durante a crise educacional causada pela pandemia da COVID-19. Os resultados da pesquisa indicam que apenas alguns países tomaram medidas para revisar suas políticas ou estruturas de REA, após a aprovação das recomendações da UNESCO. Contudo, as respostas também sugerem que a maioria dos países já tem ou estava em processo de desenvolvimento de políticas para apoiar a integração, o desenvolvimento e a avaliação de REA, provavelmente antes da aprovação das recomendações. Além disso, a pandemia da COVID-19 pareceu catalisar mais conscientização sobre REA e envolvimento com REA em todas regiões. O Comitê OERAC recomenda que o ICDE apoie a pesquisa e a avaliação em torno do trabalho de REA; reforçar a comunicação sobre os esforços existentes de REA, medidas de avaliação e estruturas de incentivos, e como eles se desenvolvem nos próximos anos. O ICDE também deve fortalecer a rede e a prática em torno do compartilhamento de informações. Quando mais formuladores de políticas e instituições tomam conhecimento de (1) iniciativas de capacitação existentes, (2) políticas de apoio, (3) exemplos de estruturas de incentivos e iniciativas de construção de acesso mais equitativo a REA de qualidade, (4) modelos de sustentabilidade, e (5) exemplos de esforços de monitoramento e avaliação, em outros países, mais fácil será adaptar esses esforços às necessidades locais. Finalmente, o ICDE deve realizar uma pesquisa de acompanhamento, uma vez que existem mais esforços de implementação a relatar.

La encuesta del Comité de Defensa de los REA de la ICDE (OERAC) recopiló comentarios de las partes interesadas, los miembros y los socios de la ICDE sobre el estado de la implementación de la Recomendación de REA de la UNESCO durante los primeros siete meses de adopción y durante la crisis educativa causada por la COVID-19. Los resultados de la encuesta mundial indican que solo unos pocos países tomaron medidas para revisar sus políticas o marcos de REA después de la aprobación de la Recomendación de la UNESCO. Sin embargo, las respuestas también sugieren que la mayoría de los países ya tienen o estaban en el proceso de desarrollar políticas para apoyar la integración, el desarrollo y la evaluación de los REA, probablemente antes de que se aprobara la Recomendación. Además, la COVID-19 pareció catalizar una mayor concienciación sobre los REA y el compromiso con los REA en todas las regiones. La OERAC recomienda que la ICDE apoye la investigación y la evaluación en torno al trabajo de los REA; que refuerce la comunicación en torno a los esfuerzos existentes, las medidas de evaluación y las estructuras de incentivos de los REA, y cómo se desarrollan en los próximos años. La ICDE también debería fortalecer la red y la práctica en torno al intercambio de información.
Cuando más políticos e instituciones se den cuenta de (1) iniciativas de desarrollo de capacidades, (2) políticas de apoyo, (3) ejemplos de estructuras de incentivos e iniciativas que construyen un acceso más equitativo a REA de calidad, (4) modelos de sostenibilidad y (5) ejemplos de esfuerzos de monitoreo y evaluación, en otros países, será más fácil adaptar estos esfuerzos a las necesidades locales. Finalmente, la ICDE debería realizar una encuesta de seguimiento, una vez que haya más esfuerzos de implementación que informar.

Swedish


Turkish

OERAC, ICDE’nin AEK ile ilgili araştırma ve değerlendirme çalışmaları üzerinde odaklanması gerektiğini düşünmektedir: AEK uygulamaları arasındaki iletişimin güçlendirilmesi, değerlendirme ölçütleri ve teşvikler ile gelecek yıllarda bunların nasıl geliştirileceğinin incelenmesi önerilen konulardan bazılarıdır. ICDE, ayrıca bilgi paylaşımı konusundaki ağları ve uygulamaları da güçlendirmelidir. Politika üreticiler ve kurumlar, diğer ülkelerdeki (1) kapasite artırımı girişimlerini, (2) destekleyici politikaları, (3) kaliteli AEK’na daha eşit erişimi sağlayan teşvik yapılarını ve girişimleri, (3) sürdürülebilir modelleri ve (5) izleme ile değerlendirme ilgili örnek uygulamaları gördüklerinde, bu çabaları kendi yerel ihtiyaçlarını karşılamak için daha kolay uyarlayabileceklerdir. Son olarak, rapor edilecek daha fazla uygulama olduğunda, ICDE bu tür anket çalışmalarını tekrarlamalıdır.

PREFACE

This global survey aims to provide a general baseline against which the international community can map future progress toward the UNESCO OER Recommendation. The report also aims to provide context and recommended next steps, with a special recognition of COVID-19’s impact on OER activities. It is worth noting: (1) the survey results reflect non-rigorous research; (2) responses from individuals related to the ICDE network do not reflect accurate samples of the national populations they represent. Because those surveyed responded as individuals, this overview does not represent national perspectives or scopes. (3) This survey also included respondents from non-UNESCO member states. (4) Responses were likely influenced by a number of factors including: (a) it is still relatively early for most governments to make policy changes, given the complexity of policy making; (b) the urgency of COVID-19 responses may have overtaken government work to implement the UNESCO OER Recommendation; (c) framing of the survey questions and (d) survey respondents were largely representatives from civil society, lacking insight into internal policy efforts.

Still, findings indicate several clear opportunities for ICDE’s engagement in the near future.
INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) General Conference recently adopted a Recommendation on Open Educational Resources (OER) [1] which marked an important step toward the goal of quality education and access to information for all. Adopted 25 November 2019, the UNESCO Recommendation targets five action areas, including: i) Build the capacity of stakeholders to find, re-use, create and share OER, ii) Develop supportive policy, iii) Ensure inclusive and equitable access to quality OER, iv) Nurture the creation of sustainability models for OER, and v) Facilitate international cooperation. This new Recommendation will support the development and sharing of openly licensed learning and teaching materials, benefiting students, teachers and researchers worldwide. To support implementation efforts of the Recommendation, UNESCO also organized the UNESCO OER Recommendation Dynamic Coalition, a network of UNESCO member states, civil society organizations and private sector counterparts. Mr Moez Chakchouk, UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Communication and Information has highlighted that "The Recommendation on OER will contribute to the building of open and inclusive knowledge societies, and to the achievement of the United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goals." As a member of the Coalition, the International Council for Open and Distance Education (ICDE) sought feedback from ICDE affiliated community members and partners regarding the status of the Recommendation action areas in various regions. Specifically the ICDE OER Advocacy Committee (OERAC) created and analyzed a survey related to community members’ knowledge of UNESCO OER Recommendation implementation efforts. This survey marks a pilot effort to map progress in the implementation of the UNESCO OER Recommendation globally, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Survey questions stem from the Recommendation as well as the UNESCO OER Dynamic Coalition’s focus. The following report details the survey results.

After this brief introduction follows (1) the aim of the study, (2) the methodology, (3) the results, and (4) the conclusion, which includes recommendations and further research suggested. Additional information on survey questions can be found in the appendices.

[1] OER are learning, teaching and research materials in any format and medium that reside in the public domain or are under copyright that have been released under an open license, which permit no-cost access, re-use, re-purpose, adaptation and redistribution by others. (UNESCO, 25 November 2020). "The term open license refers to an intellectual property license that respects the rights of the copyright owner or owners, while also granting some or all of the following permissions to the public: rights to access, re-use, re-purpose, adapt and redistribute." (UNESCO, 25 November 2020).
AIM OF THE STUDY

This study is a pilot aiming to provide a preliminary overview of OER-related activities among countries working to implement the UNESCO OER Recommendation. Ideally this work will provide a general baseline against which we can map future progress toward the UNESCO OER Recommendation. The study also aims to provide context and recommended next steps, with a special recognition of COVID-19 impact on OER activities.

METHOD

The study was carried out by an online survey (via Google Form, a customizable survey tool). The survey was sent to ICDE Newsletter subscribers (14 000), and in ICDE social media channels. In addition, the ICDE OER Advocacy Committee members promoted the survey in their separate networks and social media channels.

The survey questions concerned the five focus areas in the UNESCO OER Recommendation that include i) Build the capacity of stakeholders to find, re-use, create and share OER, ii) Develop supportive policy, iii) Ensure inclusive and equitable access to quality OER, iv) Nurture the creation of sustainability models for OER, and v) Facilitate international cooperation. In addition, some of the survey questions related to the effects of COVID-19 in education communities. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected from the survey. Number of respondents was N=123. The respondents were treated confidentially.

Results reflect non-rigorous research; responses from individuals related to the ICDE network do not reflect accurate samples of the national populations they represent. Most respondents surveyed are also not directly connected to their national governments; Because those surveyed responded as individuals, this overview does not represent national perspectives or scope.

This survey also included even respondents from non-UNESCO member states. We chose to include survey data from Israel and the United States (US) based on the assumption that the UNESCO OER Recommendation is a global instrument and will therefore affect more communities than are directly responsible for implementation efforts. We anticipate that civil society communities in Israel and the US will engage in increased OER activities, given the Recommendation. Results are organized into the following eight sub-sections. The first subsection highlights demographic data from the respondents surveyed; while sub sections two through six cover the responses regarding each area of the UNESCO OER Recommendation.
The seventh sub-section addresses monitoring and evaluation. Following that, the report focuses on data from COVID-19-related questions and additional reflection. The analysis aims to cover a regional, rather than country-by-country overview; however, specific country examples are provided. Finally, the appendices provide a full overview of the respondents' answers in the survey. Appendix 1 shares the survey questions and includes graphs and shorter comments. Appendix 2 provides an overview of the global regions and countries represented by respondents.

RESULTS

This survey was issued to respondents within the first seven months of the OER Recommendation’s adoption, so what follows are preliminary findings.

Survey results indicate that only a few countries took action towards revising their OER policies or frameworks after the 25th of November 2019, when the Recommendation passed.

Responses indicate that most countries already have or were in the process of developing policies for supporting OER integration, development and evaluation. Generally: Asian countries seem to have more governmental and national policies than other regions. African countries have several nationwide governmental policies in place. Policies in Europe and in North America it seems exist more at the institutional and regional (statewide) levels.

Additional findings include:

• OER adoption was not as widely practiced as expected. This result may be due to the wording in the questionnaire asking for OER Adoption "at all levels" of the education system, or other factors. But, there was a noticeable lack of policies and formal procedures for OER adoption; in many regions the work is left to the individual educator's willingness and interest in using OER.

• All regions and almost half of the respondents mentioned that they provide OER in English. Though, most countries would prefer to offer OER in their native languages. Only a few countries or projects offer OER in a wide range of languages.

• In general, countries lack sustainability models for OER initiatives. Only a few respondents reported incentive schemes that encourage public and private investments in OER, particularly for low income and rural communities in their countries.

• Monitoring and evaluation practices also seem to be lacking. Research on the effectiveness and efficacy of OER is limited, and mainly conducted at select institutions and universities. Policies in most countries largely lack impact measurement.
Additionally, many respondents did not know of any OER capacity-building initiatives in their countries. Of the capacity-building initiatives that were mentioned, readers might infer that:

- Nearly every country has built some capacity-building initiatives at national and institutional levels using OER. However, capacity building initiatives are not designed for collaboration or interconnectedness with other initiatives.
- African countries prioritized teacher training and support.
- Asian countries offer capacity building across multiple fields (health, teacher education, economics, science and tech, agriculture and so forth). However, data was limited.

Regarding COVID-19: responses suggested that most countries already had several types of OER initiatives prior to COVID-19. Research suggests many, if not all of these initiatives existed prior to the UNESCO OER Recommendation as well. Yet, COVID-19 inspired significant new interest and engagement in open education as well OER, in all regions.

**Background info of respondents**

Most respondents were from Asia (32.5%), followed by Europe and Africa (each with 19.5%), and finally North America (16.3%), see Figure 1, and even in Appendix 1. All 123 respondents indicated their country. See a list of regions and countries represented in the Appendix 2 table.

The survey also showed that the UNESCO OER Recommendation document has already been translated to various languages, including Arabic, Bangla, English, French, Hebrew, Hindi, Italian, Indonesian, Japanese, Russian, Spanish, Swedish, and Turkish (Figure 4, Appendix 1).
Area #1 Build the capacity of stakeholders to find, re-use, create and share OER

To map current capacity building efforts for OER, the survey questionnaire included three major questions (see Appendix 1). Respondents’ answers demonstrated that most countries surveyed (nearly 70%) already had several types of OER initiatives prior to COVID-19 (Figure 2).

These initiatives ranged from textbook projects such as Libre-Text and OpenStax, course materials, videos, webinars and so on, at especially higher education levels. In addition, participants noted that after the onset of COVID-19, there were additional attempts to strengthen the creation, use and sharing of OER (or at least educational resources intended for free access), such as online learning environments, TV broadcasts and videos.

- A large number of initiatives had started prior to the pandemic in Africa, focused at the institutional level rather than national. OER Africa, South African Institute of Distance Education (SAIDE) and African Council for Distance Education (ACDE) were the organizational initiatives that were supported by more than one institution.
- From South America, the ‘EducaBrasil’ project was one example of an initiative started before the pandemic.
- In Europe and North America macro (international) level initiatives, such as OER Commons, OERu, BC Campus, Future Learn, etc. as well as national ones, such as OER Sverige (Sweden) Project, AKADEMA, Educational Informatics Network (EBA), and OpenCourseware Project from Turkey, had also been in place before COVID-19.
- In Asian countries, a number of initiatives were started before the pandemic and received more interest during the pandemic. The majority of these initiatives have government support and operate at a national level, including: the National Digital Library, e-Pathshala, SWAYAM Projects in India; J-MOOCs and Open Education Japan (Formerly, JOCW) in Japan; SPADA and Rumah Belajar in Indonesia.
However, OER adoption was not as widely practiced as expected. Only 22% of respondents indicated that adoption processes were in place at all levels of their country’s education system, and almost the same percent noted adoption was ‘still in progress’.

Responses indicate that Africa and Asia prioritize support for the adoption of OER in every level. Countries such as Botswana, India, Nigeria, and the Philippines have national policies and guidelines to include OER practices at all levels of their education systems. Where African countries listed projects mainly in the fields of teacher training and support, Asian countries noted OER in a variety of fields, such as general health, hygiene, community health, nutrition, nursing, mental health, teacher education, economics, business management, science and technology, and agriculture.

Countries including the US and Canada engage in OER adoption at the institutional level—mostly in higher education. Meanwhile slightly over 30% of the respondents expressed that OER were not adapted to all levels of education. Perhaps if the wording in the questionnaire had not specified OER adoption “at all levels,” there might have been additional positive responses for OER adoption.

Based on the answers of the questions regarding capacity building (for stakeholders to find, re-use, create and share OER), readers might infer that almost every country had a tendency to build capacity about OER in national and institutional levels. While 45.5% did not know of any OER capacity-building initiatives in their countries, a majority provided examples of projects in their countries.

Worth noting, there seems to be a shortage of interconnectedness among the capacity building initiatives. A great number of these initiatives do not support or collaborate with similar initiatives even in the same country.

Another interesting finding relates to adoption of OER into regular teaching practices. It seems that there is a scarcity of policies and procedures for adoption and in many regions it is left to the individual educator’s willingness and interest to reuse OER.

**Area # 2 Develop supportive policy**

There were 122 responses for the first question about existing policies or national frameworks related to OER. A majority (38.5%) answered “yes,” and 27.9% answered “I don't know.” Eighteen percent noted that work is “in progress,” and 15.6% answered “no” Figure 3. However, 64 respondents provided comments and examples of existing policies or frameworks.
Asian countries seem to have more governmental and national policies than other regions. Especially in India there are some noteworthy projects, one of which, entitled SWAYAM, is also an exception for the integrated structure. The Study Webs of Active-Learning for Young Aspiring Minds (SWAYAM) programme was initiated by the government in order to achieve the three cardinal principles of education: access, equity, and quality. The programme covers different areas such as teacher education, out-of-school students, undergraduate students, management and engineering. The programme also requires various educational and other institutions support. KROER, NROER, and NPTEL projects also offer policies or frameworks. China, similarly, has also developed national policy to create and use OER at the governmental level.

In Africa, according to the respondents there are nationwide governmental policies in place. For instance, the '2019 Zambia OER Strategic' initiative that led to the release of a country report entitled "Towards an OER Strategy for the Republic of Zambia". In Nigeria, there exists a national policy called "OER Policy for Higher Education" which is coordinated by the National Universities Commission. In South Africa, the Department of Higher Education and Training has published the Open Learning Policy Framework for Post-School Education and Training for comment to provide a framework for building a shared, common OER system, making extensive use of open learning approaches and distance education methodologies.

Three survey questions related to having or developing supportive policies to build and widen the use of OER as well as to support the UNESCO OER Recommendation. Most of the respondents reported that their respective countries have or are in the process of developing policies for supporting OER integration, development and evaluation. Similar to results from other areas, the majority of these policies or frameworks are at governmental or institutional level but lack integration throughout society. Further, measurement efforts for policy impact are lacking.

Thus far, the UNESCO OER Recommendation has impacted only several counties, according to the respondents. This survey was issued to respondents within the first seven months of the OER Recommendation's adoption, so these are preliminary findings. Hopefully there might be more significant impact reported in any follow up inquiries.

- Asian countries seem to have more governmental and national policies than other regions. Especially in India there are some noteworthy projects, one of which, entitled SWAYAM, is also an exception for the integrated structure. The Study Webs of Active-Learning for Young Aspiring Minds (SWAYAM) programme was initiated by the government in order to achieve the three cardinal principles of education: access, equity, and quality. The programme covers different areas such as teacher education, out-of-school students, undergraduate students, management and engineering. The programme also requires various educational and other institutions support. KROER, NROER, and NPTEL projects also offer policies or frameworks. China, similarly, has also developed national policy to create and use OER at the governmental level.

- In Africa, according to the respondents there are nationwide governmental policies in place. For instance, the '2019 Zambia OER Strategic' initiative that led to the release of a country report entitled "Towards an OER Strategy for the Republic of Zambia". In Nigeria, there exists a national policy called "OER Policy for Higher Education" which is coordinated by the National Universities Commission. In South Africa, the Department of Higher Education and Training has published the Open Learning Policy Framework for Post-School Education and Training for comment to provide a framework for building a shared, common OER system, making extensive use of open learning approaches and distance education methodologies.
In Europe and in North America it seems that there are quite a number of policies more at the institutional and regional (statewide) levels. The respondents from the UK and Belarus, for example, clearly stated the existence of institutional level policies, while in Canada, University of Regina and similar institutions have policies, supported by the local regional state agencies, such as Saskatchewan's provincial policy. In Germany and the US, there are many statewide or provincewide policies or frameworks.

- There were examples of nationwide government policies and frameworks in the US and Europe. In the US, respondents highlighted the U.S. Department of Education's OER pilot program, a framework operating at the national level. Responses also highlighted government policies at the national level in Croatia and Turkey.

When asked about awareness of impact measurements for existing policies around OER, there were 122 responses: a majority 48,4% answered “no” and 30,3% answered “I don’t know,” while 21,3% answered “yes.” However, there were 26 respondents who gave comments and provided examples, Figure 4.

![Fig. 4. Responses on the question on impact measurements](image)

Of the countries listed in responses with some sort of impact measurement projects in place, most are located in North America. For instance, the BCcampus has some measures for adoption of its OER textbooks. Also, Saskatchewan province requires annual reports on OER activities and their impact. Meanwhile in the US, institutions especially regularly measure the cost-saving impact OER. So, it seems that the impact measurement for most existing policies supporting the use, re-use an sharing of OER is weakly implemented, does not exist, or is only implemented at the institutional level.

Regarding new or revised policies or national frameworks resulting from the UNESCO OER Recommendation, survey results indicate that only a few countries (12,5%) took action towards revising their OER policies after the 25th of November 2019, Figure 5. In Africa, for example, Botswana's Open University, BOU, started to work on a policy paper, National Policy Guidelines. Respondents from Asia and India emphasized that they have modified its National Educational Policy 2019 and its guidelines to include OER related items. No other new or revised policies, frameworks related to OER have been reported.
Area # 3 Ensure inclusive and equitable access to quality OER

Concerning the OER Recommendation Area #3, ensuring inclusive and equitable access to quality OER, the survey included four questions: one about quality and others on access. According to the respondents, countries in all regions are trying to reach as many diverse groups as possible. However, responses lacked information regarding the quality policies or frameworks or general quality of OER, except North America and Europe. Only a few respondents reported incentive schemes that encourage public and private investments in OER, particularly for low income and rural communities in their countries.

According to the respondents answers one can infer that Europe and North America are the regions we see more OER initiatives then other regions but at the same time size and capacity of Indian initiatives are also remarkable.

In order to increase access and inclusion, OER are being offered in different languages. The respondents reported 17 different languages from different regions of the world:

- Yoruba, and Hausa in Africa; seven different local Indian languages, Indonesian, Japanese, and Chinese in Asia;
- Swedish, Turkish, Dutch, Spanish, French in Europe; and
- Spanish, French, and additional local languages in North America.

These results come from one third of participants who responded. Given qualitative feedback, more OER in other languages is likely. Additional information is available in Appendix 1.

Interestingly all regions offer OER in English, regardless of their native languages Figure 6. In Asia, for example, countries like China, Japan and India have been offering OER in English for some time. In European countries such as Greece, Cyprus and Turkey, there are certain MOOCs offered in English and work in progress to translate the OER into English.
In Asia, the governments like in China, India and Indonesia are developing plans for making learning materials more accessible and a high-speed internet connection opportunity for all. A similar action was observed in Africa. For instance, in Malawi the government is partnering with mobile phone service providers to reduce internet bundle costs for learners and teachers. In Zambia, online workshops have been sponsored and held to enhance the capacity of teachers and hence creating an environment where experiences and knowledge can be shared, adopted and implemented.

In North America, the U.S. Department of Education Open Textbook Pilot program includes some incentives. For example, LibreTexts project receives funding from this program and is responding by developing appropriate technology such as a cell phone app where content can be loaded either by going to a hot spot, or receiving an SD card by mail, a Raspberry PI system with a WIFI hotspot and solar cell power supply, etc. There is also a public benefit organization to provide printed versions of textbooks for use in prisons.

**Area # 4 Nurture the creation of sustainability models for OER**

The fourth area of the UNESCO OER Recommendation is related to sustainability of the OER initiatives. A clear majority of the respondents reported "no" (35%) or "I don't know" (36,7%). Only 20,8% reported "yes" and "work in progress" was not a visible percentage. However, 37 answers were given on work in progress and examples were provided.
In Africa, the funding mainly comes from the large-scale international organizations, such as EU, UNESCO and UNICEF, and just a few from the local governments.

In Asia, usually the governments (ministries of education or similar government agencies) provide funding for OER initiatives. However, in Japan, those institutions who would like to offer MOOCs on the JMOOC platform should provide some funding.

In Europe, similarly, the local or national (federal) governmental funds support the OER projects. However, in North America, the funding sources range from single institutions (e.g., professional development, stipends, and research leaves for OER development) to provincial or state (e.g., state of New York, state of Georgia, state of Texas, state of Colorado) to national government (e.g., Open Textbook Pilot grant program) to private foundations (e.g., Hewlett, Michelson). However, it was also noted that in the US, there is a tendency to fund sources that do not aim to make a long-term commitment to OER, but rather move on to artificial intelligence (AI) applications.

For a large percentage of the respondents (45%), no report has been issued on current costs of education materials and also more than half of the respondents don't know if there is any reporting in their countries on costs. In several regions, such as Africa and Asia, the reporting on costs is limited to internal use of governmental agencies (ministries, etc.) while in Europe especially in some countries like Sweden, the reporting on costs is monitored and evaluated regularly by audits at several levels by governmental agencies and/or several NGOs dedicated to open education.
Meanwhile in North America, responses indicate there is no national tracking or reporting on the cost of educational materials. The trade association for college and university bookstores voluntarily tracks and reports sales, but this is of course different than actual costs. This is the case for the US. In Canada, faculty members report the cost of the textbook replaced. Also, some provincial governments try to monitor the cost of integrating OER.

**Area # 5 Facilitate international cooperation**

A great number of the respondents (nearly 60%) haven’t asked for support abroad, nor were they part of a regional or international network focused on the implementation of the UNESCO OER Recommendation, (Figure 17, in Appendix 1). Interestingly, although the countries were not in part of any regional or international networks specific to the Recommendation, a large majority of the respondents reported that they (individually) or their institutions were part of networks promoting OER (53,7%). One can infer that the international or regional networks exist at institutional and individual levels but not at national level.

More than half of the participants or participant institutions are a part of networks that promote the use, sharing and creation of OER. The following organizations and networks are the most common indicated by the respondents: OERu, ICDE OER Advocacy Committee, OE (Open Education) Global, Commonwealth of Learning (COL), African Council for Distance Education (ACDE), UNESCO, UN WSIS, EDEN, Open Education Policy Forum, Open Education for a Better World (OE4BW), DEASA and the World Bank.

- In Africa, UNESCO, COL, ICDE Advocacy Committee, African Council for Distance Education, DEASA, UNESCO Dynamic Coalition are the major organizations and networks of which the majority of the respondents are members.
- Similarly, COL, ICDE Advocacy Committee and UNESCO OER Dynamic Coalition are the networks more active in Asia.
- In Europe there are more diverse organizations, including ICDE, UNESCO Dynamic Coalition, EDEN, Open Education Policy Forum, Network of Open Organizations, Open Education for a better world (OE4BW), OE Global, COL, EADTU’s OpenupEd, Virtual Teacher’s Toolbox (an Erasmus+ project), etc.
- In North America, along with the above-mentioned networks, Manitoba Open Textbook Initiative, Open Library (OOLN) of Ontario, CanadaOER, BCcampus, CCCOER-OERI, OE Global, and LibreText are listed commonly by the participants.
Monitoring and Evaluation

The survey covered four questions regarding monitoring and evaluation of the initiatives that focused on the UNESCO OER Recommendation. Almost half of the respondents (47.1%) reported that no mechanisms were in place for monitoring and evaluation and only 18.2% noted the sort of mechanisms used, Figure 8.

![Research mechanisms to measure effectiveness and efficiency of OER policies](image)

Fig. 8. Research mechanisms to measure effectiveness and efficiency of OER policies

Many countries do not have research mechanisms deployed to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of OER policies. The research is mainly conducted with the efforts of institutions and universities all around the world.

- African respondents, such as respondents from Botswana, Zambia and Nigeria, conveyed the names of the several institutions in their countries conducting research on effectiveness and efficiency of OER but not specifically on policies. In Africa, UNESCO also led a study on OER adoption.
- In Asia no specific study was mentioned but existence of studies, led by individual faculty members and also by NITTTR of India, was noted.
- Similarly, in Europe, no data was provided except a project funded by the EU, Virtual Teacher’s Toolbox concerning this question.
- In North America several private research groups (e.g.; ISKME and OpenEd Group) and individual researchers conduct studies when they are funded to do so. Along with national and regional funds, NGOs or private foundations or projects (e.g.; BCcampus) also present grants for research on effectiveness and efficiency of OER projects.

Briefly, it can be interpreted that no widespread research mechanism has been established in any part of the world to measure and evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the OER policies; there are likely only contemporary research studies run at individual institutions.

Question 17 relates to progress, good practices, innovations and research reports on OER collected and disseminated in the participants’ countries. One third of respondents answered ‘yes,’ affirming advancements (Figure 20). Qualitative data revealed that mostly these sorts of reports have been done via individuals or groups of academicians and some organizations.
• Africa, especially Zambia, has several ongoing and completed reports, such as the OER report published by the Ministry of Trade and Commerce, and ZIPAR. Kenya, Malawi, Nigeria and South Africa also stated the existence of reports prepared by individual researchers and UNESCO.
• In Asia, a similar case was also observed. In Indonesia the institutions that offer OER provide annual reports publicly.
• In Europe, several organizations, such as the Edutopia network in Sweden, SRCE of Croatia, National Forum of Ireland and European OE Librarian Network of the Netherlands, along with individual researchers in the universities publish some list of reports on progress, good practices, innovations and research on OER. Meanwhile, we would like to highlight the efforts of a European center, the Center for Open Education Research (COER). The COER was established in the University of Oldenburg, Germany and brought a diverse research group from all around the world to conduct research studies on different aspects of the field of open education, including OER. One of the first projects conducted globally was about the current status of OER in the World. It intended to examine and compare the OER in different countries of the world. The members of the center prepare macro, meso and micro level reports that summarize developments about OER in four sections: infrastructure, policy, quality, and change. The project reports are prepared and published as research papers in IRRODL and Open Praxis of ICDE.
• Responses for South America were lacking, but respondents from Brazil indicated that the Educa Digital initiative shares some some information about OER, objects and initiatives in Brazil.
• Similarly, in New Zealand the OER Foundation provides these reports.
• In North America, COL, UNESCO Chairs for OER, BCcampus (in Canada), SPARC and US-PIRG (in US) offer these kinds of reports. Also, the International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning (IRRODL) has been publishing reports on OER for some time and was given as a major resource for such reports by some participants.

Similar to one of the previous questions, only a few (16.5%) of the participants stated their awareness about the strategies to monitor the educational effectiveness and long-term financial efficiency of OER in their countries (Figure 9). The qualitative data uncovered the scarcity of such strategies globally. The respondents from North America (Canada) and Asia (Indonesia) were able to name strategies (BCcampus and eCampus Ontario in Canada; Quality Assurance Review in Indonesia) for monitoring the effectiveness and efficiency of OER.

Fig. 9. Strategies to monitor the educational effectiveness
The last question regarding the monitoring and evaluation efforts revealed that quite a majority of the participants (almost 70%) didn’t know of the existence of any agreement for cross-border collaboration and alliances to implement and monitor the implementation of the UNESCO OER Recommendation in their countries, Figure 10.

Based on qualitative data in 13 responses, only a handful of agreements have been created so far. In Asia, the TESS (Effective teacher training in rural areas in India) Project and a collaborative agreement between the Directorate General of Higher Education and UNESCO in Indonesia were mentioned. A similar agreement with the Brazilian government and UNESCO was listed. And the Swedish government’s signature of Adoption of the OER Recommendations was another mentioned agreement.

![Figure 10. Cross border collaboration](image)

**Response to COVID-19**

The survey also included a section about the responses to the COVID-19 pandemic in regard to OER.

Qualitative data show that the COVID-19 pandemic created a need for OER awareness-raising all around the world. As education was delivered remotely, teachers were far more aware of educational technologies and opportunities for online materials. In many regions, teachers have been supported by the ministries, universities and other institutions to raise awareness of OER.

- Respondents from Africa highlighted the need for awareness raising as evidenced in the increasing number of TV, radio, and newspaper advertisements about use of OER for teaching and learning. Increasing need and discussions around OER from governmental, educational and civil society circles as well as increasing number of webinars were cited as additional evidence. African respondents also reported on the increase in the number of participants of MOOCs.
- Asian respondents also mentioned boosting the amount of social media posts on creation and use of OER as well as increasing the number of research articles on OER along with the ones expressed by African respondents. There was a specific figure by Indonesian respondent that according to the Association of Indonesian Internet Connection Network, traffic on the internet increased 15-20% during COVID-19 outbreak, including access and use of OER. Japanese respondents specifically mentioned the dramatic increase in use of courses in MOOCs Platform.
European respondents reported that special recommendations were elaborated both on national and institutional level; there were an increased number of mentions in the news; special announcements, specialized workshops and conferences on national and international levels. Increasing number of exchange of resources and experiences among students, academicians, teachers in especially social media was also quite noteworthy. According to respondents, European ministries of education have been continuously encouraging the institutions and individual educators to open up their resources. It was also mentioned that the increase in need for awareness throughout Europe was not enough and there is a need for more research on awareness raising. 

In North America, respondents reported that there was actually an increasing need for awareness towards use of OER mainly due to the costs of education (e.g.; textbooks, etc.) but the pandemic also boosted the need. Also, an increase in searches for OER repositories among faculty and teachers was also observed during the pandemic.

Other regions also showed similar responses, such as New Zealand’s OER4Covid initiative in collaboration with COL and ICDE.

As can be seen in Figure 11, a high percentage (70.2%) of survey respondents indicated the need for an increased use of OER. Seventy-three respondents mentioned the severe need for increased use of OER almost in the same sentences. One of the reasons for this need was expressed as to make learning accessible despite the digital divide between different regions and student profiles. Most schools converted to online education due to the pandemic, curating resources has become extremely important. A marked increase in request for information on adapting and adopting resources since COVID-19 has been observed in all regions, countries and institutions.

During COVID-19, teachers and institutions began to look for alternative types of learning materials with larger and wider use; therefore, this resulted in the increased use of OER. Respondents from regions, such as Africa, Asia, and Europe, TV broadcasts have regained an interest as an educational tool. In Asia, specifically in China, a lack of quality materials in some regions especially boosted the need for OER. Furthermore, a lack of awareness of OER among K12 institutions and educators was indicated by several respondents in Europe (Portugal and Turkey), and in South America (Brazil). One respondent noted that in the US, many people were unemployed and could not afford to pay for commercial textbooks. The “predatory” work of for-profit publishers and providers increased during the time of the pandemic, proposing and advertising “solutions” that increased student and faculty dependence on their products. Minimal advocacy for OER specifically as a counter to this disaster profiteering was taking place. The same respondent also stated that students had their books and materials before the shutdown, but in the coming fall semester, those who were not face-to-face learning would need to get books from alternatives to college bookstores; moreover money for books would be a challenge, so, the need for OER would further increase.
In Africa, according to the respondents the South Africa-Policy Brief in response to COVID-19 in the Southern African Development Committee (SADC) can be a good example for these immediate actions. In Africa, not only this Policy Brief but also national and institutional policy papers were also reported.

Respondents from Asia indicated that it seems that long term strategies received more acceptance rather than short-term implementation plans. Chinese Ministry of Education, for example, declared its support for long-term projects that especially target the poorer rural communities, such as the western part of China.

In Europe, the respondents indicated that the ministries of government agencies, such as in Belarus and Turkey, were trying to develop strategies and policies to increase creation and dissemination of OER in all levels of education. In Sweden, one of the respondents stated that there were voices raised to learn from the lessons learned due to COVID-19 and to scale, to develop and sustain initiatives; funds had also been available and a lot of initiatives from the government in all sectors not at least in the educational sector, but also health, museums, and culture sectors.

In North America, the respondents for Canada and US mostly focused on textbooks, for-profit educational resource providers and need for strategies for increasing awareness about creation and use of open resources.

According to the respondents, one of the first actions the countries or regions took was providing training to the educators (in all levels) who needed to transform their courses into remote teaching. Almost half (46.7%) of the respondents indicated the existence of training for the teachers on remote teaching and online education and 12.5% stated the ongoing preparations for these kinds of training.

Training included mostly online workshops and webinars. Additional support through correspondence took in place during the onset of the pandemic.

This was especially observed by the respondents from the Africa region where access to online resources was relatively more difficult than other regions. The training was provided by the local institutions and also by the internationally well-known institutions, such as Open University of UK, or international organizations, such as COL, African Council for Distance Education (ACDE), UNICEF.
In Asia, according to the respondents, the trainings, usually in webinar or online blended training format, were offered by diverse stakeholders including ministries and other government agencies (e.g., CHED in Philippines), universities, and local organizations.

Similar forms of training for faculty and teachers were also observed in Europe. SRCE in Croatia, Skola Hemma (School at Home) in Sweden, the National Forum and Irish Universities Association (IUA) (particularly in relation to their #IUADigEd project) in Ireland, etc. were among the organizations and platforms presented in the answers by the respondents. Also, it was mentioned that each country adopted a different strategy to offer training and support.

Likewise, each New Zealand institution adopted their own training interventions.

In North America, respondents reported heavy dependence on local context; numerous small to large scale training and support initiatives targeting educators in all levels were also seen. Almost all of these initiatives are offered by provinces, or states (e.g., eCampus Ontario), institutions and some private organizations such as the Community College Consortium for OER (CCCOER).

The next question in the survey regarded if there was a need to adopt any new policies in their country during the shift from face to face to emergency remote education and or online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic. As can be observed in Figure 12, again a large percentage (64.1%) of participants expressed this need. There has been a need to adopt some new policies in many countries due to COVID-19 and many countries took action immediately. However, most countries were not ready to shift from face to face to remote education, so palliative solutions were offered instead. These solutions become part of new policies in the future. In many countries, new guidelines were introduced by higher education councils and ministries of education.

Some regions such as Africa have no sustainable policies or have started to develop recently. UNESCO for instance started to work on a policy document in Nigeria, and some other organizations also in Zambia.

In Asia, responses indicate there is more policy development. In India, for instance, new orientation, administrative orientation and general public participation programmes have been introduced. Japan reported the "GIGA school project (one-to-one computing with Internet)" led by Japanese Ministry of Education (MEXT) as a national policy action while Indonesia expressed a new Policy of Distance Education that focused on students’ engagement and quality assurance.

In Europe, many countries responded quickly and adapted their policies into new situations. Mainly ministries and other state agencies, such as HEC in Turkey, as well as some private organizations, such as QAA in the UK, have produced new policies and guidelines. The majority of these policies adopted were related to instructors’ roles, assessment of achievement (exams), security and privacy of students and instructors, and interestingly on-screen dress code and behaviors. Conversely, some countries in Europe seemed to react late or, respondents were aware of no reaction, such as Portugal and Italy.

In South America the participants also mentioned the adaptation of new policies by the ministries.

In North American, respondents indicated that different institutions and organizations as well as provincial and states have developed and adapted various policies, such as lecture privacy policy, use of proctoring tools, back to school policies, academic integrity and exam invigilation, providing access to education, stay-at-home policies are among these policies.
Nevertheless, the need for new policies about creation and adaptation of OER so that faculty can draw from, create and curate these learning objects in local repositories within their institutions, similar to MIT OCW was also expressed clearly. Also, it was mentioned that in the US, a wide range of policies corresponding to the distribution of federal financial aid that relax accreditation requirements for distance education at the higher education level was recently adapted.

24. Has there been a need to adopt any new policies in your country during the shift from face to face to emergency remote education and or online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic? 117 responses

Fig 12. Need of adoption of policies, due to COVID-19

There were similar results in responses regarding the need for any changes in the national infrastructures during the shift from face to face to emergency remote education and/or online learning due to COVID-19. In other words, almost two third (61.7 %) of the participants indicated a severe need for change in national infrastructures, especially in bandwidth and access, Figure 13.

25. Has there been a need for any changes in the national infrastructures during the shift from face to face to emergency remote education and/or online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic? 120 responses

Fig. 13. Changes in national infrastructures due to COVID-19

All the respondents from all regions indicated the need for faster, more stable and affordable technological infrastructure to be able to offer better online learning experience.
Differences emerged in regional needs:

- African respondents noted quality learning materials, like interactive e-books.
- Asian respondents pointed out educational resources for earners and instructors as well as software for educators to develop these resources.
- In Europe, along with ICT infrastructure, needs for interdisciplinary research studies and collaborative work on guidelines were also indicated by the respondents. Meanwhile, it seems some governments have already invested in equipment and internet infrastructure.
- In North America a great deal of comments related to the need for the broad bandwidth. One respondent noted that some community colleges expanded their web coverage to their parking lots where students could sit in cars to continue their education. At the same time another respondent argued that the need and rationale for OER is relatively independent of the pandemic.

A need for changes in the pedagogy in their countries during the shift from face to face to emergency remote education and or online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic was also voiced by the majority (70.6%) of the respondents (see Figure 29, Appendix 1).

The qualitative data derived from 72 respondents' comments revealed that the need for change in the pedagogy focused on two points: difference between remote and online education, and quality materials (resources) for online education. Firstly, a large majority of the participants from all regions around the world stated the fact that many realized the difference between remote learning and online learning. That was why the respondents reported the efforts of the countries to train educators and administrative staff to acquire appropriate skills for online and blended learning.

- For Africa, a respondent indicated the need for comprehensive review of the current implementations and draw conclusions from these experiences, and also one more focused on capacity building for academic and administrative staff.
- In Asia, along with the general need for adopting online learning pedagogies, some respondents focused on how fields such as medical education have changed and how didactic assignments became popular. Also, a number of materials, mostly multimedia presentations (PPTs, videos, and audio) were created and presented to the students.
- In Europe, again along with the raised awareness about differences between online and remote learning, the participants responded that the importance of the centers for teaching and learning, faculty or teacher support, and collaboration opportunities among educators have become more visible during the pandemic. Also, in Europe, one respondent indicated the need for research studies on finding more evidence for the need for pedagogical change.
- In North America, the most interesting point was about the emphasis on pedagogical change towards more engaging and interactive methods and tools. In other words, quite a number of institutions mentioned how the new pedagogies needed to focus on student-centered, more engagement of learners.

A similar finding was uncovered about evaluating the quality of available OER as well as creating OER during the COVID-19 pandemic. Only one third of the respondents noted the availability of any policy regarding evaluating the quality of OER (Figure 30, Appendix 1).

The Asian respondents also reported COL frameworks, SWAYAM, NPTEL and UN Teacher Training Project in India.

In Europe, the respondent from Portugal indicated almost no policy for quality while Turkey presented an interesting attempt about developing a policy and system in regard to evaluating the quality of distance education services. The Turkish Higher Education Quality Council (THEQC), a semi-governmental agency built to evaluate the quality processes in higher education institutions, has developed a set of standards and a rubric to evaluate the HE institutions. The THEQC has also focused on online distance education and formed a “Distance Education Working Group” as of 27 March 2020 to be able to guide higher education institutions on the components.

The North American respondents, on the other hand, indicated the existence of strict guidelines and procedures implemented in some projects, such as BCcampus, but at the same time lack of widely accepted policies.

**Other Comments**

The final section of the survey allowed the participants to indicate their comments other than the questions. The respondents from various regions wrote some similar and different comments about OER. The similar comments focused on the significance of OER not only during the pandemic but also in regular times; they, at the same time, mentioned how the pandemic uncovered the cruciality of the OER and other creative solutions to increase access to educational resources.

- More precisely African respondents pointed out the importance of working collaboratively on raising awareness about creation and use of OER, licensing OER with Creative Common Licenses, developing policies and action plans, establishing professional development opportunities and training for educators, and also building better technological infrastructures.
- Asian participants mostly expressed the importance of OER but also specifically the significance of offering OER in different languages. They also noted the importance of collaboration opportunities under ICDE, UNESCO, COL kinds of international organizations.
- European respondents specifically indicated how UNESCO OER Recommendations drew a big picture about policies, actions, implementations concerning OER in the region. Some of the participants were quite interested in regional results of the survey.
- From North America, only US respondents expressed some ideas, one of which was focusing on how the communication about policies and implementations in the US was weak about OER and the other one was about the importance of a common set of material selection processes. The respondent argued that different selection criteria were usually being used and especially OER materials in elementary and secondary school mathematics have failed in completeness requirements. Without adequate teacher and student supplemental materials they were usually not considered for adoption.
CONCLUSIONS

The ICDE OER Advocacy Committee (OERAC) survey aimed to gather feedback from ICDE stakeholders, members and partners about the status of the UNESCO Recommendation’s implementation globally, in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

This survey was issued to respondents within the first seven months of the OER Recommendation’s adoption. Thus far, only a few countries took action towards revising their OER policies or frameworks after the 25th of November 2019, when the Recommendation passed. Granted, low response numbers may be the result of a few factors: 1) it is still relatively early for most governments to make policy changes, given the complexity of policy making; 2) the urgency of COVID-19 responses overtook government work to implement the UNESCO OER Recommendation; and 3) survey respondents were largely representatives from civil society. They likely would not have insight into internal policy efforts until those policies were finalized and made public.

Responses suggest most countries already have or were in the process of developing policies for supporting OER integration, development and evaluation. Furthermore, COVID-19 acted as a catalyst for greater awareness-raising of OER, and engagement with OER in all regions. While COVID-19 is a travesty, the resulting support for OER, whether in the form of policy work, infrastructure investment, or resource sharing was significant.

COVID-19 has radically changed the way education institutions do everything: research, teaching, social responsiveness and internationalization. Ironically, the lockdown has resulted in the opening of the connections. While the possibility of experiencing the location in a tangible way has disappeared, there have been many positive aspects of these changes that universities have embraced and want to take with them into the future. The great hope is that as new technologies are used and proven reliable during the pandemic there will be more opportunities for international cooperation and creativity with OER.
**RECOMMENDATIONS**

There are ample opportunities for existing OER efforts to align with the UNESCO OER Recommendation in future iterations, and for new OER efforts to explicitly address the Recommendation. Specific recommendations include:

- Reinforcing communication around existing OER efforts, and how they further develop in the coming years will (1) give countries recognition for (direct and indirect) work implementing the UNESCO OER Recommendation and (2) strengthen the framework the Recommendation provides for everyone.
- Developing a stronger network and practice around information sharing. When more policy makers and institutions become aware of existing (1) capacity building initiatives, (2) supportive policies, (3) examples of incentive structures and initiatives building more equitable access to quality OER, (4) sustainability models, and (5) examples of monitoring and evaluation efforts, in other countries, it will be easier to adapt these efforts to local needs.

ICDE can further support the communication, network building and information sharing through it’s work with stakeholders, such as the UNESCO OER Dynamic Coalition and Network of Open Education Organizations. Specifically, ICDE can:

1. Promote at regional/national level on the progress of implementation of the UNESCO OER recommendation, and implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
2. Promote translations of the UNESCO OER Recommendation, and implementation, monitoring and evaluation.
3. Promote micro, meso and macro level implementation, monitoring and evaluation efforts of the UNESCO OER Recommendation.
4. Promote work at the UNESCO offices, and governmental levels for policies and strategies.
5. Continue to promote the achieved experiences with OER, opening up education, and the digital transformation during the pandemic and work for sustainability.
6. Promote work in partnership for implementation, and build local, regional, national and international partnerships with stakeholders for implementation and impact.

Additional recommendations to ICDE include:

1. Given that this survey was administered before most countries have developed policies addressing the UNESCO OER Recommendation action areas, ICDE might consider administering two additional surveys: one survey could be administered 1-1.5 years after the Recommendation was passed (between November 2020 and May 2021), and an additional survey could be administered 3, 4 or 5 years afterward. We suggest additional survey work to compare the change in responses over time. The survey conducted earlier in 2020 provides us with a baseline understanding of implementation efforts, based on the perspectives of colleagues in OER networks we accessed. We anticipate that future survey results would more easily highlight specific efforts that resulted from the Recommendation. In case of any further research it should be considered if such can be made in collaboration with others as for example UNESCO OER Dynamic Coalition and Networks of Open Organizations.
2. Given the low numbers of research and evaluation activities reported, ICDE could add value to the UNESCO Dynamic Coalition efforts by focusing on research and evaluation deliverables in the near future. Conducting research and evaluation efforts related to OER activities developed in response to the UNESCO OER Recommendation would seem to fill a current gap.

a) ICDE could explore a larger scale impact evaluation of existing policies that support the use, re-use and sharing of OER local countries. However, impact evaluations are time and resource intensive, and this might not be feasible.

b) ICDE could begin to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of OER policies through additional survey work and research over time.
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APPENDIX 1

Survey

In the following all survey questions are provided and with short answers both with graphs and short text for some questions.

Background info of respondents

The total number of respondents were 123 (n=123). It was a high completion rate; almost everyone answered all questions.

General Questions

The first two questions were about which region the respondents represented, and with a follow up question about their country (Q1). In which region is your organization based? and Q2. In which country is your organization based?). All respondents answered (n=123).

The first question was about which region the respondent represented. All respondents answered (n=123). Most respondents were from Asia (32,5%), followed by Europe and Africa (each with 19,5%), and finally North America (16,3%). See Figure 1. In Figure 2 country distributions are given in a map, and in Table 1 (Appendix 2 the regions are provided with the countries represented in alphabetical order.

![Fig.1 Regional distribution of respondents](image1)

![Fig. 2. Country distribution, respondents](image2)
Are you a member of ICDE?

The second background information question related to respondent’s ICDE membership status. While a majority of the respondents were not ICDE members (44.7%). Twenty Eight point five percent (28.5%) of respondents were institutional members and 9.8 % were individual members; 14.6% of respondents answered “I don’t know,” reflected in Figure 3.

![Fig. 3. Respondents answers of membership of ICDE](image)

Is the UNESCO OER Recommendation officially translated in your country?

All 123 respondents answered this question. A majority of the respondents answered that they “don’t know” (44.7 %), and approximately one third (30%) answered “yes,” while 11.4% answered “no,” Figure 4. In a follow up question, 52 respondents shared information on the languages in which the OER Recommendation was officially translated. The languages include (in alphabetical order): Arabic, Bangla, English, French, Hebrew, Hindi, Italian, Indonesian, Japanese, Russian, Spanish, Swedish, and Turkish. Many respondents reported that English already is their language and or is understood by a majority, so for many the answer was “NA” or not applicable.

![Fig. 4. Respondents answers about translations of the UNESCO OER Recommendation](image)
Questions related to the UNESCO OER Recommendation, the five areas

Area #1 Build the capacity or stakeholders to find, re-use, create and share OER

Q1: Are there any OER initiatives that you are aware of in your country, in schools, universities, and other educational institutions such as museums, libraries or NGOs, etc.? 

On this question there were 122 responses. A majority (69.7%) of the respondents answered that initiatives were in place in their countries, while 18.9% answered that they “don’t know,” and just 9% noted that no initiatives were in place. However, there were 88 respondents who gave comments and provided examples.

Q2: Is OER adopted at all levels of the education system in your country?

On this question there were 122 responses. The answers by the respondents were rather even for this question, although a smaller majority answered “no” (31.1%), and 27.9 answered “I don't know.” Respondents who answered “yes” were 22.1% and 18.9% answered “work in progress.” However, there were 50 respondents who gave comments and provided examples.
Q3: Could you provide an estimate of the number of capacity building solutions for OER in relation to integrated capacity building initiatives in your country (such as, Teacher education; Agriculture; Health studies etc.)?

On this question there were 121 responses. Almost half of the respondents answered that they “don’t know” (45.5%) and 22.3 % answered “no.” 19% answered yes, while 13.2% answered that there was work in progress. However, there were 41 respondents who gave comments and provided examples.

Area #2 Develop supportive policy

Q4: Are there any existing policies or national frameworks related to OER in your country (stand alone, integrated, at governmental level, at institutional level)?

Responses for this first question in Area 2 are 122. A majority (38.5%) answered “yes,” and 18% note that work is in progress. Twenty-seven point nine % (27.9%) answered “I don’t know,” while 15.6% answered “no.” However, 64 respondents provided comments and examples.
Q5: Are you aware of any impact measurement for existing policies supporting the use, re-use and sharing of OER in your country?

For this question responses were 122. A majority 48,4% answered “no” and 30,3% answered “I don’t know,” while 30,3% answered “yes.” However, there were 26 respondents who gave comments and provided examples.

Q6 : Have there been any new and/or revised policies, national frameworks related to OER in your country (stand alone, integrated, at governmental level, at institutional level) after the 25th of November 2019, when the UNESCO OER Recommendation was adopted?

The number of responses for this question were 120. Half of the answers (50%) noted "I don’t know," and 33,3% answered “no.” Just 12,5% answered “yes” and the numbers for “Work in progress” was not measurable in a percentage. However, there were 20 respondents who gave comments and provided examples.
Area #3 Ensure inclusive and equitable access to quality OER

Q7: Could you share information about any quality OER created by local stakeholders in your country?

For this question no graph is available as the answers were only text based.

Q8: Are you aware of any initiative to increase OER content in languages other than English in your country?

For this question there were 121 answers. One third (33.9%) answered “yes,” while also almost a third (31.4%) answered “no” and almost also one third (28.1%) reported “I don't know.” However, there were 49 respondents who provided comments and examples, such as:

- OER in foreign languages is strongly advocated by the Ministry of Education in China.
- India offers OER in seven different languages in its NPTEL OER initiative and is developing OER in regional languages and in English.
- In Cyprus, OER courses and the massive open online courses under the AKADEMA project are offered both in English and in Turkish.
- In Nigeria, there exists an ongoing project by one of the mentees of Open Educational for a Better World Project (OE4BW), creating OER in the area of climate-related matters in Yoruba.
- In the US, there are some Spanish OER, in addition to the standard English.
- Canada has OER in English and French.

While many countries prefer to offer OER in local languages, in addition to English, only a few countries or projects offer OER in a wide range of languages.

Q9: Are you aware of any initiative to increase OER content in English in your country?

For this question there were 120 responses. Almost half of the respondents (40.8%) answered yes, and numbers for work in progress was not measurable in a percentage. Respondents who reported no were 27.5%, while 25% noted “I dont know.” However, there were 52 respondents who gave comments and provided examples.
Q10: Are you aware of any incentive schemes that encourage public and private investments in OER, particularly for low income and rural communities?

The numbers of respondents here were 121. A clear majority of the respondents reported “no” (42.1%) and “I don’t know” (40.5%). Only 15% of the respondents reported “yes,” and work in progress was not measurable in a percentage. However, there were 21 respondents who gave comments and provided examples.

Area #4 Nurture the creation of sustainability models for OER

Q11: Is there any evidence of government policies that support long-term investment in OER in your country?

The first question in Area 4 was answered by 120 respondents. A clear majority of the respondents reported “no” (35%) and “I don’t know” (36.7%). Only 20.8% reported “yes” and work in progress was not visible in a percentage. However, 37 answers were given on work in progress and examples were provided.
Q12: Do you have information about the funding sources for OER in your country?

Respondents for this question were 121. Almost half of the respondents answered “no” (40.5%) and 29.9% reported that they “don’t know.” Twenty-seven point three percent (27.3%) of the respondents answered “yes,” and “work in progress” was not available in a percentage. However, there were answers provided in text format by 40 respondents.

Q13: Do you have any knowledge on how your country is reporting on current costs of education materials?

For this question there were 121 answers from the respondents. Almost a majority (45.5%) reported “no,” and almost a third (33.1%) reported that they “don’t know.” Only 20.7% of the respondents answered “yes.” However, 29 respondents provided information on work in progress, and gave examples.
Area #5 Facilitate international cooperation

To be able to collect information about the fifth area of the UNESCO OER Recommendation, two questions were asked.

Q14: Have you asked for support abroad or are you part of any regional or international network for the implementation of the UNESCO OER Recommendation?

For the last Area (5) there were 120 respondents. A very high majority (59.2%) reported “no” on this question, and an insignificant percentage reported work in progress. Respondents who reported “yes” were 25%, and 10% reported that work is “in progress.” However, 41 respondents have provided examples of work in progress.
Q15: Are you or your institution part of a network(s) that promote the use of OER and/or create and share OER?

Respondents for this question were 121. A large majority of the respondents reported that they were part of networks promoting OER (53.7%), and approximately one third reported “no” (28.1%) and “I don’t know” (14%). The percentage of responses listed as “Work in progress” were too small to be visible. However, 68 respondents, almost half of the numbers, reported that networks are in place, and examples were provided.

![Fig. 18. Question of institutional networks](image)

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

Q16: Do you have any knowledge of research mechanisms deployed in your country to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of OER policies?

In the section for monitoring and evaluation there were 121 responses. Almost half of the respondents reported that no mechanisms were in place for monitoring and evaluation, and 29% reported that they “don’t know.” Only 18.2% of the respondents reported that mechanisms were in place. For work in progress, it was not visible to count as a percentage. However, 28 responses were given and examples were provided for work in progress.

![Fig. 19. Research mechanisms to measure effectiveness and efficiency of OER policies](image)
Q17: Are progress, good practices, innovations and research reports on OER collected and disseminated in your country?

For this question there were 120 respondents: 31.7% reported "yes," and 10.8% reported "work in progress;" 20% reported "no;" and 37.5% reported that they "don't know." However, there were 44 responses on work in progress and examples were provided.

Q18: Do you know if there are strategies to monitor the educational effectiveness and long-term financial efficiency of OER in your country?

Responses for this question were 121. Almost the same numbers reported "I don't know" (40.5%) and "no" (39.7%) knew about monitoring strategies. 16.5% reported "yes," and work in progress was not visible in a percentage. However, 22 respondents reported work in progress and examples were provided.
Q19: Has your country entered into any agreement for cross-border collaboration and alliances to implement and monitor the implementation of the UNESCO OER Recommendation?

For this question there were 121 responses. A very high majority of the respondents answered, “I don’t know” (69,4%). Almost similar percentage was seen for “yes” (14%) and “no” (15,7%), and for responses for “Work in progress” did not amount to a significant percentage. However, 13 respondents reported “Work in progress” and examples were provided.

Q20: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic has there been a need for awareness raising of OER in your country/region?

In this section the first question was about the need for awareness raising of OER. This section highlights consequences due to COVID-19. There were 121 respondents who answered the first question. A large majority (69,4%) indicated this need for awareness raising; 16,5 % reported “I don’t know” and 8,3% answered “no;” and those who reported it was a “work in progress” were an insignificant percentage. However, there were 75 responses about the work in progress and examples were provided, Figure 23.
Almost half of the respondents (41.7%), expressed a need for developing specific strategies or policies regarding OER in their countries, and 10% reported work in progress. Thirty-four point two percent (34.2%) reported “I don't know,” and 14.2% reported “no.” However, 50 respondents provided answers on “work in progress” and examples were given.

Q21: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic has there been a need for an increased use of OER in your country/region?

For this question there were 121 responses: A large majority answered yes (70.2%); 19.5% reported that they don't know; there was not a significant percentage of responses for “No” and “Work in progress.” However, 73 respondents provided answers on work in progress and examples were given.

Almost half of the respondents (41.7%), expressed a need for developing specific strategies or policies regarding OER in their countries, and 10% reported work in progress. Thirty-four point two percent (34.2%) reported “I don't know,” and 14.2% reported “no.” However, 50 respondents provided answers on “work in progress” and examples were given.

Q22: Due to the COVID-19 pandemic has there been a need to develop specific strategies/policies regarding OER in your country/region?

For this question there were 120 respondents. Almost half of the respondents answered yes (41.7%), and 10% reported work in progress. 34.2% reported “I don't know,” and 14.2% reported “no.” However, 50 respondents provided answers on work in progress and examples were given.
Q23: Did the teachers in your country receive any specific training during the shift from face to face to emergency remote education and or online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic?

For this question there were 120 responses. Almost half of the numbers of respondents reported “yes” (46.7%); 12.5% answered work in progress; 26.7% of the respondents answered “no,” and 14.2% of the respondents reported that they “don’t know.” However, 64 respondents provided comments and examples were given. However, 50 respondents provided answers on work in progress and examples were given.

Q24: Has there been a need to adopt any new policies in your country during the shift from face to face to emergency remote education and or online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic?

For this question there were 117 respondents. A large majority (64.1%) answered yes. 20.5% answered I don’t know and 8.5% answered no. For work in progress percentages was not visible. However, 62 respondents provided work in progress and examples were given.
Q25: Has there been a need for any changes in the national infrastructures during the shift from face to face to emergency remote education and/or online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic?

For this question there were 120 respondents. A large majority (61.7%) answered yes, and 25% reported that they don’t know. Just 9.2% reported no, and “Work in progress” did not garner a significant percentage. However, 62 of the respondents provided comments and examples were given.

Q26: Has there been a need for changes in the pedagogy in your country during the shift from face to face to emergency remote education and or online learning due to the COVID-19 pandemic?

For this question there were 119 respondents. A large majority (70.6%) reported yes, and 9.2% reported on “work in progress.” 14.3% of the respondents answered “I don’t know,” and for “no” it was not visible for no-answers. However, 72 respondents reported comments and provided examples.
Q27: Are you aware of any national/institutional/regional policy regarding evaluating the quality of available OER as well as creating OER?

For this question there were 121 respondents. A majority (40.5%) reported “no,” and 29.8% reported “I don’t know.” Almost a third (24.8%) of the respondents answered “yes,” and for work in progress it was not visible in a percentage. However, 33 respondents provided comments and gave examples for work in progress.

28. Any other notes or any additional information?

For this question the only option was free text, which have been reported in the main report.
**APPENDIX 2 Country distribution**

Table 1. Country distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>AFRICA</th>
<th>ASIA</th>
<th>C. AND S. AMERICA</th>
<th>EUROPE</th>
<th>MIDDLE EAST</th>
<th>N. AMERICA</th>
<th>OCEANIA</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRIES</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>N.Zealand</td>
<td>Multinational Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>North Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>