

Case study 1	Psychiatry Teaching Resource
School or Department	School of Medical Sciences Education Development
Institution(s) involved	Newcastle University
Contact + Email	Brian Lunn (b.s.lunn@ncl.ac.uk) Lindsay Wood (lindsay.wood@ncl.ac.uk)
Date	12 Feb 2010
Tags	medicine, psychiatry, psychopathology, cases, disorders, mental state examination, NHS clinician, honorary contract, branding, existing OER, toolkits v1
Questions	Explanation and further information
1. What is the curriculum context of the resource or resource collection?	The learning resource consists of a website that is aimed at providing psychiatry teaching materials to undergraduate medical students (MBBS) at Newcastle University. The intended learner profile is students in the clinical years of undergraduate study (Stage 3 and 5 attachments in psychiatry and also used by Stage 4 students doing a psychiatry SSC). The resource website provides video clips of role players portraying clinical case scenarios to supplemented core teaching.
2. What were the aims and objectives of the resource or resource collection?	Built to facilitate learning in psychiatry emphasizing the importance for all doctors to have at least some knowledge of psychiatry. Diagnoses in psychiatry, how they are made, and an introductory discussion of some of the important diagnostic categories. An introduction to the principles of management of psychiatric patients.
3. How was the resource or resource collection implemented?	Initially as a HTML-based website with .avi and Real Media video clips. Currently, the trend is towards a WordPress blog with embedded Flash & HTML 5 videos hosted on associated YouTube & Vimeo channels along with downloadable files for use on mp4 players e.g. iPod/iPhone.
4. What technologies and/or e-tools were needed to deliver this?	Video editing software. Visual Understanding Environment (http://vue.tufts.edu/) was used to construct decision tree maps for guidance package advice. Open Labyrinth (http://sourceforge.net/projects/Open_Labyrinth/) was used to create an online application to deliver the decision tree maps. SurveyMonkey (http://www.surveymonkey.com/) was used to survey interested parties and collection data on their methods used in pedagogy and resource discovery. JorumOpen (http://www.jorum.ac.uk/) was used as a repository to which learning resources were uploaded to.
5. What guidance and/or support did you develop?	Preliminary Patient Consent guidance was followed and indicated that the resource was suitable for OER release. This was due to the use of role players to portray clinical case scenarios. The role players had consented to their recording and distribution online for educational purposes. Consent for specific OER release was not gained and it would seem prudent to develop specific advice for this in light of recent Human Rights legislation. IPR/Copyright guidance was followed. The resource is already licensed by a CC Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 2.0 UK: England & Wales agreement. This has been in place since 2005. The existence of a pre-existing license resulted in only a limited exposure to the IPR/Copyright guidance available. The guidance package assumes that the original license is valid and that IPR/Copyright has been correctly assigned. The license to use the host's University trademark to brand the resource was not tested by the guidance package. There is a possible disparity between the wish to have the resource branded and the use of a license that allows derivative works if the license is maintained, but not the branding per se. Institutional IPR Policy guidance was not available. The resources were created while working within an honorary University contract, although the author was employed by a NHS contract. It is the resource author's opinion that the NHS has no claim to the IPR of the materials and that there is no specific policy documents that state otherwise. Internationalisation guidance was not available. Pedagogy and QA guidance the preliminary pedagogy survey was completed and it was noted that IMS terminology is not widely understood. No modifications were made to the resource. Resource Discovery guidance was not available. The preliminary resource discovery survey was completed. No modifications made to the resource and evidenced-led metadata guidance would be useful. Advice on an OER repository resource description, rather than an Institutional repository/website resource description maybe needed to allow maximum discovery and exposure of a resource across subject disciplines. Resource Upload guidance was followed and the resource URL was uploaded to JorumOpen (the resource also exists on YouTube).
6. Uploading and hosting resources.	The resource hyperlink was successfully uploaded as an OER to JorumOpen by the creator, an Honorary Clinical Senior Lecturer with a long standing interest in online media. The JorumOpen repository upload was deemed easy to use. The user was experienced with keyword tagging and anticipated the use of comma separated keywords and quotation mark

	<p>delimiting of keyword phrases. A clearer explanation of the current submit 'one at a time' keyword addition was thought needed.</p> <p>The repository publishing environment needs to be able to keep in sync with resources that are updated on an external site.</p>
<p>7. What are the key outcomes of the resource or resource collection?</p>	<p>For learners and teachers, a source of self-directed learning and revision has been provided. This process has added an additional access route to the resource collection (although already available as open access). It is likely that there will be more access from unintended learner groups (see below).</p> <p>The profile and recognition for the learning resource creator and Institution has been enhanced.</p>
<p>8. What follow-up activity will be/has been carried out as a result of the resource or resource collection?</p>	<p>The guidance may lead to a future a departmental review and development of procedures for the use of role players in learning materials, with specific permission granted for OER.</p> <p>The issue of Institutional branding usage has been raised.</p>
<p>9. What are the lessons learned from the resource or resource collection?</p>	<p>There needs to be clarification of the guidance advice for an existing OER. For example should not the IPR/license of an existing open education resource be re-evaluated in light of continually developing guidance advice.</p> <p>In terms of sustainability, it is proposed that this resource collection will be reviewed at six months intervals using end user review and voting on which resources have been the most useful and what additional resources need to be added. Thus resource collection content will change over time.</p> <p>No risks are perceived. The resources have been online for some time in various forms and locations.</p> <p>Benefits are cited as raising the profile of the teacher and institution.</p> <p>Unexpected outcomes were the additional range of learners that discovered the resource when originally delivered as an open access resource such as police, federal healthcare assessors, nurses, caregivers and patients.</p> <p>Further information:</p> <p>http://open.jorum.ac.uk/xmlui/handle/123456789/1598</p> <p>http://mbbs-psychiatry.ncl.ac.uk/</p> <p>http://www.youtube.com/user/psychiatryteacher</p> <p>http://www.vimeo.com/user1710824</p>