

Coordinating OER Efforts Across a Mid-Sized College Campus

Jennifer Pate, *University of North Alabama*

Darlene Townsend, *University of North Alabama*

John McGee, *University of North Alabama*



Image by [Rawpixel](#)

ABSTRACT

In 2018, the University of North Alabama (UNA) began to formalize its efforts to promote the use, creation, and adaptation of sustainable open educational resources (OER) on campus. UNA's strategic plan for 2019-2024, *Roaring with Excellence*, aspires to have some form of OER integrated into at least half of all academic programs at the university. Following the lead of the Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE), which had begun promoting OER statewide, the university was eager to assess the knowledge and use of OER on campus and to provide training and education to faculty to encourage the enhanced understanding and adoption of OER.

A three-person informal working group formed on the university's campus at the behest of the university president and provost. The make-up of the group included a scholarly communications librarian, a cataloging librarian serving as interim university librarian,

and the director of the university's Educational Technology Services (ETS). This paper details how the working group began to create a sustainable culture of OER on the university's campus.

Keywords: OER, open educational resources, climate surveys, libraries, university faculty, textbooks, course materials, learning materials

Coordinar los esfuerzos de REA en un campus universitario de tamaño medio

RESUMEN

En 2018, University of Northern Alabama (UNA) comenzó a formalizar sus esfuerzos para promover el uso, la creación y la adaptación de Recursos Educativos Abiertos (REA) sostenibles en el campus. En el plan estratégico de UNA para 2019-2024, *Roaring with Excellence*, aspiran a tener alguna forma de REA integrada en al menos la mitad de todos los programas académicos de la universidad. Siguiendo el liderazgo de la Comisión de Educación Superior de Alabama (ACHE), que había comenzado a promover REA en todo el estado, la universidad estaba ansiosa por evaluar el conocimiento y el uso de REA en el campus y proporcionar capacitación y educación al profesorado para fomentar una mejor comprensión y adopción de REA.

Un grupo de trabajo informal de tres personas se formó en el campus de la universidad a instancias del presidente y rector de la universidad. La composición del grupo incluyó un bibliotecario académico de comunicaciones, un bibliotecario de catalogación que sirve como bibliotecario interino de la universidad y el director de los Servicios de Tecnología Educativa (ETS) de la universidad. Este documento detallará cómo el grupo de trabajo comenzó a crear una cultura sustentable de REA en el campus de la universidad.

Palabras Clave: REA, recursos educativos abiertos, encuestas climáticas, bibliotecas, profesorado universitario, libros de texto, materiales de curso, materiales de aprendizaje

在一个中型大学校园开展开放教育资源（OER）协调工作

摘要

2018年，北阿拉巴马大学（UNA）正式开始推动校园可持续开放教育资源（OER）的使用、创造和改编工作。在UNA对2019年至2024年的战略规划“Roaring with Excellence”中，他们渴望将OER的部分形式融入至少一半的大学学术课程中。继阿拉巴马州高等教育委员会（ACHE）带领全州推动OER之后，UNA渴望评估校园中有关OER的知识和使用，并对教师提供培训，以期鼓励对OER的进一步理解和采用。

应UNA校长和教务长要求，该校组建了一个由三人组成的非正式工作组。工作组成员包括一名学术传播图书馆员、一名负责编目的内部图书馆员、以及该校教育技术服务（ETS）董事。本文将详细描述该工作组如何开始在校园创建一个可持续的OER文化。

关键词：OER，开放教育资源，气候调查，图书馆，大学教师，课本，课程资料，学习资料

Background

In Fall 2017, the Academic Affairs division of the University of North Alabama (UNA), which includes Collier Library and Information Services, and Educational Technology Services (ETS), became aware of a new statewide initiative to raise awareness and promote the use of open educational resources (OER) among Alabama's institutions of higher education. The initiative was set to kick off with a series of workshops held across the state in early 2018. Several representatives from UNA attended the first workshop,

which was held at Athens State University. These representatives included administrators, faculty, instructional designers, and librarians. Two of the authors of this paper were among the attendees. After completing the workshop series, the Alabama Commission on Higher Education (ACHE) announced a statewide grant program to support OER use, adoption, and creation in general education courses. Soon after, the president of UNA, in consultation with the provost, decided to follow the state's lead and make OER a priority on our campus.

To support the new campus OER initiative, the provost charged the university librarian and the ETS director to lead the university's efforts. The library had recently hired a scholarly communications librarian. With the provost's approval, the directors recruited her to join them as an informal three-person OER working group. The group immediately began promoting the state's OER grant program on campus. The timing of these events was not ideal, occurring at the end of the spring semester, a time when faculty are busy finishing spring courses and preparing for summer schedules. However, one education professor's interest in adapting OER for a course resulted in a grant award for a university team who were subsequently asked by ACHE to partner with another team from Wallace State Community College.

The scholarly communications librarian was part of the team awarded the statewide grant at UNA. In addition to the education professor and the librarian, the grant team included an instructional designer to help integrate the OER into the course shell and a second education professor to assist in the research analysis and reporting. The grant required the instructor to use traditional material in a fall semester section of the class and OER in a spring semester section of the class. The librarian worked closely with the education professor to locate OER materials to replace her traditional course materials. The course is a required, high-enrollment general education course in her department. Preliminary data shows on overall 3.9 (on a 1-5 scale) student

satisfaction score when using the traditional learning materials. When using the OER, the satisfaction rate was a 4.7. A full report to ACHE is expected at a later date.

In Fall 2018, the campus OER initiative received a second boost when the university's strategic plan for 2019-2024, *Roaring with Excellence*, specifically included OER. The plan defined an aspiration to integrate OER of some form into at least half of all academic programs at the university. Given this formal directive, the OER working group created an agenda and goals, and started to work on the first steps to realizing this aspirational strategic directive.

First Steps

Faculty survey

In order to set a clear timeline for OER adoption and implementation, it was important to first assess the current status of awareness and use of OER on campus. An IRB-approved survey was sent out to all faculty, staff, and adjuncts affiliated with UNA in September of 2018 through a variety of channels, including campus-wide emails and campus digital announcements. The survey was created based on the strategic aspiration of the university and many questions were borrowed from a variety of openly licensed sources. We utilized questions from OpenStax College Educator Survey (2016), the Babson Survey Research Group (Seaman & Seaman, 2018), and the faculty perceptions survey administered by Jung, Bauer, and Heaps (2017). The survey recorded 101 total attempt-

ed responses. Of those 101, a total of 81 participants completed the survey.

The survey instrument assessed instructor demographic information, current textbook use and selection criteria, instructors' impressions of student textbook use, awareness and use of OER, perceptions of quality of OER, and perceived challenges for adoption or creation of OER. Once all of the survey data was recorded and reviewed, it was used as the basis of a report the working group presented to the provost. This report included not only survey data, but also the goals the group established based on the findings from the survey. A brief review of the survey and the data collected follows.

Demographics

Survey respondents had an average of 12 years of teaching experience, with a

low of 0 for a respondent who indicated they worked in administration to a high of 47. The primary method of instructional delivery was full-time face-to-face teaching with a blend of other methods (see Table 1). Respondents primarily teach both undergraduate and graduate courses. The majority of responses came from assistant professors, with an equal number of associate and full professors having the second highest response rate, although staff, adjuncts, and others were also represented (see Table 2).

Textbooks: Responsibility and Criteria for Selection

The second section of the survey asked participants to provide information related to their current textbook use, including responsibility for textbook selection, and the

Table 1. What kind of teaching do you do? (select all that apply)

Answer	Respond	%
Staff	3	3.70
Adjunct	6	7.41
Instructor	10	12.35
Assistant Professor	24	29.63
Associate Professor	17	20.99
Professor	17	20.99
Department Head	6	7.41
Administration	5	6.17
Other (please describe)	3	3.70

"Other" responses included none, professional development, and study abroad.

Table 2. What is your status at UNA? (select all that apply)

Answer	Respond	%
Full-time face-to-face	41	50.62
Part-time face-to-face	9	11.11
Full-time online	13	16.05
Part-time online	14	17.28
Full-time blended (face-to-face and online)	26	32.10
Part-time blended (face-to-face and online)	2	2.47
Other (please describe)	5	6.17

“Other” responses included curriculum developer, fundraiser, grant writer, and graduate coordinator.

importance of features, such as ancillary resources and access codes, when selecting a textbook. Participants were also asked questions relating to textbook costs, including when they had last checked the price of the materials they required for classes, how often students asked if the text was required or if an older edition could be used, and how much they thought students spent on materials per course. Finally, participants were asked how often they thought students did not purchase required class texts.

Since survey participants may teach multiple classes, they were given the option to choose multiple answers regarding textbook selection. Fifty-four respondents indicated they have sole responsibility for textbook selection and 19 respondents are involved in textbook selection committees. The next highest choice was “Entire department,” with 7 responses (see Table 3).

Respondents were asked to rate their personal criteria for textbook selection on a Likert scale from “Not at all important” to “Extremely important.” The criteria with the most importance to 37 participants was “Clear & accessible writing.” Sixty participants indicated that “Sponsorships or other financial incentives offered by the publisher” were not at all important. Other “Extremely important” criteria included “Comprehensiveness of coverage” (26) and “Cost to the student” (20). Table 4 shows the complete breakdown of participant responses.

When rating ancillary resources that can come bundled with textbooks, participant responses were mixed. Fifteen participants rated slide decks as “Extremely important,” but 18 selected “Not important at all.” With an average value of 2.95, “Online student resources” received the highest overall importance of the resources listed (see Table 5).

Table 3. Who has a role in selecting required course materials (including textbooks) for use in the course(s) you teach? (select all that apply)

Answer	Response	%
I am solely responsible for the selection	54	66.67%
Another faculty member makes the selection	6	7.41%
I lead a committee/group that makes the selection	2	2.47%
I am a member of a committee/group that makes the selection	19	23.46%
A committee/group of which I am not a member makes the selection	3	3.70%
Entire department	7	8.64%
Course developer	5	6.17%
Instructional Design group	1	1.23%
Administration	0	0.00%
Other (please describe)	4	4.94%

“Other” responses included course leader selects then approved in committee meeting, depends on the class, and common classes are done by concurrence of all instructors who teach those classes.

Table 4. When selecting a required course textbook, how important is each of the following factors to you?

Question	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important	Average Value
Cost to the student	1	2	15	42	20	3.98
Reputation of author(s)	3	8	26	29	15	3.56
Quality of ancillary resources (question banks, Powerpoint slides, etc.)	9	11	25	25	11	3.22
Comprehensiveness of coverage	1	2	8	44	26	4.14
Recently updated edition	4	11	18	33	15	3.54
Used/recommended by other faculty	11	15	26	24	5	2.96
Clear & accessible writing	-	-	7	37	37	4.37

Theoretical orientation	6	15	26	24	10	3.21
Works with Canvas	23	16	16	13	13	2.72
Relationship with publisher	42	16	12	9	2	1.93
Sponsorships or other financial incentives offered by publisher	60	10	6	3	2	1.48

“Other” responses included course leader selects then approved in committee meeting, depends on the class, and common classes are done by concurrence of all instructors who teach those classes.

Table 5. In addition to textbooks, how important are ancillary resources to your teaching?

Question	Not at all important	Slightly important	Moderately important	Very important	Extremely important	Average Value
Question Banks	19	18	16	19	9	2.77
PowerPoint Slides	18	19	23	6	15	2.77
Instructor Activity Manual	15	24	21	12	9	2.70
Adaptive/ Online Quizzing	23	18	19	11	10	2.59
Online Student Resources (e.g., flashcards, tutorials, demos, etc.)	14	15	24	17	11	2.95

Textbooks: Perceptions of Student Use

Survey participants were asked a series of questions related to student purchase and use of textbooks. Only 26 of the 81 respondents required students to purchase an access code that was bundled with a textbook.

Three participants had never checked the price of their textbook, while 67 said they had checked the price within the last year. According to the College Board’s Average Estimated Undergraduate Budgets, 2018-19 (2016), students at a four-year public university spend an average of \$1,240 per academic year on books and materials. If a student were

to take four classes in both the Spring and Fall semesters, this would mean the student spends an average of \$155 per class. When asked about their perceptions about student spending on course materials, 23 participants thought students spent between \$150 and \$200 per class, while 26 participants thought students spent between \$100 and \$150. Twenty-one participants thought students spent less than \$100 on course materials.

Participants were also asked to estimate the number of student questions they receive regarding textbooks. Thirty-six respondents indicated that they are asked by students between one and five times each semester if the textbook is required, and another 20 said they are asked between five and 10 times each semester. Further, 48 respondents said they are asked between one and five times per semester if an older edition of the required text can be used, far outweighing the other responses to this question. Only 12 respondents said they did not have students ask them about using older editions of required texts.

The final question in this section asked participants to tell us what percentage of their students they thought went without purchasing the required textbook. Responses ranged from 0 to 100%. One participant stated that “they [students] cannot pass the class without an access code.” Other comments to this question were “depends on the course, but less than 20%” and “most.” Of the varied responses, 61 participants said 25% or fewer students did not buy

the textbook, 13 responses fell in the range of 26-50%, and 6 responses were 51% or higher.

Open Educational Resources Awareness on Campus

The first question in this section asked participants how much they knew about OER based on the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation definition, which defines OER as “teaching, learning, and research resources that reside in the public domain or have been released under an intellectual property license that permits their free use and re-purposing by others. Open educational resources include full courses, course materials, modules, textbooks, streaming videos, tests, software, and any other tools, materials, or techniques used to support access to knowledge” (Atkins, Brown, & Hammond, 2007). The majority of survey participants were either unaware of OER (23 responses) or had heard of OER but did not know much about them (28 responses). Only seven participants were currently using OER, with another five responding that they have used them previously for teaching (see Table 6).

The 69 respondents who were either unaware of OER or who had never used OER were then asked if they would consider adopting OER for any of their courses. Of those 69, 65 said they would consider adopting OER and four indicated they would not.

The 12 participants who were using or had used OER were directed to

a series of questions about their use of OER in their courses. The first question asked them how they had used or created OER. Eleven responded that they had used OER, with seven responding that they had adapted OER. Two had created OER for study or teaching and two had added OER to a repository.

One participant has created and published OER with an open license.

The participants who had used OER were then asked what types of OER they had used. Videos had the highest response rate with 11, and open textbooks were second with nine. Full responses are detailed in Table 7.

Table 6. How aware are you of open educational resources (OER)?

Answer	Response	%
I am not aware of OER	23	28.40
I have heard of OER but don't know much about them	28	34.57
I am unaware of OER and have previously used them for teaching	18	6.17
I am aware of OER and have previously used them for teaching	5	6.17
I am aware of OER and currently them for teaching	7	8.64

*OER is defined by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation as "teaching, learning, and research resources that reside in the public domain or have been released under an intellectual property license that permits their free use and re-purposing by others. Open educational resources include full courses, course materials, modules, textbooks, streaming videos, tests, software, and any other tools, materials, or techniques used to support access to knowledge."

Table 7. Which of the following types of OER have you used? (select all that apply)

Answer	Response	%
Open textbooks	9	75.00
Whole course	0	0.00
Elements of a course (e.g., a module or unit)	4	33.33
Videos	11	91.67
Podcasts	7	58.33
Images	5	41.67
Infographics	5	41.67
Interactive games	2	16.67
Lectures	2	16.67

Lesson plans	0	0.00
Tutorials	1	8.33
Quizzes	1	8.33
E-books	6	50.00
Datasets	1	8.33
Learning tools, instruments, & plug-ins	2	16.67

Participants who used OER had varied purposes for using it, from teaching (10 responses) to inspiration (six responses). Some used it as supplementary material (eight responses) and some to provide e-learning material for online students (six responses). See Table 8 for a full breakdown.

Table 8. For which of the following purposes have you used OER? (select all that apply)

Answer	Response	%
For teaching	10	83.33
To supplement my existing lessons of coursework	8	66.67
As “assets” (e.g., images or text extracts) within a classroom	3	25.00
To give to students as compulsory “self-study” materials	2	16.67
To give to students as optional “self-study” materials	3	25.00
To provide e-learning materials to online students	6	50.00
To engage my students more fully in a topic area	4	33.33
To interest hard-to-engage learners	2	16.67
For inspiration and new ideas for my teaching	6	50.00
To make my learning more culturally diverse	2	16.67

Challenges to OER Adoption and Use

Of the participants who used OER, challenges included finding high-quality resources (seven responses) and not having time to search for and evaluate suitable resources (seven responses). Other

challenges are detailed in Table 9. All survey participants were asked to rate potential deterrents to adopting OER in their courses. The lack of awareness and difficulty in finding resources ranked high among concerns. Other issues include not having enough resources or ancillary resources. Full responses are in Table 10.

Table 9. Which challenges, if any, do you most often face in using OER (select all that apply)

Answer	Response	%
Overcoming technology problems when downloading resources	2	16.67
Knowing where to find resources	6	50.00
Finding suitable resources in my subject area	5	41.67
Finding resources of sufficiently high quality	7	58.33
Find resources that are up-to-date	6	50.00
Getting work colleagues, including supervisors, to accept the use of OER	1	8.33
Not being skilled enough to edit resources to suit my needs	1	8.33
Not knowing whether I have permission to use, change, or modify resources	3	25.00
Not having enough time to search for and evaluate suitable resources	7	58.33
Not having connections with peers using OER for support and advice	4	33.33
Not having time to experiment with using OER in the classroom	4	33.33
Lacking institutional support for my use of OER	3	25.00

All survey participants were asked to assess which factors would make them more likely to select a particular OER. Relevancy of the resource to the instructor's needs had the most responses at 66. Easily downloadable resources ranked second, with 42 responses. Participants also rated interactive/multimedia content (38), description of the learning objectives (37), and positive user ratings (36) highly. The criterion selected least was the resource having a catchy title or attractive images.

Participants were asked to choose the one item they thought would be the biggest challenge for OER adoption at UNA. With 21 responses, discoverability was seen as the biggest challenge.

Other challenges included faculty perception (15), OER availability (10), and time (10). None of the respondents chose scalability or advocacy as a challenge for adoption, and planning, technology, and ownership of the OER initiative were each selected only once.

Finally, all survey participants were asked how they perceive the quality of OER. Fifty respondents indicated that they do not know, followed by 23 respondents rating them about the same as traditional material. Six respondents said they perceive OER quality as worse than traditional material. Only two responses rank OER quality as better than that of traditional textbooks (see Table 11).

Coordinating OER Efforts Across a Mid-Sized College Campus

Table 10. To what extent do you feel that the following are deterrents to the adoption of OER in the courses you teach?

Question	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Average value
Not aware of OER	5	9	3	11	11	16	26	5.05
Unsure of how to use OER	4	7	4	9	15	18	23	5.13
Too difficult to find what I need	-	8	2	34	14	10	11	4.62
Not enough resources for my subject area	2	6	1	32	16	17	5	4.58
No available ancillary resources	1	8	4	34	10	17	6	4.49
Unprofessional appearance	3	12	3	45	7	8	2	3.91
Not current	2	11	3	40	11	11	2	4.10
Not high quality	2	7	7	38	9	12	5	4.26
Not understanding permissions for use	3	10	7	37	12	9	2	4.00
Lack of institutional support	6	12	5	36	8	8	5	3.90
Too difficult to change or edit	3	8	4	46	10	8	-	3.96
To difficult to integrate into technology I use	1	10	5	46	9	8	1	4.00
Other	1	1	-	10	-	3	1	4.25

Table 11. Overall, how do you perceive the quality of OER?

Answer	Response	%
I do not know	50	61.73
Better than the quality of traditional textbooks and course materials	2	2.47
About the same as the quality traditional textbooks and course materials	23	28.40
Worse than the quality of traditional textbooks and course materials	6	7.41

Key Takeaways and Strategies

The survey made it immediately apparent that there is a lack of awareness or limited awareness about OER on UNA's campus. When asked directly about awareness, close to two-thirds of respondents selected "not aware" or "have heard ... but don't know much." Similarly, the highest responses regarding deterrents to adoption were "not aware" and "unsure of how to use." High numbers of neutral answers to the other deterrents listed in this question may also indicate a lack of or limited awareness on campus.

Answers to several questions on the survey suggest that instructors on UNA's campus are unsure about locating and evaluating high quality resources that meet the needs of their courses. They are also concerned about the time this activity takes. Among the survey respondents, over two-thirds of respondents teach at least one course for which they have sole responsibility for textbook selection. Instructors with sole responsibility for course material selection have more freedom to explore alternatives for their courses. Survey data also indicates that a large number of current OER non-users would consider using OER.

Efforts by the working group on OER to raise awareness on campus began as soon as they started reviewing the survey data. In Spring 2018, the working group offered workshops and lectures about OER, copyright, and scholarly communications. Outside experts were brought to campus, including Will Cross, Director of the

Copyright & Digital Scholarship Center at North Carolina State University, who led two days of OER information sessions and a workshop about finding and adapting OER for the classroom. The library worked to bring the ACRL Roadshow, *Scholarly Communications: From Understanding to Engagement*, to campus, an event aimed at librarians and instructional designers from our campus and the surrounding region. Although these events were successful, they only reached a limited number of our campus instructors.

Results of the survey support continuation of efforts to promote and educate the campus community about OER as a critical aspect of achieving the aspiration of the strategic plan. The working group is looking at other potential outside speakers to invite to campus. In addition, the working group feels strongly that part of raising awareness should include promoting the expertise and services of librarians and instructional designers on campus who can help with the challenges identified in the survey data, while offering practical training on OER collections, tools, and other assets. To that end they are planning a series of talks/workshops led by working group members on topics such as using library tools to locate OER, integrating OER into Canvas, and customizing OER for the classroom. A project to leverage LibGuides to highlight quality OER resources by subject is already underway.

A key component of the working groups efforts will be offering a grant program to instructors who adopt, adapt, or create OER to help

offset the time required for this activity. The working group has proposed a Provost Grant Program modeled after successful programs at other colleges and universities. Invaluable to our efforts to create this proposal is the work done by Grand Valley State University to compile a fairly comprehensive document detailing OER initiatives and grant programs at colleges and universities across the United States (Yahne, Rander, & Ruen, n.d.). The proposal also was greatly informed by the ongoing successful grant program in Oregon (OpenOregon, 2018) and the work done by Christopher Barnes as part of his SPARC Open Education Leadership Program requirements (2018).

As part of this grant program, instructors who receive awards will be encouraged to assess their use of OER in the classroom. It would be beneficial for UNA's instructors to add to the growing body of literature on education outcomes of OER and OER-related institutional efforts. To that end, we would like to see instructors consider employing the model used by similar grant programs, where they obtain IRB approval for a comparison study of student learning outcomes using traditional course materials and OER course materials. Instructors would also be encouraged to publish and share their adapted or new OER materials via the UNA Scholarly Repository and in Alabama's OER Commons.

The working group gauged instructor perceptions of course material costs through several survey questions. The evidence from the survey generally indicates that instructors on campus are

aware of the costs of course materials to students. They generally have a good perception of the average cost of materials; the majority has checked the price of their course materials in the last 11 months and several instructors indicated they had fielded questions from students about other options to purchasing the textbook. This awareness of course material costs and the potential impact on students could suggest an opportunity to promote OER as a way to lower costs for students, make education more affordable, and encourage instructors to consider OER adoption as a benefit for students.

The library has become heavily involved in the push to reduce textbook costs for students. They have begun a program called the *Textbook Affordability Initiative*, which utilizes a variety of measures to purchase learning materials for students. One part of this project that has already begun is the strategic purchase of textbooks for high-enrollment courses. These books are placed on course reserve so that students have access to the materials without having to purchase expensive textbooks. Another push by this project is to begin to strategically purchase databases that can be used to supplement or replace traditional learning materials.

The survey also aimed to identify whether campus instructors had experience using OER in their teaching. The survey data reveals some use of OER by UNA's instructors. Twelve respondents have used or were using OER at the time of the survey. This current use of OER, though small, could be a foundation for increasing OER use on campus. One

goal of the working group is to identify all instructors at the university who are using OER and build a database, so that we can assist them in any way, from understanding open licenses to ensuring instructional design standards are maintained. Thus far, through workshop events and library outreach, we have identified several instructors who are OER users, including the provost and the university's president. Finding champions of open access and OER on campus can benefit the working group and help achieve the university's strategic directive.

The current working group acknowledges the limitations of the survey, considering that the number of responses (81) compared to the number involved in teaching that fall semester (455) is small. Also, according to the demographic data, there is limited feedback from part-time instructors at UNA. However, given the inclusion of OER in the campus strategic plan, the evidence from the survey results provides the working group guidance on strategies to build awareness on campus and increase OER in UNA's courses.

As the campus OER initiative continued to grow, the working group realized that it would benefit the group to include other campus representatives. To accomplish this, we have invited three people to join our working group: a full-time teaching faculty member, a student engagement staff member who works with the campus food pantry and at-risk students, and a sophomore student who serves as a student government senator. As part of this expansion, a memo has been draft-

ed and sent to the provost to formalize our working group through campus shared governance. In the documentation, we have drafted language to define our charge to be the following:

1. To support the campus initiative to adopt, implement, and use OER.
2. To raise awareness of OER on campus.
3. To advise and educate the campus about OER and related issues, such as copyright, fair use, open access, and open pedagogy.
4. To propose changes in areas related to OER, including policies, procedures, and products used.

Future Directions

The importance of administrative support, including funding and promotion of OER efforts and building OER initiatives into the campus strategic plan, cannot be understated. However, without understanding the needs of the campus, the allocation of funding and support would be difficult. Thus, the first step in implementing an OER process was assessing the current status of awareness and use of OER on campus. Using the results of that assessment has allowed the OER working group to coordinate a strategic rollout of OER initiatives across campus for all teaching faculty and staff. The purpose of this research is not only to explore awareness and adoption at our institution, but also to contribute to the growing body of research on

OER at institutions of higher learning. In addition, the authors especially hope to encourage other mid-sized regional public institutions to evaluate their campus OER usage and implement OER initiatives.

In addition to monetary grants, we would like to see formal language drafted for tenure and promotion documentation for any faculty member who chooses to adapt or create OER for use in their courses. While OER is free for students, we recognize that there is a substantial time commitment involved for faculty OER work and feel that they should be rewarded for their efforts. The working group plans to submit proposed language for consideration by the university's faculty senate and shared governance system.

Our next big project will be to design a new IRB-approved survey instrument to poll students about textbooks based on the research questions used in the Student Textbook and Course Materials Survey (Florida Virtual Campus, 2016). If our expanded workgroup is approved by the provost, we will leverage the new student working group member to promote survey participation via student government and other traditional channels, such as email and campus digital announcements. We are hopeful that the data from this forthcoming survey will help support an initiative to develop a clear way to identify course offerings that utilize OER textbooks or course materials in our online catalog so that students can make financially-informed decisions when choosing classes. This type

of course identification is formalized in law in certain states and is in the process of being presented to various state legislatures (Lynden Tribune, 2019; SPARC, 2019).

In addition, the working group members plan to continue to apply for outside OER research and education opportunities, such as ACHE grants, OpenStax Partnerships, and OER Research Fellowships. We are also in the process of investigating the financial feasibility of the university joining the Open Textbook Network. Increasing the working group's knowledge and understanding of the issues and challenges to OER will help inform how we present and support future initiatives on our campus and will enable us to reach our strategic plan aspiration to create a sustainable culture of OER use in 50% of our courses by 2024.

References

- Atkins, D. E., Brown, J. S., & Hammond, A. L. (2007). A review of the open educational resources (OER) movement: Achievements, challenges, and new opportunities. *Report to the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation*. Retrieved from <https://hewlett.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ReviewoftheOERMovement.pdf>
- Barnes, C. (2018, June 1). *Piloting faculty OER grant programs: A practical guide for librarians*. SPARC Open Education Leadership Program, 2017-

18. Retrieved from <https://cupola.gettysburg.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1091&context=librarypubs>

College Board. (2016). Average estimated undergraduate budgets, 2018-2019. *Annual survey of colleges, NCES, IPEDS Fall 2016 enrollment data*. Retrieved from <https://trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing/figures-tables/average-estimated-undergraduate-budgets-2018-19>

Florida Virtual Campus, Office of Distance Learning and Student Services. (2016). *Student textbook and course materials survey*. Retrieved from https://www.openaccesstextbooks.org/pdf/2016_Florida_Student_Textbook_Survey.pdf

Jung, E., Bauer, C., & Heaps, A. (2017). Higher education faculty perceptions of open textbook adoption. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 18(4). doi:10.19173/irrodl.v18i4.3120

Lynden Tribune. (2019, March 6). *Van Werven bill requires "low-cost" notice on college books*. Retrieved from https://www.lyndentribune.com/news/van-werven-bill-requires-low-cost-notice-on-college-books/article_5cb0b528-3f9a-11e9-8623-7fb671f1e9b0.html

OpenOregon. (2018). *Call for proposals: Open educational resources grants*. Retrieved from <https://openoregon.org/call-for-proposals-open-educational-resources-grants-2/>

Open University and OpenStax College. (2016). *OpenStax college educator survey*. Retrieved from http://openedgroup.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/OER_Hub_Teacher.pdf

Seaman, J.E., & Seaman, J. (2019). *Freeing the textbook: Educational resources in higher education, 2018*. Retrieved from <https://www.onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/freeingthetextbook2018.pdf>

SPARC. (2019). *OER state policy tracker*. Retrieved from <https://sparcopen.org/our-work/state-policy-tracking/>

University of North Alabama. (2019). *University of North Alabama strategic plan 2019 - 2024: Roaring with excellence*. Retrieved from <https://www.una.edu/strategic-plan/index.html>

Yahne, J., Rander, J., and Ruen, M. (n.d.). *Sample senate task force OER & textbook affordability initiatives*. Retrieved from https://docs.google.com/document/d/1cVFDRaqrz595T3EWvPoKRvd3mlOIaLrllqRPgY7nNZo/edit?usp=embed_facebook