

Using OER for Professional and Curricular Development: Lessons from Two Composition Textbooks

Christina Branson, Alex Wulff, and Vaughn Anderson

Maryville University, USA

ABSTRACT

The composition program at Maryville University was allocated funds to replace the textbooks used in a two-course introductory-level sequence with OER materials. While full-time faculty organized the effort to compose two new textbooks, part-time faculty were the primary authors for most chapters. Full-time and part-time instructors who created materials participated in a series of workshops and one-on-one editing sessions. The creation of these OER materials ultimately helped to save over 100,000 dollars annually, but also yielded a range of benefits for a program infusing on-line and on-ground courses with a newly redesigned curriculum. There were distinct benefits to being able to customize materials for a new curriculum with authors who knew the specific student population. The professional development opportunity for both full-time and part-time faculty also increased communication and a sense of community across the program. Students surveyed about the materials rated them highly. Surveys were also sent to faculty participants, who reported that they felt they benefited significantly from the experience of authoring OER texts and that the collaboration process was impactful.

Keywords: OER development, professional development, curriculum, faculty training

Uso de REA para el desarrollo profesional y curricular: lecciones de dos libros de texto de composición

RESUMEN

Se asignaron fondos al Programa de Composición de la Universidad de Maryville para reemplazar los libros de texto utilizados en una secuencia de nivel introductorio de dos cursos con materiales REA. Mientras que los profesores de tiempo completo organizaron

el esfuerzo de redactar dos nuevos libros de texto, los profesores de medio tiempo fueron los autores principales de la mayoría de los capítulos. Los instructores de tiempo completo y tiempo parcial que crearon materiales participaron en una serie de talleres y sesiones de edición individuales. La creación de estos materiales REA finalmente ayudó a ahorrar más de 100.000 dólares anuales, pero también produjo una serie de beneficios para un programa que incorpora cursos en línea y presenciales con un plan de estudios recientemente rediseñado. Hubo distintos beneficios al poder personalizar los materiales para un nuevo plan de estudios con autores que conocían la población estudiantil específica. La oportunidad de desarrollo profesional para los profesores de tiempo completo y parcial también aumentó la comunicación y el sentido de comunidad en todo el programa. Los estudiantes encuestados sobre los materiales los calificaron altamente. También se enviaron encuestas a los participantes de la facultad, quienes informaron que sentían que se beneficiaron significativamente de la experiencia de la creación de textos REA y que el proceso de colaboración fue impactante.

Palabras clave: Desarrollo de REA, desarrollo profesional, plan de estudios, formación de profesores

使用开放教育资源进行专业发展和课程 开发：两本创作课本得出的经验

摘要

玛丽维尔大学的创作计划（Composition Program）获得专项资金，用于在两门导论课中使用开放教育资源（OER）代替传统课本。尽管全职教师组织了两本新课本的创作，但兼职教师是大多数章节的主要作者。创造该材料的全职和兼职教师参与了一系列研讨会以及一对一编辑会议。这些OER材料的创造最终帮助节省了每年超10万美元的费用，同时还为创作计划一将重新设计的课程设置融入网络及线下课程一带来了一系列益处。让了解特定学生群体的作者为一门新课程定制材料是有明显好处的。全职和兼职教师的专业发展机会也增加了该计划中的传播和社群感。接受调研的学生对OER材料的评价很高。教师也参与了调研，他们报告称，自身从创作OER内容的经历中受益良多，并且协作过程具有影响力。

关键词: OER开发，专业发展，课程，教师培训

Introduction

As the use of open educational resources continues to grow, much of the conversation continues to focus on the cost benefit for students and, in turn, the institutions they attend (Fischer, Hilton, Robinson, & Wiley, 2015). Our article extends a recent trend (Staben, 2019) of thinking about OER at the level of the academic program or department, rather than primarily a contract between the institution and individual faculty members. While the university saved money and individual faculty were compensated for their roles as authors and editors, we focus on the program and professional development benefits here. In this current age of austerity, the development of OER resources has been the most significant professional development opportunity our department has been able to support.

Two years ago, the Composition program at Maryville University was given the opportunity to develop our own OER materials. In working through this process, we discovered benefits to professional development, faculty involvement, and curriculum development. Full-time and adjunct instructors were offered the opportunity to be compensated for developing content. The decision was made to create a new textbook for each introductory composition course, with single or co-authored chapters. This meant that 14 instructors (11 part-time and 3 full-time) were able to author sections of the OER. After the materials were completed and published in our learning

management system (LMS), we offered additional professional development to train new and experienced faculty in using the new materials. The process of planning, developing, implementing, and evaluating our OER materials has been a benefit not only to our students and institution, but to our team of instructors. Our program is much more unified in what we teach, how we teach, and the assignments we use than we were before this opportunity arose.

Review of the Literature

Student and Institutional Benefits

Given that textbooks are linked to student success (Skinner & Howes, 2013), increasingly cost more than students can afford (Whitford, 2018), and that faculty can be reluctant to adopt OER alternatives (Jung, Bauer, & Heaps, 2017), it makes sense that a great deal of the literature surrounding OER initiatives focuses on cost, student success, and faculty buy-in (Fischer et al., 2015; Hilton, 2016.) For instance, the Babson Survey Research Group has monitored faculty perceptions about OER since 2014 and has found that faculty increasingly understand the impact of textbook costs on students (especially those faculty in leadership roles), and that faculty also increasingly adopt OER and less-expensive digital materials (Seaman & Seaman, 2018). Even still, less than half of faculty were aware of OER in 2018 and only 13 percent of them were willing to make OER adoptions (Seaman & Seaman, 2018). Even if COVID-19 and the need to adapt materials and lessons

for online environments have increased awareness of OER alternatives (McKenzie, 2020), there remains a lag in faculty awareness of OER and in the willingness to adopt OER once made aware.

While faculty are increasingly aware of the need for lower cost texts, it is equally important that faculty who use OER texts see an impact on student learning outcomes and retention. Studies indicate that use of OER positively affects these measures of student success. A multi-institutional study by Fischer et al. (2015) explored the impact of OER on learning outcomes, course completion, and retention. In these three measures of student success, the study found that students using OER generally performed as well or better than students not using OER. Interestingly, when evaluating enrollment trends, students who used OER were significantly more likely to enroll in more credit hours the following semester.

Colvard et al. (2018) disaggregated data to assess student success outcomes of OER use based on financial need, ethnicity, and registration status, leading to a conclusion of OER as an “equity strategy for higher education: providing all students with access to course materials” (p. 273). This study found that end-of-course grades improved and rates of DFW (D grades, failures, and withdrawals) decreased for Pell Grant recipients when enrolled in a class using OER. In regards to registration status, the study revealed that the use of OER helped narrow the achievement gap between part-time and full-time students. A similar result was

found when considering the disaggregated data based on ethnicity.

Faculty Benefits and Professional Development

As OER initiatives gather momentum in higher education, and as the evidence for their effectiveness grows, there has been increasing critical focus on faculty development initiatives aimed at familiarizing instructors with OER and incentivizing them to adopt these materials.

While most of these discussions center on how to aid faculty in adopting existing materials (Belikov & Bodily, 2016; LaMagna, 2019), there have been some studies of faculty involvement in customizing and/or creating new OER. Nevertheless, the majority of these explore the challenges of implementing incentive structures (grants, individual payments, reassigned time, leadership opportunities) for an endeavor that resists a one-size-fits-all approach (Dilley, 2018; Todorinova & Wilkinson, 2020; Zhadko & Ko, 2020).

Most useful to the present study are recent discussions of OER as professional development that emphasize the potential for these initiatives to strengthen pedagogy and foster collaboration. For example, DiSanto et al. (2019) and Pate et al. (2019) explore the impact of making OER professional development opportunities available to various stakeholders across the university, including faculty, students, and library staff. Part-time faculty should be included among these stakeholders, especially in programs that tend to rely

heavily on such instructors. Yet, there seems to be little discussion of providing OER professional development opportunities aimed specifically at helping part-time faculty to produce OER. As Dilley (2018) notes, there are often institutional structures in place that actively discourage this kind of outreach.

While discussions of incentives for part-time faculty participation in professional development need to start with considerations of fair monetary compensation, Zhadko & Ko (2020) point out that OER faculty development provides related skill-building in online pedagogy and course design, and often offers leadership opportunities. These can be valuable for faculty looking to build their portfolios. Kinskey & Lewis Miller (2019) offer a successful example of this in practice, where graduate teaching assistants were invited to help in the creation of new OER materials. All participants reported that this was a valuable experience.

One of the reasons that fair compensation is so important to the discussion of OER adoption is that, even for instructors who are using OER materials created by others, there is significant time and effort that goes into gathering appropriate OER resources from various sites and sources. With adjunct salaries for most part-time instructors well below the poverty line in the United States (Flaherty, 2020), expecting adjunct instructors to curate resources for a course as well as teach it is an equity concern as well as a logistical one.

Within the field of composition there are several large repositories

for OER materials that an instructor would need to comb through to locate materials. The increase in OER efforts means that the materials at [the Writing Commons](#), [the Writing Across the Curriculum Clearinghouse](#), [Lumen Learning](#), and even individual university platforms, have grown at a considerable rate even in the two years since we made the decision to create our own materials. This is one of the reasons why libraries have become so important to OER adoption. Without the assistance of the library in curating OER, the task can be overwhelming for individual faculty members. With the exception of the resources available at [Lumen Learning](#), most of the resources available for composition instructors also then have to be integrated into a learning management system. With many part-time instructors teaching on multiple LMS platforms at different institutions each semester, OER adoption could seem more like a tax on an instructor living below the poverty line than a benefit.

Additionally, as noted by Heron (2016) in reference to the Writing Commons open resource for composition materials, opening up the process of creating OER to a group of faculty members can reveal multiple pedagogical approaches in our content areas. The collaborative development of open materials presents opportunities to draw on diverse voices and perspectives. It is also an opportunity to compensate the labor of part-time instructors.

Methodology

In the summer of 2018, Alex, the Director of Composition at Maryville University, had a meeting with one of our University's chief technology officers. The meeting was primarily about Canvas shells, but the topic turned to a new university-wide initiative: the development of OER textbooks. Because Maryville University buys books for students under a "one fee" program, the university was willing to incentivize faculty to develop and use OER resources to keep costs down. Composition, with more than a hundred sections, was considered a "high-value target" for the new OER program.

While the OER incentive program did not leave room to negotiate the dollar amount, it did have two different levels of funding. The director could choose to simply adopt an existing text or texts currently available in OER format and receive professional development funds. Those funds would be enough to fund two summer workshops to introduce the new materials and to support curriculum development. The director could develop most or all of the materials and receive funds for authorship and editorship, with enough funding to pay for four professional development workshops (three-day summer workshops for two years).

To be blunt, none of these options seemed ideal at the moment they were proposed. As a program, we had gone through the process of creating a new mission, new goals, and new outcomes for our courses one year prior.

We had also just chosen new textbooks that supported the new mission, goals, and outcomes. The process of choosing textbooks had come with no funding for professional development, so getting feedback from instructors had taken time and effort beyond what it may have. Alex and Christina, who was an adjunct instructor at the time, had also finished an update of the online versions of our two-course sequence (English 101 and 104) a year prior that involved using outside OER materials for both courses. Alex and Christina felt that the materials were effective, and students responded well to the readings, but instructors who taught both online and onground were still planning on using the new textbooks rather than the OER materials that had been gleaned for the online course. Alex was concerned about resistance to standardization if the program moved away from textbooks that were freshly chosen by a large number of instructors to outside OER resources.

Also, the development would need to take place over the course of a calendar year (for budgetary purposes) and the thought of designing an entire textbook by himself in that amount of time was daunting to someone in his second year of a five-year tenure track. Because the book would only be available to Maryville University students, it would only ambiguously count in a tenure portfolio. This seems to be true for OER initiatives at many institutions (Todorinova & Wilkinson, 2020).

At the same time, the offer was presented as a pilot that could become

more than a voluntary university initiative, with less funding associated with later iterations. That is, the department could potentially take a large pot of money for a lot of work now or we might be asked to take a much smaller pot of money for just as much work later. Additionally, the OER pilot contract was only three years. The department would be able to renegotiate for additional funds, or simply move back to outside textbooks, in three years.

Given the choices, Alex decided that the most prudent course of action would be to write both books for the larger amount of money—and to use that money as broadly as possible. If editing and authoring roles could be spread across the program, this would be the most money for professional development the program ever has available. Faculty would also have the chance to more fully embrace the new curriculum the program had piloted and just selected textbooks for. The more recent textbook adoption would mean that the instructors authoring the in-house versions of chapters would be able think about what they wanted their own chapters to look like as they experimented with new textbooks. They would be able to identify what worked and what did not work for their students as they were writing. Alex informally asked several instructors (especially those who were excited about the new textbooks) if they would be interested in being paid to compose OER materials to replace the recently adopted textbooks. He received a positive response, with several instructors expressing excitement and appreciation at being valued as authors.

Thinking about OER as professional and curricular development, rather than primarily about saving money for the university or for students, made the decision an easier one to make.

Alex began the process by surveying OER initiatives more broadly. While other universities centralize OER development through their libraries (Temesio, 2020; LaMagna, 2019), Maryville University is small enough where departments and faculty need to do this kind of legwork themselves. Alex contacted colleagues at other universities who had experience with OER materials, but he found those departments facilitated OER adoption by individual faculty members without developing in-house materials.

It was at this point that Alex asked Christina and Vaughn to take the lead in editing each of the textbooks. Christina would edit English 101 materials, and Vaughn would edit English 104 materials. The three of us would collectively make all the editorial decisions, put on professional development meetings, and help instructors complete their chapters. Christina was, at the time, a part-time instructor who had already gone through adopting OER materials with the online courses, and Vaughn was a full-time faculty member with a wealth of editorial experience.

The three of us set out to review composition specific OERs that we could use as models for our own projects. We also began the process of educating ourselves about copyright and fair use, as our roles in this project would require us to make editorial

decisions that had perhaps not come up before in our careers. This research impacted several instructors who were new to authorship in ways that they said made it into their own classrooms. This has meant that more of our composition courses feature chances for students to learn about copyright and fair use when they learn about plagiarism. The professional development meetings that we had around this topic also help instructors see ways they could customize their chapters for Maryville students. Rather than generic images of college students, authors could—for instance—get permission from Maryville to use Maryville promotional images. Similarly, faculty brought their own pictures into their final products.

After Alex and Christina had integrated OER materials into the online courses there had been significant developments at Lumen Learning (and their partnership with the SUNY system). Because Lumen resources are already integrated in Canvas (our current LMS), if their developments had matched our curriculum, adopting some of what was available at Lumen would have been easier because it would have avoided the “last mile” (Kortemeyer, 2013) problem with collecting OER materials: there is often a formatting challenge when it comes to presenting OER inside an LMS. Because Lumen’s resources were designed to work within Canvas, we would have less formatting work to do if we did decide to adapt materials from Lumen. While we decided that Lumen’s materials were not a match for our curriculum, we were impressed by the design possibilities within Can-

vas. All three of us had experience designing online Canvas shells for other instructors to use, but we had gone into this process thinking we would need to do some designing outside of Canvas to accomplish our goals. After reviewing what was available at Lumen, we knew that working fully within Canvas was a possibility and a desirable one if we wanted our faculty to be able to edit materials quickly.

Rather than post a general call for chapter proposals first, we decided to put out a rough outline of the chapters we thought we would need to complete the two books, based on our research and experience with the online courses. We emailed all the instructors in the program announcing the OER opportunity and asked them what additional chapters they might want to contribute. Response from the instructors was positive, with faculty suggesting ideas for additional content. For instance, faculty suggested that we address the health professions in our textbooks at several points because an overwhelming percentage of Maryville University students major in one of the health professions. Similarly, faculty wanted to make sure that digital literacy was given more attention than it had been in our adopted textbooks. With this information, we put together a final list of chapter topics.

Next, we created a list of materials we wanted to have inside each chapter. For instance, we asked everyone for outcomes, assignment options, writing prompts, readings, relevant non-copyrighted images, relevant video exam-

ples, rubrics, tips for writers, and tips for instructors teaching the chapters.

Once we had our outline in place, we sent out a call for proposals within the program. We already knew we had part-time instructors with long publication histories that might be interested. We also knew that some of our part-time instructors were new to publication. Our first call for proposals was met with a lot of questions, but not as many proposals as we had hoped. We recruited some instructors to write chapters who had never published before. We also encouraged instructors to submit proposals for more than one chapter, anticipating that some chapters may be more popular than others.

After gathering enough proposals, we met to discuss the proposals. With some chapters not generating enough interest from potential authors, we each selected a chapter to write ourselves. That gave us 16 accepted chapters, with two authors deciding to write two chapters.

We offered several professional development brainstorming and writing sessions to get authors started on their chapters. We also shifted the topics of our traditional department-wide professional development meetings to be helpful to authors.

Another key editorial decision was to publish directly in Canvas. In addition to already having experience in using Canvas for our online design and instruction, we also believed that making updates and edits directly in Canvas would be smoother. Additionally, this would allow instructors to publish as-

signments and readings in the OER directly from the Canvas LMS.

To help with revising and editing chapters, we sent a first round of personalized feedback to each writer based on their draft. The first round of feedback also included an updated timeline for when to submit revisions, when authors would receive the next round of feedback, and when final drafts would be due. Authors responded that the first round of feedback was helpful in providing additional guidance for the chapter and ideas for moving forward.

After authors submitted revisions from the first round of feedback, we met again to discuss next steps for the chapters. In the second round of feedback, we sent authors an updated checklist and models of mostly completed chapters. Once we had full drafts of the chapters loaded into Canvas, we gave each author the ability to make corrections in a last round of feedback.

With several of our chapters-in-progress, authors found themselves unable to complete the work that they initially had planned. In these cases, the editors arranged solutions that included co-authoring chapters and incorporating excerpts from incomplete chapters into other chapters that were on track for completion. We also faced the opposite issue: too much material or too many assignments. In these cases, we guided authors in selecting those aspects of their chapter that fit our redesigned curriculum.

As we were finishing editing the chapters, Alex put together a summer workshop series to introduce the new

OER materials. All returning and new instructors were given (viewing, not editing) access to all the OER materials. The workshops were a chance to introduce the new materials, but also a way for part-time instructors to be paid for building courses with new texts. Christina and Vaughn gave everyone a tour through the material in each textbook to start the workshops, and authors were asked to discuss the material and example assignments in their chapters. The materials were well received. Most instructors had not yet read through all of the OER materials, so there was ample discussion about choices and possibilities.

Instructors were then given time to select readings and work in groups as they built the assignment sequences they wanted to use. Groups were first created based on which courses instructors were teaching in the fall. Next, even smaller working groups were created based on what instructors wanted to work on first. Some wanted to start building out particular assignments, while others wanted to focus on unit structures.

The goal of these summer workshops was for instructors to leave with rough drafts of their syllabi for the fall. Almost all instructors met this goal. Being paid to do the kind of preparation that is usually unpaid was appreciated.

All of these efforts led to much more standardization in the curriculum. While standardization can be seen as a risk rather than a reward, we would argue that this depends on a department's situation. For instance, when

Alex was hired as the new Director of Writing and Multimodal Composition, he undertook a review of the program. After extensive syllabus review and interviews with instructors, it was determined that, aside from a research essay in English 104, there were no unifying assignments in the program and that requirements varied wildly depending on the instructor.

While others have noted that faculty are often concerned about the implications of standardization when making OER adoptions (Reed, 2018), writing the OER materials in-house meant that there was extensive faculty buy-in. The materials were clearly customized for our students (several chapters begin with a direct address to Maryville University students and use examples from our campus) and tied to what faculty were already teaching. Because we asked for sample assignments with each chapter, faculty were engaged in an extensive process of sharing materials with their colleagues.

There would have been another round of workshops, with instructors getting paid to personalize the OER materials for their courses, but a budgetary emergency caused by the fallout from COVID-19 meant that all professional development funds not yet spent were swept into a fund for preparing to teach in a hybrid format.

Findings

It is certainly true that one of the significant benefits of adopting OER materials for a course or program

can be cost savings. Previously, our two-course sequence had three different textbooks for each course. These textbooks were selected by instructors. The cost to the university was between 110 and 130 dollars per student. With more than 1,000 students in these courses annually, Maryville University has saved more than 100,000 dollars a year for the past two years.

After publishing our OER materials in our LMS, we embedded a link to a survey in each of the chapters for students. Students were able to give feedback on various aspects of each of their chapter readings. In the survey, students gave qualitative and quantitative feedback on the quality, usefulness, readability, and relevance of each chapter.

In analyzing the survey responses, students have responded positively to the instructor-created materials. The majority of students surveyed rated each chapter as having a higher quality and usefulness than traditional textbooks. The majority of students also rated the chapters as easy to read and saw the relevance of reading the chapter to their success in the course.

Students completed surveys for individual chapter materials. In total, 80% (67 out of 84) of students rated the quality as better than traditional textbooks. Eighty-six percent (72 out of 84) students rated the usefulness as better than traditional textbooks. Eighty-one percent (68 out of 84) students rated the chapter as easy to read. Eighty-seven percent (73 out of 84 students) responded that it was easy to see the rel-

evance of reading the chapter to their success in the course. Research shows that students rate their connection to courses that use OER as higher than courses that use traditional materials ([Fine & Read, 2020](#)).

Multiple students commented on the interest and readability of the chapters. For example, one student wrote, “It was interesting to read and easy to understand.” Students also noted the relevance of the content of the chapters. For example, one student commented, “It’s better coming from the actual teacher than just a textbook. Feels more hands on.”

Another major benefit we have found is the usefulness of our OER materials for both students and instructors. As part of our OER review process, we created an anonymous survey for all composition instructors. Several instructors completed the survey and offered their feedback on the quality and usefulness of our materials for their students and for themselves. We asked if instructors believed having OER materials available in Canvas is helpful to their students and to themselves as instructors. Ten out of ten respondents answered yes.

One instructor expanded on why the OER materials are helpful: “Since the information is more carefully chosen, I feel as if the students are more apt to make associations between the reading and their assignments, which increases the probability of retaining the information.” Another instructor noted that the “materials are approachable and interactive.”

In the survey, instructors who worked on developing OER materials mentioned that they found the experience to be valuable as professional development. For example, one instructor noted, "This experience provided opportunities not usually afforded to adjuncts: collaborate with colleagues, take a deeper dive into researching topics that are vital for students' growth, and place a publication on my CV."

Beyond these instructor survey results, we asked for feedback in a follow-up survey to gain insight into how instructors felt about the value of OER authorship in relation to other professional development opportunities. In this short survey, we posed two questions and eight authors responded. In the first question, we asked faculty to rate the professional development experience of authoring a chapter with other professional development opportunities provided by the university. Five out of eight authors rated the experience as significantly better than other professional development at the university. Two out of eight rated the experience as moderately better than other professional development at the university. One out of eight rated the experience as neither better nor worse. In the second question, we asked faculty to rate the professional development experience of authoring a chapter with other professional development opportunities outside of the university. Five out of eight authors rated the experience as significantly better than other professional development outside of the university. Two out of eight rated the experience as moderately better than

other professional development outside of the university. One out of eight rated the experience as slightly better.

Last year, instructors who collaborated on the OER materials were given the opportunity to create a statement to our university's Board of Trustees. Various instructors commented on how participating in creating our OER materials was a benefit professionally. One instructor highlighted the sense of professional value that working on our materials created:

The most amazing part about contributing to the composition OER is the rare opportunity for adjuncts to help create the foundational material from which they are asked to teach. The very fact [that] my knowledge and experience is valued as more than just something adjacent to the English Department and university helps foster a sense of belonging with my colleagues.

The development of our OER materials encouraged a higher level of consistency among instructors and their sections of composition. OER authors embedded various instructional materials in the OER modules, including assignments, writing projects, class activities, and collaborative work. Within each module, instructors had multiple options for meeting course outcomes through various writing project options. Authors also worked to build in scoring rubrics for assignments and writing projects. This model has an added advantage for new instructors as they are able to immedi-

ately access a fully planned and developed curriculum.

Student and faculty resources built into the OER materials led to another essential feature of our development and deployment process, which was the training for our instructors. We offered an orientation and guided tour of the materials through summer training workshops. All composition instructors were offered the option to attend a series of workshops offered the summer before our OER materials went live in our classes. Attendees were compensated for their participation through significant professional development funds.

It is our belief that the training was important for promoting buy-in from faculty who were going to be using these materials. Trainings were a paid opportunity for instructors to collaboratively prepare for their class(es) with the new materials in a new format. As Dilley (2018) notes, OER initiatives often tend to focus on training full-time faculty, but we felt that encouraging participation from our part-time faculty was crucial to our developing curriculum. The open process of creating in-house textbooks helped create opportunities for part-time and full-time faculty to engage in the kinds of extensive pedagogical discussions that can be difficult to support financially. The ability to renew our textbooks, with funding from the university, every three years is also a chance to renew the openness of our own pedagogical relationships. We will not be switching back to outside textbooks when our

three-year contract is finished. The opportunity to edit, revise, add chapters, share pedagogy, and build community is too valuable to pass up.

Besides offering presentations within our department, our OER experience led to ideas for presentation opportunities involving both full-time and part-time faculty. As an example, we highlighted our development of a multimedia writing project from our OER materials at a teaching and technology conference.

Our OER materials were originally developed for our traditional, on-ground classes. In using the materials for those courses, we found that we could also transfer some of the material to our online classes. For example, we decided to use our “Introduction to Summary” chapter in the summary module for our English 101 course. While this required minor adjustments, the extra support for online students learning foundational expectations and strategies for writing a summary has been an advantage for instruction. We plan on replacing more of the outside OER materials in our online courses with the materials that were created in-house when there is additional funding made available for a significant redesign of those courses.

Conclusions and Recommendations

From our experience with developing and implementing OER materials, we believe that OER could be used more frequently for faculty and

curriculum development. Through involvement of both full-time and part-time instructors in the program, we were able to build a relevant and useful OER product for the benefit of our students and our faculty team. For OER development projects, we would recommend considering the professional and curricular benefits of involving various faculty members.

With programs relying on adjunct faculty extensively for instruction, we believe building involvement opportunities for those same faculty members with the development of materials they are to teach only makes sense. This investment in both full-time and part-time faculty to create materials they are using has paid dividends for our program for both the student and faculty experience.

We would also recommend intentional training and continual professional development opportunities in the use and implementation of new materials. It is our belief that the creation and use of OER materials in our program has led to greater student success and faculty satisfaction through the relevancy and customization of the materials for our program and curriculum. If universities can be convinced that OER efforts are not solely about saving students money, but effective means of curricular and professional development, it may be possible to alter the calculus that makes so little OER development funding available at some institutions.

References

- Annand, D. & Jenson, T. (2017). Incentivizing the production and use of open educational resources in higher education institutions. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 18(4), 1-15. <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/3009/4226>
- Belikov, O. M. & Bodily, R. (2016). Incentives and barriers to OER adoption: A qualitative analysis of faculty perceptions. *Open Praxis*, 8(3), 235-246. <https://www.oerknowledgecloud.org/record1236>
- Colvard, N. B., Watson, C. E., & Park, H. (2018). The impact of open educational resources on various student success metrics. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 30(2), 262–276. <https://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/pdf/IJTLHE3386.pdf>
- Dilley, R. (2018). Reassigned time as faculty incentive to adopt OER. CCCOER: Community College Consortium for OER. <https://www.cccoer.org/2018/09/28/reassigned-time-as-faculty-incentive-to-adopt-oer/>

DiSanto, J. M., Cummings-Clay, D., Mitchell, S., & Ford, M. (2019). Beyond saving money: Engaging multiple stakeholders is a key to OER success. *The International Journal of Open Educational Resources*. 2(1). <https://www.ijoer.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/Beyond-Saving-Money-.pdf>

Fine, M. B., & Read, H. (2020). Factors impacting student perception of open educational resources. *E-Journal of Business Education & Scholarship of Teaching*, 14(1), 151–173. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1276430.pdf>

Fischer, L., Hilton, J., III, Robinson, T. J., & Wiley, D. A. (2015). A multi-institutional study of the impact of open textbook adoption on the learning outcomes of post-secondary students. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 27(3), 159–172. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12528-015-9101-x>

Flaherty, C. (2020). Barely getting by. *Inside Higher Education*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/04/20/new-report-says-many-adjuncts-make-less-3500-course-and-25000-year>

Herron, J. (2016). Writing Commons: A model for the creation, usability, and evaluation of OERs. *Composition Forum* 33. <http://compositionforum.com/issue/33/writing-commons.php>

Hilton, J. (2016). Open educational resources and college textbook choices: a review of research on efficacy and perceptions. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 64, 573–590 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-016-9434-9>

Jung E., Bauer C. & Heaps, A. (2017). Higher education faculty perceptions of open textbook adoption. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 18(4). <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/3120/4218>

Kinskey, C. & Lewis Miller, C. (2019). Creating faculty professional development on OER. *The International Journal of Open Educational Resources*. 1(2). <https://www.ijoer.org/creating-faculty-professional-development-on-oer/>

Kortemeyer, G. (2013). Ten years later: Why open educational resources have not noticeably affected higher education, and why we should care. *EDUCAUSE Review Online*. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2013/2/ten-years-later-why-open-educational-resources-have-not-noticeably-affected-higher-education-and-why-we-should-care>

LaMagna, M. (2019). Making the connections: The role of professional development in advocating for OER. In Jonathan Lashley (Ed.) *OER: A Field Guide for Academic Librarians | Editor's Cut*. Boise State Pressbooks. <https://boisestate.press->

books.pub/oer-field-guide/chapter/making-the-connections-the-role-of-professional-development-in-advocating-for-oer/

McKenzie, L. (2020). Window of opportunity for OER. *Inside Higher Education*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2020/08/13/pandemic-drives-increased-interest-open-educational-resources>

Pate, J., Townsend, D., & McGee, J. (2019). Coordinating OER efforts across a mid-sized college campus. *The International Journal of Open Educational Resources*, 2 (1), 209-226. <https://ir.una.edu/libfacpub/7>

Reed, M. (2018). OER and obstacles to adoption. *Inside Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com>

Seaman, J. E., & Seaman, J. (2018). Freeing the textbook: Open education resources in U.S. higher education. *Babson Survey Research Group*. <https://www.bayviewanalytics.com/reports/freeingthetextbook2018.pdf>

Skinner, D., & Howes, B. (2013). The required textbook friend or foe? Dealing with the dilemma. *Journal of College Teaching & Learning (TLC)*, 10(2), 133-142. <https://doi.org/10.19030/tlc.v10i2.7753>

Staben, C. (2019). A new way to motivate faculty adoption of OER. *Inside Higher Education*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/views/2019/02/13/encourage-faculty-adoption-oer-share-savings-departments-and>

Temesio, S. (2020) Accessible open educational resources and librarian involvement. *International Journal of Open Educational Resources*, 3 (1). doi:10.18278/ijoer.3.1.7. <https://www.ijoer.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/Accessible-Open-Educational-Resources-and-Librarian-Involvement.pdf>

Todorinova, L. & Wilkinson, Z. T. (2020). Incentivizing faculty for open educational resources (OER) adoption and open textbook authoring. *Journal of Academic Leadership* 46(6). <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7427534/>

Whitford, E. (2018.) Textbook trade-offs. *Inside Higher Education*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/07/26/students-sacrifice-meals-and-trips-home-pay-textbooks>

Zhadko, O. & Ko, S. (2020). *Best Practices in Designing Courses with Open Educational Resources*. Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group.

APPENDIX A
Student Survey of OER Materials

1. Rate the quality of the chapter.
 - a. Much better than other published textbooks
 - b. Moderately better than other published textbooks
 - c. Slightly better than other published textbooks
 - d. Neither better nor worse than other published textbooks
 - e. Slightly worse than other published textbooks
 - f. Moderately worse than other published textbooks
 - g. Much worse than other published textbooks
2. Please take a moment to expand upon your answer and offer feedback about the quality of this chapter.
3. Rate the usefulness of the chapter for this class.
 - a. Much better than other published textbooks
 - b. Moderately better than other published textbooks
 - c. Slightly better than other published textbooks
 - d. Neither better nor worse than other published textbooks
 - e. Slightly worse than other published textbooks
 - f. Moderately worse than other published textbooks
 - g. Much worse than other published textbooks
4. Please take a moment to expand upon your answer and offer feedback about the usefulness of this chapter.
5. How easy or difficult was it to read the chapter?
 - a. Extremely easy
 - b. Moderately easy
 - c. Slightly easy
 - d. Neither easy nor difficult
 - e. Slightly difficult

- f. Moderately difficult
 - g. Extremely difficult
6. How easy or difficult was it to see the relevance of reading this chapter to your success in this class?
- a. Extremely easy
 - b. Moderately easy
 - c. Slightly easy
 - d. Neither easy nor difficult
 - e. Slightly difficult
 - f. Moderately difficult
 - g. Extremely difficult
7. Would you recommend that we use this chapter next year as it is? If so, why? If not, what do you think we should change?
8. Please take a moment to provide any other feedback you might have about this chapter.

APPENDIX B

Faculty Survey of OER Materials

1. Do you believe having the OER materials available in Canvas is helpful to your students?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. No
 - d. Unsure
2. Do you believe that having materials available in Canvas is helpful to you as an instructor?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Unsure
3. Rate the quality of our composition OER materials vs conventional textbooks.
 - a. Much better than other published textbooks
 - b. Moderately better than other published textbooks
 - c. Slightly better than other published textbooks
 - d. Neither better nor worse than other published textbooks
 - e. Slightly worse than other published textbooks
 - f. Moderately worse than other published textbooks
 - g. Much worse than other published textbooks
4. Please take a moment and expand on your answer and offer feedback about the quality of Maryville's OER materials.
5. Rate the usefulness of these materials for your students
 - a. Much better than other published textbooks
 - b. Moderately better than other published textbooks
 - c. Slightly better than other published textbooks
 - d. Neither better nor worse than other published textbooks

- e. Slightly worse than other published textbooks
 - f. Moderately worse than other published textbooks
 - g. Much worse than other published textbooks
6. Please take a moment and expand on your answer and offer feedback about the usefulness of Maryville's OER materials.
7. Would you be interested in writing OER materials in the future (with compensation)?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Unsure
8. What changes or updates would you make to our OER materials?
9. Do you teach in any other programs at Maryville? If so, how do the composition OER materials compare to the materials used in those programs?
10. We encourage instructors to edit OER materials to best suit their classes. Have you ever edited OER materials?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
11. If you have edited a chapter, please briefly describe your edits and your reasons for making the edits.
12. Did you author any of the materials included in our English 101 or English 104 OERs?

If yes:

13. Would you be interested in writing another chapter in the future? (Assuming the compensation was similar.)
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Maybe
14. Was this experience valuable to you as professional development?
- a. Yes

- b. No
- c. Maybe

15. Please take a moment to explain how your experience connected to your broader professional development.

If no:

16. Would you be interested in editing a chapter in the future? (Editors are compensated.)

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Maybe

17. Would you be interested in authoring a new chapter in the future? (Authors are compensated.)

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. Maybe

APPENDIX C

OER Authorship Professional Development Survey

1. How would you rate the professional development experience of authoring a chapter in English 101 or 104 at Maryville University with other professional development opportunities (like REAL week) provided by Maryville University? (The experience of authoring includes the researching, writing, and editing of the chapter, any workshops you attended as part of the OER process, and then teaching your own materials.)
 - a. Much better than other PD at Maryville
 - b. Moderately better than other PD at Maryville
 - c. Slightly better than other PD at Maryville
 - d. Neither better nor worse than other PD at Maryville
 - e. Slightly worse than other PD at Maryville
 - f. Moderately worse than other PD at Maryville
 - g. Much worse than other PD at Maryville
2. How would you rate the professional development experience of authoring a chapter in English 101 or 104 at Maryville University compared with professional development you have had outside of Maryville University? (The experience of authoring includes the researching, writing, and editing of the chapter, any workshops you attended as part of the OER process, and then teaching your own materials.)
 - a. Much better than other PD outside Maryville
 - b. Moderately better than other PD outside Maryville
 - c. Slightly better than other PD outside Maryville
 - d. Neither better nor worse than other PD outside Maryville
 - e. Slightly worse than other PD outside Maryville
 - f. Moderately worse than other PD outside Maryville
 - g. Much worse than other PD outside Maryville