

Survey Results

Executive Summary

Introduction

Academic institutions are increasingly developing programmatic approaches to support the creation, adoption, and adaptation of affordable course content (ACC) and open educational resources (OER) as part of wider strategic initiatives to enhance the access to and affordability of higher education and to improve teaching and learning. Affordable course content may include materials that are library-licensed or available at a low additional cost to students. Open educational resources are one type of affordable content; OER refers to any type or format of content or software that is in the public domain or licensed with a Creative Commons, GNU public license, or any other intellectual property license that allows free use, modification, and redistribution. Such materials share the idea of adaptability, low or no cost to students, and more control for faculty who use them.

In addition to teaching and learning units and faculty development centers, academic libraries often play significant or lead roles in ACC/OER programs. Library expertise in copyright and licensing, networks of faculty relationships, and emerging involvement in instructional design and digital publishing present opportunities to create open education and affordability initiatives that will bear a lasting institution-wide contribution to student academic achievement and faculty engagement. These initiatives are also a quantitative way that libraries may demonstrate their value in enhanced learning opportunities and reduced costs for students.

The purpose of this survey was to determine the degree to which ARL member institutions are engaged in ACC/OER advocacy, support, and development. The survey was designed to gather information on ACC/OER initiatives at the institutional level and the role of the library in these initiatives. It asked about initiatives' origins, implementation, governance, and funding, incentives for faculty participation, and the types of affordable/open course content that have been developed. It also explored library support of ACC/OER activities with staffing and services. The survey was distributed to the 124 ARL member libraries in March 2016. Sixty-five (52%) responded by the April 16 deadline. Of these institutions, 46 have or are planning an ACC/OER initiative. Another 12 plan to investigate the possibility in the near future.

Institutional Initiatives

Campus-wide ACC/OER initiatives are started and sustained by a myriad of actors, generally with the purposes of improving educational quality and reducing student learning resource costs. Responding institutions reported a diverse range of projects that include open courseware initiatives, digital course packs, interactive course companions, open or low-cost textbook adoption/creation, and use of public

domain, openly licensed, library licensed/subscribed materials. Campus-wide ACC/OER initiatives are at times embedded within other teaching and learning initiatives.

The survey asked which entity originated the ACC/OER initiative and which are involved in implementing it. Respondents indicated that their libraries have taken the lead in originating ACC/OER efforts well over half of the time (29 of 45 responses, or 64%). Higher-level administration, such as a president, provost, or vice provost, is the second most frequent initiator of their institution's ACC/OER initiatives (17 or 38%). Other initiators include extension, distance learning, or colleges/academic units, instructional design groups, student organizations, the university bookstore, and local or regional consortia. Notably, only two respondents reported that a faculty development or faculty governance group had originated their ACC/OER initiatives.

Libraries are more likely to be involved in implementing (33 or 73%) than in originating an initiative. Other entities showing high levels of involvement in implementation include teaching and learning groups (16 or 36%), instructional design groups (15 or 33%), college/academic department/units (33%), high-level administration (10 or 22%), university bookstores (9 or 20%), and student organizations (8 or 18%).

The majority of respondents (32 or 70%) indicated that their existing or planned campus initiative includes both affordable and openly licensed course content. Twelve (26%) are focused only on openly licensed content, and two (4%) reported focusing only on affordable course content.

Governance of Campus-Wide Initiatives

Fewer than 40% of respondents reported having a standing committee or limited-term task force/working group as their ACC/OER initiative governing structure. Many reported unofficial partnerships with one or more groups, oversight arrangements to get the work done, and informal collaborations. A few reported there is no governance structure at all.

Of the 35 respondents who identified which entities participate in or lead an ACC/OER governance body, the majority (31 or 89%) indicated that libraries are represented in the group. In addition to libraries, student organizations and teaching & learning groups were identified as active participants in around half of the governing bodies. Twenty-five percent of respondents indicated some representation from each of the following: high-level administration, college/academic department/unit, academic computing, instruction design group, university bookstore, faculty governance body, and the faculty development center. At three institutions the university press participates.

Half of the governing bodies are lead by the library, while at eight institutions high-level administration is the leader (29%). A representative of another group takes the lead at one or two institutions and in a few cases there is joint leadership.

Funding of Campus-Wide Initiatives

Library general operating budgets, external grants, or library special project funds were identified as the most frequent sources of funding for ACC/OER initiatives (51%, 28%, and 23% of responses, respectively). In some cases, institutional general operating budgets, academic department budgets, IT budgets, institutional special project funds, and endowment funds supplement library funding. Respondents who reported zero library funding for ACC/OER initiatives indicated that funds came from provincial or state government or legislature funds, the bookstore, external grants and gifts, grants from student groups, an IT department, academic departments, student fees, or consortium funding.

Funds predominantly cover faculty incentives or grant funds (29 responses, or 74%). Library and technical support staff are also frequently covered. Some respondents indicated that funds were used for

training faculty and library staff, funding student assistants, and purchasing multi-user e-textbooks or open textbook examination copies. Faculty course release and equipment were spending categories for fewer than 20% of respondents.

Approximately three-fourths of respondents reported there are funding continuation plans. The remaining respondents indicated that they have dedicated funding for a period of time and will need to refine their funding model and/or seek future financial support from campus senior administration. Others reported that future funding may be contingent on program evaluation, or that the status of continued funding is currently unknown. Some respondents indicated that core operating expenses would be self-funded and projects would be grant funded. Others are negotiating support from campus senior administration and other academic units. We suspect that continued funding goes hand in hand with formalization of special initiatives or pilot projects into regular services.

Faculty Incentive Programs

Anecdotal evidence suggested that faculty incentive programs have been an important and widely used early strategy for many libraries and institutions and the ACC/OER survey confirmed this conclusion. Three quarters of the responding libraries with activity in this area indicated their campuses provide an incentive program for faculty to adopt, adapt, or create affordable course content/open educational resources. A majority of the incentives offered (25 or 80%) were financial incentives (grants, stipends, etc.) or instructional design support (17 or 55%). Five programs use some funding for faculty course release as well. Several respondents also report they help faculty find and identify affordable/open content, connect faculty with additional support/services on campus (graphic design, academic technology, teaching and learning), and work with the Open Textbook Network to introduce faculty to open textbooks in their discipline and engage them via a review of a specific open textbook. Licensing, copyright, and publishing support are other areas noted here and later in library support services.

Details related to financial incentive grants indicate the amount and number awarded varies widely across institutions. Twelve institutions reported average grants of \$1250 or less with a total of approximately 288 awards. Two institutions reported larger incentive grants averaging ~\$3000 and \$4500 while still providing numerous awards (23 and 15, respectively). Three other institutions reported even more substantial awards of \$5000, \$10,000, and over \$15,000 but awarded fewer grants overall to date (1, 5, and 2, respectively).

The trend of offering more numerous, small incentive grants or fewer large grants was supported by the comments in this section of the survey as well. For example, one institution noted, “Three types of grants: \$12,000, three grants awarded; \$7,500, three grants awarded; \$1,000, nine grants awarded.” Respondents’ comments also indicate that several institutions have plans to implement an incentive program on their campus in the future, or extend or provide more awards at similar levels used in the past. Some incentive programs are intertwined with larger campus efforts that include ACC/OER content as one option among other teaching and learning transformations that qualifies for an award.

The requirements for faculty incentive grant programs, while numerous, are not universal across the responding institutions. By far, the requirements implemented at the most institutions are that faculty provide data about the course size and the cost of the existing textbook (17 responses, or 61%) and submit updates about their projects (14 or 50%). About a third of respondents indicated they also require faculty to apply an open license to newly created works, assess student learning, share content within their institution, use only openly licensed content, and report usage of ACC/OER for a number of years. A number of institutions indicated that they don’t “require” the items listed in the survey but obtain similar results through consultation with faculty as part of their incentive programs.

Institutional Policies and Practices

Survey responses indicate that current university-wide tenure and promotion policies do not explicitly encourage faculty adoption, adaptation, or creation of ACC/OER. However, faculty may list ACC/OER-related grants or awards on their CV and claim credit for digital works of scholarship. Several respondents noted that the attitude of academic departments varies, with some departments looking favorably on these efforts but not requiring or privileging creation of ACC/OER.

Whereas sharing beyond the institution is a priority, all but one of the responding institutions have an IP policy that specifies ownership and rights to original works. These policies are important for faculty members and other employees seeking to create and share OER beyond their institution. Most respondents (21 of 33) indicated that authors retain rights to their curriculum resources. Even more respondents indicated that ownership and rights of originally authored curriculum works are less than straightforward. Examples of complicating factors include: co-ownership by an author and department or author and institution, limitations on ownership due to use of “substantial university resources” or “additional support” received, author ownership unless a contract was signed, author ownership but institutional assertion of rights to use, and discretion over employee-created curriculum resources by departmental administrators. Two respondents listed the institution or university as the only entity holding ownership or rights. In response to a question on whether ACC/OER incentive programs require faculty participants to openly license original created works, 10 (36%) indicated that this is a requirement. (The survey did not ask how project policies requiring open licensing interacted with institutional policies.)

Current Faculty Practices

The survey asked what types of resources faculty have adopted, adapted, or created as part of the ACC/OER initiative. Not surprisingly, and perhaps reflecting existing faculty practice with traditional course content, faculty at the 30 responding institutions have most commonly created, adopted, or adapted textbooks (80%), readings or articles (70%), library licensed content (67%), and videos and websites (63% each). At the majority of responding institutions (23 or 77%) faculty have created open educational resources. At many institutions they have also created affordable content and have adopted or adapted ACC and OER content.

Seventeen respondents who actively support ACC/OER initiatives have also implemented some assessment measure to track the impact of their efforts on teaching and learning (41%). The metrics most frequently tracked are student savings (9 or 53%) and the number of students using OER (8 or 47%) or ACC (6 or 35%). The next tier of metrics focuses on tracking faculty behavior, including the number who are replacing course materials with OER (29%) or ACC (18%) or adapting or creating OER (18% each). Respondents’ comments on metrics used to evaluate the impact of the use of ACC/OER indicate some more complex methods, including examination of grade patterns prior to and after adoption of a more affordable option, number of student applicants influenced by OER usage, and various surveys focused on student satisfaction and perception of the ACC/OER materials. Nineteen other respondents (45%) plan to assess the impact of ACC/OER materials. Only six have no plans to assess their initiatives.

The library is the most likely candidate for conducting the assessment process, either now or in the future (11 responses, or 55%), followed distantly by teaching and learning, instructional design, and academic technology groups on campus (3 or 14% each). High-level administration is also interested in assessment measures in a few cases. The variety of entities reported as data gatherers in this area (including college/departments, bookstores, consortia, outreach, faculty development, and institutional research at several institutions) indicate the potential for broad interest and participation across campuses in ACC/OER work.

Only seven institutions reported sharing the results of their assessment efforts. A variety of methods have been used, including public websites, publications, conference presentations, presentations at faculty teaching events, and reports for senior administrators. The current assessment and reporting environment provides opportunities for more coordinated efforts both on and across various campuses to better demonstrate the benefits and impacts of ACC/OER.

ACC/OER Support Services and Educational Efforts

Forty-two respondents answered a question about the types of ACC/OER support activities their libraries provide or plan to provide. Forty answered a question their educational services for faculty. Many of the most implemented or planned for services and educational efforts are tied to existing library services or could be considered an expansion of traditional services. For example, the two support activities most commonly implemented or planned for in the future are copyright/open licensing consultation and reserves software and services (at over 90% of responding institutions). Searching and finding affordable content (83%), local repositories for openly licensed content (81%), educating users about affordable content topics or working with student advocacy groups (~70%) or purchasing additional course materials (60%) all might be considered extension or expansions of many existing library services as well. Activities that require a larger investment have not been implemented or planned for as widely, e.g., software systems for publishing openly licensed content (43%) or staff support for publishing the same (36%).

Educational services implemented or planned for reflect topics that closely align with the support activities mentioned above. Author's rights (100%), open licensing (90%), depositing open materials (88%), open publishing options (83%), and copyright contract negotiation (68%) are all covered at over three quarters of the responding institutions. Educational services focused on innovative pedagogy are much less likely to be covered (35%).

Faculty Engagement Strategies

Effective faculty engagement strategies focus primarily on training and outreach opportunities. Respondents indicated that training on ACC/OER has been provided as part of stand-alone training and programming and integrated into existing programming, notably copyright training and liaison services. Many respondents indicated that Open Education Week and Open Access Week have provided good opportunities for programming. Unique strategies include leveraging e-book licensing to share texts with faculty for course integration, targeted outreach to faculty who use course packs, and including OER in faculty development programs for courses transitioning to online delivery.

Library Staffing

Not surprisingly, there was some variation among responding institutions regarding library staff involvement with ACC/OER initiatives. The home department(s) within most libraries varies; however, some patterns emerged. The majority of the 41 respondents reported staff contributions to ACC/OER initiatives from scholarly communications (83%), library liaisons (73%), and public services/reference (54%). Teaching and learning departments at 20 institutions (49%) contribute to ACC/OER initiatives as well. In addition, several respondents indicated that the copyright office, library IT, and marketing also contribute staff to ACC/OER initiatives.

There was great variation among the 33 responding libraries with regard to the number of staff contributing to ACC/OER initiatives. Responses ranged from 1 to 25 staff, with a median of 6. The comments indicate that the higher number of staff involved reflect liaison or outreach programs in which ACC/OER are integrated in the full suite of services and partnership opportunities provided.

Of particular note is the range of positions that support ACC/OER initiatives at the responding libraries. Each respondent was asked to report the titles of up to five library staff who are involved. Forty

institutions reported a total of 164 positions. Only one reported a single staff member who supports ACC/OER initiatives and twenty listed titles for five positions. Associate/assistant university librarian (AUL) positions are involved in ACC/OER at a higher rate than anticipated. Of the 164 positions reported, 18 are AUL positions (11%). Many of the rest are department head positions or service/institute directors (35 or 21%). Across the positions reported, noteworthy titles include copyright officer/librarian, digital projects manager/librarian, e-learning librarian, and instructional technologist/designer. ACC/OER-specific titles include open education, copyright & scholarly communications librarian, and open educational resources coordinator.

Across the positions reported by each institution, the amount of time spent on ACC/OER does vary; however, ACC/OER is not a daily time commitment for most positions. The majority of positions (135 or 84%) spend “some time” each month, week, or day on ACC/OER. Only 26 (16%) spend significant time each week or day.

Library OER/ACC Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities

The respondents were asked to indicate the knowledge, skills, and abilities that are needed in order to support ACC/OER initiatives and to select three that are the most important. The KSAs identified as most needed and most important by the 42 respondents are familiarity with the availability of ACC/OER resources (93%), intellectual property (90%), and familiarity with search strategies for ACC/OER resources (83%). Other KSAs needed at the majority of libraries include assessment (69%), familiarity with the learning management system (62%), and project management (60%).

Staff at the 40 responding libraries take advantage of multiple professional development opportunities to improve their knowledge, skills, and abilities to support ACC/OER activities. Professional conferences (80%), in-person training/workshops (73%), virtual training/webinars (68%), and online discussion groups/professional communication (60%) are used at a majority of responding institutions.

Libraries and ACC/OER

The survey asked respondents to describe how they envision future library roles related to both ACC and OER. The most common themes closely align with current institutional or library program areas. This alignment provides credibility and stability that facilitates administrative and faculty buy in to support program longevity. Given libraries expertise in content (from copyright to tools and infrastructure), respondents see numerous opportunities for libraries to provide leadership on their campuses to support affordable and OER services and programs. Libraries frequently have strong ties with campus partners in administration, technology, and teaching and learning groups; ACC/OER efforts offer the chance to expand or build on these relationships. Many response emphasized the importance of libraries taking on a leadership role and on campus collaborations in this arena.

Advocacy, promotion, and awareness-raising educational efforts are key to helping faculty understand the array of course content options available to them and to work for change of culture and practice in the future. Helping interested faculty discover existing affordable content (whether it is library licensed or OER) and then providing easy access to that content (through reserves or support for implementing OER) are important service/support efforts that utilize a range of librarian and technology systems expertise and infrastructure support. Libraries also have the opportunity to advance the conversation regarding teaching and learning promotion criteria that support ACC/OER. Finally, publishing or hosting newly created open content, as well as providing needed copyright and licensing advice, are viewed as necessary future investments in many library spaces. Given the wide range of funding models, project types carried out (course reserves, publishing, authoring, copyright, open licensing support, etc.), the varying roles across campus partnerships, as well as libraries support

and educational services, provide pieces that other libraries can use to develop their own blueprint when ready to implement ACC/OER programs.

New state, national, and possibly global collaborative opportunities that are beginning to emerge in open textbook or OER publishing are worth highlighting as well. While library awareness and education efforts may be focused on a local campus, librarians could strategically recruit and incentivize the creation of new open content (to avoid the duplication of other highly regarded content already published) across institutions and across the globe to create the broadest possible impact.

Finally, developing sustainable models for funding ACC/OER initiatives and creating more robust assessment methods are two areas for growth in libraries. Many respondents indicated unclear or uncertain plans for future funding. Development of more standardized and robust assessment models could support proposals for permanent funding. While many institutions reported gathering data on cost savings, very few have tied metrics in course completion or student retention to ACC/OER efforts, factors that are important to institutional administrators. Other standard assessment measures would allow aggregation or comparison across institutions as well.

Based on the number of responding institutions, affordable course content and OER support within libraries continues to grow as an emerging area of interest. Nearly 60 ARL member institutions have or plan to have significant services and support available in the near future. We predict that this number will grow as faculty participation and interest increases. Libraries are uniquely poised to act as leaders, connectors, and content experts on their campuses to further a significant culture change related to course content selection and use.

NOTE: The executive summary (pages 2–8) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



Survey Questions and Responses

The SPEC Survey on Affordable Course Content and Open Educational Resources was designed by **Anifa Walz**, Open Education, Copyright, and Scholarly Communications Librarian at Virginia Tech Libraries; **Kristi Jensen**, Program Development Lead, eLearning Support Initiative at University of Minnesota Libraries; and **Joseph A. Salem, Jr.**, Associate Dean for Learning, Undergraduate Services, and Commonwealth Campus Libraries at Penn State University Libraries. These results are based on responses from 65 of the 124 ARL member libraries (52%) by the deadline of April 8, 2016. The survey's introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

Academic institutions are increasingly developing programmatic approaches to support the creation, adoption, and adaptation of affordable course content (ACC) and open educational resources (OER) as part of wider strategic initiatives to enhance the access to and affordability of higher education and to improve teaching and learning. In addition to teaching and learning units and faculty development centers, academic libraries often play significant or lead roles in ACC/OER programs. Library expertise in copyright and licensing, networks of faculty relationships, and emerging involvement in instructional design and digital publishing present opportunities to create open education and affordability initiatives that will bear a lasting institution-wide contribution to student academic achievement and faculty engagement. These initiatives are also a quantitative way that libraries may demonstrate their value in enhanced learning opportunities and reduced costs for students.

Affordable course content may include materials that are library-licensed or available at a low additional cost to students. Open educational resources are one type of affordable content; OER refers to any type or format of content or software that is in the public domain or licensed with a Creative Commons, GNU public license, or any other intellectual property license that allows free use, modification, and redistribution. Such materials share the idea of adaptability, low or no cost to students, and more control for faculty who use them. Some initiatives are strongly committed to use only OER, while others may combine a wide variety of resources to achieve the goal of providing more affordable course content.

The purpose of this survey is to determine the degree to which ARL member institutions are engaged in ACC/OER advocacy, support, and development. The survey is designed to gather information on ACC/OER initiatives at the institutional level and the role of the library in these initiatives. It examines initiatives' origins, implementation, governance, and funding, incentives for faculty participation, and the types of affordable/open course content that have been developed. It also explores library support of ACC/OER activities with staffing and services. The results of this survey can inform senior library decision-makers who are considering new or additional initiatives to support ACC/OER.

BACKGROUND

1. **Has any part of your institution implemented an initiative that is focused on encouraging faculty to adopt, adapt, or create affordable course content/open educational resources for teaching and learning?** N=65

Yes	37	57%
An initiative is in the planning stage	9	14%
Not yet, but we plan to investigate the possibility in the near future	12	18%
No, and we have no plans for such an initiative at this time	7	11%

If yes or an initiative is in the planning stage, is the initiative focused on affordable content or openly licensed course content (i.e., OER) or both? N=46

Affordable course content	2	4%
Openly licensed course content	12	26%
Both	32	70%

Comments N=12

Openly licensed course content N=6

Library is participating in new Open Textbook Network (OTN) initiative through Boston Library Consortium.

Mainly OER, but it is possible that library-subscribed materials or “free online” but not openly licensed contents also be used. A separate program outside of the OpenEd initiative purchases print (reserve) & multi-user licensed textbooks when requested or at the initiative of the liaison librarian. These are the most popular parts of our collection in terms of circulation numbers.

Mostly focused around re-shareable content for open online courses.

Since 2007, University Extension has published ~100 courses, 200+ seminars and conferences, and thousands of individual course video lectures. The single largest initiative has been OpenChem (16 courses), which is now catalogued as learning resource at the library.

The libraries license some content such as exam preparation materials, e-books, and streaming media that are also used as curricular materials.

We suspect that the activities occurring at the university (within and outside the library) are less formal than at other institutions so far, but we wanted to respond to this survey with as much info as possible about the OER-related activities that we do.

Both N=5

The initiatives are those of independent faculty members.

The president’s office has announced a pilot grant program to incentivize faculty to adopt open course content. The Libraries will be planning the program after April 1st and will probably expand the scope to include affordable content to extend the options available to faculty participants.

We encourage faculty to use online library materials in addition to open content.

We have a LOT of these programs, and it’s going to be quite hard for me to distinguish between them.

We have started with an affordable course content approach that combines both licensed library content with open content but we are expanding in the direction of incentivizing open textbook adoptions.

Not yet N=1

We are thinking through both options but have not yet settled on a direction.

If you answered Yes or an initiative is in the planning stage, please complete the survey.

If you answered No or not yet, you will jump to the section Future Library ACC/OER Role.

ACC/OER INITIATIVE DEVELOPMENT

2. Please indicate which entity(ies) originated the ACC/OER initiative and which are involved in implementing it. Check all that apply. N=45

Entity	Originated	Implementing	N
Library	29	33	38
High-level administration (president, provost, vice provost, etc.)	17	10	22
Teaching and learning group	5	16	17
Instructional design group	8	15	16
Student organization(s)	8	8	14
College/academic department/unit	9	15	17
University bookstore	6	9	10
Local or regional consortium	6	6	8
Academic computing	4	6	7
Faculty development center	1	7	7
University system-level administration or unit	3	2	5
University press	3	4	4
Faculty governance body or organization (e.g., faculty senate)	1	2	3
Other entity	8	8	10
Total Responses	45	45	45

If you indicated that an academic department, consortium, or other entity originated the initiative, please identify the academic department, consortium, and/or other entity. N=18

College/academic department/unit N=7

Center for Media Citizenship

Economics department created a textbook and worked with the bookstore to implement, but this text is no longer in use. The bookstore has worked on a number of affordable textbook initiatives with academic departments. The Libraries have created a campus OER Interest Group.

Faculty of Engineering

Office of Distance Education and eLearning (ODEE)

Outreach College

School of Public Health

The College of Education and Human Development has a separate effort focused on Open Textbooks.

Local or regional consortium N=6

Boston Library Consortium/Open Textbook Network

Campus Alberta Open Educational Resources (OER) Initiative

CIC [Committee on Institutional Cooperation]

Maryland PIRG (Public Interest Research Group)

OCUL [Ontario Council of University Libraries]

UALC [Utah Academic Library Consortium]

Other entity N=7

Faculty member in the School of Information and Library Science

Individual students not part of student government

NJ PIRG [New Jersey Public Interest Research Group]

The Center for New Designs in Learning and Scholarship sponsors an Initiative on Technology-Enhanced Learning (ITEL), which has produced some OER materials. I'm not sure that you would call it a campus-wide initiative, though. ITEL does more than just OER.

University Extension/Distance Learning Center, now reorganized as the Division of Continuing Education and the Division of Teaching and Learning.

Vanderbilt Institute for Digital Learning

Virginia History Lab, Jefferson Trust, Alumni Hall

If you indicated that an academic department, consortium, or other entity is involved in implementing the initiative, please identify the academic department, consortium, and/or other entity. N=19

College/academic department/unit N=11

Center for Media Citizenship

Center for Teaching & Learning of the School of Public Health

College of Letters & Sciences, Learning Support Services unit

DELTA/Distance Learning and Faculty Development Office

Faculty of Engineering

General Faculties Council, Teaching and Learning Committee

Office of Teaching, Learning & Technology

Outreach College

The College of Education and Human Development has a separate effort focused on Open Textbooks.

The OpenChem initiative is a collaboration between University Extension (Division of Continuing Education), the School of Physical Sciences, and the Chemistry Department.

We're working with multiple academic and administrative departments on implementation and expansion, and our plans are to engage them all in this effort.

Local or regional consortium N=6

- Boston Library Consortium/Open Textbook Network
- Campus Alberta Open Educational Resources (OER) Initiative
- GALILEO, Board of Regents for the University System of Georgia
- Inter-University Council of Ohio (IUC)
- OCUL [Ontario Council of University Libraries]
- UALC [Utah Academic Library Consortium]

Other entity N=5

- A small group of students has formed with an initiative to reduce costs of texts for students. They contacted the faculty lead to explore collaboration.
- Emory Center for Digital Scholarship
- Teaching, learning, and technology roundtable (not part of formal governance structure)
- Undergraduate Student Government (USG)
- Virginia History Lab, Jefferson Trust, Alumni Hall

ACC/OER INITIATIVE GOVERNANCE

3. What is the structure of the governing body that is responsible for guiding and/or executing the ACC/OER initiative? N=41

Standing committee	7	17%
Limited term task force/working group	9	22%
Other structure	25	61%

Please briefly describe the other structure. N=25

A group of faculty, librarians, and students won a grant award from the Office of Digital Learning to explore open educational resources, specifically open textbooks, at the university.

A working group composed of members from Libraries' Scholarly Publishing Team, Research & Library Instruction, and Center for Teaching.

A working group with representatives from the faculty development center, the libraries, the university press, and the bookstore was convened by the faculty member in 2012. This group has evolved to be a volunteer advisory group, without term limits. At the university system level there are new initiatives underway such as an application for an NSF grant to support OERs system-wide. Support and willingness are there and initial efforts have been taken. The rest of the responses in this survey apply to the grassroots efforts initiated by the faculty member in library and information science.

An unofficial partnership between Libraries, Office of Distance Education and eLearning (ODEE), University Student Government (USG), University Center for the Advancement of Teaching, and the Office of Academic Affairs.

At this time, we are not using a review committee, but our initiative specifies that we will form one. This is primarily because we have not received more proposals that we can fund. When we start to receive more proposals, and the application process becomes a bit more competitive, we will create a steering committee to review proposals. Our plans call for the library to lead a governing body with representation from high-level administration, library, faculty governance body or organization, student organization, and faculty development center.

Campus Champion is currently our Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. Library Coordinator is currently me. Each of the member universities of the University System of Georgia has appointed a Campus Champion and a Library Coordinator.

Coordinator at one member library with designated contacts at participating member libraries.

Currently, the university librarian, associate university librarian for collection management and scholarly communication, and the director of communications. That may change as we move further ahead with implementation. Also, short-term committees comprised of faculty members are enlisted to review applications in each cycle, and the input they provide on applications can have implications for how we develop a governing structure.

Library administrative oversight with University Faculty Senate Library Committee reviewing applications.

Library unit with occasional consultation from partners.

Our institution has a teaching, learning, and technology roundtable (TLRT) made up of faculty, administrators, librarians, and other academic support offices. While the library funds the initiative and manages it, the TLTR is connected with the project and faculty who sit on the TLTR typically review proposals for project funding. More recently our institution has formed a Textbook Affordability Task Force that was charged by the provost to submit recommendations for the institution to adopt. There is overlap between the TLTR and the task force so I will include both groups in the checklist below.

Outreach College borrowed a librarian to coordinate OER for 18 months; have standing committee of librarians and instructional design personnel for system communication about OER.

Relatively informal different ad hoc groups that are working on various different initiatives to support/ implement. In the case of the press, the support of an OA platform and creation of books/OER's is part of their regular work.

Right now, we have examples on campus of distinct initiatives aided by the bookstore.

TBD. Our Undergraduate Experience Librarian will convene a team. It will probably start as a task force, but could extend to a standing committee if the program continues beyond one year.

The Campus Alberta OER Steering Committee guides this initiative, and includes faculty, students, senior academic officers—including librarians—provincial government representatives, and other experts who champion open educational resources in the province.

The Center for Teaching & Learning of the School of Public Health is operationally in charge of the Open Courseware system. There isn't really a governing body, it's just a part of the work done.

The library is leading this initiative in consultation with the provost's office, the Teaching and Learning Transformation Center, the Senate Library Committee, the Student Government Association, and the Libraries' Student Advisory Group. This is not a formal group or task force.

The Scholarly Communications and Copyright Office of the Libraries

There is no structure.

UCI Open is a unit of University Extension and has ongoing responsibility in this area. It has a staff of ~3.5 FTE.

We are planning to create a campus-wide task force in Fall 2016. I would like to see representation from faculty, educational technology, education research/teaching/pedagogy training department, library, and students.

We do not have an umbrella structure focused on OER initiatives.

We have just had a few librarians working on this. One librarian has been given a limited amount of job duties in this area. Vice-President for IT who is also Dean of Libraries is supporting this. Administration approves. No real group or governing body. Student group is also interested.

We've had a working group/task force in the past. Now most of the OER work is done as an ongoing process when we find content—or develop content—for MOOCs (massive open online course) and other types of open courses.

4. How many individuals participate in this governing body? N=33

Standing committee N=7

Respondents reported the following numbers of individuals in their governing bodies: 4, 8, 10, 12, 12, 12, and 26: 2 co-chairs (voting); 15 voting members; 9 non-voting members.

Limited term task force/working group N=9

Respondents reported the following numbers of individuals in their limited term task force/working group: 5, 6, 8, 8, 10, 13, 14, 20, and variable.

Other structure N=17

Respondents reported the following numbers of individuals in their other structure: 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, 5, 5, between 5-7, numbers fluctuating between 5-10, 6, 6, 6, around 10, 14, 15, and 25 across 9 campuses. One respondent planning a committee with five members (listed above) indicated: “Our plans call for creating a committee with five members. This committee will primarily review and approve proposals. They may also assist with keeping participants on track to complete their projects in a suitable time frame.”

5. Please indicate which entities these participants represent and which entity takes the lead in the governing body. Check all that apply. N=35

Entity	Participant represents	Leads governing body
Library	31	14
Student organization(s)	17	1
Teaching and learning group	15	2
High-level administration (president, provost, vice provost, etc.)	13	8
College/academic department/unit	11	2
Academic computing	10	1
Instructional design group	9	2
University bookstore	8	1
Faculty governance body or organization (e.g., faculty senate)	7	0

Entity	Participant represents	Leads governing body
Faculty development center	7	0
University press	3	0
University system-level administration or unit	1	0
Local or regional consortium	0	0
Other entity	5	1
Total Responses	35	28

If you selected “other entity,” please specify that entity. N=5

Alberta Innovation and Advanced Education, Government of Alberta

Emory Center for Digital Scholarship

Registrar, university, information technology, faculty advisory committee to university information technology

Special unit that collaborates with faculty, library, and others on an ad hoc basis. Not a governing body in any sense, but interacts with university administration and school administrations as needed.

We also have participants from the Disability Resources for Students.

Additional Comments N=2

Group is not representative; self organized and collaborative across campuses.

TBD—this does not yet exist.

6. What is the role of the governing body? Check all that apply. N=36

Promote ACC adoption and/or OER adoption, adaptation, and/or creation practices	29	81%
Implement the initiative	25	69%
Provide priorities and guidance for the initiative	23	64%
Assess organizational needs	18	50%
Advocate for policies that encourage/enable OER adoption, adaptation, and/or creation	16	44%
Advocate for policies that encourage/enable ACC adoption	15	42%
Other role	10	28%

Please briefly describe the other role. N=10

Assess success of OER adoption, provide training about copyright and OERs, and develop other educational opportunities about OERs.

Develop policies that require faculty to provide timely and accurate information about curricular learning content to the registrar so that information is available when students register for courses.

Engagement: facilitating broad campus participation and involvement of faculty, staff, and students

Examining vendors offering OER solutions.

Identify potential faculty. Administer the grant program.

Our plans call for the committee (i.e., the governing body) to provide priorities and guidance for the initiative; implement the initiative; advocate for policies that encourage/enable OER adoption,

adaptation, and/or creation; and promote ACC adoption and/or OER adoption, adaptation, and/or creation.

Promote adoption, keep the organization they represent informed, promote new stipend program (2016) initiated by the faculty member, provide expertise to faculty who are interested in OER.

Still partially determining the role of the committee.

The governing body is still new so may take on some of the other roles later.

To review OER/ACC proposals.

7. Please enter any additional comments you may have about the initiative's governing body. N=12

Annual updates on the program are provided to the Library Policy Committee, which is the libraries' faculty and student advisory committee.

At this point the governing body is not governing much. It is not at a point where we are exploring what the body should look like and who should participate. We think we have the right participants but just need to organize better.

At this point, the library is responsible for implementation and governing and the partners are advocates, supporters, and review OER proposals.

I'm not sure about the governing body. The Center for New Designs in Learning and Scholarship might have an advisory board for ITEL, but I'm not certain of the details.

It is critical to have a wide mix of representatives from administration to faculty to librarians to bookstore to students, etc.

Our OER steering committee will be meeting for the first time on March 30th and includes representatives from the Libraries, Teaching & Learning Center, Information Technologies (instructional design), University Press, University Bookstore, Student Government (ASUW), Disability Resources for Students, and Undergraduate Academic Affairs.

Several departments have worked with our campus bookstore to publish "affordable" course content. These projects are not connected, except by the bookstore involvement. The Libraries have created an OER Interest Group that is working to share information and educate about OER with interested stakeholders including the bookstore, educational technology staffing, and some faculty.

Specific participants and roles will be determined before we convene the group.

The Textbook Affordability Task Force is a short-term appointed body and met only enough times to develop a set of recommendations to the provost. It is as yet to be seen what will become of those recommendations or how they will be implemented.

This is a grassroots effort to encourage understanding, incorporation, sharing, and creation of OER content. Consideration of re-envisioning instruction is a desired by-product.

This is an initiative that would benefit from a local committee.

We don't have a governing body. Each entity primarily leads their own initiative with loose coordination. Other campus partners—central IT, college level ed tech support, Center for Educational Innovation (former Center for Teaching and Learning)—serve as advocates for the initiatives and services.

SOURCE OF FUNDING FOR ACC/OER INITIATIVES

8. What are the sources of funding for the initiative? Check all that apply. N=39

Library's general operating budget	20	51%
External grants	11	28%
Library's special project fund	9	23%
Institution's general operating budget	7	18%
Academic department budget	5	13%
Institution's IT budget	3	8%
Institution's special project fund	3	8%
Endowment	2	5%
Student fee	1	3%
Other funding source	17	44%

Please specify the other funding source. N=17

A library donor provided special funds to start the initiative.

Additional support has come from the provost's office and the faculty development office.

Bookstore

Campus partner's budget

Consortium funding

Initiative funded by provincial government: Alberta Ministry of Innovation and Advanced Education

Initiative was initially funded by the institution's general operating budget, but is now sustained by the library's budget.

Initiatives thus far have been funded by students paying for the materials, though at a reduced cost. In the case of the development of an economics textbook, the department did provide some release time for faculty to work on the project and therefore funded indirectly. The Libraries are dedicating some staff time to OER outreach. The bookstore initiatives are funded through cost recovery.

Internal grant from the Vanderbilt Institute for Digital Learning

IT has provided staff to build OER repository.

Lead faculty member is providing some grant funds to pilot a stipend program in spring 2016.

Otherwise, there is no funding for this initiative at present.

None locally. The statewide project is funded by the Georgia legislature. Local faculty have been awarded grants by the project, so I will speak to these below.

Provincial government offers OER Adoption Pilot funding and peer review funding.

Student group may donate some funds as well.

Student groups on campus: University Student Government (USG) and UConn Public Research Interest Group (UConn PIRG)

UCI Open has received hundreds of thousands of dollars in external grants since 2007. One department received an anonymous gift for its work on open educational resources. Its core staffing is funded by University Extension.

Waiting to find out right now about possible institutional IT budget (one-time funding) to support a proposal for textbook purchases for large survey courses with high-cost texts.

Comments N=13

The College of Education and Human Development project is primarily funded by a grant but some support comes from the college generally. The bookstore focuses on affordability in their practices but doesn't fund anything specifically. The Libraries has allocated money for projects and staff.

Currently, no funding.

Grant funded by campus IT. Membership in the Open Textbook Network (OTN) and faculty incentives associated with that membership funded by library special projects fund if we decide to join OTN. Library's general operating budget covers all library labor involved in OER.

HR; parts of several FTE are working on the OER Initiative in the Libraries.

In the future we expect to receive funding from the provost's office in terms of a faculty course release for a faculty advocate to develop and increase awareness and knowledge among faculty and support across schools and colleges.

The cash awards come out of the library's discretionary funds (noted as "special project fund" on the list above); however, discussions are underway to have these centrally funded by the campus senior administration. Funds needed for acquisitions related to awarded projects come out of the library's regular operating budget.

The external grants were used in the first 5 years (2005–2010). The grants were from the Hewlett Foundation. For now and the foreseeable future the general budget will support Open CourseWare.

The OER Interest Group recognizes the need for a central funding source to support a campus-wide initiative.

This has not cost much yet. We did host a local program that cost about \$6K and some travel expenses.

This is likely to be adjusted as the program develops; pilot funds came from the IT budget and library and IT in-kind support.

Thus far the only initiative we've implemented is the OTN faculty reviews. Those mini-grants were paid for out of a Libraries' special project fund. We don't currently have a dedicated OER librarian. I am co-chairing the OER Steering Committee with the director of our undergraduate library.

We in the library are hoping that with the recommendations from the Textbook Affordability Task Force that the provost will add additional funds to expand the project. The Teaching & Learning Center has indicated it would also want to add funding to the project.

We're still in early planning stages and haven't determined what funding there will be and what the funding will be used for.

9. What items does the funding cover? Check all that apply. N=39

Faculty incentive or grant funds	29	74%
Library staff	16	41%
Technical support staff	12	31%
Software	10	26%
Faculty course release	7	18%
Equipment	7	18%
Other item	14	36%

Please specify the other item. N=14

A few sample copies of open textbooks in print for faculty examination.

Acquisitions

The College of Education and Human Development funding supports staff outside the Libraries.

Faculty training

Funding for student assistants

Membership in Open Textbook Network

Participation in OTN

Potentially, multi-user e-textbooks

Professional development

See above. [Lead faculty member is providing some grant funds to pilot a stipend program in spring 2016.] The first round of applications has just been submitted, reviewed, and awarded.

Support for institutional initiatives

The campus bookstore has a digital publishing service and also offers a platform for access to online texts.

The faculty member receives a NSA award; potentially it could be used for student workers, equipment, etc.—but usually it is seen as an award for the additional time needed to create an alternate textbook project.

Training for library staff and faculty.

10. Is it expected that this funding will continue or are there other plans to fund/sustain the initiative in the future? N=33

This funding will continue	24	73%
There are other funding plans	9	27%

If there are other plans to fund/sustain the initiative in the future, please briefly describe them.
N=8

Grant funding is over 18 months. Provost office has promised adequate support for five years.

If the pilot stipend program is successful, the plan is to seek funding from central university administration to continue the incentive program.

It's unclear if funding will continue at this time.

No option that matches my answer. Funding future uncertain beyond 1st year presidential pilot.

Still being determined.

We are in first round; future funding will be pursued via provost, student fees, and endowment.

We will need to include a funding model in our recommendations.

When the initial funding is expended, we plan to seek funding support from the university.

Funding will continue N=8

Again, these are specific one-time projects.

Continuing funding will come from a mixture of self-funded core operating expenses and project-based grant funding.

For the moment, the funding for staff continues and we are determining whether or not this is a service that will continue (rather than as a special initiative). It is unclear whether we will continue to provide faculty incentive funding in the future but we did just fund 22 more projects this month.

Funding for faculty incentives may continue for a short time.

It's not an option to choose both, so I'm adding a comment here. The library will continue to serve as the main funding source as long as it is needed, but we are actively soliciting support from the campus senior administration to serve as the main funding source instead.

No specific plan but it is hoped that the provost and other academic units will begin to contribute to support an expansion of this project into new areas.

Other plans in discussion—not far enough into that to specify what that may involve, but there is buy-in on multiple levels for supporting OER/ACC.

There may be additional funds in the future.

Additional comments N=5

Funding continuation is not in place.

Future funding is likely contingent on evaluation of 2016–2017 funding & programs related to OER.

Not sure about the status of ongoing funding.

Unknown at this time.

Unknown at this time. The library is discussing the issue: what is our role in creating content versus being a distributor of content.

FACULTY ACC/OER SUPPORT/INCENTIVES

11. Are there any incentives that encourage faculty to adopt, adapt, or create affordable course content/open educational resources? N=42

Yes	31	74%
No	11	26%

If yes, please indicate the type of incentive. Check all that apply. N=31

Financial incentives (grants, stipends)	25	81%
Instructional design assistance	17	55%
Course release time	5	16%
Letter of commendation	5	16%
Other incentive	9	29%

Please briefly describe the other incentive. N=9

Currently we offer ad hoc grants for faculty-identified needs. These are on a case-by-case basis and have covered funding student peer reviewers. We have also offered a great deal of graphic design support and connect faculty to another unit for instructional design support when needed.

Currently, our award allows us to provide a small financial incentive of \$200 to members of faculty who review open textbooks in their fields of expertise.

Faculty are featured on a LibGuide about the initiative.

Promise of help with lowering student cost, i.e., assistance with finding copyright compliant material, and funding for the purchase of transactional licenses for content that exceeds fair dealing.

Technical help, for example, support for producing e-books.

The creation and support of a specialized team that might include central or collegiate academic technology, Center for Educational Innovation, and Libraries support.

The faculty development center on campus offers both grants and instructional design assistance for faculty who wish to redesign their courses. While not focused on ACC/OER, these are an opportunity to introduce the concept and assess faculty interest. The library representatives on the OER working group connect faculty with subject librarians who can help them find OER/ACC and answer or refer questions re Creative Commons licensing and copyright. The university press has recently hired a position to assess needs and develop services for faculty interested in creating lower-cost and open journals and texts.

We recently joined the Open Textbook Network and we will offer incentives for faculty to attend a workshop on adopting open textbooks.

Working with Open Textbook Network at first. Gave incentives for faculty to review materials (for OTN catalog) and attend workshop—will probably do more. Had good speakers in on this subject.

12. If faculty are provided course release time, is this available university wide or only in select departments? N=7

University wide	5	71%
Select departments	2	29%

If only in select departments, please identify the departments. N=2

This is negotiated by individual faculty on a case-by-case basis.

We do not have any generally available incentives, but we are aware of one example of a department giving course release time to support the creation of an online textbook.

13. If faculty incentives include grants, what is the average grant amount and how much money has been distributed since the initiative started? N=22

Average grant amount:	Number of grants distributed to date:	Amount of grants distributed to date:
\$200	4	
\$250	about 40	
\$450	0	
\$500	0	
\$750		\$750
\$1,000		\$8,500
\$1,000		\$45,000
\$1,000		\$30,000
\$1,082	67	
\$1,135		\$42,000
\$1,200	18	
\$1,250	37	

Average grant amount:	Number of grants distributed to date:	Amount of grants distributed to date:
\$1,500	None	
\$2,950		\$67,900
\$4,466		\$67,000
\$5,000		\$5,000
\$10,,000	5	
\$15,,800	2	
new as of spring 2016		\$3,000–\$5,000 annually
unsure	~25	
unsure	unsure	
varies	n/a	

Comments N=18

Anticipated OTN grants will encourage faculty to write reviews of OER textbooks/course materials.

At one point, there was some limited provost support for faculty creating open course content, but that was suspended due to a number of reasons. Potential for that being reinstated in the future.

First incentives will be awarded in summer 2016.

Funding and grants tied to open course development, jump-start grants to fuel teaching innovation, and other projects. None are explicitly promoted as solely OER.

Grant project to launch in summer 2016; expected grants to average between \$1K and \$5K.

Grants are divided into two parts. Participants receive \$500 after completing immersion training and \$500 after implementation and assessment has been completed.

Our provost is not a fan of course release time because we need our faculty in the classroom; the preference here is to offer faculty stipends for added responsibility. We are recommending stipends for faculty who will be selected as OER advocates and will be tasked for encouraging other faculty to think first about affordability and learning quality when selecting curricular learning content.

President’s initiative provides \$12,000 for pilot program. TBD how many grants this will fund and the amount of each grant.

The faculty grants are part of larger programs from our Teaching and Learning with Technology and Center for Online Innovations in Learning units. OER adoption is one option to get funded.

The initiatives are not organized in a way that allows this determination. The range is likely ~2,000 to ~50,000.

These 20+ projects were funded in 2015 and were primarily focused on the development of open educational resources/textbooks for courses. Projects at a range of post-secondary institutions in Alberta were funded, including two at the University of Alberta. There is currently a call for grant applications for two additional programs: one for peer reviewers of OERS and the other for OER creation/adopt and internal capacity building.

This amount will be raised to \$500 during the next round. We have only implemented one round to date.

Three types of grants: \$12,000, three grants awarded; \$7,500, three grants awarded; \$1,000, nine grants awarded.

Two other projects at \$5,000 have been approved and are awaiting implementation.

We are in the middle of the first round of incentive funding. Expect ~15 faculty to be funded.

We did provide \$200 stipends for reviewing a textbook in the Open Textbook Library. Aside from that, we have not provided any other incentives. Since the OER committee is just forming, it's early days for us.

We have not yet distributed any funds to faculty.

We're still in very early planning stages; nothing has been implemented yet.

14. Please indicate if the incentive program includes any of the following requirements for faculty participants. Check all that apply. N=28

Supply data regarding the size of the course and previous textbook cost	17	61%
Submit periodic updates regarding their project	14	50%
Openly license original created works (e.g., apply a Creative Commons license)	10	36%
Share adapted or newly created works with your institution	10	36%
Assess student learning as a result of the project	10	36%
Use only openly licensed content	8	29%
Report whether they are using the learning material for a certain number of years	8	29%
Share adapted or newly created works beyond your institution	6	21%
Present to campus members as part of a faculty showcase	6	21%
Reduce student textbook costs to zero	5	18%
Participate in a faculty learning community	5	18%
Establish a research component related to the project	4	14%
Reduce auxiliary resource costs to students to zero	3	11%
Present the project beyond campus members	3	11%
Other requirement	11	39%

Please specify the other requirement. N=11

Clearly articulate how the project will be sustained once the funds have been expended.

Faculty are required to use the learning material for a minimum of two semesters.

Report experience with the program.

Share info about their efforts via our faculty Partnership for Affordable Content showcase page <https://www.lib.umn.edu/elearning/partnership/showcase>. Our incentive program strongly encourages all of the behaviors checked off above. Require may be too strong of a word. Experience to date indicates that faculty who participate in our incentive program do all of these things.

Stop using a commercial textbook for which there is a cost to students. I would say that most of all the items on this list have been an outcome of our project, but the operative word here is "required" and we don't place too many requirements on the project participants other than that they share what they are doing with others in their department and submit an evaluation at the end of the semester.

There are no requirements to use OERs as such, but awardees are encouraged to better integrate library resources into their course materials and to consider lower-cost options to high-priced course materials (or lower-cost access methods rather than purchase). Each awardee also receives personal assistance

from a library staff member, who provides suggestions/resources as appropriate that lower the cost to students.

There is no coordinated governance, therefore, no consistent requirements across any area.

These requirements are still being developed.

These requirements only apply to the pilot stipend program being launched this spring 2016. Other initiatives will have different requirements.

We encouraged faculty to have students create content, though we did not require students to openly license or transfer copyright to that content.

Workshop participation, meet with librarian

15. Do tenure/promotion policies at your institution encourage faculty to adopt, adapt, or create affordable course content/open educational resources? N=41

Yes, university wide	0	—
Yes, in select departments	1	2%
No	40	98%

If yes, but only in select departments, please identify the departments. N=1

Departments select their own promotion and tenure criteria. Departmental attitudes vary.

Additional comments N=3

I don't see this happening anytime soon here but our Textbook Affordability Task Force is recommending that the institution adds a textbook affordability statement to all course syllabi that would require faculty to indicate that they have or have not attempted to lower textbook costs by adopting open content or other alternatives (such as licensed library content).

Not that I am aware of currently.

This depends on the department. Generally not supported in most departments currently, but beginning to see this in some departments. Some departments look favorably on these efforts but we are not aware of any that formally require or privilege the creation of affordable or open course content.

16. Does your institution have an intellectual property policy that specifies who owns and who has rights to original works? N=40

Yes	39	98%
No	1	2%

If yes, please indicate who owns or has rights to the following works. N=33

Curriculum Resources	Research Outputs	Learning Software
"Designated Instructional Appointee" who created it has copyright; university has perpetual, royalty-free license to use for instructor.	Creator retains copyright (unless s/he signs it over to a publisher). University has an open access policy for research articles through which creators grant it a license so they can then post articles' text in an OA repository.	If considered part of course materials, see answer regarding Curriculum Resources.

Curriculum Resources	Research Outputs	Learning Software
Faculty and other eligible authors own the copyright to the extent such material constitute pedagogical or scholarly works; the university asserts a nonexclusive right to make use of curriculum resources, regardless of copyright ownership. Copyright ownership for curriculum materials is often tied to the amount and extent of resources the university has provided for their creation. The default for copyright ownership of curriculum materials also varies by department at the discretion of that department's administrators.	Ownership will depend on the nature of the output (data, copyright works, patentable works, etc.) and specific circumstances under which it is created.	University generally owns software if it is either patentable or has commercial value.
Author	Author	Author (with some exceptions)
Author	Author	Arizona Board of Regents
Authors	Authors	Authors
Creator	Creator	Creator
Creator (unless created with the use of "university resources")	Creator (unless created with the use of "university resources")	Creator (unless created with the use of "university resources")
Depends	Creators	Shared
Faculty	Faculty (does not apply to patents)	It depends
Faculty	Faculty	Faculty
Faculty	Traditional academic works: faculty; Patents/etc.: university/faculty	University/faculty
Faculty	Depends	Depends on how it is produced.
Faculty (University has license to use)	Faculty	Faculty (after review)
Faculty and departments	Faculty and departments	Faculty and departments
Faculty author, unless a contract is signed.	Faculty author, unless a contract is signed.	Faculty author, unless a contract is signed.
Faculty-developed content without additional support is owned by faculty.	This can vary.	This can vary.
Faculty member	Faculty member	Institution
Faculty member	Depends-see policy link below	Not sure
Faculty unless using "substantial university resources"	Faculty unless using "substantial university resources"	Faculty unless using "substantial university resources"
Faculty/creator	Depends	Depends
Generally, owned by the faculty member, teaching/graduate assistant	Generally, owned by the faculty member, graduate student	Patentable software generally owned by university; unpatentable software generally owned by creator

Curriculum Resources	Research Outputs	Learning Software
Institution	Institution	Institution
Institution	Institution	Institution
Instructor owns, university has universal license	Instructor owns	If it's faculty developed they own it.
Instructors, as long as the resource development doesn't require "significant campus resources."	Researchers, unless other arranged.	
It depends on whether the work is commissioned by the university and the extent of university resources used to create the work.	Faculty own their own scholarly output.	It depends on whether the work is commissioned by the university and the extent of university resources used to create the work.
Unclear	Creator	Creator
University	Faculty	University
University	University	University
University and author/researcher	University and author/researcher	University and author/researcher
University or Author	University or Author	University or Author
University owns, but employees may share/openly license with consent from their dean.	Employees, university retains rights to use at no cost in teaching, research, and extension.	Employees must disclose and offer the university the right to commercialize. If commercialized, a pre-established cost-sharing agreement is activated. Employees must go through a confusing process if they want to openly license software. It is not well-established, clear, or encouraged.
	All rights in scholarly books, articles, and other publications, artistic, literary, film, tape, and musical works ("Literary and Artistic Works") are granted to the faculty, staff, and students who are the authors.	"All rights in technology created by faculty members, staff members, or students with the use of university facilities or funds administered by the university are granted to the university, with income to be distributed in accordance with this [Faculty Manual] policy."

17. Please enter any additional comments you may have about faculty incentives to adopt, adapt, or create affordable course content/open educational resources. N=14

Complicated. Policy at <http://tco.osu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/PatentCopyrightPolicy.pdf>. University Libraries and the OCIO jointly support some of the staff in the Copyright Office, which lives in the libraries.

Faculty have used participation in UCI Open initiatives as part of research grant applications, particularly as a means of dissemination. There are a variety of institutional and professional benefits that fall outside of the narrow issue of faculty incentives.

I know we have an IP policy but I do not know the specifics. I believe that all of the above are viewed as work-for-hire output that the university owns, but I also believe that in fairness to faculty there are stipulations for faculty to have some ownership depending on the resource.

In our IP policy, the institution waives copyright for scholarly works, unless more than normal support is received by the author. Whether a particular type of work is owned by the author or the institution is determined by the circumstances.

Our faculty code doesn't explicitly encourage faculty adopt/adapt/create OER but the language about what qualifies as research & scholarship is vague enough that creation of OER could be counted as a scholarly activity. For example, "Contributions to a profession through published discussion of methods or through public demonstration of an achieved skill should be recognized as furthering the University's educational function. Included among these contributions are professional service activities that address the professional advancement of individuals from underrepresented groups from the faculty member's field."

Our first round promoting OER required that faculty members attend a workshop and review an OER. Our next round asks faculty members to attend a workshop and adopt an OER or library-licensed material in place of a traditional textbook.

The faculty of the School of Public Health consider creating and sharing educational material part of their basic mission.

The university's IP policies don't provide clear black/white answers to the ownership questions on the three categories of works. This is in part because ownership often depends on the identity/status of the author: faculty vs. student vs. EHRA/SHRA (exempt or subject to the state's Human Resources Act), etc.

"The University owns/has rights to all materials developed within an employee's scope of employment except 'scholarly and academic works (such as journal articles, books and papers) created by academic and research faculty who use generally available University resources.'" BUT "The University asserts its right of copyright ownership if significant University resources (including sponsor-provided funds) are used in the creation of such works, and: (a) the work generates royalty payments; or (b) the work is of commercial value that can be realized by University marketing efforts."

There are policy discussions occurring at university governance levels.

There are very few incentives beyond faculty concern for their students. There are, however, pockets of support.

Traditional products of scholarly activity have been considered to be unrestricted property of the author.

Unless work is "work for hire" faculty own IP.

With no budget set aside for financial incentives, our initiative relies on one-to-one outreach with faculty, outreach to departments, and the promise that the strength of the UTL collective is such that the actual composition of course readings lists will change very little, if at all. Our initiative has been targeted at faculty using course packs.

ACC/OER RESOURCES

18. What types of resources have faculty adopted, adapted, or created as part of the ACC/OER initiative? Check all that apply. N=30

Resources	Created ACC	Adopted ACC	Adopted OER	Adapted OER	Created OER	N
Textbook	8	9	13	10	14	24
Readings or articles	6	12	13	10	13	21

Resources	Created ACC	Adopted ACC	Adopted OER	Adapted OER	Created OER	N
Library-licensed content	1	17	4	4	0	20
Videos	4	8	9	5	14	19
Websites	5	6	10	8	13	19
Images	4	4	10	4	10	15
Online simulations	2	1	4	2	6	10
Open source software or code	1	0	4	5	3	7
Software packages	0	2	1	1	2	6
"Clicker" software	0	1	0	1	0	2
Other resource	0	1	2	1	3	5
Total Responses	12	18	20	20	23	30

If you selected Other resource/Adopted, please briefly describe the resource. N=2

Open access "applets" for a statistics course.

We have had several faculty use primary research resources available through our special collections.

If you selected Other resource/Adapted, please briefly describe the resource. N=1

Test question/exam banks

If you selected Other resource/Created, please briefly describe the resource. N=3

An e-book with public domain literature for an American Literature to 1865 course.

Open Courses (on EdX and Coursera)

Test question/exam banks

Additional comments N=2

Just launching the OER stipend pilot so we do not have this information yet.

We are still surveying to see what has been used.

ACC/OER ASSESSMENT

19. Has there been any assessment of the impact of ACC/OER on teaching and learning? N=42

Yes	17	41%
Not yet, but we plan to	19	45%
No and we have no plans to	6	14%

20. If yes, what metrics have been used? Check all that apply. N=17

Number of dollars saved by students	9	53%
Number of students using OER	8	47%
Number of students using ACC	6	35%
Number of faculty replacing course materials with OER	5	29%

Number of faculty replacing course materials with ACC	3	18%
Number of faculty adapting OER	3	18%
Number of faculty creating OER	3	18%
Number of faculty supplementing course materials with ACC	2	12%
Number of faculty creating ACC	2	12%
Number of faculty supplementing course materials with OER	2	12%
Increase in course completion	1	6%
Increase in student retention	0	—
Reduction in student drops	0	—
Other metric	11	65%

Please briefly describe the other metric. N=11

I have had faculty evaluate their projects by examining grade patterns and comparing prior years and the semester they used an alternate textbook. The primary assessment method is for faculty to survey students about their experience with an alternate textbook and then share that in a final report; so it is a mix of quantitative and qualitative findings.

Number of students whose decision to apply to School of Public Health was influenced by OER programs.

Perception of students using OpenStax College Physics textbook

Proportion of materials already held in licensed collection vs. held in print.

Qualitative

Student satisfaction with use of OER in classes

Surveys of students and instructors

Types of resources created and university services utilized.

Use of video lectures and self-evaluation of learning effectiveness

We are tracking the faculty who have reviewed Open Educational Materials and if they have adopted. We will track to see how the outcome goes.

We track the number of faculty awards, but because each award often involves a combination of library-licensed, -owned, or -digitized materials, OERs, and items the students still have to purchase, it's impossible to break that number down into the categories on this list. We also assess whether awardees' instructional objectives were achieved and the level of satisfaction with the course materials of both awardees and students.

21. If yes, who is conducting these assessments? Check all that apply. N=22

Conducts Assessment	Yes	Plan to	%
Library	9	3	55%
Teaching and learning group	1	2	14%
Instructional design group	1	2	14%
Academic computing	1	2	14%
High-level administration (president, provost, vice provost, etc.)	2	0	9%
College/academic department/unit	1	0	5%

Conducts Assessment	Yes	Plan to	%
University bookstore	1	0	5%
Local or regional consortium	1	0	5%
Faculty development center	0	1	5%
Faculty governance body or organization (e.g., faculty senate)	0	0	—
Student organization(s)	0	0	—
University press	0	0	—
University system-level administration or unit	0	0	—
Other entity	4	1	23%

If you indicated that an academic department, consortium, or other entity is conducting assessments, please identify the academic department, consortium, and/or other entity. N=7

College/academic department/unit N=1

Outreach College

Local or regional consortium N=1

Campus Alberta OER Initiative

Other entity N=5

Admissions Office of the School of Public Health

Emory Center for Digital Scholarship

OER Textbook Working Group

Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment

UCI Open

22. If an assessment has been done, are the results shared publicly? N=18

Yes 7 39%

No 11 61%

If yes, where? N=6

Presentations at faculty teaching events

Publication forthcoming

Report published online (3 responses)

Yes, in reports shared with senior administrators, colleagues, and at conferences, in which individual recipients are not described in any identifiable way.

LIBRARY ACC/OER SUPPORT ACTIVITIES/SERVICES

23. Please indicate the types of ACC/OER support activities/services your library currently provides or plans to provide. Check all that apply. N=42

Support Activities	Currently provides	Plans to provide	N
Copyright and/or open licensing consultations	37	4	39
Reserves (print and electronic) software and services that provide access to course content	38	2	38
Support for identifying (searching/finding) affordable content for a course	27	12	35
Local repository for openly licensed content	30	6	34
Education services on open/affordable content topics	26	6	30
Educate or work with student advocacy groups on campus	27	3	29
Funding for the purchase of additional print and electronic textbooks/course materials	22	5	25
Software systems that support the publication of openly licensed books	12	6	18
Staff support for the publication of openly licensed books or other learning objects (e.g., editing, formatting, and other traditional publication services)	12	4	15
New course design support including open/affordable content	11	5	15
Software systems that integrate free and fee-based content (e.g., digital course packs)	13	1	14
Instructional design support for new and (redesign) existing courses	11	3	13
Hosting or other support for student textbook exchange program	2	1	3
Other support activity/service	6	1	6
Total Responses	41	24	42

If you selected “Other support activity/service,” please briefly describe the activity/service. N=6

Information sessions and outreach activities on campus.

Regarding the two items connected with the publication of openly licensed books: those are either provided by or under development by the university system of which our campus is part.

Reserve textbooks, we also purchase multi-user e-books (textbooks) when available.

The library links to open resources through the catalog.

The undergraduate library has a \$2,000/year budget for buying books requested by faculty for reserves. They also order e-books on request but do not get many of these. Some requests come from faculty through subject librarians. If print is requested and e-book can be ordered, it is made available through the catalog for all students’ access. The library’s media resources center provides a range of services to instructors, including ordering films, providing video editing equipment, audio/video equipment for checkout. The health sciences library gets support materials for courses, though not in every case. The collection development librarian quite frequently gets an e-book when requested, if there is one available for this purpose; she also seeks out databases and services that are supposed to be for classroom/training support. Examples – HS Talks, Browzine, assorted streaming videos, BoardVitals, anatomy dbs, etc. Some were requested; all were bought while working with faculty to encourage them to use them. Some are open in part, and we have collected them. For 7+ years, the library has supported a book exchange for medical students. Estimated per-student savings for 100+ students is \$500.00.

We also held a forum for faculty to showcase the work they had done.

Additional comments N=4

Note: new course design and course redesign handled by another unit, Center for Online and Distance Learning, with whom we are working closely and hope to have a relationship beneficial to both units.

Office of Distance Education and eLearning (ODEE) has staff support for the publication of openly licensed books or other learning objects (e.g., editing, formatting, and other traditional publication services). University Center for the Advancement of Teaching (UCAT) does new course design support including open/affordable content and support for identifying (searching/finding) affordable content for a course.

Promotes the good work of faculty who participate in our alternate textbook project.

We provide funding support for the purchase of additional print and electronic course materials, but generally speaking not textbooks.

24. If your library provides or plans to provide educational services to faculty, please indicate which topics are covered. Check all that apply. N=40

Services	Currently provides	Plans to provide	N
Author's rights	37	4	40
Open licensing	32	5	36
How/where to deposit open materials	31	5	35
Open publishing	28	6	33
Copyright contract negotiation	23	4	27
Innovative pedagogy	12	3	14
Other topic	2	2	3
Total Responses	39	12	40

If you selected Other topic/Currently provides, please briefly describe the topic. N=2

Impact of OER use on student success

The libraries' Scholarly Communications Officer consults or teaches on all of these, however, the faculty development center provides more services in the area of innovative pedagogy.

If you selected Other topic/Plans to provide, please briefly describe the topic. N=2

Impact of OER use on student success; support for authoring, licensing, hosting, and distributing OER (in conjunction with campus academic computing resources).

Support creation projects: programming, platform support, etc. Innovative pedagogy addressed by other units; coordinating efforts.

Additional comments N=3

How to find and evaluate OER and affordable course content. How and where to deposit new content.

Many support activities provided by Digital Scholarship Librarian but not specifically under ACC/OER umbrella. Similarly, reserves and liaison work occasionally support activities, again not currently under a specific ACC/OER initiative.

Others in the library provide support for open educational materials that are not formally labeled as OER, for example, open projects and materials created by faculty and staff in history, public and

global health, nursing, archeology, and other areas. Librarians have also provided help to faculty developing MOOCs.

LIBRARY STAFF ACC/OER PARTICIPATION

25. What departments within the library contribute staffing to these activities/services? Check all that apply. N=41

Scholarly Communications	34	83%
Library Liaisons	30	73%
Public Service/Reference	22	54%
Teaching & Learning	20	49%
Administration	19	46%
Collections & Technical Services	17	42%
University Press	5	12%
Other department	12	29%

Please specify the other department. N=12

Access

Copyright Office (2 responses)

Data and Technology

Digital Library Initiatives

Emory Center for Digital Scholarship

Interlibrary Loan

Library Systems Department

Marketing department and IT services

Note: University press not part of libraries but provides platform and other OA/OER support.

Teaching and Learning isn't a department that we have; it's part of our Collections, Research, and Instruction department and our New Media Center.

We are supplying MARC records and repository records for the Open Textbook Network.

26. How many library staff are involved in supporting these activities/services? N=33

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	N
1	25	9.21	6.00	6.86	29

Comments N=18

~10-15

10 plus, but none full time really

2 (1 FTE + portions of other personnel equaling a second FTE)

20+ (if you include reference staff and liaisons who are able to help/answer questions relating to OER and finding OER)

3 full-time staff, 2 administrative sponsors (AULS), other liaisons and staff as appropriate, specifically including our course reserves staff and Copyright Librarian

4: 1 at 60% FTE and the others as special project assistance only

About 16

About 20

Approximately 20. It varies because it is project-based.

Counting a graduate research assistant, there are six.

Currently, the three positions listed below are explicitly assigned to this work (two are co-chairs of the OER steering committee, one is the Libraries Copyright Officer). However, I don't know how many liaison librarians are doing this work. I'm listing one who has been very active in advocating for OER to her department, but I'm sure there are others who support OER adoption in the normal course of their work with faculty. The Steering Committee co-chairs are trying to educate liaisons about ways to talk with faculty about OER, so this work will increasingly become part of what they do.

Difficult to estimate, since so many are involved either directly as a point person on a given award or tangentially in support of a service used by awardees (e.g., reserves).

In fall 2015 we assigned one librarian to coordinate activities related to OER. Other librarians provide support within the Libraries.

It is primarily administered by one staff member, but all the others listed are needed to participate at different times, perhaps for promotion, support, program development, etc.

Mostly just one liaison; others help, perhaps 2 or 3.

Over 25

There are no dedicated numbers of staff involved. This is integrated within work of liaisons and scholarly communications officer within the libraries. Four library staff have served fairly regularly on the working group/advisory team. Collections & Technical Services pays for and manages some subscriptions that subsidize aspects of ACC/OER, e.g., memberships that provide author subsidies such as Biomed Central, etc. We also serve as electronic resources/tech support when something goes wrong. This staff also seeks out and adds evaluated OER to the catalog for users to find, sometimes directly promoting them if we have a personal contact among the faculty or the library liaisons.

These are all anticipated participants. Exact numbers TBD.

27. Please enter the position titles of up to five library staff who support affordable /open course content activities/services. N=40

One Position Reported N=1

Undergraduate Experience Librarian

Two Positions Reported N=4

Associate University Librarian for Research and Instructional Services

Library Publishing and Scholarly Communications Specialist

Copyright Officer

Manager, Digitization and Repository Services

Librarian
ScholarSpace Manager
User Engagement Librarian
Subject Librarian

Three Positions Reported N=5

Assistant deans
Subject librarians
Acquisitions coordinator

Director Copyright and Scholarly Communications
Multimedia Project Manager
Librarian (various)

Director of Digital Scholarship
Senior Associate Dean
Academic Liaisons

Scholarly Communications Librarian
Subject Specialist Librarian
Instructional Technologist

Scholarly Communications Officer
Director - Center for Instructional Technology
Academic Technology Consultants

Four Positions Reported N=10

Assistant Interlibrary Loan Librarian
Head of Circulation
Reference Librarian
Head of Systems

AUL Undergraduate & Distance Learning
Head of Liaison & Instruction Services
Digital Scholarship Librarian
Librarian/Bibliographer III

Collections and Scholarly Communications Librarian
Digital Projects Librarian
Social Sciences Librarian

Education Librarian

Director of the Undergraduate Library

Libraries Copyright Officer

Coordinator for Access Services

Business Librarian

Director, Copyright and Digital Scholarship

Undergraduate Instruction and Outreach Librarian

Interim Associate Head, Digital Library Initiatives

Associate Director for Collections and Scholarly Communication

Director, Scholarly Communications

Associate Dean for Collections

Director, Liaison & Instruction Services

Coordinator, Institutional Repository

Director, Scholarly Communications

Copyright & Scholarly Communications Librarian

Scholarly Repository Librarian

Digital Learning Specialist

Liaison Librarian

Assistant Dean for Collections and Scholarly Communication

Other liaison might supply some information on the topic.

Digital Repository Unit Coordinator

Open Education, Copyright & Scholarly Communications Librarian

Graphic Designer

Marketing Manager (Supervises graphic designer)

IT Specialist

Open Educational Resources Coordinator

Student Assistant, OER

Associate Dean, Scholarly Resources & Services

Subject liaison librarians

Five Positions Reported N=20

Associate Dean for Public Services

Director of User Services and Resource Sharing

Associate Dean for Collections Strategies and Services

Directory of Research and Teaching

Digital Scholarship Librarian

Associate Dean for Research and Learning Services

Department Head, Digital Resources and Discovery

Associate Professor, Academic Liaison

Department Head, Library Systems

Instructional Developer

Associate University Librarian

Social Sciences Librarian

Sciences Librarian

Collections Strategist

Undergraduate Engagement Librarian

Associate University Librarian for Collection Management and Scholarly Communication

Director of Communication

Head of Scholarly Communication and Licensing

Copyright and Licensing Librarian

Librarian for Digital Collection Management

Copyright Outreach Librarian

Copyright Outreach Librarian

Copyright Outreach Librarian

Scholarly Communications and Licensing Specialist

Head, Scholarly Communications and Copyright

Digital Projects Manager

Scholarly Communication and Special Initiatives Librarian

Copyright Librarian

Academic Department Liaison

Academic Department Liaison

Digital Repository Services Librarian

Public Services Manager

Collections Coordinator

Copyright Librarian

Public Services Librarian [liaisons]

Director of Scholarly Communication

Director Teaching & Learning Programs

E-Learning Librarian

Outreach & Instruction Librarian

School of Education, Manager of Library and Instruction Services

Director, Scholarly Repository Services

Strategist

Scholarly Communication Librarian

Senior Director, Content Stewardship and Program Director, Academic Preservation Trust

Director of Information Policy

Head, Access Services

Library Assistant 2, Reserves

Library Assistant 2, Streaming Services

Undergraduate Experience Librarian

Campus & Community Engagement Librarian

Head of Access Services

Metadata Librarian

Copyright Officer

Reference & Instruction Librarian

Online Learning Librarian

Head of Copyright Resources

Subject Librarian

Coordinator for Outreach & Engagement

Collection Development Program Coordinator

Head of Teaching & Learning

Head, Office of Scholarly Communication & Copyright

Scholarly Communication Librarian

Project Manager, Office of Scholarly Communication & Copyright

Business Librarian

Library Coordinator

Head of Outreach and Education

AUL for Public Services

Research Librarian for Chemistry

Head of Access Services

AUL for Research Resources

Head, Scholarly Communications and Copyright

Copyright Outreach Librarian

Copyright Outreach Librarian

Copyright Outreach Librarian

Digital Projects Librarian

Head of Scholarly Publishing and University Press

Managing Editor

Head, University Copyright Office

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs

Associate Dean for Research

Head of User Services, Health Sciences Library

Director of Research and Instructional Services, University Libraries

Scholarly Communications Officer

Research Assistants

User Experience staff

Program Development Lead, eLearning Support Initiative

Technology Lead, eLearning Support Initiative

Web Application Developer, Library Initiatives

Course Reserve Coordinator

Copyright Program Librarian

Scholarly Communication Librarian

Acquisitions

Associate Dean

Digital Scholarship Librarian

Subject Specialist (multiple)

Vice Provost for University Libraries

Reference, Instruction, and Liaison Librarian

Associate University Librarian for Collections & Discovery

Waterbury Regional Library Director & Regional Campus Library Coordinator

Head of Marketing & Communications

28. Please indicate the approximate amount of time each position spends on these activities/services.

N=39

Positions	Some time each month	Some time each week	Significant time each week	Some time each day	Significant time each day	N
Position 1	16	9	5	5	4	39
Position 2	18	10	3	2	5	38
Position 3	20	8	4	1	2	35
Position 4	19	6	1	3	0	29
Position 5	13	4	2	1	0	20
Total Responses	32	22	11	6	7	39

29. Please briefly describe ways that library staff have successfully engaged faculty around affordable course content/open educational resources issues. N=26

“Some time each month” is probably overstating. We have had a few meetings to discuss this. Library staff have not engaged faculty around ACC/OER. We have referred to the UCI Extension/UCI Open.

Co-sponsored training for faculty and helping faculty identify OER resources.

Faculty are particularly receptive to the opportunity to shape library collections as they relate to instruction, which is one of the options our initiative offers. They appreciate the flexibility of how they can spend their award money and very much appreciate the speedy, personalized service the library provides to identify, acquire, digitize, or otherwise make accessible course materials. Summary: the most successful engagement strategy involves making it clear to potential applicants the amount of hands-on assistance they’ll receive.

Faculty have attended several workshops on ACC and OER at the main campus and two of our regional campuses. They are presented with the big picture: the problem of student debt and exorbitant prices for commercial texts, information about what open means and Creative Commons licensing, hands on with both online open textbooks as well as a few print versions (from OpenStax), and liaison librarians have distributed our LibGuide amongst their faculty. This has resulted in one adoption, several very interested faculty, and helped the library understand better what concerns the faculty have about these materials. Our chemistry faculty will be using an open textbook for all entry-level classes starting in the fall of 2016. That is 1850 students. Savings of over \$500,000 in that semester alone. We actively promote use of library e-materials for classes as well in these workshops and on our LibGuide.

Held information sessions. Met one-on-one with faculty. Sent mass emails. Responded to faculty inquiries.

Held training sessions. Worked with faculty on grant-funded OER/ACC activities, particularly identifying sources.

I am currently having conversations with faculty who are interested in publishing Open Textbooks and will be supporting them in their efforts as part of a pilot project. We also hosted the Open Textbook Network workshop, and about 20 faculty attended. Some of those are writing reviews for the OTL. Also our business librarian has been identifying OER that could replace traditional textbooks that are being used in high enrollment courses. She hasn’t gotten an adoption yet, but she’s hoping to speak with a curriculum committee soon.

Liaison librarians were provided information about the pilot stipend program that they shared with faculty. Research assistants have helped build a library guide and add faculty profiles of those incorporating OERs into their courses. The lead faculty person and the Head of User Services were interviewed about the OER initiative for a national blog article (<http://blog.aace.org/?s=hemminger&submit=Go>).

Librarians have leveraged current e-book licensing and sharing available texts with instructors for integration into courses.

Lots of individual outreach and information gathering among campus partners to date

OER presentation during Open Access Week

Our incentive grants have had the greatest impact on reaching out to faculty and working to create/adopt/adapt affordable content or open resources. Expanding our reach by educating other colleagues (outside the libraries) who work with faculty on course design about our services has also had the most impact. We have engaged with faculty through a variety of workshops.

Outreach to faculty using course packs has been very successful.

Participating in faculty development programs around shifting to online and blending learning.

Participating in institutional MOOC project. Consulting to individual faculty through course reserves, liaison, instructional, or reference services.

Primarily we have gotten faculty to stop using commercial textbooks and start using affordable course content and OER. Not only is this our way of engaging faculty but we know that the faculty who participate in our project have influenced their colleagues to seek alternate approaches to delivering curricular learning content.

Receiving referrals and working with faculty at the point of need. Integrating 'Open' into copyright instruction. Offering open textbook adoption workshops through training provided by the Open Textbook Network. Collaborating with instructional designers to get access to faculty in the course re-design process.

Successful workshops and outreach

The academic liaison has coordinated information table displays in the library for OER Week and OA Week, sent outreach email to faculty, met with interested individual instructors who contact him directly, and communicated with graduate teaching assistants of general education classes. Other librarians and library staff have assisted with some of these efforts.

The Libraries are giving presentations at teaching events and coordinating OER Interest Group activities. We sponsored OER Week activities in 2016.

To date primarily in association with open access conversations, etc. Specific ACC/OER initiative begins with library staff OTN training this summer.

Two library staff members attended an SECU-sponsored event on open access and open educational resources; they assisted in writing an internal grant and now participate in the OER working group with the faculty PI.

University Libraries recently hosted three events related to Open Education Week. These events were designed to engage faculty in discussions related to OERs. One session focused on Creative Commons licensing, another provided participants with a keynote and introductory workshop on the why, whats, and hows of OERs, and the final session was a panel that highlighted library, student, and faculty projects aiming to address textbook affordability. We also recently partnered with our local Students' Union to make a significant number of course textbooks available on reserve in the library. We are currently in the process of reviewing data and soliciting feedback from students on the impact of this project.

We have completed multiple outreach efforts through news articles, surveys, and other promotion. Workshops have grown in content and attendance through promotion and word of mouth.

Webinar series, immersion training for the Emory Open Education Initiative program, faculty forum
Webinars, library guides, in-person discussion

Workshops, library guides, websites

LIBRARY STAFF ACC/OER SKILLS

30. Please indicate the knowledge, skills, and abilities your library employees need to have or develop to meet the needs of the initiative. Check all that apply. Then select up to three that are the most important. N=42

Knowledge, Skill, Ability	Need	Most Important
Familiarity with the availability of ACC/OER resources	39	24
Intellectual property/copyright/open licensing	38	25
Familiarity with search strategies for ACC/OER resources	35	18
Assessment	29	7
Familiarity with the learning management system	26	4
Project management	25	11
System/technology	18	1
Publishing skills	15	4
How to conduct a reference interview	14	3
Instructional design	11	6
Media design/creation	11	1
Media editing	9	1
Editorial skills	6	1
Other knowledge, skills, and abilities	10	6

If you selected “Other knowledge, skills, and abilities,” please briefly describe the knowledge, skill, and/or ability. N=10

Need N=4

Communication skills, public speaking, etc.

Familiarity with the benefits of ACC/OER and ability to communicate about concerns associated with commercial, proprietary, online course content

I would add familiarity with the course e-reserve system that is embedded in the learning management system.

Presentation skills. Effective communication skills. Imagination. Openness to constant change and the ability to cope with it. Deep interest in the concept of affordable/open. Caring about social justice issues in education. Comfortable with going outside the library to engage all sorts of people and groups.

Need and Most Important N=6

Appropriate/approved use of state funds

Familiarity with the wealth of supportive resources for faculty on campus: what is offered by the faculty development center, university press, bookstore, instructional design units, scholarly communications officer, etc.

Graphic design

How to work well with others, how to manage a team effort, flexibility, adaptability

Marketing campaign skills and knowledge of distribution channels

Need: The skills that were not selected are ones we know are available elsewhere on campus or in the university system. They're important, but library staff don't necessarily need to have them because we know we can get them outside the library. Most important: the ability to listen and really understand and address a need. This is part of doing a reference interview (also selected), but I wanted to call it out on its own.

31. What professional development opportunities have library employees found helpful to further their knowledge, skills, and abilities in support of the initiative? Check all that apply. N=40

Professional conferences	32	80%
In-person training/workshops	29	73%
Virtual training/Webinars	27	68%
Online discussion groups/professional communication	24	60%
Other professional development opportunities	5	13%

Please briefly describe the other professional development opportunities. N=5

ASERL [Association of Southeastern Research Libraries] webinars, CCC-OER [Community College Consortium for Open Educational Resources] webinars, and discussion via the SPARC Lib-OER group have been extremely helpful. Training from the Gen textbook network has been helpful. There are not many in-person training opportunities on this topic.

EdX meetings

In-person training/workshops are currently in planning.

The library staff on the working group/advisory team have benefited from an early onsite visit from a scholarly communications officer from Amherst, where a well developed program exists; the research the lead faculty member has done and shared in group meetings; a survey conducted on a scholarly communications listserv, a faculty development listserv, and a health sciences listserv; research assistant's compilation of information on OER programs from university websites; discussions at meetings of the larger advisory group members

We will be hosting an onsite staff workshop on open textbooks this spring semester.

FUTURE LIBRARY ACC/OER ROLE

32. Please briefly describe what you envision as the role of research libraries in affordable course content services in the future. N=45

Academic research libraries will play a key role in facilitating discovery of and access to open educational resources. Library publishing services will provide alternatives to commercial publishing options. Academic libraries will work with faculty to leverage licensed and purchased digital collections as affordable course content.

Advocacy and promotion within university to faculty through digital and liaison services.

Building awareness about the real costs of commercial course content and supporting campus initiatives towards providing more affordable course content options.

By harnessing the experience and skills established to support open scholarship, libraries are well positioned to both partner with and establish their own presses to create open textbooks, increasing access to knowledge.

Continue to encourage use of library-licensed content in classes and provide technical infrastructure and staff to support this role.

I believe that the research library can and should take a leadership role on campus to advocate for textbook affordability, to fund incentive programs, to educate and create awareness about textbook affordability to create an institutional strategy that will help to ensure program success and to create a coalition of campus partners who will work to make textbook affordability an institutional priority.

I don't see a huge shift from what we currently do. We provide scanning services for content that falls within fair use and our university has an affordable coursepack system for content that does not. Course reserve staff will assist faculty with creating stable links in Canvas to our licensed content. As faculty become more sensitized to the course materials cost issues, they may seek more assistance from librarians in finding affordable course content.

I expect that research libraries will make the costs of materials more transparent to faculty, allowing them to understand better the financial implications of curricular resource selection.

I see it as an area where the library can play a leadership role facilitating services, content and expertise.

I would like to see groups of libraries work on publishing/grants for open educational content. I would like to see individual library help in the area of education, identification, etc.

I'd like to see libraries negotiate better publisher agreements that give explicit permission to use licensed manuals in courses. Ultimately, I'd like to see more open access publishing and outrageous subscription prices driven down. I'm very hesitant to put many efforts in the area of affordability without tackling the larger publisher-monopoly issues. (This is my personal opinion and not necessarily that of my institution.)

Integrating affordable content into courses (specifically LMSs) by working closely with faculty should be one of the primary services that research libraries offer. This is a service area we expect to make significant progress and see significant growth in the next three years.

Leveraging our library holdings and resources to maximum potential in order to support the teaching and learning needs of the institution. This means expanding course reserve, pushing boundaries of copyright and fair use, advocating what we have, and assessing what we're not providing.

Libraries are often seen as the stewards of information. This should include open information as well. We provide expertise in searching and synthesizing content to fill the needs of faculty and students of the university.

Libraries are part of a broader campus-wide conversation about the high cost of texts. Different units are approaching the problem from different perspectives and strategies. Libraries focus on open materials.

Libraries have an opportunity to lead in these areas and we should. We should be an active participant in the research life of the university.

Libraries should participate in development of standards, business/funding models, and policies to enable availability, integration, and accessibility of ACC in formats that are most useful to teachers and learners. Libraries should be a partner with other campus leaders in developing strategies and programs to support ACC services. In addition, libraries can provide skills and systems to support discovery, authoring, licensing, publishing, and archiving of ACC.

Libraries will bring together interested parties, help identify best practices, provide structure, host content, and share knowledge of distribution channels.

Libraries will continue their role in providing access to affordable licensed content, but will also become increasingly active as partners in creating low-cost course content for students.

More effectively leveraging research libraries' vast collections and extensive expertise for instructional purposes is where research libraries can provide the utmost value to universities' efforts to adopt affordable and/or open course content. There are many departments on a given campus that could lead an effort focused exclusively on open content. But librarians and library staff, with their deep knowledge of their holdings, how to find materials, copyright issues, and making materials accessible, provide a much richer level of service.

Much expanded from where we are now, but need buy-in from faculty and university admin to make it work since the curriculum decisions are so tied to what the teaching faculty does. Everyone agrees saving students \$\$ is a good idea, but when the rubber hits the road it will take time and effort to make the changes necessary.

Partner with faculty, the bookstore, and others to select and make content available, perhaps through our institutional repository. Also play an educational role in helping campus community understand their options. We have already been purchasing multiple-simultaneous user e-books, some of which are used as textbooks; these are therefore affordable for the students. We will continue this practice.

Partnering with other campus units, providing examples of how course content can be provided using alternate mechanisms besides student-purchased materials, and hosting resources.

Potentially a hub/clearinghouse, or tied more closely to educational, instructional, and information literacy design initiatives.

Providing suitable e-resources, continuing to provide textbook reserves. Helping faculty identify and link to ACC.

Providing technical platforms, applications, and knowledgeable staff to support the production of ACCs, as well as search mechanisms for finding developed content. We already administer the campus learning management system and the open access repository. Making the link between the two as it relates to ACC/OER more explicit is a goal.

Purchasing textbooks for library reserve. Using library technical services staff to negotiate, license and do group purchasing of textbooks. Supporting faculty with applications like courseware plugins that allow them to assign and track use of library-licensed e-content that is already available.

Research libraries can help faculty find alternative, high-quality, low-cost materials. Maybe provide grants. Research libraries can provide customized course pages linking students to content (print and electronic).

Research libraries have been great innovators and one of the major driving forces behind the affordable course content movement. I think that beyond OER (expanded below), we will need to collect and promote this course content in our collections and discovery services.

Research libraries will continue to drive the adoption of affordable course material, but will do it in concert with other campus stakeholders such as administration, faculty, university presses, and students.

Role of libraries: Assist faculty who wish to publish or adopt open content in doing so. This may mean publishing with us online/print-on-demand or referring them to other disciplinary repository sites. It could also mean helping faculty to find appropriate open content for their courses. Continue current efforts in producing course packs that reduce the costs to the students by ensuring that library resources are appropriately leveraged and that copyright charges aren't paid twice.

Supporting role: licensing and reserves expertise

The library has a great deal of experience with storing and disseminating research and learning materials, and should therefore take an active role collecting and supporting the use of open educational resources.

The library is creating a task force on Open Educational Resources (OERs) and Open Textbooks. The task force will be reviewing the background of past OER/Open Textbook initiatives at the university. The task force will be reviewing current OER/Open Textbook landscape beyond the university including academic libraries and how they are leading and support successful OER/Open textbook programs. The task force will identify key decisions including developing local OERs versus adoption of OER content.

The library will be a very important player in providing affordable course content through use of our ever-growing research and scholarly collections in both digital, and to a lesser degree, print. We envision a discovery tool that will allow both for easy linking within course management software and expedient discovery through the development of highly sophisticated search tools. We expect our search tools to easily and seamlessly flow from discovery to delivery in the future.

The library would like to be involved with these initiatives in the future, but so far a campus-wide, large-scale initiative has not been started. Only smaller initiatives have been championed so far.

The role of research libraries in affordable course content services in the future builds on our longstanding roles in providing information resources for teaching and learning. Library materials are by their nature “affordable” and particularly so when they are digital and licensed for use without any multi-user restrictions. An important role for research libraries is advocating for great use of already licensed content in courses and building tools to enable more seamless content integration. Pursuing digitization programs with attention to campus teaching and learning needs is another important strategy. Ultimately, the greatest challenge is communications and outreach. Research libraries provide access to immense amounts of content but it is underutilized because it is not always easy to discover, access, and integrate.

There are areas on campus that are investigating affordable course content, but it is too preliminary for a cohesive plan.

There are opportunities to pull resources to license necessary educational content.

To support faculty to develop and include affordable content.

We already often have the platforms available to deliver them, such as digital repositories or e-reserve systems. I see greater use being made of them in the future for this purpose.

We believe libraries can and should play an integral role in providing these services, but we’re still trying to figure out what that means for our institution.

We envision our future role as one where we engage more actively with faculties to become collaborators in their course design to better promote ACC. In addition, we expect partnerships with editors to add ACC in our collections.

We envision our role being that of a change agent. Over time we hope to change faculty culture and thinking as it relates to the use and creation of course content. Often faculty don’t know what options might be available to them beyond traditional textbooks and/or they don’t have the time to make changes to what they already use without some added incentive and support. We provide that incentive and support and extend our reach by educating other central teaching and learning support staff on campus about what we can do to help faculty. Little by little we are seeing our impact and reach grow. Our approach also allowed us to build the infrastructure that supports the types of new projects (open textbooks, digital course packs, interactive course companions, and more) faculty describe as their

ideal outcomes. We hope to encourage other libraries to participate as well through larger collaborative efforts like Unizin and the CIC to grow the impact at a national level.

We think the library should play a key role on campus as the advocates for affordable course content services in the future. Further, we can provide a critical support role in helping faculty identify possible content, as well as offering incentives to encourage affordable course content. The library should be the campus leaders in this area, in addition to creating the necessary infrastructure for these activities.

33. Please briefly describe what you envision as the role of research libraries in open educational resources services in the future. N=49

As the number and breadth of OERs continues to grow, instructors will need more assistance to discover suitable OERs. As we move away from teaching from the textbook, instructors will require more assistance in instructional design for flipped or online classrooms, multimedia production, and creating digital learning objects. There is also a role for the library in storing and preserving some of this content, or referring instructors to a suitable repository.

A key role for research libraries in OER services is as a partner/facilitator with faculty and students in OER development, discovery, access, and use. Right now there are many OER repositories but there is a need to improve discoverability across the diverse range that exist.

Deliver on digital repository platforms. Use of digital collections creation expertise to also aid in creation. Support services for authors.

Engaging with faculty about identifying and creating open educational resources, and collaborating with other units on campus to promote and support OER.

Hosting a platform that supports the hosting and publication of open e-textbooks and open e-journals.

Hosting and discovery services. Facilities, support, and training enabling production of ACC/OER materials.

I believe that libraries will take on greater publishing roles (both of Open Access and OER content) and will naturally continue to aid faculty in the discovery, evaluation, and implementation. Libraries will seek grants or divert collection development funds to fund the creation of content and grants provided to faculty to adopt OER.

I expect that research libraries will continue to develop their support for open educational resources, especially assisting with the identification of high-quality OER across various fields of study.

I feel we can own the resources services space both in content and providing infrastructure.

I see research libraries able to facilitate cross-institutional collaboration to create and host OER.

I think our librarians will be routinely called upon to assist with finding discipline-specific OER similarly to how we currently assist with research. Many academic libraries will have positioned themselves as leaders in OER by starting and coordinating campus initiatives, so we will be looked to as the OER experts on campus and will continue to provide programming around OER. Many of us will provide a publishing platform for creation of OER.

I'd like to see libraries play a more active role in providing alternative publishing options for faculty and groups of faculty who become aware of cost-related student textbook problems. I'd like to see libraries continuing to raise awareness regarding the problem that expensive textbooks and learning software pose for students. I'd like to see groups of libraries work together to enable groups of faculty to create high-quality, top-scholar-written, learning materials that will be freely available and editable/openly licensed. I'd like to see libraries leading collaborations in open education (textbooks, technology, and assessment) with instructional designers, IT, and pedagogy experts in response to faculty and

administrative (and student) requests for assistance in these areas. I'd like to see liaisons trained to assist faculty in finding open course materials.

Librarians and staff at research libraries can provide invaluable assistance with search strategies to identify the most appropriate OERs. They can advise on rights issues for individuals who want to create OERs. And they can offer cataloging expertise to better organize the already vast body of OERs and make it easier for instructors to find exactly the right one at the point of need.

Libraries and librarians will expand their roles beyond knowledge of traditional publishing and printing arenas to include depth of knowledge in Open Educational Resources general and subject specific repositories. We will take a very active role in providing discovery tools for faculty to be directed most efficiently to curricular materials available on the open web as well as providing guidance in Creative Commons licensing newly created teaching materials. Libraries will also become storehouses for locally produced open instructional materials open to all.

Libraries have an opportunity to lead in these areas and we should. We should be an active participant in the research life of the university.

Libraries should participate in development of standards, business/funding models, and policies to enable availability, integration, and accessibility of OER in formats that are most useful to teachers and learners. Libraries should be a partner with other campus leaders in developing strategies and programs to support OER services. In addition, libraries can provide skills and systems to support discovery, authoring, licensing, publishing, and archiving of OER.

Libraries will become the central hub of content, with the Institutional Repository leading the way to storing and providing access to that content. Services will also include the development of content through research and collaboration.

Libraries will develop OER services in several ways. First, they will be advocates for the development of OERs. Second, they will provide educational services to increase awareness of using OERs in the classroom, both integration of OERs created elsewhere and locally created OERs. Finally, OERs will become an important part of the portfolios of library publishing initiatives.

Libraries, along with bookstores, teaching and learning centers, and IT departments, will continue to lead the way in providing these services.

Our future role in OERs is very similar to the answer above. In addition, we will provide expanding outreach, education, and consultations related to content licensing, OER impact (i.e., metrics & usage), as well as providing services around the life-cycle of OERs, including planning, production, versioning, archiving, publishing, and preservation.

Our role will be working with faculty to identify, locate, procure, and integrate OERs into LMSs so that students can have low-cost, convenient access to the research materials they need to succeed in their courses.

Partner with faculty, the bookstore, and others to select and make content available, perhaps through our IR. Also play an educational role in helping campus community understand their options.

Partnering with other campus units, advocating and educating instructional and teaching staff in open access materials, providing assistance with copyright and other issues.

Potentially a hub/clearinghouse, or tied more closely to educational, instructional, and information literacy design initiatives.

Providing assistance in locating and identifying OERs, copyright and licensing consultations, learning object repository to host OERS.

Providing better ways to sort and search for OER. Providing clear guidance on publishing OER.

Providing copyright assistance, identifying open materials.

Providing expertise, resources, and fertile space to power transformative open education.

Research libraries have licensed content that can be used in classrooms. Libraries can help with creation of digital course packs.

Research libraries will be in the OER services. Research libraries will be encouraging the use of open materials, support the access to open materials for both faculty and students, and encourage production of open textbooks and materials. Research libraries will help us find and reuse OERs, as well as make our OERs discover-able.

Research libraries will continue to drive the adoption of affordable course material, but will do it in concert with other campus stakeholders such as administration, faculty, university presses, and students. They will support the creation of new OER by acting as a consultant, publisher, and promoter.

Research libraries will make OER resources findable in local catalogs; will work on system “dumps” of publicly available material. Librarians have domain knowledge and data collection expertise.

Research libraries, especially those that oversee a university press, should take a leadership role in identifying where gaps exist in the existing open textbook literature to strategically develop and produce open textbooks—and develop publishing platforms that simplify the process for faculty at all institutions to adapt their learning content for openness. These libraries should also create global partnerships to ensure that libraries and partner organizations are working together to create textbook affordability. In general, create a culture of openness in higher education.

Same as above. [I'd like to see libraries play a more active role in providing alternative publishing options for faculty and groups of faculty who become aware of cost-related student textbook problems.]

See above. [Much expanded from where we are now.]

See above. [We envision our role being that of a change agent.] Applies to affordable and OER. We focus on what best meets the faculty needs rather than one particular content type. OER may not be the answer for everyone.

Support for adoption, adaptation, and creation through outreach and information provision, project funding, identifying useful resources, tech support for projects.

Support national OER efforts. It's preferable to have OER published in national/disciplinary repositories instead of each academic library maintaining their own repositories.

Supporting role: copyright and repository expertise

The libraries can collect and catalog teaching, learning, and research resources that are free to use, share, and adapt. The libraries can help faculty identify free or low-cost alternatives to expensive textbooks. Libraries can advise faculty about copyright and intellectual property issues.

The role of research libraries in OER services in the future is primarily two-fold: (1) serving as a repository and/or publishing/disseminating OER and (2) outreach, communication, and marketing to encourage discovery, access, and integration of OER into teaching and learning activities.

There are areas on campus that are investigating open educational resources, but it is too preliminary for a cohesive plan.

This survey will start some discussions.

To collaborate with other academic units to encourage the adoption of OER.

We can see this and other research libraries becoming a central repository of expertise and server space (our institutional repository) for locally developed OER materials and we have this as part of the pilot program described earlier.

We envision a role where we actively advocate for OER by offering support to create OER and identifying content, education services, and copyright consultations.

We need to build an audience for the OER services that the library provides. Without engaged recipients, we'll just have websites that no one needs or uses.

We think the library should play a key role on campus as the advocates for OER adoption/creation. Further, we can provide a critical support role in helping faculty identify possible OER content, as well as offering incentives to encourage OER adoption/creation. The library should be the campus leaders in this area, in addition to creating the necessary infrastructure for these activities.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

34. Please enter any additional information regarding affordable course content/open educational resources activities at your library and institution that may assist the authors in accurately analyzing the results of this survey. N=16

As mentioned earlier, we don't have any institutional initiative that is focused on ACC/OER. However, the library does have a copyright office that was established in June 2014 following a request from a vice provost. Its main objective is to ensure course material conformity regarding the Copyright Act. In addition, the office does offer some education services and copyright consultations and it does suggest alternative ACC/OER when the cost to use a specific resource is too high. Now that the office's activities are smooth and regular, we can envision a more active role in ACC/OER promotion. Our liaison librarians sometimes make suggestions of OER to professors as well. Recently, a portal was created on our website to promote OER in sustainable development for one of our institution's MOOCs.

Currently, the state of Connecticut is having severe budget problems that have resulted in major cuts to university programs. When the economy recovers, I believe the University of Connecticut will be able to provide more funding and course release time for faculty who wish to develop ACC and OER.

I think one of the most exciting things in this early phase is how quickly we have identified interest and begun collaboration between academic departments.

In planning stages leveraging Boston Library Consortium OTN initiative to train staff, increase awareness, and formalize local initiative beginning this summer 2016.

Joined OTN in summer 2015 and hosting workshops for librarians and instructional designers, OER creators, and teaching faculty in spring 2016.

Our activities are in an experimental stage and, so, have no structures in place and no coordinated effort.

Our campus has invested in several "e-textbook pilots" that explored the features and formats students valued in relation to what they're willing to pay for textbooks. That effort led to an OER-focused pilot program and now into a strategic campus effort that's still being developed. Most of our responses to this survey have been related to a recent small-grant project, but our campus is currently developing a larger-scale, no-longer-pilot effort to support and sustain OER. I expect we'll be able to make that strategy document available by June 2016.

Our initiative was initially launched as a pilot in order to assess the levels of interest, effectiveness, and work involved. It has been recently relaunched as a formal part of the library's service portfolio, but we don't yet regard it as having strictly defined parameters. We're still very much adapting the service, considering new types of awards, thinking about different methods of assessment, expanding our outreach efforts, building up partnerships across campus, and learning about new ways in which we can support instruction and instructors. It's very exciting to have this opportunity!

Our library has established an Open Educational Resources Interest Group with representation from multiple campus units and some individual faculty. We are actively seeking opportunities to promote awareness of OER on campus, including sponsorship of activities during OER Week, an online guide to information about OER, and presentations at campus teaching events.

The faculty development center does teaching and learning work and instructional design. The campus ITS center has a separate entity within it, ITS Teaching and Learning, which has liaisons within the faculty development center paid by ITS. Instructional design services exist in colleges, schools, and the library. The faculty governance body passed an open access resolution in 2015, which is in the process of implementation. The campus libraries provide an institutional repository for university scholarly products. The libraries partner on digital humanities and other digital projects, which result in robust and freely available content that is used in courses.

The model we use to promote textbook affordability is not without gaps and imperfections, but over the past five years it has allowed us to make some progress in promoting textbook affordability and creating awareness about textbook costs. We now appear to be gaining momentum by increasing our campus partners, involving students and faculty in a leadership capacity, and getting the support that will make this an institutional priority. I would hope that other institutions thinking about similar initiatives could learn from our experience and those of other adopters—and I would encourage those just getting started to think about developing an institutional strategy that ensures the research library is not going it alone on this—but creates the possibility for greater inclusiveness and partnerships. I think more progress will occur more quickly this way. I know that some research libraries have created an OER librarian position and that is a good strategy as well but may not be possible for everyone where salary lines are restrictive.

This is an emerging opportunity for us. The grant program went into effect February 1, unexpectedly. The librarian who will lead our efforts is on leave until April 1st. She will hit the ground running upon her return and the questions from this survey will help us define our scope. So although we aren't able to provide significant information yet, we hope to be in a very different position one year from now.

We have developed several committees to work on templates for library materials that could also end up going across disciplines and into the classroom. We have worked with SpringShare and Canvas to create an LTI to bring Library Research Guides into the Canvas classroom seamlessly for faculty and students. If we go with the SpringShare and their new LibWizard application, we may be able to create OERs and add them directly to our Canvas instance like we currently do with LibGuides.

We have much that is going on, but the provost put together the task force that was described to pull it together into more of a cohesive program.

While individual librarians may have had conversations with individual faculty about ACC/OER, the library was not involved in the creation of the School of Public Health's Open CourseWare system. All your questions are about how the library has supported that initiative.

While we do not yet have an initiative, we have undertaken some activities: Open Educational Resources (OER) provides a basic introduction that has been used by a number of other libraries as a basis for their LibGuide on the topic. Library staff have done training on affordable course content (though not using that phrase) and/or OERs at the annual Faculty Institute (technology in teaching focused) on a regular basis. The bookstore participated in a national study on faculty attitudes about digital course materials conducted by Casey Green of Campus Computing Project. The bookstore and the library are beginning to explore ways to incorporate info more systematically about library-provided digital versions of course materials (currently done on ad hoc basis). The library's Coordinator for Information Literacy is currently chairing the campus-wide bookstore Faculty Liaison Committee, which is advising the bookstore on OER.

Responding Institutions

University of Alberta
Arizona State University
Auburn University
Boston University
Brigham Young University
University of Calgary
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Los Angeles
Case Western Reserve University
University of Chicago
University of Colorado at Boulder
Colorado State University
University of Connecticut
Duke University
Emory University
University of Florida
Georgetown University
Georgia Institute of Technology
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Iowa
Iowa State University
Johns Hopkins University
University of Kansas
Kent State University
University of Kentucky
Université Laval
Library of Congress
University of Louisville
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska—Lincoln
New York University
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
Ohio University
Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
Oklahoma State University
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University
Rutgers University
University of South Carolina
University of Southern California
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Syracuse University
Temple University
Texas Tech University
University of Toronto
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia
Virginia Tech
University of Washington
Washington State University
Washington University in St. Louis
University of Wisconsin—Madison
York University