



TheRPGroup



Research, Planning & Professional Development  
for California Community Colleges

SM

# US Dept. of Education Open Educational Resource Grant California Consortium for Equitable Change in Hispanic Serving Institutions Open Educational Resources (CC ECHO OER)

Final Project Summary

Rogear Purnell, PhD

Alyssa Nguyen, MA

March 2024

[www.rpgroup.org](http://www.rpgroup.org)

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
Methods and Participants.....	3
Findings .....	3
Impetus for and Anticipated Effects of OER Participation .....	3
Faculty Experiences with OER Development and Implementation.....	4
Content Development .....	4
Peer Review .....	5
Anticipated and Experienced Challenges and Barriers.....	5
Project Outcomes .....	6
Summary and Conclusions.....	6
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Reader’s Guide</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>Methods</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Participants</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Findings</b> .....	<b>8</b>
Impetus for OER Participation .....	8
Faculty Experiences with OER Development and Implementation.....	10
Content Development .....	12
Peer Review .....	13
Anticipated and Experienced Challenges and Barriers.....	14
Project Outcomes .....	15
<b>Summary and Conclusions</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>Acknowledgments</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>Appendix A: Initial Faculty Interview Protocol</b> .....	<b>19</b>
<b>Appendix B: Follow-Up Faculty Interview Protocol (Round 1)</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Appendix C: Follow-up Faculty Interview Protocol (Round 2)</b> .....	<b>23</b>

# Executive Summary

Since February 2021, the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges (The RP Group) has partnered with West Hills Community College District to evaluate its US Department of Education (DOE) California Consortium (CC) for Equitable Change in Hispanic Serving Institutions (ECHO) Open Educational Resource (OER) effort. The evaluation was **designed to monitor the impact** of the authorship and adoption of new open-access resources for teaching and learning at the participating institutions. The goal of this evaluation was **to determine the ways in which OER materials increase students' access to General Education (GE) and transfer-level coursework, and how said access supports equitable academic outcomes for students**, particularly those who are disproportionately impacted or historically underrepresented.

## Methods and Participants

The qualitative research in this evaluation involved **conversations with the faculty project leads; trained student workers who were supporting the instructional faculty from six California community colleges** in identifying relevant OER resources; and **instructional faculty who were developing OER materials** in a number of different subjects including the sciences, humanities, and social sciences. These conversations were designed **to understand the culture, climate, and context for the development and use of OER** at the participating institutions and to highlight issues, themes, and concepts to explore as part of this formative portion of the overall evaluation.

## Findings

The report is organized to present faculty OER developers' motivations for developing OER, and how this effort could advance institutions' equity agendas. The section that follows describes participants' perspectives and experiences during the preparation, development, and implementation phases. Faculty developers' suggestions and recommendations to strengthen each key phase of work are also highlighted. The challenges and barriers these developers faced along the way are noted, followed by the individual, departmental, institutional, and statewide outcomes they hoped would result from OER implementation. Where appropriate, recommendations to improve the grant program are included.

## Impetus for and Anticipated Effects of OER Participation

Most commonly, faculty participants shared they were inspired to develop OER to **decrease students' college costs** by offering free textbooks and learning materials and to provide students with **immediate access to needed learning materials** at the start of the semester. Another motivating factor for faculty was the **ability to create appropriate, culturally reflective, and accessible course materials** that were better geared to their teaching styles. According to faculty participants, this grant also provided an opportunity to **increase the**

**availability of free learning materials** in subjects and courses where such resources were limited. While OER development was a driving impetus, faculty also highlighted the importance of their ability to use **formats that are more accessible for students** with learning differences or different abilities.

## Faculty Experiences With OER Development and Implementation

During the OER planning, preparation, and set-up phases, **faculty accessed or received various supports** that included other colleagues developing OER and the grant leads; an online course outlining how to develop culturally relevant, antiracist, and open pedagogy; and professional development opportunities such as flex day presentations about how to develop and implement OER. They also noted their appreciation for the availability of personnel to help with curation, editing, and licensing. The faculty also highlighted the following groups as having provided critical support: the administrative grant leads, librarians, students in courses who provided real-time feedback, and professionals trained to help faculty with technology issues, formatting, and accessibility concerns.

### Recommendations to Improve the Planning, Preparation, and Set-Up Phases

- Provide a template that includes a sample OER outline and work plan with key tasks.
- Facilitate a launch meeting to create a community of developers and implementers.
- Offer an overview of critical grant timelines, anticipated outcomes, and supports.
- Identify funding opportunities to compensate faculty to develop OER.
- Market and advocate for the development and use of zero-cost learning materials and pathways.

## Content Development

Faculty appreciated the **help they received with technical issues** such as presenting and formatting their resources for online and printed formats. Faculty highlighted the student specialists who provided crucial help with sourcing, citing, and referencing material and identifying relevant images. Faculty also noted that the **feedback from students enrolled in their courses** where the OER was to be implemented helped inform the OER content.

## Recommendations to Improve Content Development

- Engage students who are enrolled in courses where OER will be implemented to provide input.
- Fund and train student workers to support OER development.
- Offer tips on issues such as citing sources and sizing images.
- Tap classified professionals and student workers to inform and complete tasks such as addressing accessibility concerns.
- Create a clearinghouse of relevant resources.

## Peer Review

Faculty **engaged colleagues within and outside their discipline and also personal contacts outside of their institution to review their OER**. Some respondents also sought more information about the peer review process and how they might work with other OER developers to review each other's OER from start to finish.

## Recommendations to Improve the Peer Review Process

- Describe and explain the peer review process, including an overview of the rubric and the anticipated timeframe for completion at the start of the OER development.
- Encourage faculty to gather input from students and potential reviewers outside of their core disciplines and/or institutions.
- Carve out dedicated time for the reviewers to complete their work.
- Provide opportunities for the reviewers to have dedicated time and space to provide feedback and suggestions to each other.

## Anticipated and Experienced Challenges and Barriers

Faculty noted that the OER development and/or implementation could be hindered by the following factors:

- The **amount of energy and time required** to balance teaching and other responsibilities may discourage others from developing OER, as well as the need to develop new skills, such as learning to ensure that material is accessible.
- **Limited opportunities to connect with other OER developers** to get to know, support, and be supported by other faculty and identify potential peer reviewers.
- The desire from some students for **printed copies** of learning materials.

## Project Outcomes

Beyond meeting the grant outcome of 20 culturally relevant OER for GE and transfer-level courses with high Latina/o/x enrollment, *for the faculty developers*, OER development **reinvigorated their enthusiasm for teaching** and **provided opportunities to engage students, collaborate with colleagues, and develop and offer better learning materials**. *For students*, the most critical and desired outcome was **immediate access to free, relevant, and culturally responsive and reflective materials**. *For their departments and disciplines and at the institutional and statewide levels*, faculty noted outcomes including **access to professional development, promotion of the OER development and zero textbook pathways**, and the **ability to offer culturally responsive resources** while bringing positive attention to their disciplines and institutions. In addition to the outcomes noted above, faculty hoped that at the end of the grant, **other faculty, and not just those at their institutions, would be able to access OER**, take advantage of opportunities to customize course content, and have a chance to support the larger field.

## Summary and Conclusions

The OER development process **re-energized some faculty** to explore their fields and develop **more culturally reflective resources** that better aligned with their course content and teaching approach/philosophy. Faculty OER developers **sought additional guidance** in attributing and citing materials, resource outlines, and templates, along with more opportunities to connect with other faculty to create a supportive OER-focused community. According to these faculty, they were driven by the potential of OER to provide more students with **access to free, culturally relevant, and accessible textbooks and materials** that can advance and support their learning.

# Introduction

Beginning in February 2021, the Research and Planning Group for California Community Colleges (The RP Group) partnered with West Hills Community College District to evaluate its US Department of Education (DOE) California Consortium (CC) for Equitable Change in Hispanic Serving Institutions (ECHO) Open Educational Resource (OER) effort. The evaluation was designed to monitor the impact of the authorship and adoption of new open-access resources for teaching and learning at the participating institutions. The goal of the multi-year evaluation (February 2021 through June 2024) was to answer the following questions to determine whether OER materials help to advance the colleges' equity agendas:

1. In what ways do OER materials increase students' access to General Education (GE) and transfer-level coursework, particularly for those who are disproportionately impacted or who are historically underrepresented?
2. In what ways does access to OER support equitable academic outcomes for students, particularly disproportionately impacted or historically underrepresented students enrolled in GE and transfer-level coursework?

Key learnings and takeaways are gleaned from conversations with the faculty and students who are using OER developed as part of this project, the student workers who support the OER development, and the consortium leads.

## Reader's Guide

The report begins with an overview of the research methods used followed by a description of the respondents. Key findings are outlined, including an investigation of the various phases of OER development. The faculty's impetus for OER participation, their anticipated impacts of OER on their institutions' equity agendas, and their anticipated challenges and barriers are summarized. There is discussion of the institutional and statewide outcomes for the developers, students, and departments/disciplines expected as a result of the OER development that was supported as a part of this grant. Suggestions and recommendations to continue to support OER development in the future, and a summary and conclusions round out the report.

## Methods

The evaluation activities included a **mix of qualitative and quantitative research methods**. The goal of the evaluation was to learn more about why each faculty member volunteered to participate in the project and to explore how they felt this effort could advance equity at their institution (for questions used to frame these conversations, see Appendix A, *Initial Faculty Interview Protocol*, Appendix B, *Follow-Up Faculty Interview Protocol [Round 1]*, and Appendix C, *Follow-Up Faculty Interview Protocol [Round 2]*). The qualitative efforts were complemented by and used to inform the quantitative analysis that employed a quasi-experimental design in analyzing select academic performance outcomes for students in sections taught by faculty using the newly developed OER to a group of statistically equivalent students in sections where traditional textbooks are used.

## Participants

The qualitative research involved conversations with (1) six of the faculty project leads, (2) three trained student workers who support instructional faculty in identifying relevant OER resources, and (3) 19 instructional faculty while they were developing and after they began to implement their newly developed OER materials. Some instructors were interviewed twice, and in one case, three times. The respondents were developing OER for the sciences (e.g., biology, geology, kinesiology), the humanities (e.g., art, design, history), and the social sciences (e.g., criminology, ethnic studies, political science, psychology, sociology) at Allan Hancock College, College of the Canyons, College of Marin, Los Angeles Harbor College, Madera Community College, and West Hills College. Their length of employment ranged from two to 25 years.

## Findings

The ultimate goal of the evaluation was to determine whether OER materials help to advance the colleges' equity agendas. These conversations were designed to understand the culture, climate, and context for the development and use of OER at the participating institutions and to highlight issues, themes, and concepts to explore as part of this formative and summative evaluation.

## Impetus for OER Participation

Most faculty participants shared they were inspired to develop OER to **decrease students' college costs** by offering free textbooks and learning materials. Other student-centered motivations included providing students **immediate access to needed learning materials at the start of the semester**. Some participants were excited about the ability to write and create materials **better geared to their teaching styles** and the most appropriate content for the course level. A few participants indicated that OER would benefit their fields by **increasing the availability of learning materials** for subjects and courses where free learning materials did not



exist. Their OER development would also offer an **opportunity for existing materials to be strengthened or built out** to be more accessible for students with learning differences, to be structured to be more relevant for students' experiences, and to incorporate antiracist viewpoints, culturally relevant pedagogy, and diversity, equity, and inclusion components.

## Anticipated Effects of OER

In addition to inquiries about faculty participants' motivations to participate in this effort, respondents were also asked to reflect on the ways in which OER materials would accomplish the following:

- Increase students' access to General Education (GE) and transfer-level coursework
- Provide additional opportunities to advance culturally relevant pedagogy
- Advance an equity agenda at the institutional level

## What Did Participants Share With Colleagues?

When discussing the grant or their OER project with other faculty, the respondents most commonly stressed that the development of these materials offered opportunities to do the following:

- Expand students' access to free textbooks and learning resources
- Address gaps in and quality of available resources at Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs), especially in some general education and transfer-level courses
- Customize the learning materials to include information instructors feel is especially relevant to their students
- Design content that is more aligned with their teaching style and better suited to the course level
- Support open pedagogy<sup>1</sup> where students co-create learning materials
- Create content that is accessible, antiracist, and culturally and context-relevant with DEI components
- Author learning materials, an opportunity that is often less afforded to community college instructors whose contracts focus on teaching and do not include time dedicated to research and publishing

---

<sup>1</sup> Open pedagogy invites students to be co-creators in the information based on their lived experiences that supports their learning. The materials that are produced by students are "open licensed" to allow anyone to access and use them (<https://libguides.uta.edu/openped>). This type of pedagogy is a critical tool in antiracist teaching.

## INCREASE ACCESS TO GENERAL EDUCATION (GE) AND TRANSFER-LEVEL COURSEWORK

Multiple respondents stressed that zero-cost learning materials were **a way to free up financial resources students could use to pursue their education** and complete courses needed for a certificate, credential, degree, and/or transfer. Some faculty noted the **immediate access to free learning materials** prevented students from falling behind in the course while waiting for financial aid to purchase their books.

## PROVIDE ADDITIONAL OPPORTUNITIES TO ADVANCE CULTURALLY RELEVANT PEDAGOGY

Another core driver of the OER consortium's collective efforts was the **requirement that these OER materials were culturally relevant**<sup>2</sup> to ensure that students could see themselves and their realities reflected in the material. By creating a stronger connection for students to the course content and images—a core element of culturally relevant OER and pedagogy—respondents indicated that **faculty could better support student learning, particularly for students from minoritized groups**, since these students would likely be better able to engage with culturally relevant course content. For example, respondents noted that OER's **flexibility allows them to develop free materials that incorporate images, content, and topics most relevant for and reflective of their students and their region**. Another example comes from one respondent who relished the opportunity to bring a culturally responsive historical perspective to subjects where this perspective is missing. In general, many of the respondents were enthusiastic about how the materials would improve representation and diversity in OER at large and would allow students to co-create textbooks with faculty.

## ADVANCE AN EQUITY AGENDA AT THE INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

The cost savings of OER to students was important to respondents as well. **Providing no- or low-cost learning materials** for students from lower socioeconomic backgrounds was a driving impetus for many faculty, along with **using formats that are more accessible** to students with learning differences or different abilities.

## Faculty Experiences With OER Development and Implementation

Overall, the respondents' descriptions of their OER development suggest this work involved three phases: (1) *planning, preparation, and set-up*; (2) *content development*; and (3) *peer review*. The unexpected opportunities, the pros and cons of working collaboratively with others, and the lessons learned are summarized in this section. Each summary is followed by an outline of general recommendations and suggestions from both the research participants and the researchers' review of relevant materials for what grant project directors should continue to keep in mind to support OER coordination, development, and implementation.

---

<sup>2</sup> Faculty who will be developing the OER materials must complete a self-paced, online course that was developed by the College of the Canyons, one of the consortium partners. The course is "all about culturally relevant pedagogy, open pedagogy, DEI [diversity, equity, and inclusion] equity."

## Planning, Preparation, and Set-Up

OER development at the participating colleges varied in terms of whether the process was completed by individuals or via collaborations with others **using Google Workspace or Canvas**. Reflections from faculty who collaborated with others suggests that the opportunity to work with another colleague was helpful because they were able to share the workload across the members, but colleagues were also able to guide, inform, inspire, support, and learn from each other. However, finding the time to work together, particularly if working with a colleague from another college, led to delays. For those respondents who were responsible for or who had developed OER, there were **five key sources of support they had accessed or received**:

1. Support of and access to consortium colleagues
2. An online course of OER with a focus on culturally relevant, antiracist, and open pedagogy
3. Professional development, including OER-focused flex days, conferences, and classes
4. The hiring of personnel, including students, to support the curation, editing, and licensing of OER and to ensure the materials meet online accessibility requirements

Of these supports, access to and the input and expertise of various personnel were most critical to the spring 2022 respondents' OER development. Over the course of the past year, the current respondents **described critical support coming from the following** sources:

- **Administrators** who provided funding, championed OER, and pursued OER-focused funding and grants
- **Colleagues** who offered guidance and motivation
- **Others** who provided specific expertise including the following:
  - Librarians who advised on relevant OER platforms and resources
  - OER student specialists who helped address accessibility issues, identified source materials and images, and edited content
  - Students enrolled in their courses who provided real-time feedback
  - Professionals who were knowledgeable about and advised participants on technology, formatting, and accessibility issues

## RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO PLANNING, PREPARATION, AND SET-UP

The RP Group offers the following recommendations to improve the *planning, preparation, and set-up* for future OER development based on the conversations with these respondents:

1. Provide a template that includes a sample OER outline and work plan with key tasks.
2. Facilitate a launch meeting to create a community of developers and implementers.
3. Offer an overview of critical grant timelines, anticipated outcomes, and supports.
4. Identify funding opportunities to compensate faculty to develop OER.
5. Market and advocate for the development and use of zero-cost learning materials and pathways.

## Content Development

Faculty took the lead on writing the content for the OER. In some cases, technicians helped the authors address “technical issues,” such as ensuring resources were accessible to all students and considerations for presentation and formatting for online and printed formats. Librarians offered input on the OER format. The OER student specialists were also a resource to inform sourcing, citing, and referencing materials and addressing accessibility concerns.

Several interviewees shared the specific ways they had **engaged students**—both those enrolled in their courses and those paid to provide support—to **develop and curate content and offer feedback**. Engaging students who were enrolled in their classes throughout OER development provided

## Student Support Teams and Faculty as OER Co-Creators and Collaborators

Several of the consortium colleges are adopting College of the Canyons’ use of student workers or student support teams who are hired to promote and assist faculty’s OER development. Recommended by administrators, faculty, and tutors, these students work up to 20 hours per week at \$15 to \$25 per hour and typically report to a director of online education. Job duties for these often grant-funded positions include reviewing the course outline of record or syllabus and then searching for and citing relevant materials, citing the various sources (including creating a reference list), determining licensing requirements, and formatting the resource for accessibility. New members of the support teams are often trained by shadowing.

As OER continues to roll out, a few respondents encouraged the project directors to **offer a template, outline, and work plan with timelines** to help guide faculty’s OER development, particularly for those faculty who are working on their own. Other suggestions focused on **scaffolding the development** so that faculty know what to do when, while others stressed the need for **continued funding to support faculty’s work**. Several respondents mentioned a need for more **help with critical “how-tos”** such as **editing, attribution, licensing, and publishing**.

feedback that helped faculty strengthen the content and format and assess whether the curriculum was effectively ensuring that student learning outcomes were being met. As an example, one interviewee had hired a student aide with funds from the grant to help with identifying resources, citing material, and formatting. Respondents especially appreciated the support they received from the student specialists with identifying images, citing sources, and listing references.

## Recommendations Related to Content Development

The RP Group offers the following recommendations to improve *content development* for future OER development based on the conversations with these respondents:

1. Engage students enrolled in courses where OER will be used to review and vet materials during development.
2. Fund and train student workers to review, use, and provide feedback on OER throughout the development process and not only during the implementation pilot.
3. Offer tips on issues related to content development, such as citing sources, identifying and sizing images, and listing references.
4. Tap classified professionals and student workers to inform and complete relevant tasks such as addressing accessibility concerns, identifying images and content, citing sources, formatting and structuring resources, creating reference and author lists, and uploading the final version of the OER to the appropriate websites for distribution.
5. Create a clearinghouse of relevant resources.

## Peer Review

A few of the respondents were in the peer review stage at the time they participated in the research and **described engaging two or three reviewers that included both faculty within and outside their discipline and also personal contacts outside of the college** who have particular professional expertise. In some cases, the newly developed OER were shared via Google Workspace, and reviewers provided their individual insights and suggestions using a rubric (see sidebar on the following page, *CC ECHO Peer Review Guidelines and Rubric*, for an overview of the categories assessed). In one case, professional development days were used to provide a dedicated time for reviewers to provide feedback on draft OER. For a few respondents, the peer review process **offered unexpected and welcomed opportunities to partner with experts outside of academia**.

A few respondents **sought more information about the peer review process**—how to identify and work with potential reviewers as well as the specifics of the review process itself. For example, one interviewee voiced uncertainty about sending their OER to a general email address to launch their review and wanted to connect with someone to discuss the process

and to talk with the person who would conduct the review. A few others wondered **how they might work with other OER developers to review each other's OER throughout the development process**, not just after the entire resource was drafted.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO PEER REVIEW

The following recommendations are offered to improve the *peer review* process for future OER development based on the conversations with these respondents:

1. At the start of the OER development, describe and explain the peer review process, including an overview of the rubric and the anticipated timeframe for completion.
2. Encourage faculty to identify and engage students and potential reviewers outside of the core discipline and/or institution who have particular professional expertise as part of the OER review process.
3. Provide opportunities for the reviewers to have dedicated time and space to provide feedback and suggestions to each other.
4. Outline the process for capturing and addressing ongoing feedback on OER as they are implemented.

## CC ECHO Peer Review Guidelines and Rubric

The following **guidelines** and **rubric**, a modification of the California OER Council's Textbook Review Template, were used by each reviewer to evaluate the following:

- *Subject Matter and Content Presentation* – Review of discipline knowledge presented in the resource
- *Editorial Aspects* – Readability of the content
- *Overall Ratings* – Impressions of and ratings for the whole product

## Anticipated and Experienced Challenges and Barriers

While there are numerous benefits and opportunities this grant offered, respondents realized that administrators and faculty, while interested, **may not have the energy and time to balance teaching and other responsibilities with OER development** and grant management and coordination. For those who are interested, the technical aspects of developing and publishing OER are new skills, including citation and licensing, material accessibility, and publishing, along with a **protocol/process for receiving and addressing feedback** once the OER is implemented. At the consortium level, some noted challenges in managing a budget for a group of colleges with different pay structures.

Other respondents hoped for more opportunities to **get to know, support, and be supported by other faculty who were also developing OER** as part of the grant, and they noted the pros and cons of collaborating on a joint project. One specific request from respondents included a **dedicated space and time in which to get to know, build community, and work with their co-authors**. Others requested assistance to identify and connect with potential peer reviewers.

Some faculty sought more support with **tangential skills, support, and guidance** that may not relate directly to developing the OER but are required to do so successfully, such as time management, project management, persistence, and stamina. Faculty also highlighted a potential barrier related to **students' desire for printed copies** of learning materials.

The following bullets highlight common barriers mentioned by the participants:

- Carving out time to draft the OER while managing a full-time workload
- Working effectively with colleagues or reviewers where there may be differences of opinion or where one person was not meeting agreed-upon deadlines
- Staying on task
- Setting and meeting deadlines
- Overcoming writer's block
- Staying motivated
- Being confident in one's own ability to complete the planned OER

## Project Outcomes

Beyond meeting the stated grant outcomes—the development of 20 culturally relevant OER for GE and transfer-level courses with high Latina/o/x enrollment—the respondents anticipated or had experienced the following outcomes:

For *themselves*, the OER development seemed to **reinvigorate many of the respondents' enthusiasm for teaching** and researching core subject matter. Others were appreciative of opportunities to **engage students** and **collaborate with colleagues** to fill the need for inclusive, interdisciplinary, and/or updated materials for students and other instructors. The development of OER also allowed community college faculty to publish their work. Personally and professionally, they saw an opportunity to **develop and offer better learning materials** to their students and for their field, and to learn from and support work across several institutions and with other colleagues at their own institutions. Some appreciated the ability to create content customized to their students' varying learning styles and the different course levels they teach.

For *students*, they looked forward to **providing immediate access to free, relevant, and culturally relevant materials** and to **co-create and engage students in their own learning**. (See box on the following page, *Learning Materials Costs Prior to Availability of Open Education Resources*, for a summary of estimated cost savings for students in the respondents' courses.) Participants noted that OER allowed them to **gather and create content that engaged students by being relevant to and reflective of their experiences and lives**.



## Learning Materials Costs Prior to Availability of Open Education Resources

Seven respondents were asked to reflect on how many sections of their courses for which they were developing OER they had taught previously; how many students, on average, had enrolled in each section; and the costs of course learning materials. Prior to the OER development, student enrollment in these respondents' courses ranged from 24 to 50 students per section (average 34.1 students per section) across one to eight sections (average 2.71 sections), with learning materials costing between \$75 to \$350 (average \$216.86 per student per section). These data suggest that the cost savings for students in these courses would have been nearly \$7,400 per section (\$216.86 per student x 34.1 students per section) if OER had been offered.

*For their departments and disciplines,* the anticipated outcomes focused on **access to professional development and the promotion of the development of OER and zero textbook pathways** and addressing gaps in available OER and culturally relevant materials in their disciplines. Others mentioned that OER supported their department or discipline by **increasing course enrollment**—students are more likely to sign up for courses with free resources—and increasing their ability to offer **culturally responsive resources while bringing positive attention to their discipline.**

*At the institutional and statewide levels,* the largest number of comments highlighted how OER could improve institutions' reputations by **offering free learning materials**, a practice that could attract students. Consortium and participating institutions were hoping to support the development of **zero textbook pathways**, support their own **faculty's OER development**, **serve as leaders in the field**, make the case for the usefulness and effectiveness of OER and open pedagogy, and **advance the use of culturally relevant OER widely.**

*At the end of the grant,* expected outcomes mirrored previous responses, including the **ability of faculty—and not just those at their institution—to access OER**, the opportunity to **customize course content** to meet students where they are, and a **chance to support the larger field.** Outcomes for students again were in line with those noted above: access to zero-cost, culturally relevant materials; being more engaged as co-creators in their learning; and—ultimately—greater academic success.

## Summary and Conclusions

Equity—operationalized as access to free and culturally relevant and antiracist OER for disproportionate groups, particularly those who identify as Latina/o/x—is the foundation for the US DOE CC ECHO OER work. A desire to provide free learning materials to students to ensure **more equitable access** to postsecondary resources and coursework was a driving force for many of the faculty developing OER as part of this grant. The opportunity to develop OER also **re-energized some faculty** to explore their fields and align content and design to their course content and teaching approach/philosophy while providing an opportunity to create materials that were reflective of their students and the context of their students' backgrounds and lives. While the respondents appreciated the support they received from dedicated staff



responsible for supporting OER development, they **sought additional guidance** on source attribution and citations, resource outlines, and templates. A work plan with deadlines for key activities to support timely resource completion was a common request. Similarly, the respondents continued to desire dedicated spaces and time to **connect with other faculty** to create a supportive OER community.

If the grant is successful, the OER developed will be implemented, thereby providing faculty—at the participating institutions, across the state, and nationally—with additional resources to support their teaching. Departments and institutions will attract more students, particularly to their OER courses. However, the ultimate sign of success remains the same: **more students will have access to free, culturally relevant, and accessible textbooks and materials that can advance and support their learning**. The student survey and retroactive student academic record analysis The RP Group is conducting will allow us to explore how and whether these resources affect student course outcomes when compared to outcomes in the same courses without OER access.

# Acknowledgments

Thank you to the administrators and faculty who volunteered to share what led them to participate in this effort:

1. Rowena Bermio, History and Ethnic Studies, West Hills College-Lemoore
2. David Brooks, 2D Design, West Hills College-Lemoore
3. George Cartwright, Criminal Evidence, Madera Community College
4. Emily Fox, Microbiology and Microscopy, College of Marin
5. Carly Gott, Historical Geology, College of the Canyons
6. Brian Henderson-Barrick, Political Science, Los Angeles Harbor College
7. Kristen Kennedy, Beginning Drawing, West Hills College-Lemoore
8. Vera Kennedy, Sociology, West Hills College-Lemoore
9. Jennifer Melena, Kinesiology/Health Education, Allan Hancock College
10. Jeremy Patrich, California Geography and Historical Geology, College of the Canyons
11. Rodney Ragsdale, Physical Education, West Hills Community College District
12. Susan Rahman, Sociology, Psychology, and Behavioral Sciences, College of Marin
13. Jacqueline Shehorn, Humanities, West Hills College-Lemoore

We offer special appreciation to the faculty and administrators leading these efforts at their respective institutions:

1. Elle Dimopoulos: College of Marin Lead
2. James Glapa-Grossklag: College of the Canyons Lead
3. Ron Oxford: Librarian at West Hills College-Lemoore
4. Jessica Scarffe: Professor of Political Science and Allan Hancock College Lead
5. Joy Shoemate: Director, Online Education, College of the Canyons Lead
6. Kelsey Smith: Project Director and West Hills College-Lemoore Lead

# Appendix A: Initial Faculty Interview Protocol

## US Department of Education Open Educational Resource Grant

### Questions to Frame Faculty Conversation

#### Initial Interview Protocol

Before we start, do you have any questions for me? [Respond to questions.] Okay, my first question is...

#### Introduction

1. What is your name, and role at [name of college]? How long have you worked [at (name of college)]?
2. How do you describe this grant/project to other faculty?

#### Impetus for Participation

3. Why did you decide to participate in the Open Educational Resource (OER) effort?
4. In what ways will OER materials...
  - o Increase access to General Education (GE) and transfer-level coursework, particularly for students who are disproportionately impacted or historically underrepresented on college campuses?
  - o Provide additional opportunities to advance culturally relevant pedagogy?
  - o Advance an equity agenda at your institution?

#### Outcomes of This Project

5. What do you hope will result from your participation?
  - o For yourself?
  - o For your department or discipline?
  - o Your students?
  - o Your institution?
6. At the end of the grant, what would success look like? How will you know you've been successful?

7. How do you think this work might inform statewide OER efforts?

## Learning Material Cost - Savings

Consider the courses where you are using the newly developed OER:

1. In previous semesters, how many sections of the course do you usually teach?
2. On average, how many students enrolled in those sections in total?
3. If you had to estimate the total costs of the learning materials for your previous courses, how much did students need to spend to take these classes?

## Preparation for and Implementation of OER Development

4. What types of support have you received to prepare you for this work? What additional support might you need?
5. Are there any challenges or barriers to implementation you foresee? For yourself? For your students?
6. Are you collaborating with other faculty on your OER development? If so, how are you collaborating (e.g., development, review, or piloting of materials)? What are the pros and cons of collaborating with other faculty on this project?

## Suggestions and Recommendations

7. What should the project directors keep in mind as this work rolls out to support OER coordination, development, and implementation?
8. What are some of the critical questions or issues that the evaluation team should be sure to explore (e.g., development process, the time needed to develop materials, collaboration with student workers and other faculty, and piloting and implementation)?

## Final Question and Comments

9. Is there anything else you would like to share that we have not had an opportunity to discuss?

[Thank you for your time, and good luck with your work!]

# Appendix B: Follow-Up Faculty Interview Protocol (Round 1)

## US Department of Education Open Educational Resource Grant Questions to Frame Second Round of Faculty Conversations Follow-up Conversations with Faculty

Before we start, do you have any questions for me? [Respond to questions.] Okay my first question is...

### Introduction

1. What is your name, role at [name of college]? How long have you worked [at (name of college)]?
2. Where are you in your OER development? Implementation?
  - o What can you share about your work so far?
    - Unexpected opportunities? How did you take advantage of them?
    - Unexpected Challenges? How did you address them?

### Outcome of this Project

3. So far what has resulted from your participation?
  - o For yourself?
  - o For your department or discipline?
  - o Your institution?
4. At the end of the grant on December 31, 2023, what would success look like? How will you know you and your students have been successful?

### Preparation for and Implementation of OER Development

5. What types of support have you received to prepare you for this work? [ASK: Did you work with a student OER Student Specialist?] What additional support might you need?

6. Are there any challenges or barriers to implementation that you foresee for yourself? For your students?
7. Are you collaborating with other faculty on your OER development? If so, How are you collaborating (e.g., development, review, or piloting of materials)? What are the pros and cons of collaborating with other faculty on this project? Any lessons learned that you want to share?
8. What has worked in terms of technology during the OER creation process?

## Suggestions and Recommendations

9. What should the project directors continue to keep in mind to support OER coordination, development, and implementation?
10. What do you know now that you wish you knew when you started your OER development? What are some lessons learned you would share with other faculty/administrators?

## Final Question and Comments

11. Is there anything else you would like to share that we have not had an opportunity to discuss?

[Thank you for your time. I anticipate reaching out to you again in Fall 2022 / Spring 2023 to find out how the OER implementation is going. In the meantime, good luck with your work!]

# Appendix C: Follow-up Faculty Interview Protocol (Round 2)

US Dept of Education Open Educational Resource Grant

Questions to Frame Second Round of Faculty Conversations

## Follow-up Interview Protocol

Before we start, do you have any questions for me? [Respond to questions.] Okay, my first question is...

### Introduction

1. What is your name and role at [name of college]? How long have you worked [at (name of college)]?
2. Where are you in your OER development? Implementation?
  - o What can you share about your work so far?
    - Unexpected opportunities? How did you take advantage of them?
    - Unexpected challenges? How did you address them?

### Learning Materials - Costs

Consider the courses where you are using the newly developed OER:

3. In previous semesters, how many sections of the course do you usually teach?
4. On average, how many students enrolled in those sections in total?
5. If you had to estimate the total costs of the learning materials for your previous courses, how much did students need to spend to take these classes?

### Outcomes of This Project

6. So far, what has resulted from your participation?
  - o For yourself?
  - o For your department or discipline?
  - o Your institution?

7. At the end of the grant on December 31, 2023, what would success look like? How will you know you and your students have been successful?

## Preparation for and Implementation of OER Development

8. What types of support have you received to prepare you for this work? [ASK: Did you work with a student OER Student Specialist?] What additional support might you need?
9. Are there any challenges or barriers to implementation that you foresee for yourself? For your students?
10. Are you collaborating with other faculty on your OER development? If so, How are you collaborating (e.g., development, review, or piloting of materials)? What are the pros and cons of collaborating with other faculty on this project? Any lessons learned that you want to share?
11. What has worked in terms of technology during the OER creation process?

## Suggestions and Recommendations

12. What should the project directors continue to keep in mind to support OER coordination, development, and implementation?
13. What do you know now that you wish you had known when you started your OER development? What are some lessons learned you would share with other faculty/administrators?

## Final Question and Comments

14. Is there anything else you would like to share that we have not had an opportunity to discuss?

[Thank you for your time, and good luck with your work!]