

A Study of the Coverage of Open Educational Resources (OER) Through Websites of Colleges and Universities in Connecticut

Mary E. Brown

Department of English
Southern Connecticut State University

Hak Joon Kim

Department of Information and Library Science
Southern Connecticut State University

Abstract

Notwithstanding reports of increased awareness and use of Open Educational Resources (OER) in higher education, the literature notes that awareness of, use of, and institutional support for OER remain major challenges to campuses seeking to reduce student cost burden and support access to materials. OER also support faculty who desire to move beyond the traditional textbooks to increase their students' engagement, support pedagogical changes to enhance their students' learning, and have greater control over their courses. The university website, as a public-facing vehicle for information, is examined for findable mentions of OER. Using websites of the higher education institutions in Connecticut as a sample, websites are searched for mentions of OER, then findings are inventoried to explore the connection between library support for OER and OER usage and creation on a campus. This study found that institutions whose libraries exhibit support of any kind for OER through their websites are twice as likely to have faculty using OER materials and three and a half times as likely to have faculty creating OER materials as institutions whose libraries do not exhibit support for OER through their websites.

Keywords: Open Educational Resources, OER, higher education, academic libraries

Mary E. Brown, PhD (brownm6@southernct.edu) is a Full Professor in the Department of English at Southern Connecticut State University.

Hak Joon Kim, PhD (kimh1@southernct.edu) is a Full Professor and Chairperson in the Department of Information and Library Science at Southern Connecticut State University.

Introduction

Until the middle of the 15th century, the university lecturer read, without deviation, from a written text while students copied down the recited lecture word-for-word, with precision, to later study and have as a reference and to read to future students. Then came the printing press. The lecture no longer needed to be read aloud for students to copy down; it could now be printed and distributed for the students to read and study and retain for future reference (Taylor, 2021). Since the 16th century, “the use of textbooks has been a standard practice across educational institutions” (Bouchrika, 2024, para. 1) and “since the 19th century, they have been a staple in providing educational instruction” (para. 4).

By the early 19th century, an established textbook publishing industry led to the ubiquity of these textbooks in the college classroom (Watt, 2007). It is understandable that today we have textbooks that may not fit well into every university’s curriculum, every professor’s pedagogy, or every student’s pocketbook. By the late 1990s, faculty had begun creating, sharing, using, and assigning “open” and free educational materials for their students (West, 2016).

Open Educational Resources (OER) are “learning, teaching and research materials in any format and medium that reside in the public domain or are under copyright that have been released under an open license, that permit no-cost access, re-use, re-purpose, adaptation and redistribution by others” (UNESCO, n.d., para. 1).

An EBSCO blog post (EBSCO, 2019) tells us that the sharing of educational materials among faculty has a history that can be traced back to at least the early 1970s. The evolution of OER since then is attributed to “librarians, catalogers and volunteers who aim to create viable resources” (para. 5). We are further told that “no other issue involving OER is more relevant and affecting more users, including faculty, than discoverability” (para. 6). Academic librarians and catalogers are well placed if not critical to creating “ways to make [OER] fully ‘discoverable,’ as well as teaching faculty where and how to get to OERs [sic]” (para. 9).

The increasing awareness of student financial insecurity¹ and the role of increasing costs of textbooks, access codes, and materials in constructing barriers to

¹ “Overall, 23% of undergraduates, and 12% of graduate students, are experiencing food insecurity. And eight percent of undergraduate and 5% of graduate students are experiencing homelessness” (McKibben et al., 2023, para. 2). The “food insecurity rate among undergraduate students is more than double the food insecurity rate among all U.S. households, which the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates was 10.5% in 2020” (para. 7).

course enrollments, completion rates, and student success, has spurred increased awareness and promotions of OER across higher education institutions (West, 2016, para. 5). With this, educators have been increasingly discovering that OER enable them to change the materials to better fit specific learning objectives and class activities and to customize materials to better meet student needs (para. 3).

The OER movement, however, has been hampered by misunderstandings, inadequate knowledge and support, technology shortcomings, and the uncertain balance between faculty time and effort costs and professional and career benefits.

Academic librarians have been hailed as possessing the “professional skills [that] make them an ideal candidate to work with faculty in the exploration, adoption, promotion, and preservation of open educational resources” (Tang & Tseng, 2023, Abstract). Further, academic librarians who have begun bridging the gap between skills needed for successful OER adoption and implementation and faculty who seek training in those skills or partners who possess them, have been credited with helping to lead the way to adoption and creation of OER (Ex Libris, 2020). According to one author, “more libraries are taking the lead in affordable learning programs at their institution (35 percent) than provost’s offices (34 percent)” (Ex Libris, 2020, para. 3). Indeed, in 2018, “[t]he Research Planning and Review Committee of Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) listed textbook affordability and OER as an emerging topic for academic libraries” (Tang & Tseng, 2023, para. 3).

Other authors tell us that the OER leadership roles librarians are taking on are not just about the cost of textbooks. Seifrlle-Valencia (2020) discusses application of three central principles of social justice (redistributive justice, recognitive justice, and representational justice) to OER: specifically, the power of OER to provide free educational materials to “learners who by circumstances of socio-cultural position cannot afford them;” to support socio-cultural diversity through the “inclusion of images, case studies, and knowledges of women, First Nations people and whomever is marginalized in any particular national, regional or learning context;” and to co-construct “texts and resources about learners of colour by learners of colour, about women’s experiences by women, about gay experiences by gay identifying people” (p. 473).

Throughout the literature, librarians and their libraries are seen as and are credited with providing the skills and leadership that support, if not encourage, viable and transformative OER movements on campuses.

This study asks the question whether library support for OER correlates with higher usage and creation of OER among faculty. That is, would approximately the same percentages of faculty use or create OER whether their campus library provided resources in support of OER? This study also asks whether institutional characteristics, such as Carnegie Classifications, bring out patterns that suggest some types of institutions may be more accommodating environments for OER.

To explore these questions, we used a non-intrusive technique to consider higher education institutions of an entire state. To find the connection between library support for OER and OER awareness, usage, and creation on a campus, we collected evidence using the non-intrusive method of content analysis of the institution's website. To investigate these relationships, we used the websites of the higher education institutions in the state of Connecticut as our sample.

Method

The primary purpose of the study is to search higher education websites to discover mentions of OER, then to inventory findings as belonging to one of four categories: awareness (OER news and informational items found outside of the library's website), usage (evidence of courses using OER), creation (evidence of faculty creating OER), or library support (evidence of a library webpage or center with links to OER finding or use aids and/or OER materials or repositories). The websites of higher education institutions in Connecticut are used as the sample for this study.

Drawn from a list of higher education institutions that are based and operated in Connecticut (Clarke & Kim, 2023), 37 colleges and universities were selected for this study. The list was originally drawn from the *Colleges and Universities* website prepared by the Connecticut Office of Higher Education and includes institutions based in Connecticut and excludes institutions that are based in a different state but have a branch campus in Connecticut and out-of-state institutions that are licensed to offer online instruction in Connecticut (p. 33).

Information about the 37 colleges and universities was updated using *The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* website published by the American Council of Education (ACE) (<https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/>) and the *IPEDS: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System* found on the website for the National Center for Education Statistics (<https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/use-the-data/>).

Coverage includes institutions with Carnegie Classifications [of Institutions of Higher Education] of Doctorate Research 1 (two), Doctoral/Professional (five), Master's M1 (six), Master's M2 (two), Master's M3 (two), Baccalaureate Colleges/Bachelor's (eight), and Associate's Colleges (12). Eighteen are private institutions (16 not-for-profit and two for-profit) and 19 are public institutions (18 state-funded and one federally funded). Student enrollments ranged from just over 27,000 to less than 100, with an average enrollment of just under 5,000. Carnegie size classifications include very small institutions through large institutions. See Appendix A for the list of institutions included in this study.

Two methods were used for finding OER mentions through the institution's website for the 37 colleges and universities selected for this study. Using the search function on the homepage, each institution's website was searched for mentions of *OER* or *Open Educational Resources*. Beginning at the homepage, each institution's website was then navigated, or the search function utilized, to reach the library's homepage and examine it for mentions of OER or other terms that might lead to mentions of OER. In specific, we were looking for mentions that would supply the viewer with:

- information or news related to OER that was found outside the library website (to gauge *awareness*),
- evidence of assignment of OER in courses (to gauge *usage*),
- evidence of faculty-generated OER (to gauge *creation*),
- a webpage, reachable from or as part of the library's website, that serves as a center for accessing OER information or links (to gauge *library support*).

The initial contact with the websites demonstrated the variations in labelling and navigation of the sites as well as seeming variations in search functions.

The twelve Associate's Colleges included in this study recently merged (Fall 2023) into a single entity. A website was created to represent the new single entity while each of the campuses retained its own website. The overarching website was found to have an OER webpage, to which some of the campuses linked. For this study, the Associate level institution's websites are considered individually and reviewed for the resources accessible from their individual campus websites; the overarching website is not considered except when an individual campus website links to it.

The initial interaction with each of the 37 websites used the search function from the homepage to search for mentions of OER. Returned links lead to definitions and overviews of OER (40.5%); benefits of OER (35.1%); how to find OER repositories, textbooks, and materials (21.6%); news articles concerning OER (18.9%); articles and

resources related to OER (16.2%); information on copyright, student releases, and attribution (10.8%); and OER starter kits/guides (8.1%). Some search results, however, did not appear to include a link to an OER-focused webpage.

Wanting to locate any OER-focused webpage that was not found through the search function, we turned to the institutions' library websites. Of the 37 institutions, one (2.7%) had "Library" prominently displayed on the institution's homepage, 22 (59.5%) enabled the library's webpage to be found through following various menus near the top of the institution's homepage, four (10.8%) had links to the library's webpage at the bottom of the institution's homepage, and 10 (27.0%) required use of the search function. The primary menu labels that lead to the library's webpage included: support services, student resources, academics, and current students. Some required a second-level menu such as student resources, related resources, or other terms. Once the library's main webpage was located, menu items were examined for OER-related links.

Once on the library's main webpage, following a link with "faculty" in the label lead to 10 OER webpages (38.5% of found OER webpages). A search function on the library's main page lead to eight OER webpages (30.8% of found OER webpages). Following a link with "service" in the label lead to three (11.5%) of the found OER webpages. Other useful labels that led to OER-focused webpages contained the term "subject" (7.7%) or "quick" (3.8%). Two library main webpages contained a link labelled with either "OER" or "Open Educational Resources."

The websites were examined over several months. During that time, changes were observed in mentions of OER usage and creation and in evidence of library support for OER. The data for the results reported here were gathered in a single 12-hour period during a final search of the websites.

Results

In reviewing the 37 university websites, 23 (62.16%) had mentions of OER outside of the library website that were classified as evidence of general awareness; these generally consisted of news items, statements of usage of OER, statements of creation of OER, and announcements of grants received. Nine (24.32%) of the websites yielded evidence of OER being used in courses; nine (24.32%) of the websites yielded evidence of faculty creating OER; and 21 (56.76%) yielded evidence of library support for OER. (See Table 1 for the breakdown of data by Carnegie Classifications of control, level, and size.)

Table 1

Evidence of OER Awareness, Usage, Creation, and Library Support by Carnegie Classification

	Awareness		Usage		Creation		Library Support	
	Number	% of Group	Number	% of Group	Number	% of Group	Number	% of Group
Control								
Public [19]	11	57.89%	6	31.58%	5	26.32%	13	68.42%
Private not-for-profit [16]	12	75.00%	3	18.75%	4	25.00%	8	50.00%
Private for-profit [2]	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
TOTAL [37]	23	62.16%	9	24.32%	9	24.32%	21	56.76%
Level								
Research 1 [2]	2	100.00%	1	50.00%	2	100.00%	2	100.00%
Professional [5]	5	100.00%	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	3	60.00%
Master's [10]	6	60.00%	4	40.00%	4	40.00%	4	40.00%
Bachelor's [8]	5	62.50%	2	12.50%	2	12.50%	4	100.00%
Associate [12]	5	41.67%	1	8.33%	1	8.33%	8	66.67%
TOTAL [37]	23	62.16%	9	24.32%	9	24.32%	21	56.76%
Size								
Large [2]	2	100.00%	1	50.00%	2	100.00%	2	100.00%
Medium [17]	12	70.59%	6	35.29%	5	29.41%	10	58.82%
Small [13]	8	61.54%	1	7.69%	2	15.38%	8	61.54%
Very small [5]	1	20.00%	1	20.00%	0	0.00%	1	20.00%
TOTAL [37]	23	62.16%	5	24.32%	9	24.32%	21	56.76%

Note. Thirty-seven institutional websites were examined. Each institution carries a Carnegie Classification of control, level, and size.

Of the 23 institutional websites on which evidence of OER awareness was found, five (21.7%) also had findable evidence of OER involvement in all three categories of usage, creation, and library support; four (17.4%) had findable evidence of involvement in two of the categories; nine (39.1%) showed involvement in one category; and five (21.7%) showed no involvement with usage, creation, or library support. (See Table 2 for details.)

Table 2

Percent of Institutional Websites with Evidence of OER Awareness That Also Show Evidence of OER Usage, Creation, or Library Support

Number of Additional Categories with Found Involvement	Number of Institution	Percent of Websites with Evidence of OER Awareness	Categories of Additional OER Involvement Found		
			Usage	Creation	Library Support
3 (usage, creation, support)	5	21.70%			
2 (usage, creation)	1	4.35%			
2 (usage, support)	1	4.35%			
2 (creation, support)	2	8.70%			
1 (usage)	1	4.35%			
1 (support)	8	34.74%			
0	5	21.74%			
TOTAL:	23	100.00%			

Note. Twenty-three institutional websites were found to have evidence of OER awareness. In addition, 18 (78.26%) of the websites were found to also have evidence in up to three of the categories of OER usage, OER creation, library support for OER. Library support most frequently co-occurred with OER awareness (69.49%); each of OER usage and OER creation were found to co-occur with awareness (34.75%).

At the beginning of this study, we asked whether Carnegie Classifications can bring out patterns that might be predictive of an institutional climate that favors OER. To test this, we used the chi-square statistic to determine significance at the .05 level. This resulted in nine calculations of chi-square (for OER participation in usage, creation, and library support by Carnegie Classifications of control, level, and size).

Chi-square calculation returned no significance at the .05 level for institutional control (public vs. private not-for-profit) at all levels of OER participation (usage, creation, and library support). Library support was not significantly impacted ($p > .05$) by institutional classifications (control, level, and size). Chi-square calculation, however, did return significance at the .05 level for OER usage and creation for Carnegie Classifications of level (Research 1, Professional, Master’s, Bachelor’s, Associate) and size (large, medium, small, very small). (See Table 3 for details.)

Table 3

Level of Significance (Using Chi-Square Statistic) by Institutional Characteristic and OER Participation

	<i>df</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>X</i> ²	<i>p</i>	
Control (public; private non-profit)					
Usage	1	35	0.748	>.05	not significant
Creation	1	35	0.007	>.05	not significant
Library Support	1	35	3.346	>.05	not significant
Level (Research 1, Professional, Master's, Bachelor's, Associate)					
Usage	4	37	10.099	<.05	significant @ .05
Creation	2	30	3.074	<.05	significant @ .05
Library Support	3	35	1.688	>.05	not significant
Size (large, medium, small, very small)					
Usage	3	37	45.910	<.01	significant @ .01
Creation	2	32	6.168	<.05	significant @ .05
Library Support	3	37	4.426	>.05	not significant

Note. Per chi-square requirements, categories with zero observed instances were eliminated for that chi-square calculation. Specifically, the Research 1 and Professional categories were eliminated from calculations of the create classification; the Research 1 category was eliminated from calculations of the support classifications; the very small category was eliminated from calculation of the support classification; and the private for-profit category was eliminated from calculations of all classifications.

The other question we asked at the beginning of this study was whether library support for OER is consistent with higher levels of usage and creation of OER among faculty.

A total of nine websites were found to have evidence of OER usage. Of these, two-thirds also had evidence of library support for OER. A total of nine websites were found to have evidence of OER creation. Of these, just over 75% also had evidence of library support for OER. (See Table 4 for details.)

Table 4

Percent of Websites with Evidence of Library Support for OER That Also Show Evidence of OER Awareness, Usage, or Creation

Evidence of Library Support for OER	Evidence of OER Awareness		Evidence of OER Usage		Evidence of OER Creation	
	Number	% of Group	Number	% of Group	Number	% of Group
Library Support Found	16	69.57%	6	66.67%	7	77.78%
No Library Support Found	7	30.43%	3	33.33%	2	22.22%
Group TOTAL:	23	100.00%	9	100.00%	9	100.00%

Note. Compared to institutional websites with no found evidence of library support for OER, institutional websites with found evidence of library support for OER were more likely to also have evidence of OER usage and OER creation.

This suggests that institutions whose libraries support OER are twice as likely to have faculty using OER materials compared with institutions whose libraries do not provide support for OER. Further, the findings also suggest that institutions whose libraries support OER are three and a half times as likely to have faculty creating OER materials and more than twice as likely to carry OER news and information outside of the library’s website.

The data from the Connecticut sample suggests that higher instances of OER awareness, usage, and creation are consistent with library support for OER.

Discussion

Based on the data gathered from the websites of 37 colleges and universities in Connecticut and the analysis of that data, we conclude that:

- Levels of OER participation (usage, creation, and library support) within the public institutional websites were found at higher rates than within the private not-for-profit institutional websites (68%, 4%, and 50% higher, respectively); OER participation, however, was not found within the websites of the private for-profit institutions (see Table 1).
- Evidence of awareness of OER found on campus websites did not necessarily predict accompanying evidence of OER usage, creation, or library support (see Table 2);

- An institution's control (public, private not-for-profit) did not appear to predict its participation in OER (see Table 3).
- An institution's size (large, medium, small, very small) or level (Research 1, Professional, Master's, Bachelor's, Associate) may influence its participation in OER usage or creation (see Table 3).
- An institution's Carnegie Classification (control, level, size) did not appear to predict library support for OER (see Table 3).
- Library support for OER is consistent with higher instances of OER awareness, usage, and creation (see Table 4).

The literature affirms that academic librarians are critical leaders in promoting, initiating, and influencing OER movements on campuses through provision of information, training, and services to faculty (EBSCO, 2019). Furthermore, librarians possess the skills that are needed for effectively finding and collating OER materials (Tang & Tseng, 2023).

This suggests that simply placing links to OER repositories on the library's website without also providing associated organization, information, training, and services may not be sufficient to promote OER usage and creation and may, instead, serve as a deterrent if faculty find the resources difficult to navigate or are uncertain how found materials can be used.

The literature suggests that academic librarians can support the use and creation of OER through curating lists of OER materials; educating and advising faculty on copyright matters; and training faculty on how to use different tools associated with finding, using, and producing OER materials (IFLA, n.d.).

First, however, librarians need to become fluent in issues and technologies surrounding OER usage and creation. To do this, librarians can undertake self-study through OER websites maintained by other librarians, for example the College of Staten Island Library (CUNY) (<https://library.csi.cuny.edu/oer/>). While other libraries' OER websites can provide inspiration for campus libraries that are just beginning to develop an OER presence on their website, for those who prefer a more guided approach, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) offers a day-long program that is designed to help librarians and library staff understand the basics of OER and how their libraries can develop an OER initiative (*see* <https://www.ala.org/acrl/conferences/roadshows/oer>). Suggestions appear in the literature for joining organizations that support broad-based communities of Open

Access/OER practice (West, 2016) including: Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) (<https://sparcopen.org>), a not-for-profit advocacy organization that sponsors forums on Open Access, Open Education, and Open Data; and the Community College Consortium for Open Educational Resources (CCCOER) (<https://www.cccoer.org>), the sponsor of a community of practice with “resources, support, and opportunities for collaboration for learning, planning, and implementing successful open educational programs at community and technical colleges” (Community College Consortium for Open Educational Resources [CCCOER], n.d., para. 2). The ACRL website maintains an extensive classified list of resources as the ACRL/CJCLS OER Librarian Toolkit (<https://acrl.libguides.com/cjcls/oer>).

In an interview, one librarian, when asked about their biggest challenges supporting OER, echoed a comment found repeatedly in the literature, “time is the biggest challenge to OER creation, development, and use,” adding that “searching for OER through each independent site is an extensive, sometimes unsatisfying, process” (Blankstein, 2023, p. 3). This response is heard from both librarians supporting OER and faculty exploring OER. One approach is to diversify responsibilities through collaboration. As one author observed, “Just as learning produces the best results when it is done collaboratively, OER are best produced with the help of diverse experts using tools specifically designed for the purpose of creating quality content” (Irvine et al., 2021, para. 6). The library is in a prime position to serve as the central space that pulls together the various experts (and technologies) from across campus to workshop OER ideas and projects.

Some authors have suggested that barriers to significant implementation of OER and Open Educational Practice (OEP) include the unknown or precarious status of OER implementation in terms of promotion and tenure and even reputation of faculty. To help overcome this barrier, the group Driving OER Sustainability for Student Success (DOERS3) “has developed an adaptable advisory model to help guide faculty as they attempt to include their OER work in their tenure and promotion portfolios” (Coolidge et al., n.d., para. 1). As an additional resource, Abbey Elder (2021), librarian at Iowa State University and Statewide Open Education Coordinator for the Iowa Open Education Action Team, maintains a working document of resources that address OER in promotion and tenure, including excerpts from university documents that explicitly mention OER in relation to application for promotion and tenure.

Concerns of campus faculty can be taken into consideration when constructing and maintaining the library’s OER website. For example, the College of Staten Island (CSI) Library (CUNY) has collated OER resources for faculty and organized them in an

easily navigated website at <https://library.csi.cuny.edu/oer/>. Looking at the CSI OER website, we can gather that faculty are concerned with the basics of understanding OER and finding and creating OER materials. Also, it seems faculty are interested in learning how OER fits into tenure and promotion, how OER impacts student success and retention, useful platforms and tools for remixing and creating OER, and sources of funding for OER projects. The CSI library has also thoughtfully licensed their OER website under a Creative Commons license that allows others to copy, remix, transform, build upon, and redistribute its contents provided attribution is given, the use is non-commercial, and any remixed, transformed, or built upon adaptation is distributed under the same license as the original.

Due to varying needs across campuses, faculty may have different approaches to managing resources (how they gather, organize, and label them) and may require or prefer different types of assistance to utilize those resources effectively. A collaboration between faculty representatives and librarians, therefore, may be useful in planning for the best combination of OER support, whether you're wanting to initiate or strengthen OER usage and creation on your campus.

Conclusions

Students in higher education are facing the challenge of increasing costs and debt, which is a factor contributing to declining higher education enrollments. The cost of textbooks is rising, contributing to the general increase in the cost of college and student debt. Students are attending classes without access to needed textbooks and the quality of learning and performance is impacted.

OER give faculty the power to reduce students' textbook cost burden and to give each student equitable access to needed textbooks. At the same time, OER give faculty the power to craft assigned materials to better fit the learning outcomes of their courses and the learning needs of students in their courses.

"Most educators believe that OER present benefits unmatched by traditional copyrighted resources, yet most faculty still don't use them and do not have any plans to use them in the future" (Irvine et al., 2021, para. 4). To support OER adoption, faculty need accessible information that allows them to fully understand OER licensing and the associated rights to retain, reuse, revise, remix, and redistribute materials. Faculty need accessible and manageable links to sources or repositories of OER materials and aids for assessing materials prior to adoption. Faculty also need resources

for collaboratively creating materials that can provided at no cost to students across campuses.

Campus librarians are well placed to support OER initiatives whether undertaken as a solitary faculty initiative or as a collaborative group initiative. Librarians can offer a hybrid approach to helping faculty and staff learn about OER through a menu of services including in-person workshops, individual and group consultations, and on-demand support through websites that offer scaffolded self-study materials on understanding, getting started with, and creating OER materials. Librarians can also provide classified (and annotated) links to OER repositories and resources and build repositories of OER materials created by local faculty.

OER support fits into the library's mission and the librarians' existing instructional, outreach, collection, and institutional service commitments (West, 2016, para. 6). This positions librarians to be important facilitators and partners in OER initiatives and the library space to serve as a central unifying hub for OER activities on campus. The current research found that when libraries provide support for OER, faculty are twice as likely to use OER materials and three and a half times as likely to create OER materials.

References

- Blankstein, M. (2023, January 11). *The library's role with Open Educational Resources*. Ithaka S+R. <https://sr.ithaka.org/blog/the-librarys-role-with-open-educational-resources/>
- Bouchrika, I. (2024, June 12). *Digital transformation in 2024 & history of the textbook in higher education*. Research.com. <https://research.com/education/textbooks-digital-transformation>
- Community College Consortium for Open Educational Resources (CCCOER). (n.d.). About Us. CCCOER. <https://www.cccoer.org/about/about-cccoer/>
- Clarke, C. D., & Kim, H. J. (2023). A study of the deployment of institutional repositories in colleges and universities in Connecticut. *Practical Academic Librarianship: The International Journal of the SLA Academic Division*, 13(1), 27-59. <https://pal-ojs-tamu.tdl.org/pal/article/view/7162>
- Coolidge, A., McKinney, A., & Shenoy, D. (n.d.). *OER in tenure and promotion*. DOERS3. <https://www.doers3.org/tenure-and-promotion.html>
- EBSCO. (2019, December 16). *The history and future of open educational resources in academic libraries*. EBSCO post. <https://www.ebsco.com/blogs/ebscopost/history-and-future-open-educational-resources-academic-libraries>
- Elder, A. K. (2021, August 24). *Getting OER into promotion and tenure documents*. Open Education in Promotion, Tenure, and Faculty Development. <https://oept.pubpub.org/pub/ko3xdyo3>
- Ex Libris A ProQuest Co. (2020, February 3). Libraries play a key role in campus OER adoption. *Library Journal*. <https://www.libraryjournal.com/story/libraries-play-a-key-role-in-campus-oer-adoption>
- IFLA. (n.d.). *Open Educational Resources and libraries: A briefing*. https://www.ifla.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/assets/clm/news/oer_ifla_brief.pdf
- Irvine, J., Kimmons, R., & Rogers, J. (2021, July 12). Recognizing and overcoming obstacles: What it will take to realize the potential of OER. *EDUCAUSE Review*. <https://er.educause.edu/articles/2021/7/recognizing-and-overcoming-obstacles-what-it-will-take-to-realize-the-potential-of-oer>

- McKibben, B., Wu, J., & Abelson, S. (2023, August 3). *New federal data confirm that college students face significant--and unacceptable--basic needs insecurity*. The Hope Center for Student Basic Needs. <https://hope.temple.edu/npsas>
- Seifrlle-Valencia, M. (2020). It's not (just) about the cost: Academic libraries and intentionally engaged OER for social justice. *Library Trends*, 69(2), 469-487. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2020.0042>
- Tang, Y., & Tseng, H. (2023). Exploring academic librarians' perception of OER through the lens of technology acceptance mode. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 49(5), 102769. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102769>
- Taylor, L. (2021). *The history of the lecture – Why change is needed*. Future Learning Environments. <https://futurelearningenvironments.org/the-history-of-the-lecture-why-change-is-needed/>
- UNESCO. (n.d.). *Open educational resources*. <https://www.unesco.org/en/open-educational-resources>
- Watt, M. G. (2007). Research on the textbook publishing industry in the United States of America. *IARTEM e-Journal*, 1(1). <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED498713.pdf>
- West, Q. (2016, June 1). Librarians and the Open Educational Resource Movement. *Choice*. <https://www.choice360.org/blog-post/librarians-and-the-open-educational-resource-movement/>

Appendix A

Table of Surveyed Institutions

Institution	Location	Student Enrollment (Fall 2022)	Academic Level	Carnegie Classifications	
				Size by Student Enrollment	Control
1 Albertus Magnus College	New Haven	1,275	Master's M2	small	Private not-for-profit
2 Connecticut College	New London	1,948	Bachelor's	small	Private not-for-profit
3 Fairfield University	Fairfield	6,019	Professional	medium	Private not-for-profit
4 Goodwin University	East Hartford	3,158	Bachelor's	small	Private not-for-profit
5 Hartford Int'l University for Religion and Peace	Hartford	92	Master's M3	very small*	Private not-for-profit
6 Holy Apostles College and Seminary	Cromwell	719	Master's M2	very small	Private not-for-profit
7 Mitchell College	New London	539	Bachelor's	very small	Private not-for-profit
8 Quinnipiac University	Hamden	8,788	Professional	medium	Private not-for-profit
9 Sacred Heart University	Fairfield	10,721	Professional	medium	Private not-for-profit
10 Trinity College	Hartford	2,205	Bachelor's	small	Private not-for-profit
11 University of Bridgeport	Bridgeport	3,988	Professional	medium	Private not-for-profit
12 University of Hartford	West Hartford	5,732	Professional	medium	Private not-for-profit
13 University of New Haven	West Haven	8,819	Master's	medium	Private not-for-profit
14 University of Saint Joseph	West Hartford	1,992	Master's	small	Private not-for-profit
15 Wesleyan University	Middletown	3,253	Bachelor's	small	Private not-for-profit
16 Yale University	New Haven	14,776	Research 1	large	Private not-for-profit
17 Post University	Waterbury	17,034	Master's M1	medium	Private for-profit
18 Paier College	Bridgeport	221	Bachelor's	very small	Private for-profit
19 University of Connecticut	Storrs	27,003	Research 1	large	Public (state-funded)
20 Central Connecticut State University	New Britain	9,468	Master's M1	medium	Public (state-funded)
21 Eastern Connecticut State University	Willimantic	4,082	Master's M3	medium	Public (state-funded)
22 Southern Connecticut State University	New Haven	8,889	Master's M1	medium	Public (state-funded)
23 Western Connecticut State University	Danbury	4,417	Master's M1	medium	Public (state-funded)
24 Asnuntuck Community College	Enfield	1,264	Associate	small	Public (state-funded)
25 Capital Community College	Hartford	2,395	Associate	small	Public (state-funded)
26 Gateway Community College	New Haven	5,578	Associate	medium	Public (state-funded)
27 Housatonic Community College	Bridgeport	3,364	Associate	medium	Public (state-funded)
28 Manchester Community College	Manchester	4,164	Associate	medium	Public (state-funded)
29 Middlesex Community College	Middletown	1,880	Associate	small	Public (state-funded)
30 Naugatuck Valley Community College	Waterbury	4,554	Associate	medium	Public (state-funded)
31 Northwestern Connecticut Community College	Winsted	1,149	Associate	small	Public (state-funded)
32 Norwalk Community College	Norwalk	4,069	Associate	medium	Public (state-funded)
33 Quinebaug Valley Community College	Danielson	1,195	Associate	small	Public (state-funded)
34 Three Rivers Community College	Norwich	2,937	Associate	small	Public (state-funded)
35 Tunxis Community College	Farmington	3,267	Associate	medium	Public (state-funded)
36 Charter Oak State College	New Britain	1,602	Bachelor's	very small	Public (state-funded)
37 United States Coast Guard Academy	New London	1,037	Bachelor's	small	Public (federally-funded)

*Assigned using Carnegie descriptions