

# Report: External Review of the Open SLCC Program at Salt Lake Community College

On September 29–30, 2022, an independent review team visited Salt Lake Community College (SLCC) to assess the effectiveness of Open SLCC in meeting the goals of the institution. The following report captures their observations and recommendations after meeting with various campus stakeholders. For a detailed list of the meetings and participants, see Appendix A.

The report is divided into three parts. Part one opens with “driving questions,” addressing four focus areas (strategic alignment, processes, services & programs, structure, and serving clients) that were identified during an internal self-review. In part two, key themes were identified and described from all the stakeholder meetings. Finally, part three closes the report by revisiting driving questions with answers and actions the review team derived from stakeholder input and external expert experience.

## Review Team:

- Lead External Reviewer: Lisa C. Young, Ph.D.
  - Faculty Administrator for Open Education and Innovation, Maricopa Community Colleges
- External Reviewer: Wayde Oshiro
  - Interim Learning Commons & Library Coordinator, Leeward Community College
- External Reviewer: Jonathan Lashley, Ph.D.
  - Director of Strategic Partnerships, Online Learning Consortium
- Internal Reviewer: Marianne McKnight
  - Senior Associate Dean, Faculty Affairs, School of Humanities & Social Sciences

# Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Driving Questions</b>	<b>3</b>
Strategic Alignment	3
Processes, Services and Programs	3
Structure	3
Serving Clients	3
Students and Student Services Partners	3
Faculty	3
<b>Key Themes from Stakeholder Meetings</b>	<b>3</b>
Provost	4
Strategic Alignment	4
Structure	5
Processes, Services and Programs	7
Faculty and Student Awareness	7
Professional Development	8
Project Management and Promotion	8
Hosting and Technical Support	8
Peer Review	9
Accessibility	9
Serving Clients	9
Students	9
Student Service Partners	10
Faculty	11
<b>Summary &amp; Recommendations</b>	<b>12</b>
Recommendations	12
Strategic Alignment	12
Structure	13
Processes, Services, and Programs	14
Serving Clients	15
<b>Appendix A: External Review Agenda</b>	<b>17</b>

# Driving Questions

## Open SLCC External Review Driving Questions

### Strategic Alignment

- Overall, how well is Open SLCC meeting the stated purpose in the context of Salt Lake Community College's Mission, Vision, Values, and Strategic Goals?
- How is Open SLCC ensuring equitable and inclusive program and services?
- How is the Open SLCC addressing the needs of historically marginalized populations?

### Processes, Services and Programs

- What changes and improvements should be made in the Open SLCC program to improve services and programs and advance the institution's goals?
- Are the services offered meeting the best practice standards?
- Do program/services contribute to clear systems/ processes at the institution level?
- Does the program have adequate processes in place to continually assess its services and respond to assessment data?

### Structure

- How effectively is the unit/department structured and administered?
- Is the unit/department sufficiently resourced?
- What is the climate of the working environment?

### Serving Clients

#### Students and Student Services Partners

- How effective and efficient is Open SLCC serving students?
- How can we better integrate student awareness of OER into the institutional structure?
- What is working/not working regarding department interactions and collaborations?

#### Faculty

- What is working regarding faculty development and faculty support systems? What is not?
- How efficient or effective is Open SLCC in providing services and programs to faculty?
- Are there potential faculty who are not being served? If so, why?

# Key Themes from Stakeholder Meetings

## Provost

External reviewers first met with Provost Dr. Clifton Sanders and were impressed by his deep knowledge of the Open SLCC Program and of open educational resources (OER) in general. Sanders shared how Open SLCC supports the mission, vision, and values of the college in serving its diverse service area. His vision included “acquir[ing a] sustainable level of intentionality” at Salt Lake Community College. He spoke very highly of the work of the Open SLCC program and took the time to share the advantages of the program as it relates to shifting service area demographics, pursuing Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) status, emerging trends in higher education, supporting college go-on through concurrent enrollment, working in support of guided pathways, and educating upward to the legislature. Additionally, we discussed college policy changes that could benefit open educational resources at the college, how to engage current and future faculty in this work, and ways the college could enhance its support of the Open SLCC Department. Some of these ideas have been integrated into our recommendations.

## Strategic Alignment

The review team found clear alignment between the mission, vision, and values of the college and the goals of the Open SLCC program. Specifically, inclusive educational opportunities that promote respect and empathy for diverse cultures and perspectives are central to the work of Open SLCC in providing outstanding educational experiences for students and by supporting faculty and staff. Open SLCC supports equity efforts by advocating for students to access economically responsive alternatives to costly commercial educational materials. It is a robust program that engages a significant percentage of the faculty and saves students a great deal of money. Additionally, it is evident that Open SLCC is meeting its purpose of being “a cross-institutional team that advocates for student success, inclusivity, and educational equity by supporting faculty and practitioners in logistics, scholarship, transformational open practices, and efforts to adopt, adapt, and develop open educational resources.” Because bandwidth is limited for Open SLCC staff, innovative thinking and adaptability buoy their efforts.

The review team considers Open SLCC to be more mature than many programs, yet it is still emerging in some significant ways. The OER sustainability self-assessment shows that through efforts spanning nearly a decade, this program has achieved an OER culture progress score of 61%. As we spoke with administrators, faculty, and staff, we found significant depth in knowledge of OER and the work that is being done to support open educational practices (OEP) at SLCC. Considering the appendix of the self-study against the [DOERS3 Equity Through OER Rubric](#) (a self-assessment tool designed to guide higher education practitioners, administrators, and policymakers in integrating OER through equity-centered content, practices, policy, and planning), the activities of Open SLCC fall under the “emerging” and “established” phases—the former, for instance, recognizes broad digital availability of materials that could be more portable and accessible, while the latter represents planning that positions OER as a means of addressing

disparities in student access due to “ability, income, race/ethnicity, gender, geographic location, and majors.” While there is still work to be done to fully move all aspects of Open SLCC into the established phase, an institutional culture that accounts for the ethical and practical merits of OER has emerged robustly among faculty and those who assist them in conducting OEP.

Stakeholders who we met understood how the work of Open SLCC was meeting equity-related goals and increasing access to instructional materials for students. They shared the opportunities that making these resources more inclusive can have on student learning. Additionally, it became apparent that the Open SLCC program held positive influence over not just the student experience but also the faculty who use and create OER. Administrators, students, and faculty alike shared how the opportunity to be engaged in knowledge co-creation and scholarship of teaching and learning is invigorating and often leads to better student outcomes.

The Open SLCC program both benefits from and sponsors faculty-driven, grassroots efforts that allows faculty to choose the option of opting-in or opting-out in the delivery of OER, no cost, and low-cost materials for students. While access to these materials is assured regardless of choice, the opt-in/opt-out nature of this arrangement does not strategically address the needs of historically marginalized populations. Instead, historically marginalized populations specifically and students in general may only discover classes supported by Open SLCC by chance. An opportunity exists for deliberately pairing OER and OEP with classes that enroll higher percentages of at-risk students in that these pedagogical interventions will benefit all learners.

## Structure

The Open SLCC program accomplishes much with the resources and personnel it has. While it is administratively understaffed, it has facilitated extraordinary work both in terms of quality and quantity. The Open SLCC staff and other collaborators (library staff, eLearning staff, department heads, and faculty) deserve commendation for their efforts. Some significant outcomes that the review team observed include the recognition of OER within the Course Fee Guidelines, the Sabbatical Leave Policy, and within the Banner student registration system when courses are tagged. Yet, these outcomes are supported by a very small team comprising the following roles:

- A full-time OER Coordinator
- A part-time OER editor
- An OER faculty fellow position on 6 credit hours of reassigned time
- An Archives, New Media, and Educational Initiatives Librarian who is expected to dedicate 15% of their time but, in reality, regularly spends up to 50% of their time supporting Open SLCC
- A 20–25-hours-per-week part-time OER/Archives specialist position which is currently vacant

- A 20-hours-per-week No-cost/Low-cost Advocacy and Outreach Specialist student internship that is also currently vacant

In nearly every focus group meeting we facilitated, the review team heard emphatic appreciation for the work of those listed above but also concern that these individuals were operating at capacity and needed additional personnel. The passion of the Open SLCC team is obvious to onlookers and they appear to maintain a fun and inspired working environment despite a challenging workload. All team members appeared to get along with each other as well as, importantly, with the faculty who they serve. The spirit of collaboration between faculty and staff is a tremendous asset for SLCC in scaling and sustaining OEP, but this should not detract from the severe reality that both groups seem to be working outside of business/contract hours.

Support for open education at Salt Lake Community College observes a distributed model in which a number of departments band together to support this program. There is one full-time employee in the Open SLCC program, and this position is at a coordinator level. It is our understanding that all other positions of this type at the college are at a director level. This individual not only works with faculty to provide program support and project management but also provides leadership and guidance to dual-role team members in the library, faculty serving as faculty fellows, and those supporting OER adoption through the eLearning department. This distributed model appears to cause confusion and inconsistency for those being supported by the Open SLCC program and at least one faculty member suggested that this model does not fully address the needs of some satellite campuses.

The current structure of the OER fee, which the OER coordinator oversees, results in an inequitable distribution of funds to participating departments. While the ways the OER funds are distributed are logical—departments with large OER enrollments are annually allotted the money they generate while departments with fewer OER courses get substantially less—this structure may not take into account several structural issues that mask the problem. For instance, smaller departments may not feel particularly well supported in growing their OER offerings when they look at the budget they have been presented. Alternatively, large, well-funded departments may decide to spend all that they are allotted (whether they really need it or not) rather than see some dollars swept back into the general fund at the end of the year. In short, this model may carry some gratuitous incentives for some while de-incentivizing other departments. During meetings, some administrators were unaware that they had any funds, while others did not have guidance as to how to use the funds. What they spend funds on also varies greatly from department to department. For example, some departments used funds for peer review, while others were not aware they could do so. Inequitable and inconsistent relationships between OER funding and departments became a prominent area of concern for the review team.

Academic policy is another area where concerns arose for the review team. Specifically, rank, promotion, service, and intellectual property (IP) policies. When not explicitly addressing or supporting OEP, scholarly activity and professional development in OER may be deterred. The relevance of OER and OEP to hiring and promotion processes are not clear for faculty, and

formal recognition of OER by administrators seems underdeveloped. It came to our attention that the current college IP policy is not aligned with the work that Open SLCC is doing and the ways that OER are being licensed, but the review team was also informed that an IP committee is currently addressing this misalignment.

## Processes, Services and Programs

The Open SLCC program provides a wide array of services to faculty, extending benefits to students by way of more affordable course materials. Though there are limits to how much a small team may scale their services, Open SLCC attracts participation from faculty and departments largely through word of mouth and collaboration with the library, eLearning, department chairs, individual faculty, and academic leaders. As a result, a program that is not inherently scalable is considerably well integrated within the academic affairs of SLCC.

According to the Open SLCC program review self-study, the program current provides the following services:

- Fiscal management for participating departments
- Best practices, processes, and guidelines related to OER
- Project management and mentoring for OER adopters
- OER publishing support
- OER discovery
- OER advocacy and outreach to promote program/project visibility
- Professional development coordination
- Metric tracking
- Encouragement toward participating in OER scholarship,
- Course scheduling

From our conversations with stakeholders in a number of focus groups, divergent views around common themes emerged regarding Open SLCC processes, services, and programs:

- Faculty and student awareness of Open SLCC services
- Professional development opportunities
- Project management and promotion
- Content hosting and technical support
- OER peer review
- Accessibility

## Faculty and Student Awareness

Some faculty seemed to know that they could go to the OER Coordinator and get information; some worked exclusively with Archives, New Media, and Educational Initiatives Librarian; others made a series of calls and emails in order to finally fall in with the right contact; and some just pursued the work on their own or under encouragement from other faculty, not knowing support

was available. Everyone who has worked with someone from the Open SLCC office, however, raved about the programs and services provided.

The review team met with a group of highly motivated student leaders during the Student Focus Group. While their awareness of OER, open and affordable classes, and how to search for such classes during registration was limited, they were extremely excited about the opportunities afforded by open pedagogy. While they shared that they were unsure that all students would feel the way that they felt, they were attracted to the idea of co-constructing knowledge and passing on their education content and experiences to future students. One, in conveying his understanding of the concept, shared that the best way to learn is to be able to teach the content. Helping other students was very appealing to them. This is an opportunity for the Open SLCC to expand services in open pedagogy as a motivational factor for students.

## Professional Development

Two existing courses seem to comprise professional development opportunities sponsored by Open SLCC: (1) a low-level introduction to OER training class and (2) a course on copyright through the library. All other professional development support appears to be just-in-time, individualized training. Just-in-time training may be more relevant in accounting for distinct disciplinary and pedagogical needs, but this form of support takes a lot of the team members' time to provide since it is on-demand and individualized in nature. While more regular and diversified training would increase faculty awareness of OER and the work that is being done by faculty in collaboration with Open SLCC, the review team is skeptical current program personnel have the bandwidth to expand training and support tools beyond current levels.

## Project Management and Promotion

Faculty shared that the OER Coordinator provides great onboarding support for faculty who are new to OER, helping them identify their project-based needs and connecting them to the resources that they will need to be successful in their OER projects. This interaction with the coordinator eliminates what some early adopters of OER referred to as “lessons learned” sans institutional support. Faculty who have engaged in OER projects identified a general need for project management and workflow assistance. They wanted to have more information on timelines for getting assistance, how long processes like OER searches would take, the editing process, copyright review, and other developmental stages related to OEP. Additionally, they consider it beneficial to know which projects are being worked on by creating a directory of OER work that exists at SLCC. Many different stakeholders identified a desire and/or need for more promotion of existing and upcoming OER projects.

## Hosting and Technical Support

In conversation with faculty, the availability of the Pressbooks platform seemed appreciated but experiences varied. One faculty member who teaches at another campus described difficulty with using the platform to edit and share open content. Others found support from other faculty and each other. Coupled with the lack of a dedicated open repository for hosting, versioning,



and disseminating OER, the need for greater technical support in authoring/publishing with available resources emerged as an important theme for the review team. If Open SLCC is to consolidate and centralize support of OER adoption, development, and distribution, additional technical assistance is needed to support Pressbooks and launch a dedicated repository.

## Peer Review

While the Program Review Self-study indicates a peer review checklist is under development and funding is available for peer review, the peer review process and how that funding is available is not clear across the college. Many of the stakeholders that we met with in the focus groups shared that there is a desire to have peer review. Many departments are creating peer review processes for their OER work on their own. This process is inconsistent across the college, there is no evidence that they are using vetted peer review processes and it appears that the way it is being compensated is also inconsistent.

## Accessibility

Under current personnel constraints shouldered by Open SLCC as well as the greater institution due to turnover, accessibility and universal design services appear insufficient for a program this mature. Not only did faculty mention the need for additional support for meeting the needs of students, the Archives, New Media, and Educational Initiatives Librarian explicitly requested additional support in this area. While a workflow for accessibility was mentioned, it was also acknowledged that this process is entirely optional. Considering the SLCC commitment to inclusivity, formalizing dedicated accessibility support for OER is both necessary and urgent.

## Serving Clients

Students, faculty, and student services personnel all provided positive reviews of the work being done by Open SLCC. Interviews with faculty and academic leaders confirmed that the work of Open SLCC has granted faculty a heightened level of pedagogical creativity and agency. Faculty engaged in OER work appear to be committed to it, and should serve as a benchmark for success since so much of the open education work happening at SLCC has been grassroots in nature. Generally, faculty who engage in this work seem to do so not for compensation but because it serves their students well. Some do and will want assurance that they are fairly compensated if not meaningfully recognized for their efforts, however.

## Students

Open SLCC is serving students by providing learning options that leverage open, no-, and low-cost educational resources. These offerings provide more equitable access to often required learning materials. During their focus group, students indicated that they were not immediately aware that Salt Lake Community College offered courses with no-, low-cost, or open educational resources. Upon further elaboration by the review team, students expressed familiarity with some courses featuring such materials. All were unaware of functionality available to them at time of registration, however, to filter course options based on the cost of

learning materials. In the same focus group, student services staff indicated that two different course registration systems are available to students. While relevant search functionality exists in both platforms, the student experience varies when they are trying to find information about course materials. There is thus an opportunity to improve marketing of the search functionality for students at Salt Lake Community College so they can make more informed choices about courses based on course materials and so the Open SLCC team can benchmark student awareness and decision making. Without firm understanding of what, if any, influence OER-related information about courses (i.e., course marking) had on students during course registration, administrators, faculty, and staff generally assume that students selected their courses based on scheduling needs—specifically when they could fit in courses. Students, however, speculated that they may be inclined to modify their schedules if they knew that a course was using open, no-, or low-cost instructional materials.

During the focus group, the review team asked students about their use of and preferences for course materials. This particular student group was evenly divided regarding whether they preferred digital or physical textbooks, indicating that there is still a need to have printed versions of some of the textbooks as an option to students if SLCC wishes to be inclusive of student preferences. We also asked if students use and keep their textbooks. Students indicated that whether they read the textbook was related to how effectively faculty integrated the book as part of the course curriculum. If faculty used textbook content in class and elaborate on that material in engaging ways, students claimed to be more inclined to read and perhaps keep the textbook. When we asked faculty champions of OER about this, they indicated that they felt more inclined to engage with the textbook in class and conduct activities using the textbook when they have been greatly involved in the development of the text. It is worth noting that students shared their great displeasure with some publisher materials: the usability of their platforms, the accuracy of their content, and the uneven relationship of textbook content with assessment questions. Students were disinclined to take some courses due to the publisher materials being used, even going to lengths of registering for more classes than necessary in order to strategically drop courses that used undesirable publisher textbooks and/or platforms.

Finally, students that we spoke to expressed keen interest in the promise of what is commonly referred to as open or OER-enabled pedagogy—the deliberate practice of building and openly licensing assignments, assessments, and course content with students. They perceived clear value in co-constructing knowledge with their instructors and were excited by the prospect of leaving behind an educational legacy through course materials that would benefit future students.

## Student Service Partners

During our discussion with Student Service Partners, we found Career Services and Advising to be generally aware of OER efforts at the college. They knew that there is a search function, and understand that this information is shared with students during the orientation. That said, they also shared that the orientation is filled with information and that students may not remember everything that they've learned during those sessions. Additionally, they shared that it is difficult

to advise toward no-, low-cost, and open offerings when only one or two sections are available in a department. They find it is much easier to confidently advise students when an entire department adopts such course materials. Specifically, they referenced interest in being able to track such information via something called a “purple sheet.” Further, there are important implications for career services in raising awareness of open pedagogy and student co-creation of OER, considering such work is of a scholarly nature for students and faculty alike.

## Faculty

The majority of the faculty that we met are generally appreciative of the services that they have found from the Open SLCC team. Faculty repeatedly and specifically lauded the efforts of the OER Coordinator and the Archives, New Media, and Educational Initiatives Librarian. They shared stories about how the Open SLCC team helped refine the scope of their projects, identify unique resources that faculty could adopt, advise on complying with content licenses, connect faculty with other subject matter experts, provide expertise on remixing content, and rapidly respond to faculty needs. That said, faculty also shared concerns about the sustainability and capacity of the Open SLCC team in meeting greater faculty demand under current staffing and program design. Grassroots efforts by faculty to champion OER and support one another seems to have offset many of the bandwidth issues that stakeholders have cited for Open SLCC staff. Faculty and academic leaders recognized that while there is likely a need to grow and strategically centralize OEP under Open SLCC, special effort must be made to ensure that any changes complement the organic affinity grouping that has taken place among faculty. Simply, the pursuit of novel institutional engagement of faculty around OER should not come at the risk of upending the existing, collaborative OEP of other faculty.

Reflecting on their personal experiences in adopting, adapting, and creating OER, faculty did share concerns about the amount of work these practices entail. They identified pronounced needs in the areas of project management, the scoping of project timelines, technical support in creating accessible course content, and funding model transparency. Faculty shared that there are opportunities for Open SLCC to market and provide additional professional development and marketing of services to faculty across SLCC’s 10 campuses. Recognizing resource and personnel constraints, faculty recommended expanding a mentor program by which faculty champions of OER could mentor faculty who are just getting started with OEP. Faculty and academic leaders recognize that editing capacity could expand by leveraging adjuncts or even students. A faculty member who teaches in a small department noted the unique challenge of working on OER without a subject matter collaborator, which presents a clear opportunity for Open SLCC staff to build partnerships for faculty across institutions (especially with other postsecondary institutions in Utah). Finally, many individuals that we spoke with shared the need to have a peer review process established for evaluating the sustainability and guiding the continuous improvement of content and practices.

# Summary & Recommendations

Based on meetings with stakeholders as well as a systematic review of the program's self-evaluation, we find Open SLCC to be a mature open education initiative that, while established in some functional and strategic areas, is still emerging in others. Program staffing and services complement the existing efforts of a grassroots faculty community who pursue OER and OEP on their own or collaboratively, without the assurances of institutional support. Yet, current revenue models and staff bandwidth limit the capacity of the program in scaling to address the professional development and support needs of SLCC's stakeholder community—comprising faculty, academic leaders, librarians, instructional designers/technologists, and students.

There are numerous opportunities for the Open SLCC to grow its services and relevance to the greater SLCC community. Some changes may be symbolic, relying on the overt support of academic leaders. Other, more pressing changes, will need to address the department's parity with others of its type, inequities in the current business model, and the reality that this small team works well beyond the scope and hours of their role. Retaining current staff and providing them with additional human resources will be key to ensuring the sustainability of this program, especially if college leaders want to see the work of Open SLCC expand. The following recommendations provide a snapshot of what we consider to be possible for Open SLCC, but great care must be taken to ensure that this hardworking team does not burn out or over extend themselves due to resource limitations.

## Recommendations

### Strategic Alignment

The Open SLCC program is already well aligned with the Mission, Vision, and Values of Salt Lake Community College, and this is recognized by stakeholders of all levels. There is an opportunity to ensure that the work of Open SLCC continues to be elevated as the new strategic plan is written, especially if the program is formally centralized as part of the college's core services (e.g., positioning its services as akin in utility and authority to those provided by a department like eLearning). Additionally, from a strategic perspective, employment/hiring interviews of future administrators and faculty would benefit from questions about open educational practices. Given the work that is occurring with Guided Pathways, there is an opportunity to align some of the OER work to guided Pathways areas of Interest. By extension, there are also opportunities to explore the potential of comprehensive OER use in concurrent enrollment as well as co-development of content with four-year universities in Utah; both contexts would situate SLCC course content as an enduring bridge for students between secondary education and the completion of a four-year degree. There are additional opportunities to align a z-degree to online programs to better address shifting service area demographics and inclusively accommodate a diverse learner population.

## Structure

The structure of Open SLCC is well regarded, however, there are a number of opportunities for improvement including the following:

- Open SLCC has effectively harnessed exceptional grassroots energy among faculty. While the opt-in/opt-out nature of the program has served the college well politically, it is not sufficient for ensuring that SLCC set or reach benchmarks for OER use at scale. Strategically identifying which disciplines/courses may yield the highest impact in adopting OER will allow for more formal and predictable project management. Targeting high-need/-impact courses for comprehensive redesign around OER and OEP will require overt support of academic leaders, but this path is necessary if SLCC wishes to standardize a more equitable business model, provide more consistent services and information to the academic community, and explore the potential of Z degrees and other strategic initiatives that improve educational access and minimize financial barriers for students.
- Elevate the OER coordinator position to a director-level position as is the model for other staff leading similar initiatives. The need for parity between positions of this type is both symbolic in elevating this person as a campus authority and practical in ensuring that hard work is sufficiently recognized and rewarded.
- Create an additional position in the Open SLCC office that could be responsible for project management. Not only would this additional role help raise awareness, productivity, and consistency of OER projects, to faculty, staff and students, it would free up bandwidth for other Open SLCC team members to play to their strengths in building strategy and advising stakeholders.
- Evaluate staffing levels of partner departments to ensure that enough partner staff time is dedicated to Open SLCC. This could mean shifting individuals' workloads to allow for a higher percentage of their assigned job duties to support Open SLCC or hiring dedicated part-time employees to support Open SLCC projects. Importantly, this is an opportunity to create meaningful employment opportunities for under-employed adjuncts and/or students.
- Evaluate the OER work being done by eLearning to identify areas of overlap. The current online course development cycle practically doubles when OER is introduced as part of the design process. It is critical that strategic review and development of processes occur between these two departments in order to strengthen collaboration, streamline faculty support, ensure reliable consistency across digital learning experiences, and build capacity for more mutually beneficial established program characteristics: comprehensive development of accessible digital resources, goal-setting for and continuous improvement of equitable learning opportunities, policy redevelopment in support of the scholarship of teaching and learning, etc.
- Whether additional roles and responsibilities are added to the Open SLCC team, more deliberate and formal cross-training about OER and OEP must occur between library, elearning, advising, and other relevant support staff. We recommend that academic leaders promote Open SLCC as the authority on open education topics and prioritize. Where possible, we encourage mandatory participation of other departments in

professional development about how they may support as well as benefit from collaboration with Open SLCC.

- Whether pedagogically as part of the course curriculum or contractually as part-time employees, we recommend that SLCC actively seek student assistance in OER re/development. Many institutions have leveraged students in their OER efforts to find educational resources (information, images, media, etc.) and even edit or update materials with educators. As the students we spoke with immediately formulated, such scholarly opportunities put their domain knowledge to work in positive, tangible ways.
- Include representation on the Open SLCC Advisory Board from the diversity office, student services, and small academic programs from satellite campuses. Including people who are not using OER on the advisory committee will likely prove beneficial in arriving at more comprehensive decisions for the program as it helps capture some of the challenges that faculty who are not engaged in the work may face.
- Revise the rank and promotion/tenure process and policy to provide clear details in regard to how OER and OEP fit into these policies. Additionally, the college's intellectual property policy must explicitly address the use and creation of openly-licensed materials by faculty and students. We know that revision of the IP policy is underway but want to emphasize that these changes should be concluded quickly and marketed broadly in an effort to demystify and incentivise OER and OEP for SLCC's academic community.

## Processes, Services, and Programs

### Faculty Development

- Provide more comprehensive and strategic faculty development. Putting together specific programming for faculty related project workflow with Open SLCC, getting started with Pressbooks, adopting open pedagogy, and so on may not only increase awareness of OER on campus but also lighten the load of the Open SLCC team by effectively training faculty mentors on advanced topics in open education.
- Leverage open pedagogy to create signature open assignments for e-portfolios, especially because this content may be retained, updated, and thus be useful for students long after their time at SLCC.
- Create training opportunities with eLearning designers that empower faculty to learn instructional techniques for unbundling open content and embedding textbook material more meaningfully and intuitively into the activities of a course.

### Peer Mentorship

- Create a peer mentor program to serve the following purposes. First, recognize OER practitioners and champions as experts who can share their knowledge; second, raise awareness of OER efforts on campus; and, finally, provide another source of expertise and support for faculty. The work that it would take to establish this program would have large payoffs in streamlining the work of the Open SLCC team. At the very least, Open SLCC could play a critical role in organizing recurring, casual meeting space where faculty can discuss their OER projects and OEP experiences with others (something that had not, as far as we were told, occurred before the faculty focus group we facilitated).

## Peer Review

- Establish a peer review process and compensation model that applies across the institution. Because few concerns about content quality arose from our conversations with faculty and students, this is an opportunity to elevate peer review beyond a deficit model and instead pursue institutional as well as disciplinary definitions of quality that are desired for OER and OEP.

## Continuous Improvement

- Additional project management support would allow for the development of continuous improvement and maintenance cycles for faculty OER projects. There are several existing models that other institutions have explored for continuously improving courses and course content. Because of grassroots efforts among faculty, SLCC's model will need to capture content developed with and without institutional support. Doing so will position Open SLCC's services as relevant to established as well as novice OER champions.

## Metrics/Data Collection

- A centralized directory that inventories the OER currently being adopted or revised by faculty is necessary, even before SLCC stands up a comprehensive repository or strategy for managing content versions. While course marking already exists, identifying open, no-, and low-cost material in courses, there is a lack of information on what materials faculty are specifically using. Further, the course marking strategy needs to be revisited and/or marketed for students to raise awareness of these courses and how to find/register for them.

## Workflow

- Develop a fixed OER project workflow with reliable estimates of the amount of time that certain phases may take for faculty to complete. This documentation will help Open SLCC staff set realistic expectations for the work that needs to be done to adopt, adapt, and create OER at Salt Lake Community College.

## Repository

- Establish a website and repository where master OER materials can be effectively versioned and shared.

## Serving Clients

### Student Awareness

- Create a student-facing awareness campaign to inform students what OER, no cost, and low-cost materials are and how to search for them.
- Develop a student thank you campaign so students are aware of and recognize the work that their faculty are doing to provide them with these materials.
- Create a student awareness campaign providing the impact that OER are having in regard to cost savings and equity.

### Student Services Support

- Adding a student services member to the advisory committee for open SLCC is recommended.

- Provide regular training and awareness to student services staff to help them better advise students about OER.
- Revise the “purple sheet” to include OER options.

#### Funding Model and Compensation

- Bring stakeholders together to get input on the compensation model to provide equity across departments and disciplines for access to funding for OER.
- Analyze current compensation models for developing OER across the college and make them equitable.
- Determine ways to engage early adopter departments and faculty in future compensation for OER maintenance and work.
- Assist faculty in small programs with finding external collaboration with faculty and subject matter experts of other institutions. Not only does this lessen the workload of SLCC faculty, it creates new opportunities for cross-institutional collaboration.



# Appendix A: External Review Agenda

## OPEN SLCC EXTERNAL REVIEW VISIT AGENDA

Thursday, September 29, 2022

- Breakfast on your own
- Andrea will pick up external reviewers at the Hotel at 8:20 am

**9:00 am – 10:00 am Meeting with the Provost**

**STC- 025 Den 2**

Dr. Clifton Sanders

**10:00 am – 10:15 am Break**

**10:15 am – 11:15 am Strategic Alignment Focus Group**

**STC- 025 Den 2**

Dr. David Hubert, Associate Provost Learning  
Advancement

Dr. Jason Pickavance, Associate Provost, Operations Ann  
Richins, Assistant Director, Content Services Richard  
Diaz, Director, Orientation & Student Success Adam  
Dastrup, Professor, Geoscience, Faculty Senate President  
Corey Stevens, Assistant Director, eLearning

**11:15 am – 11:45 am Campus Tour**

Andrea Scott, OER Coordinator

**11:45 am – 12:45 pm Lunch in the Provost's Office  
Conference Room**

**AAB 364**

**1:00 pm – 2:00 pm Administrative Support Structures Focus Group**

**STC- 025 Den 2**

Barbie Willet, Associate Dean Management & Marketing  
Nick Burns, Associate Dean, Communication & Performing Arts  
Jerri Harwell, Department Chair, English, Linguistics and  
Writing Studies  
Dr. Deidre Tyler, Professor Sociology  
Ruth Trygstad, Associate Professor Mathematics  
Sarah Billington, Associate Professor Communication  
Jessica Curran, Associate Professor, Visual Art & Design

**2:00 pm – 2:15 pm Break**

**2:15 pm – 3:15 pm Student Focus Group**

**STC- 025 Den 2**

Ashley Sokia, Director of Academic Advising Alyshia  
Jenkins, Advisor, Career Services Orientation & Student  
Success Rep

---

SLCC Student Senate Rep  
SLCC Honors Program Student  
Student (Walk-in)

Andrea will take the external reviewers back to the hotel.

External reviewers can uber, lift or rideshare to the optional dinner.

**6:45 pm – 8:45 pm Optional Dinner at Lake Effect**

Hosted by Open SLCC  
Lake Effect  
55 W 200 S, Salt Lake City, UT 84101 [https://  
g.page/LakeEffectSLC?share](https://g.page/LakeEffectSLC?share) Menu: [https://  
lakeeffectslc.com/our-cuisine/](https://lakeeffectslc.com/our-cuisine/)Uber or  
rideshare

## Friday, September 30, 2022

- Breakfast on your own
- Uber/Lift to Salt Lake Community College, Taylorsville Redwood Campus

### 9:00 am – 10:00 am Faculty Focus Group

STC- 025 Den 2

#### Faculty Focus Group

Adam Dastrup, Professor, Geoscience & Faculty Senate President  
Melissa Hardy, Associate Professor, Biology  
Daniel Baird, Assistant Professor, English  
Gabe Byars, Associate Professor, OTA  
Julia Ellis, Program Manager, Public Safety  
Alison Wild-Arndt, Assistant Professor Communication

### 10:00 am – 10:15 am Break

Brenda Gardner, Associate Professor, Mathematics, OER Faculty  
Fellow  
Linda Bult, OER Editor

### 10:15 am – 11:15 am Meeting with the Open SLCC Team

STC- 025 Den 2

Ann Richins, Assistant Director, Content Services  
Jen Hughes, Archives, NMedia & Educational Initiatives Librarian  
Brenda Gardner, Associate Professor, Mathematics, OER Faculty  
Fellow  
Linda Bult, OER Editor

**Dismissed- Thank you!! Lunch and Dinner on your own but will be covered by SLCC.**