Hi all, thanks for all the great responses to this question! See below for the roundup... Amy

I completed consult this morning with a faculty member for whom the instructional design assistance was the motivator. She had been on the fence about using the OER textbook, but when I mentioned that I could format it specifically for her course (she wants to provide one chapter with each module) she was sold. Additionally, I have a sandbox in our LMS which gives us the opportunity to experiment with the text and other resources without disturbing their current course builds. This morning she said 'before this I felt like I was doing this all alone, now I feel like I have a team'.

I'd like to get to the point where I am allowed to super-duper publicize which courses are using OER. I think that would be a motivator, having the Library Communications Machine advertising your course, but so far admin is a bit cautious about taking that step.

We have funding, but it doesn't go to professors, only grad / undergrad students, sessional instructors, or media production expenses, so some projects happen without any funding because the professors are doing all the work. We offer support from IDs / educational developers when appropriate and will show them how to use Pressbooks. I'll also help them find existing materials that they can adapt.

At my institution more people are starting to recognize the importance of the cost factor. Potential students are in the same dire economic straits, and we don't want the cost of materials to keep them from enrolling, which would hurt our budget even more.

Faculty may recognize the benefit of materials that are designed for online use. Some of my faculty are interested in OER because they know they won't be teaching f2f in the fall, so they're planning ahead to make their lives easier.

The most important point I would share is that OER generates more in tuition revenue than OER grants cost. We have consistently seen an average of 0.65 credit hours increased same-semester enrollment for students taking OER-based sections over equivalent non-OER sections. At our institution, 0.65 credit hours is $86.75 in increased tuition. Our OER grants have cost an average of approximately $20 per student for implementation. That's over 400% return on investment in just the first year. And, the way we structured our grants, the increased enrollment revenue comes in before the grant stipend is paid. More info: https://harper-academy.net/teaching-with-oer/oer-at-harper/

I am writing a paper about an OER stipend program we ran for the last couple years. We just surveyed faculty who received those stipends, and it turns out that financial rewards are not the leading incentive for OER creation/adoption. At least, not among this small sample of faculty. I'm

hopeful that this data, added to the extant research on OER, will help us to similarly develop effective strategies in what promises to be a challenging fiscal future. The three leading motivations were: 1. Textbook savings for students; 2. Curricular necessity; 3. Course design/experimentation.

Just today, a Communications professor and department chair shared these points with faculty about non-financial incentives about OER. (By the way, the entire Communications faculty at our college have gone OER for all their courses, an amazing accomplishment!) Feels timely and fitting to share!
1. By using OER, we can customize the course to match/fulfill the learning objectives/outcomes of the course in a way that a publisher text wouldn't
2. Students report that they like hearing from a range of expert voices instead of just one voice and especially appreciate diversity in the readings. With textbooks, we generally hear voices with cultural power
3. That expert voice can often be a marginalized group whose research doesn't float to the top because their voices have been blocked by dominant cultural narratives
4. Sometimes students make stress-driven decisions when the text is expensive (like trying to complete the course without the text or dropping the course or taking fewer courses). This speaks to an additional part of the equity component
5. Openly licensed materials open the conversation for us to talk about copyright with students (which we often neglect). When students understand more about the copyright they hold on their own work, they respect copyright on a new level and plagiarism reduces.
6. OER allows for the most current event examples to be used in classes where cultural and news-cycle references are relevant

It sounds cheesy I know but we started with no funds available and student voice tipped faculty over the edge. For some the equity data we've all seen was helpful but truly more than anything else a survey from our college with quotes from our students made the most difference. Here is the survey:
https://www.reedleycollege.edu/_documents/faculty-and-staff/core/2017-ztc-student-survey-response.pdf

I emphasize the publishing. We have our own publishing platform. Some instructors have taken an interest in getting their work in public. I am also increasing the creation of auxiliaries. There are many faculty who have seen the time and effort involved in creating a whole course or textbook. They do not have the time to commit. However, with auxiliaries, these smaller chunks of resources are easier to create and easier for those not as familiar with open practices to delve into.This method above has led me to instructors who were already involved in OER and open education and just did not know it.

I was able to get the other Deans to agree that counting OERs only in "Service" isn't enough – it's a lot of work plus everyone already has too much Service. They can now be counted in Teaching for adopting OERs and adapting your courses to use them, and in Research/Scholarly & Creative Activity for writing/creating a new OER.

Here's a slightly different take, but we are shooting for a recognition program in the form of a challenge from the Governor's Office. See here for our "Z Degree Challenge": http://masterplan.highered.colorado.gov/governor-polis-ztc-challenge/. The idea is for the Gov. to recognize outstanding OER work thereby motivating others to get involved (minimal costs, folks recognized at our annual statewide meeting). It's the first year, so we'll see what happens this fall, but super excited to have leadership's support. I know a number of campuses that are doing internal recognition programs as well, including luncheons, public recognition, etc.

Support: We've recently subscribed to Pressbooks, and there are staff who already want to publish textbooks openly (some who have manuscripts but were unsure about the publisher restrictions, and now see a level of freedom and ownership through open publishing), but they don't have the time. Providing support for Pressbooks, connecting them with media producers for rich content development, and providing library support in terms of locating additional open content has been successful. When the academic staff realise these services 'are just part of our job' and aren't anything out of the ordinary they are keen to interact.

Reputation: We've had two texts that resulted in some of the authors being offered consultancies, and research opportunities (in both cases, they were called or emailed 'out of the blue'), which were unexpected outcomes. As part of the overall message about open content, I've told those stories and this does motivate some folk as it speaks to enhanced readership. It also helps that our university is investigating methods to track and report non-traditional research outcomes and impact. Also, there are opportunities for Australasian/Australian editions of texts where none exist, so remixing/adapting existing US texts is appealing to some academic staff.

Control/Freedom: Depending on the discipline and person, I'll speak to 'maintaining control over your content' or 'freedom to remix, adapt, contextualise' (sometimes using both). One Faculty has just experienced a vendor removing access to a host of eBooks, including electronic texts that were required readings. The withdrawal of access happened during an assessment period and caused chaos. It didn't help that one of the books withdrawn was written by the Head of School for one discipline. He was less than impressed that students couldn't access any text, and he had no legal way of providing students with access to his own intellectual property. This one incident has provided an opportunity for discussions with the entire discipline about open content, and it is one about controlling and maintaining access into the future.

Students and costs: Last year, I manually collated all the information about textbook requirements for every mandatory (core) course in every undergraduate degree program, and then added enrollment figures to generate textbook costs per course, per year. I've been discussing these costs with the lecturers in our first year courses, and some have been seriously considering the financial impact on their students. One lecturer even said to me 'I can't believe that we're making that much money for a publisher, we're only one university using it, and it's not that good either!' She is now looking at texts in the OTN.

Digital Badges/microcredentials: the university is increasing the use of these to record professional development, and we've set up a couple of OER badges.

Awards from students: our student government set up an award to faculty and departments who make a significant difference in textbook affordability, based on Texas A&M's model (https://library.tamu.edu/services/scholarly_communication/open_ed_awards.html). The awards are paper certificates for now, but we've had a couple conversations about possibly having some sort of plaque in a visible spot of the library to highlight past recipients.

Letters of recognition from a campus VIP: once a year (or a semester), a faculty member will report that they are using OER or free-to-students materials in courses X, Y, and Z. That information then gets dropped into a form letter, signed and sent by the provost, thanking the faculty member (and cc'ing the department chair). The goal is tangible evidence of the faculty member's actions, especially sustained OER usage, which could form part of tenure/promotion portfolios. And having the provost or other campus leader notice your Good Work is an excellent (free) incentive. (Also: better info for me on which course sections are actually zero cost or OER!)

Pulling OER into other forms of support: we have some internal grants for conference travel, innovative teaching, or scholarly projects. The directors of the centers which issue these grants are very supportive of OER and feel that OER projects can qualify for them.

OER Adoption Sprints: inspired by the OER Development Sprints that Rajiv and some others have talked about, but less focused on creating. A 1-2 day workshop (lunch plus an afternoon?) for invited groups of faculty to dig into a possible OER replacement for a multi-section course they all teach, and at least start redesign the syllabus, assignments, or other course elements. If the possible OER is not viable the faculty team would instead thoroughly document what's absent or insufficient, creating the outline of a special project or grant proposal in order to create what's missing.

OER/low-cost course indicators in course registration

The most significant incentive I've heard of from faculty, honestly, is frustration. Frustration at publisher price-gouging, at having to spend class time recapping info from the book because many students didn't have access, at the inevitable start of semester delay as students switch sections, drop classes, or wait for financial aid.

Asking about OER in new course proposals: our curriculum committee reviews all new course proposals or major course changes, and the course proposal form already has a couple of questions about possible textbooks or new library collections needed to support the course or program. It would be pretty straightforward to add another line asking "What free or openly-licensed textbooks, if any, could this course use?"

SUNY Buffalo's OER Studio (https://research.lib.buffalo.edu/affordable-and-open/OER-studio) looks really exciting. There are obvious costs to develop something like that, but maybe those resources are easier to assemble than a grant/stipend.