Voiceover:

Is this thing on? Hi. Hello. Is this thing on? Hi, is this thing on and on? Is this thing on? Is this thing on? Hi, is this thing on? Are we open?

Zach Claybaugh:

Welcome to Open-Ed Mic, a podcast where voices from across the educational landscape share insights, stories, and strategies for transforming learning through openness. Whether you're new to open education or a seasoned practitioner, Open-Ed Mic invites you into the conversation. All right, let's hear who is joining us today. Mike?

Mike Mills:

Hi, everyone. It's good to join you again. I'm Mike Mills, recently retired from Montgomery College as the Associate Senior Vice President within Academic Affairs.

Zach Claybaugh:

Brittany?

Brittany Dudek:

Hi, I am not recently retired and extremely jealous, but Brittany Dudek from the Colorado Community College System in Denver.

Zach Claybaugh:

Kevin?

Kevin Corcoran:

I'm Kevin Corcoran. I can see the finish line for retirement, but I'm not quite there. And I'm from the University of Central Florida down in Orlando.

Zach Claybaugh:

And I'm Zach Claybaugh at Dominican University, just outside of Chicago, Illinois. And I too am very jealous of Mike and his retired life and hope someday to be there. I do want to shout out a very special welcome to our guest today, Andrew McKinney. Andrew is the University Director of Research and Publishing Strategies for The City University of New York system and a nationally recognized advocate for rethinking how higher education values teaching, openness, and academic labor.

Andrew's work sits at a critical intersection, open education, labor equity, and tenure and promotion reform. Through his past leadership with The DOERS Community and his influential work on re-imagining tenure and promotion for open equitable teaching, Andrew has helped surface a truth many faculty feel, but struggle to articulate, that our institutions often say they value innovative, student-centered, and open teaching, while promotion systems quietly reward something else entirely.

His scholarship and organizing challenge institutions to align their values with their reward structures, asking hard questions like, "What counts as scholarly work? Who gets credit? And what kind of teaching do we actually want to sustain?" In a moment when faculty burnout is high and trust in higher ed is fragile, Andrew's work offers both critique and a path forward. We're thrilled to have a thinker who is helping the field move from rhetoric to reform. Welcome, Andrew.

Andrew McKinney:

Thank you. Wow. Who wrote that? That's the best intro I've ever gotten. Thanks, Kev. Yeah. So I mean, from theory to reform or whatever, that was just what you just said. I would love to take credit for some of this, but I don't think I can. So much of what's happening in this space and what we did with... I think part of why I'm here is this book, Valuing OER in the Tenure, Promotion Process, that we produced out of DOERS.

There's 27 case studies from across the country and Canada, and we had one case study from Nigeria. That was a big project, took a lot of people to get it across the board. I think I can take credit for it originally being my idea, but I don't think I can really take credit for its total execution. And I will say, I had a really interesting conversation with one of my colleagues this morning on the topic of tenure promotion, and she was describing something that happened at her campus.

She's a fellow who's working in my office, because I work here at the central office for CUNY. At her campus, she was talking about a process in the tenure promotion there. And I was like, "What are you talking about? I actually have no idea what you're talking about." She was like, "Wait, everybody doesn't do that here?" The answer was no, which is to say, even at my own institution, I don't have a great handle on this as much as I would like to. When I look at for The City University of New York, we are 26 campuses.

I work in our Office of Library Services. We're 31 libraries. So 26 campuses that includes community colleges, includes comprehensives, includes senior colleges, includes graduate schools. In our bylaws, the section on tenure promotion is like three sentences. There's nothing in there from a central perspective, from a university-wide. We're dictating policy stuff. So that means that it's left up to the campuses.

And if you are on a campus, you know that means that's mostly left up to the departments. So one of the things that we struggled with the most from the Doer's perspective, from a group of folks who were doing jobs like we do, where we're trying to do college-wide, system-wide, state-wide, province-wide OER stuff, we're trying to make some intervention, but an intervention into a problem that is really a departmental level problem.

So when we originally crafted ideas around it, we were really struggling with how do we make suggestions? How do we make policy interventions that don't get immediately taken from... In my experience, if you try to push policy down people's throats from a central office, there's pushback. How do we give space to departments to really think this through?

How do we give them tools to think about this? And so we got to the case studies idea, mainly because we thought, oh, well, people will be interested just to hear from a faculty perspective, hear from a departmental perspective. There were some case studies that were college-wide stuff, but the majority of them were just a faculty member being like, "This is what I did."

And I think that's what people really need. I don't think this is false humility, back to this very kind intro, I can't take credit for a lot of this stuff because it doesn't happen from my position. It happens from inside departments. It happens faculty to faculty member. That's just what the engine of change, I think, really around tenure promotion tends to be.

Mike Mills:

What prompted the focus on this tension between OER, open teaching and tenure and promotion? Was there something that was creating a disconnect that got you involved and got the DOERS group involved?

Andrew McKinney:

Yeah. Well, I think there's a couple things. One is I am blessed to be at an institution that has what we call tax levy money. So budget money from the state to incentivize faculty to use OER to create OER. But even then, we were seeing faculty say like, "Well, why should I do this? This isn't that much money." It's

like, "What I really need is time, what I really need to support from my department to care about doing this."

So early on in DOERS, DOERS, it's an interesting organization, right? It starts off, it's just CUNY, SUNY, The State University of New York, and the University System of Maryland, just three schools getting together who had money at the time to really think about what could we learn from one another? So as the organization starts to grow and we start talking to other states that have and other university systems that have OER programs, we started to, well, we have work we could be doing.

So we broke out into different working groups. And the working group I was in, we called it at the time building capacity or capacity building. I could never remember which one was which. But basically the remit of that working group was like, all right, we know that there are persistent barriers to sustainability for OER programs, right? And since I had seen, and I had had faculty and the way we run our program at CUNY is each campus has an OER representative who runs it on the campus and we'd heard back... We called them the reps.

We'd heard back from our OER reps that faculty were really interested in doing something, but especially junior faculty were saying like, "Well, if I do this, then I can't finish this article. If I do this, I can't do this service, and then that looks bad in my tenure promotion profile. So why should I do it?" So a lot of it was for me, I was seeing the bubble up from my campus. The other data point that was like what I felt like was the need is like, 2018-2019 when I first really...

2018 was my first year in this job, I felt like on CCC OER, on Lib OER, any of the list serves, you would see once a month, somebody asking a question of, "I have a faculty member or I'm a faculty member who's going up for a tenure promotion. Does anybody have an example of how they use their OER work in their tenure promotion dossier?" So that was, I think, really the origin of why we saw that need through both anecdotal stuff, but then seeing it in the community.

And then we tried a couple different things. We created this thing, me and this guy, Deepak Chanoi, who was a consultant that worked with DOERS for a while. And then it was me and Deep and Amanda Coolidge from BC campus, who now I guess is with Pressbooks very recently. We developed this thing that we ended up calling the OER contributions matrix, where it's just like a little matrix, a little table that was a list of types of OER activity, whether that be adoption or adaption or creation or doing a SoTL study on your OER or any number of other things.

And then which of the buckets of the dossier does it go in? The basic ones are teaching, research, and service. What I learned through this process, specifically in the case studies, was there are other institutions that use different categories, but you can map most things to those three. Let's say you wrote your own textbook. You could probably put that in teaching. And depending on the type of department you're in, you could maybe put that in research, right?

We did that. And then when we socialized and put it out there, people were asking for, "Well, could you put examples in the matrix?" And so there was a remix out of Oregon that did that that was super nice. It's a really great use of it. And then from there, we started thinking, "Well, maybe we should just do a case study book," and that's how we got to that part.

Kevin Corcoran:

Andy, you talked about the origin of how DOERS came to be. Just for the listeners who are not familiar with the acronym, can you explain what that is?

Andrew McKinney:

Sure. Yeah. It used to be DOERS3. So it was DOERS and S was cubed. So it's Driving Open Educational Resources for Sustainability Student Success, I believe.

Kevin Corcoran:

One question I had for you is that you have, I believe, what, it's 26 different campuses within the CUNY system, and a majority of them I think are colleges or community colleges, and you have one university?

Andrew McKinney:

No. It's everything. So we have seven community colleges, and then we have three comprehensives that would be... These, I know, it's Medgar Evers, New York City College of Technology, City Tech, where I worked at for many years, and the College of Staten Island. There are a number of graduate schools and professional schools. So the City University is the university, right? Everything else is a college or a graduate school. So none of them are universities in and of themselves. City University is the only university to date.

Kevin Corcoran:

The reason why I was asking that is with the different campuses or colleges you have, have you seen a variety of responses for tenure and promotion? Have you seen that certain areas, certain colleges have been more receptive to recognizing faculty work, or have some only recognized when faculty have created OER material only in a textbook format? I don't know, I'm just wondering if there's a different flavor or different field based on campus.

Andrew McKinney:

It really, really depends, right? I've had a couple of our schools, I won't name them, and representatives of those schools tell me when I talk about this, "Well, that's never going to work here." And what I've said to a couple of them is like, "Well, actually I've seen it work a couple times here." So I think people have a tendency to when there's change get very like, "Well, obviously this is never going to work."

And if you work in a large public bureaucracy, I think this happens everywhere in big public bureaucracies, people have a tendency to believe that change is not possible, which I don't think is true. I have a thing I say about my institution called the dialectic of CUNY that is, yes, we do work in a massive public bureaucracy that has a lot of red tape in it and a lot of... It stifles a lot of activity, but it's also too big to police all of that activity.

And so there's a lot of stuff that happens at the edges that happens just because a lot of people want to do it and get together and do it that the university has like at a central office level has no idea that it's actually happening. And so that's the dialectic of business, I think. Bigness, excuse me. Our community colleges are, I think, a little bit more invested just in the concept of teaching at a more explicit level.

That's not to say that our senior college faculty aren't because there are quite a few of them that are very dedicated to it, but the pushback against non-research activity happens less at the community college level. I think that's probably true for most community colleges across the country. I think some of our senior colleges are really invested in OER and ones that... From my perspective, I'll have a conversation with a campus where I think things are going really well.

It seems like they've got tremendous buy-in from the provost office or from upper level admin. And the message that I'll get from the folks that I'm talking to is like, "No, actually we can't get the provost to talk to us at all. All the provost cares about right now is AI." And so I might think they're doing really well, but they don't think they're doing really well. So some part of my job is to look at them in the face and say, "No, you're doing really well. Keep going. It's working really well."

At the tenure promotion level again, I can't say enough about how I don't really think it's school to school. I think it's department to department. I really think that's the case. And again, there are departments at some of our senior colleges who are so bought into OER, they are doing course coordination on OER when they are producing new courses. They're doing it OER first.

And then at that same school, two doors down in another department, they act like they've never heard about it. I feel like that's what everybody's experience is. At OpenEd this year, I did a panel with a number of folks from other states that have money, one of which was California. It was the California Community College, James Glapa-Grossklag. Great guy.

I'm sure we all know James. I'm going to brutalize what he said, but basically a win is getting someone to know what OER means when you're doing this kind of work. And there are still places. Fiscal year 2017, so academic year '17-'18 was the first year that we had $4 million from the state to spend on OER across the system. There are still departments in this institution that have absolutely no idea that this exists.

To my mind, that's not bad. That means there's room for growth still. We can still reach new people. We haven't saturated the space with it, so we can still keep moving. But at the same time, that means that if we're getting to campus P&B where somebody from a really OER centric department who's doing a ton of OER and the department says, great, promoted and tenure goes to campus P&B.

And if that campus P&B is three quarters people who have no idea what OER is, that's a problem. Just to come back to the original question, I don't know that it really shakes out to just some campuses do it better than others. It really is. It's a bottom-up culture thing.

Brittany Dudek:

So speaking of culture, do you think that... I recognize that it's really a different department to from department more so than college to college, but do you think that shifting that culture starts more with revising tenure language and focusing on tenure first, or with really shifting the departmental focus and their culture first, maybe to see the value in OER, or both, or something different completely? And I guess, what's harder?

Andrew McKinney:

Yeah, I think it's both, but maybe a little bit more of the latter. I've been at CUNY since I was 25 years old. I mean, I've been here for 20 years. So that's like my entire adult life. My brain is really wired by this place at this point. And when I say that thing about the dialectic of CUNY, part of what I'm really thinking about is how difficult it is to change policy versus how difficult it is to change culture.

And I think what I've seen many, many times, and I've been on a lot of programs, a lot of platforms, a lot of just activity at this place from the ground up, like things that I have watched just happen just from being there at the moment of inception, and I have found that if you just get a small group of people together and they start doing it and then they start advocating for it and they get a couple more people on, that's faster than changing policy.

So I think in some places that's not true, but in my experience, I think that's very true. However, I was giving a spiel about the OER contribution matrix with Amanda. I don't know, this would've been probably three or four years ago and we were talking with some folks in Iowa and we were saying this is a bottom-up document and we're trying to do bottom-up stuff, just culture change from the bottom. And it's bottom-up, not top-down.

And it was an administrator, I think, maybe from their board of ed, I don't remember where she was from, she said, "Well, I want a sandwich," which I think about to this day. I want top-down and bottom-up. And so I think you do need to do both. You can culture change all you want, but there's going to be a moment where you hit a wall where if you don't have the policy, that culture change can really only go so far.

So I think you do have to do both. I just find that it is easier to do bottom up organizing and getting people who self-select to this kind of thing and have the passion and the interest to really talk about it and do it than it is to get in the muck of writing policy. Policy is not sexy. It's not fun to do. I mean, maybe it is for some people. I don't think it's a thing that a lot of people, especially a lot of faculty, feel super drawn to.

And so yeah, I just think it's easier to start small and then get to that policy. One of my colleagues, Luke Walter, who I used to work for and I still work with it quite a bit, has a phrase that he used once about... A lot of my background is in educational technology, specifically open educational technology. And he said this thing once, which I both agree with and disagree with, which is if you build it, they will fund.

And so just get started I guess it would be my advice to everyone, is just start doing it, start advocating for it, and I think the policy will follow. I think it's hard to create policy that just produces activity. I mean, that's the thing I struggle with is I can change my policy from my seat and some of it I can get people to do if it's a compliance issue. I basically say, "If you don't do this, we won't give you any money." But if I make other policy shifts without getting buy-in from below, it's not going to happen. You can't really enforce it.

Kevin Corcoran:

Andy, you're making me think about when I was in Connecticut and there was a community college in Bridgeport, their dean... It wasn't necessarily a policy change, it was a procedural change, and they granted course releases for anybody that presented a proposal that was in high impact work. So I mean, that could be a way that the sandwich works in some form and fashion, but not policy because then you get to the letter of the law versus the spirit of it.

But I want to ping you and ask you about something that we tried to do. So we're talking about departmental focus, we're talking about cultural change from the bottom-up. We started to try to explore influencers and we started looking at discipline associations. What went wrong? Well, first, for those who don't know, can you explain what we tried to do and then your best...

Andrew McKinney:

Sure. Sure. Yeah. I think early on in DOERS, that was an early capacity building idea that we would... Because part of the capacity building thing was really, again, how do we institutionalize OER? How do we prevent barriers towards people understanding it as a thing that happens within academia that is valuable and interesting and people should incorporate it into the way they do things?

And it was Mark McBride from SUNY, who's now at Ithaka S+R, who said, "Faculty live in two places. They live in their departments, in their college, and they live in their discipline." So getting to them in their institution is one thing, but getting at them in their discipline is another place and maybe a better place. I mean, I think that's debatable which one's better, but I think for some people it probably is quite true that the discipline and the disciplinary association is really where they see their home.

So I mean, I don't know that we failed, Kevin, so much as we only had so much effort, like energy and so much ability to do things that trying to cold call disciplinary associations seemed kind of like the wrong thing to do. I mean, we talked to somebody from OpenStax, if you recall, about what their approach with the disciplinary associations is. And some of the disciplinary associations produce content. They produce educational material that they charge for.

That's part of their revenue model. So they're not going to really think greatly about OER. So that's one thing. I mean, also I think at least for me, conceptually, it was hard for me to say, which ones should we go to? Do we have to make a decision as to which discipline we're supposed to go to versus this more universal approach of the matrix of the case study, which can hit more things in more places than just going say to...

I'm a sociologist by training. We could have gone to ASA, sure, but where there's huge impact in the STEM disciplines or even with ELA or MLA, excuse me. Where? Those are massive organizations. And in math and in bio, there's a bunch of organizations. We got some suggestions about which ones to go to, and I'm sure some of them would have been really open to it, no pun intended. But I don't know, I just felt like it felt too daunting to me. That's where I came from.

Kevin Corcoran:

I think it reemphasizes your stress on grassroots because we were trying to pitch to the association. And then I think towards the end, we started to readjust and say, "Well, which faculty are leaders within that discipline association that could bring it forward?"

Andrew McKinney:

Yeah.

Mike Mills:

Andy, I want to jump back to the AI conversation, if you will. And honestly, I don't think we've had an episode of this podcast since we started that hasn't touched on AI. Last month, we had David Wiley on focusing on OER and AI. And it's a tension point for a number of faculty.

And if a pre-tenured faculty came to you and said that they were interested in open and open pedagogy, but they were scared and maybe scared because their administration, their discipline is saying, "You have to figure out a way to incorporate AI into your classes, not necessarily focusing on open," what advice would you provide?

Andrew McKinney:

So we're working on some AI guidelines for folks who are creating OER at CUNY. And we had thought about creating policy about it, and the campuses are really just in charge of how they want to dictate that stuff. And so we came to this guidelines concept of what are the things to think about while you're doing AI or using generative AI to create OER? One big one is what is citation in this?

What do you think the benefits are versus the negative costs of the usage of AI, like AI data center waste, copyright violation within the corpus of a large learning model? I guess what I would say to them is, I don't think... This is, again, 20 years in the game here. I've seen a lot of trends come and go. And I find this AI thing and this like, well, this is just what we have to do now, this is just what it is, welcome the AI overlords with open arms thing.

I think this is really silly. I think there will be a bunch of changes that happen in the next five to 10 years that will change how we think about this, either for the better or for the worse. And so going whole hog into it now, as a junior faculty member, just because your provost who... Fun fact, your provost is probably not going to be there after five years, especially if you're a large public. Shelf life on those guys is not very long.

And by the time your next provost comes around, he's probably going to have a different thing he wants you to do. If you've got OER support on your campus and those folks feel sustainable to you, just focus on the OER. The trends, like I said, trends come and go. Choose yours. If it's AI that you want to do and that's what your thing is, you're excited about it, you want to push it to the edge and really figure out how it works, go ahead.

But if you don't want to do it, just because someone in your administration says you should do it and you feel like you have to do it instead of doing a thing you want to do, I don't think that's a good job, man. I don't know. I say this thing about faculty that is maybe slightly pejorative, but I mean it with love.

I think the majority of people who are faculty, maybe not the majority, but a good chunk of people who became faculty, became faculty, went and got a PhD in this thing that they love to think about because they didn't really want anybody to tell them what to do for the rest of their lives. They wanted to be the person who was the expert, who taught people about the thing, and they wanted to be that person.

And I think that's great. And I don't think that person should have to be dictated to by upper level admin about what their priority is about where their research or where their teaching should go. That might be controversial.

Brittany Dudek:

You mentioned something earlier about community colleges and the focus on teaching. And I think that dovetails into a little bit with what you're talking about now about how many faculty don't likely want to use AI in the creation of their work. But I'm interested to know specifically with community colleges or any other institution where there may not be tenure and promotion, how do you see OER playing into that conversation?

Because I work at a community college system office. We have 13 community colleges here in Colorado, and that's something... How do we show the value aside from just cost savings and things like that? So it's easy when you can point towards tenure and promotion, but I'm interested to know if you've had those conversations or what those conversations look like.

Andrew McKinney:

Yeah. I work at a closed shop unionized institution, and we're all in the same collective bargaining unit. Tenure and promotion guidelines therefore, little that we have, apply to all of us. I don't interact with regularly an institution that doesn't have tenure and promotion as a part of its labor force. We do have one institution that's a little bit different. Our school of professional studies, which is...

It's our online only school. Like a lot of online only schools, there's a slightly more top-down where you have your tier of people who are creating content, setting curriculum, and then a set of adjuncts who are just teaching that curriculum that's been produced. I mean, I think there's... I would always argue that cost savings is important and it's something that we need to think about.

I think that the anti-profit motive element of OER is extremely important, contra with some folks would argue. However, I do think that the innovative teaching element is a really important one. I think that's where we need to go towards both the idea that faculty who are invested in cost savings for their students are often going to be people who are invested in innovative teaching models, who are invested in really the concept of student success and getting students across the line however they possibly can.

But I also think if we take that open educational practice as a larger umbrella around OER, there are plenty of people who are going to be doing OER who want to do pedagogy. And open pedagogy is going to be not only innovative teaching practice, but it's going to be training students to think of themselves as knowledge creators and not just knowledge receivers. And that's the thing that we try to emphasize.

We have a couple campuses that are deeply, deeply invested more in open pedagogy, less in like, okay, we're using an OpenStax textbook, we're just replacing stuff because we're cost saving. One of our campuses, BMCC, Jean Amaral, who's the rep there who's tremendous and a real advocate and a real thinker, her whole concept is explode the classroom, ditch the textbook. We don't even need to be doing this. If we're getting into OER, if we're getting open pedagogy, we can be doing completely different pedagogical models.

And so I think for places where if we're trying to get beyond just textbook savings, we're getting into we teach differently here. We do things differently. In our classrooms, we are able to do more productive things, more innovative things, more things that empower our students in a different fashion than what a textbook would do.

And so I think there's a lot of people in the OER world, and that includes not just faculty and administrators and campus people, but people in the vendor world who I think are interested in OER for a variety of reasons, one of which is this platform stuff where we're talking about... And that could be Lumen, that could be MyOpenMath, that could be WebWork. There's a whole world of that stuff where we're thinking about...

Well, I don't even know if people call it this anymore because I haven't heard this term in three or four years, but adaptive learning platforms where we're adapting to students. And that obviously meshes with the AI stuff really, really well. But I think there's quite a few people in the OER world who are more

interested in slower forms of teaching, more empowering forms of teaching that aren't about something outside of the student, interacting with the student in a way that in a very behaviorist psychology way manipulates the student towards, and I mean that very neutrally, the word manipulation, towards a certain outcome.

I think there are a lot of people in OER who see OER as a space for the student to run their own journey towards a learning outcome of their own design. I went to Hampshire College for undergrad, so no grades, no majors, alternative school in Western Mass. I have my son in a progressive school where we don't do testing. This is the kind of stuff I believe in as a pedagogue. I'm a fourth generation teacher and administrator. So these are the types of things that I really believe in.

And so if I am advocating for what's the value of OER beyond cost savings, Brittany, I'm looking towards the radical potential of OER to empower students to give them a sense of what is possible through their own intellects and not how they can learn concepts better via a machine interface.

Zach Claybaugh:

I really love that answer, Andy. Thank you. Okay. So we are coming towards the end of our session today. Can I take a big picture question? So if we were to fast-forward let's say 10 years and your work has truly succeeded, what feels different about how teaching is valued in higher education in that case?

Andrew McKinney:

Wow. Yeah. I love my institution deeply. Like I said, I've been here my entire adult life. It matters more to me than most things in my life. But there are elements in this place that drive me a little crazy, one of which is I think there are... My mother was an elementary education teacher in a very small college near where I grew up in Indiana. If you know me, you know I'm a ranter and a complainer.

And if you'd ever met my mother, you would know that's where I got it. And she would complain about this thing at this little place called Franklin College in Franklin, Indiana. FTE about 800 students. I grew up in this little tiny town called Edinburgh, about 4,500 people. Most of my teachers were her students. So they were taking first generation college students and repatriating them out into the community as trained elementary school teachers.

Extremely important job. And what she would complain about all the time is that the presidents of her school, the board of trustees of her school would be desperate to hire people who had gone to the Ivy Leagues or gone to University of Chicago. And it's a similar thing I see here, which is this idea that if you don't have elite educated people or you aren't trying to be an elite institution, then what are you doing?

And my point is, if you're trying to be one of those things, what are you doing? I mean, one of CUNY's claims to fame is its position as an upward mobility engine for the people of New York City. And that's fantastic. That's beautiful. I mean, I would prefer us to be a little bit more conservative citizenship, but that's another story. So what I want for CUNY is for us to understand our value as a teaching institution.

Where teaching is value, where raising up what's in the charter for City College, which is in the 19th century the first public school in New York City and is our original school of the CUNY system. In that charter, the purpose is to educate the whole people of New York. I think about it and honestly it makes me cry to think about it. I love that as a concept. And so what that means to me is we are teaching the whole people of New York.

That's the purpose of higher ed in my mind, is to teach the people of your community. And in 10 years, what I would love to see, do I think this is going to happen? No. But would I love to see this? Yes. That your college, wherever you are, but especially if you're in a public, because that's near and dear to my heart, if you're at a public, that your institution values teaching as the purpose of the institution.

I know that there's research money that's flowing into the institution that prevents us about thinking about this. There's revenue problems that we have to think about. There's all sorts of different things. But what I

want to see, what brought me to OER is that purpose. We are streamlining our students into this course. We're giving them first day access. We're not adding extra costs to them to come into our classes.

We're bringing them in with open arms, with open content. And if we're doing open pedagogy, then we're training them to be scholars. We're training them to be knowledge producers. And so what I want to see is institutions that recognize that training people to be citizens, training people to be thinkers, training people to be good human beings that think about the world in a nuanced and empathetic fashion is more valuable to a society than credentials. That's my high horse.

Zach Claybaugh:

Well, I think I can probably speak for all of us in saying that we really appreciate that. I mean, very powerful statement. And I think it's something that all of us also feel really bought into and really dearly about. So thank you very much. Okay, so we are now at the end of our episode and our tradition here at Open-Ed Mic is to end our podcast with a terrible open education related joke generated by AI. So Brittany, I believe you are taking it away this week?

Brittany Dudek:

I do have the honors. So what did the open education resource say to the paywall journal? You've got issues and they cost 49.99 each.

Mike Mills:

Oh my gosh.

Andrew McKinney:

I feel like it's 49.99 per article.

Brittany Dudek:

I had per article, yes.

Mike Mills:

That's probably more accurate.

Brittany Dudek:

We just need AI to get with the times.

Mike Mills:

In either case, it's a bad joke.

Brittany Dudek:

It is.

Zach Claybaugh:

Very bad.

Brittany Dudek:

It is.

Zach Claybaugh:

Very bad. Well, Andy, thank you so much for joining us today. And with that, everyone, the mic is closed.