Hi everyone. My name is Sarah Appedu, my pronouns are she/her/hers, and I work in the Scholarly Communications department of Musselman Library. I am a first generation college student and graduated from Gettysburg last year with a major in Philosophy and minors in Theatre Arts and WGS. I am so grateful to Susan and the WGS department for inviting me here to talk to you about how my work in the library has intersected with what I learned here at Gettysburg.

The title of my presentation is “Textbook Affordability is a Social Justice Issue: How Open Textbooks are Paving the Way to Equality in Higher Education”.

When you walked in, you should have been handed one index card. Hold onto these because we’re going to need them at the very end, and they’re going to serve at your “exit ticket” for tonight. For now, I’d like to ask you all a few questions that you can simply raise your hands to answer:
1. How many of you have been required to purchase books for a course?
2. How many of you have spent over $100 for books in one semester alone? Over $200? Over $300? (continue until almost all hands are down)
3. How many of you feel like you have the ability to do something about it?

Your answers aren’t surprising, and you’re not alone. Textbook affordability has become a
bigger and bigger issue over the past few decades. Today, we’re going to discuss how we got here, what we’re doing about it, and how we can all help create a more inclusive higher educational setting.
To begin, I want to highlight our learning outcomes for our time together today. (read slide)

I also would like to welcome you to raise your hand and ask questions throughout this presentation, but you may also hold your questions for the end.

So let’s start with our first learning goal. I started off by telling you that textbook affordability is not just a problem—it’s a social justice issue. And, our first learning objective is to understand why that is. To start, let’s look at the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 26, which states that: (read quote on next slide)
That second one is hefty, and we’ll get to that later. For now, let’s start with the first premise: Everyone has the right to education. For the purposes of this presentation, I will be working under the assumption that this is true. In fact, this premise is central to the work we do in Scholarly Communications because the reality of higher education does not reflect this truth; all people have the right to an education.

According to a Report of the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, (read quote next slide).
Now, this data is from 2006, but we have every reason to believe that this number is currently the same or higher. What this means is that despite the fact that the number of students attaining high school diplomas is increasing, access to higher education is still severely restricted by financial barriers.

“The cost barrier [to higher education] kept 2.4 million low and moderate-income college-qualified high school graduates from completing college in the previous decade.”
The average borrower owes

$28,650

in student loans (class of 2017)

This slide shows you that the average amount of debt a member of the class of 2017 graduated with nationally was $28,650. And that’s just the national number.
If you think that’s bad, these charts show you average student debt per state, meaning debt of students who attend schools in that state. Pennsylvania consistently appears at the top, or bottom, of these charts, depending on how you’re oriented. (point out various charts) The point is that this is not just a national problem but a local one.
And it’s not just local on a state-level either—this affects our own community. According to the Gettysburg College Fact Book, the average borrower at Gettysburg College from the class of 2017 owed $31,323 at the time of graduation. Currently, 62% of Gettysburg students have taken out student loans, which to me undermines the assumption that all most of our students are wealthy. A quick raise of hands—is anyone surprised by this number? Did you think it would be lower? Higher?

Clearly, the cost of education is a problem, and I’m not sure anyone needed me to point out to them today. But the bill you pay at the beginning of each semester isn’t the only money you’re spending on your education and therefore is not the only factor affecting access. You might be familiar with the notorious term “Cost of attendance” that every college has on their website, which means the real cost of a semester including room and board, meal plans, and of course, textbooks. What’s going on with those?
This chart was created by Mark Perry, a professor of finances and economics at the University of Michigan, Flint, and it’s gained a lot of attention because of the harsh reality it reveals. The goods and services that have increased in price the most since 1997 are firstly hospital services, followed by College Textbooks and College Tuition. As you can see, the cost of textbooks is increasing just as rapidly as the cost of tuition at a rate almost 200% higher than the rate of inflation. And just FYI, the cost of textbooks has increased over 1000% since the 1970s. If you’ve ever had an older person throw out the whole “I was able to do it, so you can too!” about affording textbooks, you can point them to that statistic.

We can see here too how this conversation fits into one of social justice and is related to other topics you discuss in your class, such as health care, child care, and housing. While luxury goods are becoming more affordable, essential services are becoming less and less accessible to low and moderate income people.

This issue wasn’t one I personally was taught about or discussed as an undergraduate, even though I could feel its effects each time I bought my textbooks, and even now as I pay my student loans. I just accepted things for what they were—unfair, and something I would just have to deal with. Has anyone else ever felt like that?

However, this does not have the be the case. I’m going to tell you what can we do about
this issue. But first, we need to talk a little bit about why textbook prices are increasing so rapidly.
One reason is that unlike the other consumer goods like cars and televisions that are dropping in price according to the chart I just displayed, textbooks are a compulsory purchase. This means that students are the ones fronting the bill, but have no control over what they purchase. Your professors are the ones telling you what to get. This is similar to when a doctor prescribes you a drug— they tell you what to buy, and you buy it. How often does your doctor look up the cost of a medication before writing you a prescription?

But don’t go rioting into your professor’s office hours quite yet. Faculty aren’t always aware of how much their books costs, and therefore how much they are asking students to spend, which is a problem for students. But often faculty who are very aware of the cost of course materials still find themselves in a conundrum— what if there aren’t any other options?
Commercial publishers are trying their best to ensure that their profit margins remain high, despite the popularity of the internet and the wide array of resources freely available. One way this is done is through monopolies. There are currently 4 major textbook publishers (read names), and they are able to price their books similarly to their competitors to limit variety. Plus, if one company sees that the demand is already being met by another, it might not make sense to have several options on the marketplace anymore. I’m sure some of these names will already be familiar to many of you because most of your textbooks come from one of them.

Publishers have also begun pairing physical books with online access codes. From a teaching perspective, these access codes are highly valuable, especially for faculty who are dealing with high course loads and the tenure process. However, from the publisher perspective, the teaching benefits are only a selling point— the reality is that these access codes sprung from students renting and reselling their books, which results in less profit. Pair the book with a single-user access code and suddenly students have no option but to buy the book from the publisher, without the option to resell.

They also have begun releasing new editions more frequently. Not only are these updates often minimal, but they also result in a huge increase in price. And, consequently, the older editions stop being printed until eventually they raise in price as they become less
available. And if you have ever tried to resell a textbook for which a new edition will be released soon, you know the buy back value plummets. One time I tried to sell my astronomy textbook, which I got for $50 from another student, but which is currently valued at $165 on the bookstore website. When I went to that sketchy van they have our during finals week, the guy there offered me a grand total of $3 for my book because a new edition was being released that summer. I can only hope the coffee I bought with that $3 wasn’t as bitter as I was.

(Side note, while I was looking up the price of that book on the bookstore website, I saw students now have to purchase access to an online homework system, which is another $65. I took astronomy here 4 years ago, which is all it took for this new cost to get integrated into the class. Publishers are moving quickly to make sure there isn’t any other option more appealing than theirs.)

So on top of the already high cost of college tuition and the rates of student debt, students are also being asked to spend more money every year for the very materials we are supposed to be learning from. And for what? To maintain commercial publishing companies profits? If education is a universal human right, why is this right being sold to us at such a high price?
And what exactly is that price? According to the College Board, students at private, non-profit, four-year campuses, like Gettysburg College, for example, should budget $1200 on average per year for course materials alone, with the total yearly budget reaching over $50,000.
This is a display that the department did for Open Access Week in October 2017. Students were prompted to write down the most they have spent on textbooks in one semester, similarly to how I did at the start of this talk, and add their number to the graph according to academic division. As you can see, many of our students were right around that range, a few in the sciences getting close to almost $1000 in one semester alone.
These high costs have negative consequences on student learning outcomes, and these consequences are the worst for low income and first generation students especially. This chart is from a student survey done at Florida Universities and shows many self-reported outcomes of high textbook prices, including doing poorly in their classes because they couldn’t afford the book, dropping a class, or even picking their major based on whether or not they can afford the books. This means high income students have the freedom to pursue the academic path they desire, while lower income students must be more selective, risk a lower performance in the course, or give up other basic necessities in order to afford their materials.
During Open Education Week earlier this month, my department created a display for the Main Floor of the library where students could answer this question: What do Gettysburg students think about textbook prices? Our students had a lot to say, and we actually had to remove some of our decorative elements throughout the week to continue making space. I thought it would be interesting to look at some of what you all had to say before moving on to our second learning goal.
A joke

I'm poor!

Pressure; need to listen more
don't even understand!

ABSORB.

I spend 4x the worth of my soul each semester.

LMAO

BAD

Expensive!

Way too expensive!

Sick

WUAT

In every

What

LMAO
Pell Grant: Federal Pell Grants usually are awarded only to undergraduate students who display exceptional financial need. Students whose families have a total income of less than $50,000 per year are eligible for these grants; however, Pell Grant recipients typically come from families who make less than $20,000 per year. These grants average around $5,775 per year. According to the office of Financial Aid here at Gettysburg, we currently have 413 Pell Grant recipients on campus, which represents 16% of the student body.

And this person is right— their Pell Grant DOESN’T cover this shit. If education is a universal human right, then the textbook industry is one direct barrier to realizing that right. I can’t change the cost of tuition, but we can change at least one thing.
Like I said at the beginning of this presentation, I work in the Scholarly Communications department at the library, and we are main actors on campus that advocate for the use of affordable resources, though we are by no means the only ones! We have many campus partners and supporters, but much of the outreach around this topic has come from libraries across the globe.

As experts in their fields and the ones who evaluate and assign course materials, most of this outreach is focused on your professors.

But, this isn’t a presentation for professors. When I joined the department this past summer, I knew that the student voice was one I wanted to harness on our campus, and the first step to doing that is through outreach initiatives like this one, so another shout out to Susan for inviting me to speak with you all. Students hold an immense amount of institutional power, and this is an issue where student voices are critical in determining how we proceed with our efforts as a library department, as a school, and as a society. Those boards were one example of how we are harnessing the student voice, and our efforts are no where near complete.
So let’s get into what cheaper options we’re advocating for and how they have the potential to benefit you as students and the landscape of higher education more broadly in terms of cost savings. This will accomplish our second learning goal. Then, we’ll discuss how this fits into a broader conversation around social justice in higher education and how students can advocate for change. But before I do, does anyone have any questions they’d like to ask at this point?
We’re now going to talk about Open Textbooks, which are at the heart of our advocacy in the library. One of the most important attributes of an open textbook is that they are 100% free to read. Now, this doesn’t mean that they are free to make; people still need to write, edit, and publish them, but it does mean that commercial publishing agencies are not profiting off of students. Instead, publishers of open textbooks are often non-profit, and many of their creators are individual faculty members who want to make a difference for students.

As opposed to “closed” like the commercial textbooks we’ve been discussing, to be “open” means that not only are these resources are free (click), they are also digital (click) and easy to share (click).
Here, you see two Open Textbooks that are currently being used at Gettysburg College published by OpenStax, a non-profit organization based out of Rice University. Open Textbooks are just one kind in a broader category of open resources, but they are a big one because they aim to compete directly with commercial textbook publishers. They try to mimic the structure and style of the expensive version, but their books are free to download as a PDF and very lost cost to purchase the hard copy.

Just to compare, the Chemistry book you see here cost $55 for the hard copy. The commercial textbook that this open book replaced was around $250. The math speaks for itself, and clearly commercial publishers are listening and doing what they can to prevent professors from switching.

And they’re not wrong to be nervous. Organizations like OpenStax are a direct response to the textbook crisis. Libraries assist in their efforts by designating some of their already small budgets towards supporting them. And, of course, departments like mine are doing the work to educate faculty about this option and support them in their switch.

It’s important to acknowledge that these textbooks are not always perfect and are not widely available across all disciplines—yet. OpenStax focused on the courses with the most expensive materials and the highest enrollment, meaning intro level science courses. Those
of you in the humanities might not see your disciplines, and those that do might not like the quality. Do keep in mind that like all things they are always improving, and not even commercial books are without problems. But, there are other ways to work around this issue of availability when it comes to open, or free, resources.
Here you see two Open Resources created by Gettysburg Professor Chuck Kann from Computer Science. He came to us with several resources that he had written with interest in freely sharing them online. We posted his books to The Cupola, our institutional repository (ask me later). The two on the screen have 21,756 and 30,464 downloads respectively, and his resources currently have over 55,000 downloads total from across the globe. They are used in classrooms across the country, and those students are lucky to not have to purchase a book for their course.

These are a great example of a professor seeing the value in sharing their work with the world instead of closing it off. The culture of open encourages such sharing, understanding the value in collaboration and community. Chuck could have gone commercial and maybe even made a small amount, I reiterate, SMALL amount, from royalties. But instead, they are free to access by anyone around the world.

This is also a great way to work around the lack of availability from organizations like OpenStax. But, when you consider the effort Chuck had to take to write these materials, format them, and get them online, it’s easy to see why a professor would rely on the already available commercial book. We know students are swayed by the cheaper price, but professors have other concerns, like quality and amount of effort needed to switch. Luckily, Open Textbooks have many benefits beyond reducing cost.
Open Textbooks are different from their commercial counterparts because they use Open Licensing. Basically, these licenses complement traditional copyright practices by giving creators the option to expand on the rights of their readers. David Wiley, a prominent advocate for open textbooks, coined the 5 R’s of Open to represent these expanded rights. These are (click through)

As opposed to our normal idea of copyright, which typically only allows readers to read a single version and does not allow sharing or reuse without permission. Copyright is complicated and since I’m not a lawyer, that’s all I’m going to get into at this time. Feel to free ask me more specific copyright questions later if you’re interested.

Cost is a huge asset to the accessibility of open textbooks, but the 5 R’s allow you to do so much more than you’re capable of doing with traditionally copyrighted textbooks. This means that not only can we alleviate the cost burden for students, but educators can also transform their teaching to become more reflective, conversational, subversive, and, of course, open.
Learning Outcomes

1. Describe the ways in which high textbook prices affect student success in order to understand textbook affordability as a social justice issue.

2. Explain how Open Educational Resources are a response to the textbook affordability crisis in order to see their potential to reduce unequal access to learning materials.

3. Apply the concept of intersectionality to the use of Open Educational Resources (OER) in order to identify the multitude of benefits OER can offer to a diverse array of students beyond cost.

Here are our learning goals once again. At this point, we have seen how the high cost of textbooks negatively impacts students, especially those from under-resourced backgrounds. We also saw this issue in context with other issues of justice, like access to healthcare. Next, we discussed how libraries and others are advocating for the use of open textbooks. Finally, we saw that the benefits go beyond just cost. This is where we get into that third goal, because socio-economic class is not the only factor in which questions of power and privilege come into play.

As a first generation college student myself, I personally feel so proud that my job involves advocating for educational transformation. My parents couldn’t afford to go to college back when they were my age. I’ll be 23 this year, the age my mom was when she married my dad. My mom was from rural Idaho where they had very few resources and very little opportunity for a life better than her parents. So she moved to New York where she met my dad, who loved school, especially math, but dreamed of being a rock star. Eventually my dad let go of his musical dreams and decided to attend community college to get an accounting degree to support my mom and their future family, but the cost of the degree and the rate of his estimated salary with an entry level job made it financially impossible— at the time, it made more sense not to go to college.

My mom recently has been on the job market for the first time since she got her last job
after my sister was born in 1998. She still doesn’t have a college degree, and I can see how this is hurting her morale as she searches for work. For me, the worst part is hearing her talk about how she would have liked to have gone back and taken classes, but she’s just not “meant for school”. While community college classes would not be as huge of an investment as it would have been for my parents 25 years ago, she still is unable to see herself as someone worthy of that education.

Why am I telling you this? It’s not just to remind you all of how privileged we are to be here, though that’s important. Really it’s because my parents are my motivator for everything. I’ve spent my whole life wanting to make them proud, knowing that their dream of getting a college education, and not just their dream but generations before them, was resting on my shoulders. Maybe some other first gen students will be able to relate to this feeling, but when I got handed my degree last year, it felt wrong to have just my name on it. I felt like hundreds of names belonged there, but most especially my parents. Open Textbooks can allow more and more people the ability to get their degree without an added expense, but also are available to be read by anyone who wants to learn, regardless if you have a classroom to do the learning in. For people like my parents, education no longer has to be about “who belongs”. At least, that’s the dream me and others in the library are working towards.

But, I’m not free of privilege, and I can’t go on without acknowledging the several other obstacles to a higher education that exist for other types of students. I am first generation, from a moderate-income family, and I am a woman. But I am also white, American, able-bodied, English-speaking, cis-gendered. Therefore, I cannot just look at first generation status and income to inform my work. We need to look at this issue intersectionally to ensure that no one’s voices are being left behind.

The culture of open is about sharing and collaborating, but just being Open doesn’t make the movement immune to issues of power and privilege in education and society. These materials cannot be transformative unless our discourse is transformative. And with that, it’s time to turn to third learning goal.

By now I’m sure many of you are familiar with the term intersectionality, popularized by black feminist legal scholar Kimberle Crenshaw. Most basically, intersectionality is a tool we can use to consider multiple aspects of people’s identities and how they interact to create unique experiences among different groups and individuals. She argued that feminist and anti-racist movement failed to capture the experiences of women of color, who end up at the margins of either movement. So while we have been talking about cost and socio-economic status, I as a critical educator and you as critical students can now consider what other opportunities for justice these resources could provide and their limitations by looking at other types of structural inequality.
If we look at Article 26, section 2 of the Human Rights Declaration from earlier, we can see this embodied. Education is not just for everyone, but also serves the purpose of advocating for respect, understanding, tolerance, and peace among all people.
But not all Open Textbooks accomplish this. For example, Professor Chris Free from the English department recently reviewed an anthology on the Open Textbook Library, which is a resource to help professors find open materials. Under comprehensiveness, he writes, “The range of texts offered in this compilation is relatively good, with some notable exceptions: Margery Kemp, for example, is traditionally taught in tandem with Julian of Norwich; although all anthologies must make difficult choices in this regard, it is notable when such a strong woman’s voice is excised from a collection already top-heavy with men.”

So despite being Open and free, the creators still had some implicit bias over which voices are most important to include, and women are not generally included among that list. And we know that women are underrepresented in scholarly publishing across disciplines. According to an article from Inside Higher Education, women in the field of economics take 6 months longer on average to be published, spending more time in the peer review process. This ultimately means their publications are of higher quality, but because of this “time tax”, female economists publish less frequently, and are therefore less likely to get tenure and promotions.
We can also consider how the textbooks themselves represent knowledge, as well as our systems we use to find information. April Hathcock is a prominent Scholarly Communications Librarian, especially in the realm of diversity and inclusion in libraries and education. As a black woman, she has insight into the problem and power of whiteness in academic settings, the library included as a profession that to this day remains almost 90% white.

In her blog post titled “Open but not equal”, she says “It’s important, when we talk about open scholarship, particularly within a social justice context, that we look beyond making sure scholarship is open to making sure scholarship is findable and discoverable” because knowledge truly is built upon what comes before, which means those that have been historically marginalized are not necessarily going to become mainstream by virtue of being open. She presents a few examples of bias in discoverability. Here, she says (click and read quote). In order for Open to truly be transformative in socially just way, we need to transform the very structures that bring us knowledge and question whose voices are the deciding factor over what counts as scholarship.

Representation/Discoverability

“For example, [in the LCCS] there are subject headings for Homosexual, Lesbian, and Gay but no subject heading for Queer, which is a term that many people from the LGBTQ community use to self-identify. Likewise, under the subject heading for Criminals, there are sub-headings for a variety of racial and ethnic minorities, such as African-American Criminals, Chinese-American Criminals, even Russian-American Criminals, but no heading for White-American Criminals.” -April Hathcock
Because often, the people deciding what counts as scholarship also get to decide how that scholarship is represented. On screen is a page from a McGraw Hill textbook, one of those four publishers we mentioned earlier. Roni Dean-Burren’s son brought this section to her attention and she was quick to call out an instance of misrepresentation online with the support of thousands of people.

Notice the name of the section, “patterns of immigration”. The second image is a close up of the caption over near Florida. It says, (read caption). So not only is the slave trade considered a “pattern of immigration”, as opposed to a forced migration, but slaves are also referred to as “workers”. As Dean-Burren pointed out, doesn’t workers imply wages?

Eventually, McGraw Hill said “We believe we can do better”... but this was still published.
Here is another instance of the misrepresentation of history. This book was published by a Canadian textbook publisher, and this image received a lot of attention for the caption. It says (read quote).

Can anyone tell me what this passage is referring to? That’s right, the Trail of Tears, which Wikipedia describes as “a series of forced relocations of Native Americans in the United States from their ancestral homelands in the Southeastern United States, to areas to the west...The relocated peoples suffered from exposure, disease, and starvation while en route to their new designated reserve, and many died before reaching their destinations...Approximately 2,000–8,000 of the 16,543 relocated Cherokee perished along the way”. But sure, they “agreed to move”.

And do you think this kind of representation will change by virtue of merely being free for anyone to read? The hard answer on that is no. Inequality can prevail as long as we allow it to, especially for those of us who are high in social capital. As advocates for Open Textbooks, we must be mindful of these inequalities and work to make sure a movement about social justice is itself just.
And just to be clear, while those were commercial textbooks, that same theme appears in the world of open. Open licensing is great—it allows us to share what we create freely with the world. But, what about when what you’re sharing was never really yours?

Consider Native American knowledge. Most indigenous artifacts and knowledge about indigenous people comes not from indigenous folks themselves but from the white researchers who studied and wrote about them in academic journals, books, etc.. Their history lives in museums, research papers, even libraries as a result of colonization and genocide. Non-indigenous people who share these items with an open license can be construed as flouting the fact that “indigenous knowledge” can be freely shared by non-indigenous “owners” without any input or control from indigenous people.

What you see here are called TK, or traditional knowledge, licenses, which work in conjunction with open licenses. Jane Anderson, a legal scholar, saw the need for these licenses while educating indigenous people on copyright law and how it distances them from their own history. The licenses themselves are developed by indigenous people to contextualize copyrighted images and are specific to individual groups, as different communities have very different practices. I’d like to show you a clip from their website that explains their purpose (play video).
Again, we can see how being openly licensed, and therefore free, isn’t enough to ensure justice.
By now, I’ve demonstrated that high textbook prices affects all students, but that those effects can look differently from person to person, and therefore the effectiveness of Open Textbooks can vary as well. Structural inequality pervades our education system, and we must look at multiple factors of identity to ensure this movement is inclusive of all students. We didn’t even discuss ensuring access for people with different abilities and learning needs, the lack of racial diversity in scholarly editing and publishing, or differences in access to technology and the internet, which is vital for using open resources. These are big issues and it’s going to take a lot of time and effort on the part of many for real change to continue happening.

But luckily, there are many things you all can do to make a difference if you feel empowered to.
1. Think critically about whose voices you’re being taught, and who is being left out. Seek out resources from diverse perspectives. Challenge yourself to look in places you haven’t looked before.

2. Talk to administrators.

3. Discuss issues of textbook affordability with your peers, in clubs and organizations, etc. Write about it for a blog. Be a leader.

4. Advocate for affordable textbooks to your faculty. Use your course evaluation to speak up if you’re uncomfortable doing it in person.

5. Create or participate in a research project about learning materials. Look into the Student PIRGs on textbook affordability. Learn about what other students are doing to create change on their campus.

6. Talk to Schol Comm and Hana and take our survey next Fall!
For those of you who aren’t quite ready to jump out of your seats and take action, but are interested in learning more, there are plenty of resources available on the Student Public Interest Research Group’s website that you can look at. The Public Interest Research groups work to organize people, in this case students, around issues that harm the public good, including unequal access to education. Under “Research” you can find thought-provoking articles about textbook publishing and the need for Open Textbooks. Activists, this is where you can find strategies for organizing and resources for supporting your initiative, including a Student Government Organizing Toolkit, which you can see here as well. Lastly BC Campus, another organization that supports Open Textbooks, provides a free OER student toolkit that provides guidance on how students can advocate for OER on their campus.
And finally, if you’re really feeling moved and think libraries are the place you want to be and make your career, we are offering a week long externship opportunity at the beginning of the summer for students interested in the field of librarianship. While the topics I discussed today are housed in my department of Scholarly Communications, all library work aims to achieve a better future where more people can access the information they need.
Before we get to the exit ticket for the evening, I’d like to open things up to you all, so if you have any questions now’s the time!
Finally, I’d like to turn to those index cards you got when you came in tonight. I’d like you all to pick one of the following prompts to respond to. It doesn’t have to be any more than a sentence or some bullets, and you’re definitely welcome to answer both if you’d like. Please be honest in your responses—these are not only a way for me to see whether you all took something away from this talk tonight, but is also a way for me to know how I can best work for you. If after you leave here tonight you have more lingering thoughts or questions, don’t hesitate to send me an email.

Exit Ticket

Please respond to one, or both, of the following prompts on your index card and hand it in on your way out. You do not have to write your name. Please note whether you’re answering #1 or #2.

1. What is one thing you learned tonight that you wish your professors knew?
2. Is there anything about your own experiences with textbooks that you wish the library knew?
Sources

- https://studentpirgs.org/campaigns/sp/make-textbooks-affordable
- https://icas.org/content/pub/student-debt-and-class-2017
- https://lendedu.com/blog/average-student-loan-debt-statistics
- https://www.gettysburg.edu/offices/institutional-analysis/fact-book/index.dot
• http://opencontent.org/definition/
• http://www.jl4d.org/index.php/jl4d/article/view/312
• https://creativecommons.org/2010/01/30/jane-anderson/
• https://aprilhathcock.wordpress.com/2016/02/08/open-but-not-equal-open-scholarship-for-social-justice/
• https://studentpirgs.org/campaigns/sp/make-textbooks-affordable
• https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trail_of_Tears
• https://splinternews.com/publisher-to-recall-whitewashed-textbook-claiming-first-1819222949
THANK YOU

Sarah Appedu '18, Scholarly Communications Assistant
Musselman Library, Gettysburg College | sappedu@gettysburg.edu
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