



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF FREE FACULTY CHOICE IN ASSIGNING COURSE MATERIALS, INCLUDING FORMAT, AND OPPOSING THE 'EQUITABLE' TEXTBOOK ACCESS PROGRAM (ETAP)

30 November 2023

WHEREAS

1. The primary rationale for the selection of course materials should be effectiveness for student learning;
2. Academic Senate Policy 22-05, "Accessibility and Faculty Responsibility for the Selection of Instructional Materials," clearly states, "Faculty are responsible for choosing their instructional materials";
3. There is significant peer-reviewed research that demonstrates that generally students learn better from print course materials (see Select Bibliography), and even research to the contrary confirms that there is a difference between print and digital course materials;
4. The choice to use print vs. digital course materials (or both) should be made by the subject matter expert, i.e., faculty, based on their assessment of which will contribute best to student learning;
5. Ensuring course materials meet accessibility needs is the purview of our excellent Bob Murphy Access Center;
6. The affordability of course materials plays an important, but secondary role in their selection;
7. It is common knowledge, and perfectly understandable, that students acquire course materials through a variety of avenues, or sometimes do not acquire them at all, depending on their life circumstances—and that it is better that students engage imperfectly than not at all;
8. Under the ETAP (in its current form), *any* textbook that is available in digital format will *only* be provided to students in digital format, thus taking away faculty choice in assigning print vs. digital course materials;
9. The ETAP incorrectly assumes that instructional materials are the same whether they are in digital or print format;
10. The ETAP is based on the faulty assumption that it makes no difference to student learning whether students have course materials digitally or in print;
11. The ETAP therefore infringes on academic freedom;

12. The ETAP was originally developed without substantial faculty or student input and then presented as a *fait accompli* to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (but not yet to the Academic Senate as a whole);
13. The ETAP makes no allowance for differences between colleges, departments, programs, disciplines, and courses;
14. Beach Shops have (so far) not presented data on the current cost of course materials for CSULB students in general or disaggregated by college, department, program, discipline, or course and have not offered information on how much students *actually* spend on course material (i.e., when they buy second-hand, rent, share, borrow from the library, etc.);
15. This raises the question of whether in the ETAP disciplines with lower-cost or no-cost course materials would be cross-subsidizing disciplines with more expensive course materials;
16. The ETAP may have the unintended consequence of encouraging faculty to assign more expensive course materials—or of encouraging faculty to find course materials that are not available in digital format;
17. The Beach Shops rejected an Opt-In option for the ETAP on the grounds that publishers would in that case not give sufficient discounts;
18. The Opt-Out option in the ETAP will be underutilized by students, especially first-time first-year and transfer students who are not yet familiar with practices at the University;
19. When students exercise the Opt-Out option in the ETAP, the book shop will provide printed course materials individually and only on demand, with a time frame of about two or three weeks;
20. The ETAP uses the word ‘equitable’ in a way that does not accord with any standard definition of that term (rather than ‘equal’ or ‘flat fee’); and
21. The information, arguments, and assessments presented to the ASI Senate before they passed their resolution in support of ETAP unfortunately only came from the perspective of the Beach Shops;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED THAT

THE ACADEMIC SENATE OF CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

- I. concludes that the ETAP could be harmful to student learning and therefore the academic mission of the University;
- II. demands that faculty retain free choice in assigning course materials, including in what format;
- III. opposes the ETAP in its current form;
- IV. requests that the term ‘equitable’ only be used at CSULB when it is accurate and appropriate; and
- V. shall distribute this resolution to the President of CSULB; the Provost of CSULB; the Provost’s Chief of Operations, Senior Communications Strategist, and Executive Assistant; the Vice President for Student Affairs; the Deans and Associate Deans of CSULB; the Vice Provosts and Associate Vice Presidents in the Division of Academic Affairs at CSULB; the Beach Shops Board of Directors; the ASI President and Senate at CSULB; and the leadership of the CSULB chapter of CFA.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baron, Naomi. "Reading in a Digital Age." *Phi Delta Kappan: Connecting Education Research, Policy, and Practice* 99.2 (October 9, 2017): 15-20.

- When students have a choice, they spend less time on digital reading and have lower comprehension scores.

Clinton, Virginia. "Reading from Paper Compared to Screens: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Research in Reading* 42.2 (May 2019): 288-325.

- Based on random effects models, reading from screens had a negative effect on reading performance relative to paper ($g = -.25$). Readers had better calibrated (more accurate) judgement of their performance from paper compared to screens ($g = .20$). Readers may be more efficient and aware of their performance when reading from paper compared to screens.

Colvard, Nicholas, Edward Watson, and Hyojin Park. "The Impact of Open Educational Resources on Various Student Success Metrics." *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 30.2 (2018): 262-276.

- Study found that open educational resources [not 'equitable' textbook programs] positively influence grades and decrease withdrawal rates for all students and do so at higher rates for low-income students, part-time students, and racial/ethnic minorities.

Delgado, Pablo and Ladislao Salmerón. "The Inattentive On-Screen Reading: Reading Medium Affects Attention and Reading Comprehension under Time Pressure." *Learning and Instruction* 71, February 2021.

- On-print (but not on-screen) readers increased on-task attention when required by the task. On-screen (as compared to on-print) readers comprehended less when reading under time pressure.

Delgado Pablo, Cristina Vargas et al. "Don't Throw away Your Printed Books: A Meta-Analysis on the Effects of Reading Media on Reading Comprehension." *Educational Research Review* 25 (November 2018): 23-38.

- Paper-based reading yields better comprehension outcomes than digital-based reading.

Furenes, May, Natalia Kucirkova et al. "A Comparison of Children's Reading on Paper Versus Screen: A Meta-Analysis." *Review of Educational Research* 91.4 (August 2021): 483-517.

- The comparison of digital versus paper books that only differed by digitization showed lower comprehension scores for digital books.

Hurley, Tracy and Amir Fekrazad. "E-Textbooks, Inclusive Access, and Academic Performance." *Inclusive Access and Open Educational Resources E-Text Programs in Higher Education*. Ed. T.A. Hurley. Springer, 2020: 177-84.

- Success rates increase when digital vs. print resources are compared across 112 courses. Some sections used digital resources [though not necessarily in 'equitable' textbook access programs] and other sections used print within the same course.

Jeong, You and Gahgene Gweon. "Advantages of Print Reading over Screen Reading: A Comparison of Visual Patterns, Reading Performance, and Reading Attitudes across Paper, Computers, and Tablets." *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 37.17, 2021.

- In terms of reading attitude, readers reported higher levels of perceived understanding, perceived confidence, and perceived immersion and lower levels of perceived fatigue for reading printed text than reading from a device screen.

Kong, Yiren, Young Sik Seo, and Ling Zhai. "Comparison of Reading Performance on Screen and on Paper: A Meta-Analysis." *Computers & Education* 123 (August 2018): 138-49.

- The meta-analysis showed that reading on paper was better than reading on screen in terms of reading comprehension, and there were no significant differences between reading on paper and reading on screen in terms of reading speed.

Mueller, Pam and Daniel Oppenheimer. "The Pen Is Mightier than the Keyboard: Advantages of Longhand over Laptop Note Taking." *Psychological Science*, 2014, 1-10.

- Even when laptops are used solely to take notes, they may still be impairing learning because their use results in shallower processing.

Sidi, Yael, Maya Shpigelman et al. "Understanding Metacognitive Inferiority on Screen by Exposing Cues for Depth of Processing." *Learning and Instruction* 51 (October 2017): 61-73.

- Cognitive and metacognitive researchers find screen inferiority compared to paper in effort regulation, test performance, and extent of overconfidence.

Singer, Lauren and Patricia Alexander. "Reading Across Mediums: Effects of Reading Digital and Print Texts on Comprehension and Calibration." *The Journal of Experimental Education* 85.1, 2017.

- While there were no differences across mediums when students identified the main idea of the text, students recalled key points linked to the main idea and other relevant information better when engaged with print.