

6-15-2023

Exploring Open Pedagogy in a Librarian-Taught Honors Course

Teresa Schultz

University of Nevada, Reno, teresas@unr.edu

Elena S. Azadbakht

University of Nevada, Reno, eazadbakht@unr.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/comminfolit>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Information Literacy Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Schultz, T., & Azadbakht, E. S. (2023). Exploring Open Pedagogy in a Librarian-Taught Honors Course. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 17 (1), 221–237. <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2023.17.1.2>

This open access Innovative Practice is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License \(CC BY-NC-SA 4.0\)](#). All documents in PDXScholar should meet [accessibility standards](#). If we can make this document more accessible to you, [contact our team](#).

Exploring Open Pedagogy in a Librarian-Taught Honors Course

Teresa Schultz, University of Nevada, Reno
Elena S. Azadbakht, University of Nevada, Reno

Abstract

This case study describes how the authors incorporated the principles and practices of open pedagogy into a three-credit Honors College course focused on information literacy and undergraduate research. It included using literature review sources to help edit *Wikipedia* articles, registering a research project proposal with the Open Science Framework (OSF), and the creation of an openly licensed toolkit crowdsourced with students' tips and suggested resources for other students new to research. Students demonstrated improved understanding of several information literacy concepts, such as the role of copyright. The use and benefits of open pedagogy were, however, hindered by unrelated classroom issues, like low enrollment and, at times, a lack of student engagement. Nevertheless, the authors' general approach and the activities and assignments they developed could be adapted and used in other library instruction contexts.

Keywords: open pedagogy, credit-bearing instruction, open educational resources, OER, information literacy

Special issue exploring the intersections between information literacy and open educational practices

Innovative Practices edited by Andrea Baer, Carolyn Gamtso, and Merinda McLure

Schultz, T., & Azadbakht, E. S. (2023). Exploring open pedagogy in a librarian-taught honors course. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 17(1), 221–237.

Copyright for articles published in *Communications in Information Literacy* is retained by the author(s). Author(s) also extend to *Communications in Information Literacy* the right to redistribute this article via other scholarly resources and bibliographic databases. This extension allows the authors' copyrighted content to be included in some databases that are distributed and maintained by for-profit companies. All other rights of redistribution are licensed by *Communications in Information Literacy* under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).

Exploring Open Pedagogy in a Librarian-Taught Honors Course

Open pedagogy builds off the open educational resources movement's work to make classroom materials that are both free and licensed for reuse by involving students in the creation of their own open course materials (Wiley, 2013). Open pedagogy is a growing movement in higher education, and its successful use has been demonstrated in a number of disciplines (Clinton-Lisell, 2021). Previous research suggests it has several benefits, including helping librarian instructors center students' learning on the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education's* (Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL], 2015) six frames (Cullen & Dill, 2022).

This case study describes how the authors, two librarians at the University of Nevada, Reno, incorporated open pedagogy into an interdisciplinary three-credit honors course with student learning outcomes related to the frames. The authors' primary goal was to see if utilizing open assignments helped facilitate students' understanding of key information literacy concepts, as evidenced by their completion of the assignments and their participation in class. A secondary goal was to explore the use of open pedagogy to bridge disciplinary differences. *Discovering Research Across the Disciplines* (Honors 235) is aimed at students within University of Nevada, Reno's Honors College who are interested in learning about planning, conducting, and disseminating the findings of a major research project, like the thesis or capstone many of them will complete for the program. The course involved three open assignments: editing *Wikipedia* pages related to the topic or research question on which they chose to focus, registering their proposed research method(s) with the Open Science Framework (OSF), and the creation of a toolkit of helpful resources for new student researchers like themselves. This paper will explore the use of these open pedagogical assignments in helping students understand and make use of the frames as well as changes the authors would make for future iterations and how other instruction librarians could incorporate open pedagogy into their own work.

Literature Review

Wiley (2013) first argued for the connection between open educational resources (OER) and open pedagogy, stating that the use of OER in a course could expand beyond the mere inclusion of an open textbook by involving students in the creation of the course materials

themselves. The idea was not just to reinvent the textbook but to reinvent pedagogy as a whole. He proposed that most assignments are disposable, having no use beyond the teacher evaluating it in order to assign a grade. Through open pedagogy, students become empowered not just as users but as creators of information. Through this, students can see how their work extends beyond the class assignment and helps others. However, while Wiley coined the term, DeRosa and Jhangiani (2017) argued that the concept and practices around open pedagogy have long existed in the educational realm. They viewed open pedagogy as related to other important pedagogies, including constructivist and critical pedagogies. They noted that open pedagogy encourages faculty to look at broader issues of access to information, stating that

Knowledge consumption and knowledge creation are not separate but parallel processes, as knowledge is co-constructed, contextualized, cumulative, iterative, and recursive. In this way, Open Pedagogy invites us to focus on how we can increase access to higher education and how we can increase access to knowledge—both its reception and its creation (DeRosa & Jhangiani, 2017, para. 13).

Open Pedagogy and Information Literacy

Others have already charted the connections between open pedagogy and information literacy, especially as seen through the lens of the *Framework*. Cullen (2022) noted that open pedagogy is a “natural fit for issues of information literacy” (p. 11), especially as many open pedagogy assignments involve students having to find, evaluate and use sources of information. Bergstrom-Lynch et al. discussed how open pedagogy relates to Char Booth’s (2022) call to leave behind the curricular black box, stating “We maintain that when students recast themselves as producers of knowledge, they break down barriers to their own participation in scholarship, inspire their peers, do away with the ‘curricular black box,’ and bridge divides carved by information privilege,” (p. 238). Goodsett (2022) argued that open pedagogy can actually push students to develop more in-depth information literacy skills as they are no longer just passive consumers of information but are looking to edit and adapt other information sources, which presents the opportunity for librarians to teach them about copyright.

At the same time, because open pedagogy assignments often require more library support, they allow librarians to move beyond the one-shot instruction session to more meaningful and lasting engagement with both faculty and students (Gumb, 2022). Younger et al. (2021)

echoed this belief, stating that “having knowledge in open pedagogy and OER can allow library workers to offer alternatives to or diversify their approach to one-shot instructional sessions or guest lectures” (p. 84).

Librarian Support of Open Pedagogy

Librarians have begun documenting their experience incorporating open pedagogy into their information literacy support. Courses have ranged from first-year composition, engineering, technical writing, education, biology, honors, and graduate-level classes; and have included supporting students in editing *Wikipedia* pages, creating scholarly journals, transcribing historical documents, and creating multimodal projects, a research guide, a textbook, and technical manuals (Evelyn & Kromer, 2018; Goodsett, 2022; Hare et al., 2020; Hollister, 2020; Johnson & Hooper, 2019; Park & Bridges, 2022; Riehman-Murphy, 2022; Shuttleworth et al., 2019; Thomas et al., 2021; Younger et al., 2021). Some of these examples have incorporated teaching copyright and related concepts to students, which directly relate to the frame “Information Has Value” (Park & Bridges, 2022; Younger et al., 2021). At Cleveland State University, Goodsett (2022) detailed how her work with a first-year composition course resulted in students mentioning copyright and expressing a desire to learn more in their final project reflections.

Others have noted the connection of open pedagogy to how students see themselves as creators, applying the frames “Authority Is Constructed and Contextual” and “Scholarship as Conversation” (Hare et al., 2020; Johnson & Hooper, 2019; Shuttleworth et al., 2019; Younger et al., 2021). Riehman-Murphy (2022) worked to decenter the instructor’s authority in helping students on a transcription project, noting that even the instructor was not familiar with the particular texts they worked on. Others have also connected open pedagogy projects to “Research as Inquiry,” such as one project where students had to learn the process of finding and synthesizing information for their project (Shuttleworth et al., 2019).

Assessment of these projects generally has reported positive results. Hare et al. (2020) stated that a slight majority of student comments in their class demonstrated understanding of the concepts at the emerging level, which they considered satisfactory as a mastery of the concepts could have shown the material was not advanced enough. In a similar study, Hollister (2020) noted that all students in a class reported seeing the value of open pedagogy and would recommend it. On the other hand, 60% of these same students reported feeling anxious at the beginning of the course about making their work public. Although many of

the students became more receptive to sharing their work widely as the course progressed, their initial discomfort is worth noting (Hollister, 2020).

At the same time, these case studies have found areas where problems appeared. For instance, in a study looking at the use of *Wikipedia*, the authors noted that students struggled with completing tasks on time, such as drafting their content in wiki sandboxes (Park & Bridges, 2022). Thomas et al. (2021) faced a similar situation, which in turn meant plans to have students peer review each other's drafts suffered. The authors also commented that the final products showed large variability in quality. Shuttleworth et al. (2019) also observed the increased work for both the instructor and the librarian to oversee the project.

While the literature has looked at the use of open pedagogy to support information literacy instruction in classes for other disciplines, none have looked at its use in a library-taught course focused on teaching students the frames. This case study provides a look at one such course that sought to use open pedagogy to not only teach information literacy skills but also to bridge disciplinary gaps in an honors course that often includes students from various departments.

Course Background

The University of Nevada, Reno is a public land grant university with just under 15,000 undergraduates and 2,000 graduate students (Nevada System of Higher Education, 2022). It is a doctoral university with very high research activity (American Council on Education, 2022). The University Libraries features a robust liaison program. These librarians support and frequently collaborate with both the University's Honors College and its Undergraduate Research program.

Honors 235 is a librarian-taught course offered through the University of Nevada, Reno Honors College. Interdisciplinary in nature, its primary learning objectives center on information literacy and undergraduate research. The course was until recently a five-week, one-credit course meeting once per week that fulfilled a requirement for honors students about to begin work on their senior capstone project or thesis. With the arrival of a new director in 2019 and the transition from Honors program to Honors College in 2020, librarians saw an opportunity to redesign it into a three-credit course that would better align with the new College's goals, which included allowing students to go beyond the traditional thesis for their final project, such as by completing a business proposal or a

performance. The process of redesigning and teaching the first section of the new Honors 235 has been written about previously (Azadbakht & Tokarz, 2022).

Since this change, each section of Honors 235 has been taught by pairs of librarians so as not to overburden any one liaison. The authors, who served as co-instructors for the second offering of the revamped course in fall 2022, decided to use their pairing and the increased sessions of the course to experiment with open pedagogy to address several issues.

Historically, librarians who have taught this course have struggled to meet the various and differing research needs of students from across all departments and disciplines. Although a majority of students often come from STEM fields, the class often includes those from the social sciences, arts, and humanities. Trying to ensure readings and assignments are applicable to all students has been difficult. At the same time, reference librarians at University of Nevada, Reno have been exploring OER and open pedagogy, and one of the authors is leading those efforts. To better support open pedagogy among their own faculty, the two authors wanted to experience creating and leading open pedagogy assignments themselves. They saw this class as a good opportunity for open pedagogy, as it could be used to help bridge some of the challenges of an interdisciplinary class.

Since the Honors 235 course objectives reflect the *Framework*, the instructors thought the course was an ideal candidate for the inclusion of open pedagogical principles and practices. Specifically, they felt that incorporating open pedagogy into the course would help meet the student learning outcomes related to the frames “Authority Is Constructed and Contextual,” “Information Creation as a Process,” “Scholarship as Conversation,” “Information Has Value,” and “Research as Inquiry.” The course’s main assignment is a research project proposal that is centered on a question of their choice. The project requires an introduction, literature review, and (hypothetical) methods section. The students complete this incrementally and turn in a final, polished version in lieu of an exam. The research project proposal provides students the freedom to explore their individual interests and leaves room throughout the semester for other, less traditional assignments. To gain a better sense of the students’ feelings toward the open pedagogy assignments and the concepts they were aimed to highlight, the instructors designed a survey for the students to gather information about students’ experience with open pedagogy in the course. This project received exempt status from University of Nevada, Reno’s Institutional Review Board.

Open Pedagogy Assignments

The instructors settled on three open pedagogy assignments that they would incorporate into Honors 235, two of which would be required and one that was a voluntary option.

Editing *Wikipedia*

The first assignment involved having the students edit *Wikipedia* pages. The instructors wanted the students to enhance *Wikipedia* pages related to their topics by incorporating at least five sources used for their literature review into the *Wikipedia* pages. Although many open pedagogy projects utilizing *Wikipedia* will curate a list of pages ahead of time for students to focus on, the instructors knew they could not do so for this course as the students came from different majors. Therefore, part of the assignment helped guide students in how to find and evaluate *Wikipedia* pages in need of more information and sources. The instructors opted to apply for, and were accepted to, the WikiEducation's not-for-profit *Wikipedia* Student Program that helps support instructors using *Wikipedia* in their classes. The program provides a dashboard for instructors to manage assignments, a set of tutorials for students to learn about *Wikipedia*, and technical help. The dashboard also helps establish a timeline for when pre-assignments and tutorials should be completed. The project lasted over most of the semester, with incremental assignments and due dates to scaffold the project. This included some in-class activities to help guide and support students' understanding of *Wikipedia*, such as an activity focused on how to evaluate a *Wikipedia* page and discussing who and what *Wikipedia* considers to be a credible source and their potential biases.

Undergraduate Research Toolkit

The second assignment was the creation of the Undergraduate Research Toolkit, which serves as an annotated bibliography of tools and tips for students going through the research process. As noted previously, instructors for this class have struggled to make learning materials and assignments broad enough so that no student feels left out. The toolkit was seen as a way to provide students with a place to share the knowledge that they've acquired as well as provide resources that, while they might be specific to certain fields, could be adapted and used by others. The instructors created a Google Docs file and invited all students as editors at the beginning of the semester. They were then required to share at least nine items over three due dates throughout the semester. An item could have come from something they learned in class or elsewhere. They were expected to provide helpful,

descriptive information about each item they included, such as what the resource did, whether something was free or had a cost. They were also expected to comment on each other's additions to provide supportive feedback. Finally, the class as a whole voted on which Creative Commons license they would apply to the toolkit.

Methodology Registration

The third incorporation of open pedagogy focused on the methodology of their main project. The instructors had already planned on addressing the issue of the replicability crisis during the semester and decided that encouraging students to register their own methodology with Open Science Framework (OSF) could help teach not only the role that registration plays in making research better but also provide another outlet for them to publicly share their work.

Registration encourages researchers to establish and publicly share their full methodology before starting a research project. By doing this, the goal is to make it harder for researchers to later manipulate their methodology. OSF provides both a public repository of registrations and various templates to help guide researchers through creating a registration. The instructors thought the templates would serve as useful models for students struggling to understand how to write a methodology. However, the instructors did not want to overburden students and thus decided to make OSF registration optional. Students who did not choose to register their methodology could instead write and submit their report in a text document.

Incorporating Information Literacy

Each of the above assignments incorporated information literacy in various ways. For instance, students had to use skills tied to “Research as Inquiry” and “Information Creation as a Process” frames. First, they had to find sources for their literature review and *Wikipedia* and then format the information differently based on the need of each audience: for their instructors who were grading them, for theoretical fellow researchers who might read their literature review, and then for a more general audience reading on *Wikipedia*. Their authorship of *Wikipedia* content, the toolkit, and the registration also allowed them to engage with “Scholarship as Conversation,” and they explored “Authority Is Constructed and Contextual” by learning which sources were considered acceptable by *Wikipedia* as well as discussing how biases about who is written about and cited can be reflected within *Wikipedia* citations.

All three assignments also incorporated “Information Has Value.” The assignments started early in the semester as the instructors explained open pedagogy and open educational resources to the students and led a discussion around the concept of information privilege. The class then spent a week learning about copyright and Creative Commons licenses and how sharing their work on different platforms either required them to use a specific Creative Commons license (*Wikipedia*) or allowed them to choose whether they could add one at all (OSF). The toolkit, however, led to the most discussion around the ownership of information as the class had to discuss and agree on one license for a work to which they all contributed.

Assessment

The authors assessed the use of open pedagogy through several methods. Even though the primary means of assessment was done by grading the open pedagogy assignments, other assessments were utilized to identify which areas needed support. Overall, the instructors believe the open pedagogy assignments helped the students more fully explore some information literacy concepts, as suggested by Goodsett (2022).

However, the impact of these efforts was somewhat limited. Honors 235 is now an elective and while enrollment has always varied from semester to semester, only four students participated in this iteration. Student absenteeism was a major problem, leading to varying levels of success for each open pedagogy project.

The small class size also likely affected the instructors’ attempts at more formal assessment – only one student opted to complete the survey sent to students toward the end of the class. Because of concerns with using assessment data based on only one student, the instructors have opted to not include the survey results in this section.

Wikipedia

The issues with student engagement and attendance appeared to affect this project the most. The instructors initially planned on three main assignments connected to the *Wikipedia* project, which included students submitting draft content, then peer reviewing each other’s work, and then publishing the final content to the *Wikipedia* page. Several smaller assignments and in-class activities were used to scaffold the students’ learning about editing *Wikipedia*, and students were expected to work through all related modules offered through WikiEducation dashboard, although no grade was assigned for these modules. However, the

instructors noticed that most students fell behind in their module readings, and some did not attend class sessions that involved activities to support their growth in editing *Wikipedia*. When it came time to turn in draft content, some students did not turn in a draft at all and others turned in drafts that were less well-developed than expected, which, as noted by others (Thomas et al., 2021), made it difficult to assign peer reviewers. The instructors instead opted to delay the peer reviews until after the final content submissions were due and to then dedicate class time for students to complete them.

Overall, the instructors found a mix of the quality of content added to *Wikipedia* pages through this project. They looked for evidence of the knowledge practices and dispositions tied to the “Authority Is Constructed and Contextual,” “Information Has Value,” and “Scholarship as Conversation” frames when assessing their students’ work, including “motivat[ing] themselves to find authoritative sources,” “giv[ing] credit to the original ideas of others through proper attribution and citation,” and “identify[ing] the contribution that particular articles, books, and other scholarly pieces make to disciplinary knowledge” (Association of College and Research Libraries [ACRL], 2015). Some students understood and demonstrated *Wikipedia*’s rules for neutral voice and practices around citations while others struggled, choosing third-party sources instead of relying on peer-reviewed scholarly articles or not providing citations when needed. Most students also selected *Wikipedia* articles that were already fairly well-developed, suggesting that perhaps more time could have been spent in class on article selection, source selection, and the specialties of citing in *Wikipedia*. Students displayed improved understanding of some of these concepts in their peer reviews, which offered guiding questions that appeared to help them understand what they should consider when evaluating *Wikipedia* articles. Finally, students were asked to discuss editing *Wikipedia* as part of their final presentation they gave. Comments during these presentations focused on how the students were able to add what they identified as important yet missing information to *Wikipedia* pages, their ability to add authoritative sources to *Wikipedia*, and the opportunity to become an author of *Wikipedia* pages that others would use.

Toolkit

Students displayed better engagement with the Undergraduate Research Toolkit. Contributions included citation tools, helpful browser extensions like Grammarly, favorite places to find research articles, and even specific journals (i.e., PLOS One.) Overall, the additions to the toolkit represented a balanced mix of what the students learned in the class

and what they brought in from their own knowledge, a practice that showcased their own authority as scholars, as Riehman-Murphy (2022) described. The instructors did notice one of the more popular categories of items added were related to open access, which the class spent a week learning about, and included places to find open access articles. Interestingly, while students used the term *open access* for some of these, others simply noted the articles were free.

However, not all items remained in the final toolkit. Students were given class time to peer review each other's additions and make suggested changes, as well as suggest items that should not ultimately be included. The "tips" section saw the most cuts as students and instructors both noticed many of the tips shared were too broad to provide much help to other undergraduate student researchers.

Perhaps the most positive aspect of this project centered upon the two discussions the class had as to which Creative Commons license to apply to the toolkit. Students showed evidence of learning related to the "Information Has Value" frame, especially the ability to see themselves "as contributors to the information marketplace rather than only consumers of it" (ACRL, 2015). They first discussed this in the second third of the semester when they learned about copyright and Creative Commons and then again at the end. The students displayed an understanding of the licenses, opting against a No Derivatives element as they understood the toolkit in many places was specific to the University of Nevada, Reno and thus students at another institution might want to make their own versions, which they wanted to allow. They also all believed strongly that they wanted such future versions to also give back to the open community by including a Share Alike license. Finally, although they recognized the unlikelihood of anyone monetizing the toolkit in the future, they all agreed they did not want to allow for that chance. They ultimately all agreed on a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Share Alike (CC-BY-NC-SA) 4.0 license.

Registration

Although registering their methodology with OSF was optional, most of the students chose this route, which demonstrates "Scholarship as Conversation." Overall, the students who used OSF templates—and the clear outlines and examples provided therein—demonstrated more fully fleshed out methodologies. The instructors also noted that the quality of the writing improved compared to the introductions and literature reviews that the students had submitted prior to that methodology assignment.

The instructors did note that each student chose a different license for their registered report, including licenses never discussed in class, which could show a need for more understanding of open licenses in general and demonstrates there was still room for learning related to the “Information Has Value” frame. Also, the students who chose the registration option all came from STEM majors. Although the instructors believe that the templates (including one for qualitative data) can be helpful for non-STEM students, the layout for the general template does appear to be more geared towards STEM fields.

Finally, the instructors allowed students to create methodologies for dream projects, i.e., they could be methodologies the students would never carry out. With just four students total, the instructors were not overly worried about adding such projects to the OSF Registration Registry; however, this could be a different issue with a larger class that’s repeated over multiple semesters, as this might be an inappropriate use of the OSF registry.

Lessons Learned

Unfortunately, as noted above, the instructors struggled with a few classroom issues—primarily attendance and engagement—that may have lessened the impact of the open pedagogical principles and practices they incorporated into the course. Enrollment was low and, at certain times during the semester, at least two or three students were absent on any given day, making certain in-class activities impossible or awkward. Likewise, when the students felt particularly stressed or were overwhelmed by assignments or exams in their other courses, the instructors saw a noticeable drop in engagement both in and outside of class. Low enrollment also hampered the instructors’ ability to assess the use of open pedagogy in helping to teach students from various disciplinary backgrounds. The class size, however, also facilitated learning; the instructors were able to give each student the individual attention and assistance they required, and everyone had the opportunity to participate in in-class discussions. While attendance and engagement did improve after the instructors reiterated their expectations and deployed some helpful strategies (e.g., in-class bonus quizzes and writing prompts), a slightly larger class would have been ideal.

There were some small hiccups with two of the assignments. The toolkit is (for now) a Google Doc, and, at first, the students made their additions anonymously, so that the instructors did not know who contributed what. Students had to be reminded to use the Suggestion Mode feature. In addition, the instructors had never before used *Wikipedia* in this way and so had to become quickly familiar with the WikiEducation dashboard and how

to track students' editing work within it. Ideally, they would have participated in more training beforehand and would have enforced using the dashboard for all *Wikipedia* assignments, as some students ultimately worked outside it, which in turn created problems for peer reviewing and grading the work. The instructors also had to ensure that each piece of the *Wikipedia* project was reflected in the online learning system, Canvas, where all other class materials were kept and grades tabulated. Despite these issues, the instructors would include the same three open assignments should the opportunity arise to teach Honors 235 again.

More broadly, the experience of incorporating open pedagogy in the classroom has helped both of the authors feel more confident in supporting this area, and one of the authors plans on using this experience when working with faculty who take part in University of Nevada, Reno's OER grant program. The program briefly touched on open pedagogy in the first iteration, and plans for the upcoming second iteration of the grant program include delving more into open pedagogy and encouraging participating faculty to investigate its use through exploration of other existing open pedagogy assignments. Although neither of the authors have yet partnered with a faculty member on an open pedagogy assignment, they feel more prepared to do so and also see how it can lead to more integrated work with classes, as discussed in prior studies (Gumb, 2022; Younger et al., 2021).

Implications for Information Literacy Librarians and Library Workers

The instructors' overall approach, learning outcomes, and individual assignments could be adapted for use in other credit-bearing undergraduate information literacy courses at other institutions or incorporated into undergraduate research programs. Likewise, embedded librarians, or liaisons who collaborate with and/or assist their disciplinary faculty with designing assignments could try implementing some of the strategies and activities discussed here. Both the *Wikipedia* project and the toolkit could be tailored to different courses with their own unique units and learning outcomes, although, these might be more difficult to manage with a large class. For instance, introductory information literacy courses could benefit from the inclusion of assignments based on these two ideas. Students in such classes might instead evaluate and edit a predetermined set of *Wikipedia* articles that reflect that course's learning objectives and build a toolkit of resources centered on a problem or theme of greater interest to them or their institution.

Some of the assignments and activities described herein could be adapted for use in one-shots, but this may be more difficult. Librarians in such situations do not always have the flexibility to teach what they would prefer and must deal with time constraints. Related to this, it is not always possible to adequately develop and cultivate the familiarity and trust needed to bring some open pedagogical ideas into one-shots or similar teaching contexts. That said, with the support of the course instructor and sufficient preparation, a librarian could lead the class in a *Wikipedia* editing session or *Wikipedia* article evaluation activity. Also, a less ambitious version of the toolkit assignment could be deployed in one-shots. In a scenario where the librarian can count on being invited to the same course every semester, having the students continue to contribute to a toolkit might make sense. For instance, one common hands-on activity is to have students fill out a shared online Google doc or other document sharing sources they found through a database and/or suggestions for how to use the database. Paired with a Creative Commons license, this could become a living document used by other iterations of the class as well.

Conclusion

Overall, the instructors found developing and teaching an open course to be a positive experience. Moreover, there appeared to be real benefits for the students as they developed information literacy skills and engaged with new and familiar resources and tools (i.e., *Wikipedia* and OSF). The assignments also provided the students with the opportunity to apply what they were learning about in the course in real-world contexts. Based on a review of the students' work and the close observation of students during in-class activities and discussions, the searching, summarizing, synthesizing, and citing they did while crafting their literature reviews facilitated their editing of *Wikipedia* articles on related topics. The students likewise used their newly acquired understanding of copyright and Creative Commons licenses to make an informed decision about how they wanted to share the toolkit they created together. Their in-class feedback indicated that, overall, the students appreciated taking part in open pedagogy. However, because both the authors and the students were new to open pedagogy and some of the tools used, there was a learning curve in addition to other classroom issues like periods of limited student engagement. This course's assignments serve as a starting point for bringing open pedagogy into information literacy instruction and could be adapted to other library instruction contexts, like one-shots. Future research could explore these other contexts specifically and in greater depth, as

well as move beyond case studies to look more broadly at how librarians are incorporating open pedagogy into their information literacy instruction.

References

- American Council on Education. (2022). *Basic classification description*. Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education.
<https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/institution/university-of-nevada-reno/>
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2015). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. <https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>
- Azadbakht, E. S., & Tokarz, R. E. (2022). Discovering research across the disciplines: Redesigning a librarian-taught honors course. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 29(3-4), 139–152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2022.2140464>
- Bergstrom-Lynch, Y., Mahoney, M., & Thomas, J. (2022). Doing away with the “curricular black box”: Empowering students as OER creators to challenge information privilege. In M. A. Cullen & E. Dill (Eds.), *Intersections of open educational resources and information literacy* (pp. 237–266). Association of College and Research Libraries.
<https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/textbooks/1258>
- Clinton-Lisell, V. (2021). Open pedagogy: A systematic review of empirical findings. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 8(2), 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.56059/jl4d.v8i2.511>
- Cullen, M. A. (2022). An open primer: OER, open pedagogy, and information literacy. In M. A. Cullen & E. Dill (Eds.), *Intersections of open educational resources and information literacy* (pp. 1–30). Association of College and Research Libraries.
<https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/textbooks/1258>
- Cullen, M. A., & Dill, E. (Eds.). (2022). *Intersections of open educational resources and information literacy*. Association of College and Research Libraries.
<https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/textbooks/1258>
- DeRosa, R., & Jhangiani, R. (2017). Open pedagogy. In E. Mays (Ed.), *A guide to making open textbooks with students*. The Rebus Community for Open Textbook Creation.
<https://press.rebus.community/makingopentextbookswithstudents/chapter/open-pedagogy/>

- Evelyn, S., & Kromer, J. (2018). OER evaluation as a means of teaching information literacy in individual and small group settings. *Reference Librarian*, 59(1), 1–9.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2017.1402730>
- Goodsett, M. (2022). Supporting open pedagogy with information literacy instruction for multimodal composition projects. In M. A. Cullen & E. Dill (Eds.), *Intersections of open educational resources and information literacy* (pp. 145–166). Association of College and Research Libraries. <https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/textbooks/1258>
- Gumb, L. (2022). OER-enabled pedagogy meets info lit: Empowering the next generation of open scholars. In M. A. Cullen & E. Dill (Eds.), *Intersections of open educational resources and information literacy* (pp. 49–70). Association of College and Research Libraries.
<https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/textbooks/1258>
- Hare, S., Frye, J. M., & Samuelson, B. L. (2020). Open pedagogy as an approach to introducing doctoral students to open educational resources and information literacy concepts. *Library Trends*, 69(2), 435–468. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lib.2020.0041>
- Hollister, C. (2020). Using open pedagogy to engage LIS students: A case study. *Journal of Librarianship & Scholarly Communication*, 8(1), Article eP2357.
<https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2357>
- Johnson, F., & Hooper, M. W. (2019). iFixit with the library: Partnering for open pedagogy in technical writing. *OLA Quarterly*, 24(3), 13–17. <https://doi.org/10.7710/1093-7374.1950>
- Nevada System of Higher Education. (2022). *NSHE enrollment*.
<https://ir.nevada.edu/page.php?p=enrollment>
- Park, D., & Bridges, L. (2022). Meet students where they are: Centering *Wikipedia* in the classroom. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 16(1), 4–23.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2022.16.1.2>
- Riehman-Murphy, C. (2022). Situated learning and open pedagogy. In M. A. Cullen & E. Dill (Eds.), *Intersections of open educational resources and information literacy* (pp. 167–180). Association of College and Research Libraries.
<https://open.umn.edu/opentextbooks/textbooks/1258>

- Shuttleworth, K., Stranack, K., & Moore, A. (2019). Course journals: Leveraging library publishing to engage students at the intersection of open pedagogy, scholarly communications, and information literacy. *Partnership*, 14(2).
<https://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v14i2.5339>
- Thomas, P. A., Jones, M. F., & Mattingly, S. G. (2021). Using *Wikipedia* to teach scholarly peer review. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 15(2), 178–190.
<https://doi.org/10.11645/15.2.2913>
- Wiley, D. (2013, October 21). *What is open pedagogy? Improving Learning*.
<https://opencontent.org/blog/archives/2975>
- Younger, K., Branstiter, C., & Bobkowski, P. (2021). From passive participants to active learners: Open educational resources as a vehicle to move beyond one-shot library instruction. *Journal of New Librarianship*, 6(1), 84–126.
<https://doi.org/10.33011/newlibs/10/12>