

From Passive Participants to Active Learners: Open Educational Resources as a Vehicle to Move Beyond One-shot Library Instruction

Karna Younger
Callie Branstiter
Peter Bobkowski
University of Kansas

Abstract: In this article, the authors argue that partnering with course faculty to develop and use open educational resources (OER) and open pedagogy to integrate information literacy (IL) into the curriculum. As this case study indicates, creating an OER allowed a team of librarians and a professor to effectively scaffold the “Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education” (Framework) throughout a required large-enrollment undergraduate journalism course. Including openly licensed student tutorials in the OER created a more inclusive space for students to learn and become peer-educators. This case study outlines a process for using OER and an open pedagogy assignment to teach IL and offers tips for how library workers can incorporate open educational practices (OEP) into their instructional sessions and collaborations.

Keywords: *Open educational resources, OER, open pedagogy, information literacy, instruction*



This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

Open educational resources (OER) and open pedagogy offer library workers exciting student-centered methods for teaching information literacy (IL) (Katz, 2020). OER are low or no-cost learning alternatives to expensive textbooks. The open aspect of OER refers to open licensing or existence in the public domain, and makes it possible to access, reuse, revise, remix, and redistribute OER (Wiley, 2013). A common example of OER are open textbooks, which are openly licensed textbooks that are freely available to students online across devices, downloaded as a PDF, or purchased for the cost of printing at college bookstores. The use and implementation of OER in the classroom are broadly known as open educational practices (OEP) and may encompass open pedagogy. Open pedagogy refers to a broad range of social justice and learning theories and practices, including critical pedagogy (Freire, 1968/2017), that are used to empower students as creators and authorities of information (DeRosa & Jhangiani, n.d.; Lambert, 2018). While open pedagogy takes many forms, it is often most recognizable by assignments that ask students to share their work with the purpose of educating each other or even their greater communities (Wiley, 2013).

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. OER and OEP may offer many library workers some needed pedagogical support and alternative approaches to their instruction. For instance, some library workers seek other instructional approaches because they believe one-shot instruction may be pedagogically inefficient (Howard, Nicholas, Hayes, & Appelt, 2014; Tewell, 2018; Bowles-Terry & Donovan, 2016) or may be experiencing an associated sense of burnout from teaching too many one-shot sessions (Affleck, 1996; Arellano Douglas, 2017; Bryant, Bussell, &

Halpern, 2019). Having such experiences, OER and open pedagogy offered librarians in this study a professionally fulfilling alternative to integrate and scaffold IL into a multi-section journalism course.

Our case study at a large midwestern university presents an OER collaboration between a journalism professor and a team of academic librarians, including an open pedagogy librarian (the team). The course is a required, high-enrollment information literacy course taken by journalism undergraduates in their first or second year. The students are focused on a variety of program tracts, including strategic communications as well as news and information in traditional print and emerging media. The original textbook was a commercial fact-finding guide that did not directly relate to journalism, course learning outcomes, or information literacy. The team created a discipline-specific OER with integrated IL concepts and used an open pedagogy assignment to involve student-learners as contributors to the OER. Asking students to create tutorials for the OER involved them in learning and teaching IL while offering practical experience relevant to their future careers. In this case study, the authors demonstrate the development of an OER and an open pedagogy assignment to engage students as peer-educators of discipline-specific IL. Additionally, the team shares how library workers can leverage OER and open pedagogy to sustainably move beyond or modify their one-shot instruction sessions.

Literature review

Information Literacy instruction

Many library workers lean on traditional-one shot instruction to teach IL across disciplines. The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) has unified and shaped IL instruction for academic library workers through the “Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher

Education” (Standards) as well as the “Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education,” (Framework) which replaced the Standards in January 2016 (ACRL, 2000; ACRL 2015). ACRL formally approved the mapping of the Standards to journalism in 2011 (ACRL, 2011). The Standards and the Framework prompt library workers to use a variety of pedagogies to integrate IL into the curriculum, particularly during a student’s first year of college, to aid in higher final grades and improving student retention and persistence (ACRL, 2015a; ACRL, 2016, ACRL, 2017). ACRL, however, did not include OEP or open pedagogy as pedagogical approaches to IL instruction (ACRL, 2000; ACRL, 2015b).

Problems with one shots

A variety of pedagogy approaches are essential to ACRL’s aspiration for IL to be “an educational reform movement” (ACRL, 2015), but one-shot instruction has remained a ready tool for a variety of reasons. ACRL charges library workers to “redesign instruction sessions, assignments, courses, and even curricula” to become power players throughout students’ educational experience (ACRL, 2015). One-shot instruction is part of ACRL’s vision and for Framework, but authors of the Framework have argued that the Framework was “not designed to be implemented in a single IL session in a student’s academic career” (ACRL, 2015, Appendix 1). Rather, library workers should assert themselves as “subject matter experts” who need “more than a 50-minute one-shot session with students” to integrate their interdisciplinary concept of IL throughout the undergraduate experience, authors of the Framework have persuasively argued (Townsend, Hofer, Hanick, & Brunetti, 2016, pp. 38-39). Moving beyond “traditional bibliographic instruction sessions” and merely being “a supplementary source of expertise to the subject faculty,” the Framework authors explained, would help library workers form equitable teaching partnerships with course instructors (Townsend, Hofer, Hanick, & Brunetti, 2016, p. 38). As a result, some libraries, such as the University of Arizona Libraries,

champion partnering with faculty to programmatically integrate IL across the curriculum instead of teaching one-shot sessions (University of Arizona Libraries, 2018)

One-shot instruction, however, has endured as an established practice well beyond its “heyday in the 1990s and 2000s” for a variety of practical reasons (Bowles-Terry & Donovan, 2016, p. 137; Downey, 2016, pp. 82). The persistence of one-shots is related to the convenience of one-shots as an engagement tool and feminized perceptions of librarians. To explain, liaison librarians commonly market one-shot library instruction to course instructors because course instructors can easily accommodate their course schedules for one session with a librarian (Logue, Ballestro, Imre, & Arendt, J., 2007; Stoddart, Bryant, Baker, Lee, & Spencer, 2006; Jaguszewski, & Williams, 2013; Church-Duran, 2017; Johnson, 2019). Once one-shot sessions are established, some library workers may fear time-pressed course instructors will revoke the allotment for a one-shot if the library worker asks for more than a guest lecture, and they may refrain from suggesting alternatives. Rather, library workers may tell themselves and colleagues that they should “be grateful” for the opportunity to “teach one instruction session” (Stoddart, et al., 2006, p. 422). Being in a woman-majority feminized field, library workers may unintentionally reinforce perceptions of themselves as maternal helpers rather than equal partners or lack the resources to assert themselves as equals (Garrison, 1972; Pagowsky & DeFrain, 2014; Sloniowski, 2016; Arellano Douglas & Gadsby, 2017; Arellano Douglas & Gadsby, 2019; Bryant, Bussell, & Halpern, 2019). In other words, the ways library workers “are perceived influences the work we do, and the work we do influences how we are perceived” (Pagowsky & DeFrain 2014). Library workers can only stop teaching one-shots once course instructors mutually consent to alternatives, but course instructors are unlikely to try alternative approaches that they do not associate with current library instructional practices. Library workers, especially those from marginalized backgrounds, may not

have the institutional or other resources to challenge the power relationship with course instructors by suggesting alternatives to course instructor's expectations (Mounce, 2010; Tewell, 2018, pp. 22-23).

Under such circumstances it is not surprising that instructional library workers may struggle to maintain positive attitudes toward their instruction. First, the instructional demands of one-shots can be rather stressful for library workers. Liaison librarians have reported feeling like "a jack of all trades and a master of none" while struggling to scale their "physical presence in the classroom" across multiple courses (Jaguszewski, & Williams, 2013, pp. 8, 10; Johnson, 2019). Feeling overwhelmed by the quantity of skills required to repeatedly teach single sessions has contributed to burnout among library workers (Patterson & Howell, 1990, pp. 517-523; Sheesley, 2001, p. 448). Aside from learning skills to teach, library workers who lack formal pedagogical training have likewise experienced greater stress and burnout while struggling to define their roles as educators (Affleck, 1996, pp. 166-167, 173-174; Pagowsky & DeFrain, 2014). The popularity of stories in Maria T. Accardi's now-defunct *Librarian Burnout* blog validates the unfortunate commonality of such problems, especially for library workers coping with other stresses, such as women and people of color (Arellano Douglas, 2017; Bryant, Bussell, & Halpern, 2019).

Finally, the one-shot model may not help students become information literate. One study found the single session did not increase student use of scholarly sources and the diversity of sources used, though students were prone to using the last resource mentioned in a library instruction session (Howard, Nicholas, Hayes, & Appelt, 2014, pp. 36-37). Tewell (2018) uncovered a variety of limitations: the one-shot model may limit librarians' pedagogical approaches to teaching, prevent library workers from delving deeply into material, hamstring class discussions, and make it difficult to know if the session had any impact on the students (Tewell, 2018, pp. 21-22). More generally, Bowles-Terry and

Donovan (2016) convincingly argued that one-shots fail to offer “sustainability or scalability” for teaching IL, and push librarians into the role of “service-providers for faculty and students” instead of lifting librarians into the role of collaborative instructional partners (Bowles-Terry & Donovan, 2016, p. 137). In other words, one-shots may not afford library workers enough time to support student learning.

Alternatives approaches

Critical pedagogy

Library workers have used a variety of pedagogical methods to move beyond the one-shot model (Johnson, 2003; Reynolds, Johnson, & Jent, 2007; Linares, Sproles, McClellan, Johnson, & Detmering, 2015). With the birth of internet search engines, some library workers replaced mechanical demonstrations with lectures on thinking critically about information (Joint, 2005). Some library workers became guides on the side who designed active learning exercises to encourage students as peer educators (King, 1993; Allen, 1995). Finally, library workers and course faculty collaborated to use problem-based learning to engage students in critically applying their literacy skills to real-world problems (Kenney, 2008; Pelikan, 2004; Cheney, 2004; Spence, 2004). A key takeaway from each of these approaches is the value of a practical and authentic approach to engaging students with IL.

Such vitality is seen in the marriage of IL with social justice imperatives to support critical IL and the critical librarianship movement. Critical librarianship is grounded in the works of Paulo Freire (1968/2017) and bell hooks (1994, 2010), who challenged traditional lecture-based instruction with student-centered active learning practices. Critical librarianship gained steam after Elmborg (2006) called for library workers to develop “critical consciousness in students” within the social and political

contexts of libraries and information (Elmborg, 2006, p. 193). Library workers in this movement, such as Andrew Battista (2015), have since labored to inject social justice principles into the Framework, particularly the “Authority is Constructed and Contextual” and “Scholarship as Conservation” Frames (Battista, et al, 2015; Doherty, 2007; Accardi, Drabinski & Kumbier, 2010; Downey, 2016; Tewell, 2018; Pagowsky & McElroy, 2016). As further discussed below, this project pulls from such scholars and practitioners to awaken journalism students to their privileges and responsibilities as information consumers and producers.

Scholarly communication

Some library workers have turned to scholarly communication to similarly empower students as creators of information. Scholarly communication is the system and community in which all scholars research, create, evaluate, disseminate, and preserve research and other information for future use (ACRL, 2003). From the Standards to the “Scholarship as Conversation” and “Information has Value” frames, ACRL has long advocated for coupling digital and information literacies to teach principles of authorship, open access, and copyright (ACRL, 2010; ACRL, 2012; ACRL, 2013; ACRL, 2015). Specifically, ACRL has shared how library workers have partnered with students to publicly share their work, and imparted students with understandings of the sociocultural and economic dimensions and processes of scholarly communication, publishing, and copyright (Duckett & Warren, 2013/2015; Hattwig, Lam, & Friedberg, 2015; Gilman, 2015; Clement & Brenenson, 2015; Johnson, Buhler & Gonzalez, 2015; Ball, 2015; Hensley, 2015; Shulte, et al, 2018; Johnson & Daley, 2015). Such student work is possible because of the open access (OA) movement, which advocates for “the free, immediate, online availability of research articles coupled with the rights to use these articles fully in the digital environment” (Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition, 2018). OA enables scholars to

share research with whom information would not be traditionally shared, and effectively subvert information privilege (Hare & Evanson, 2018). Combining OA principles with IL aligns with Freire's student-centered active learning (1968/2017) and accomplishes similar access and creation goals seen in critical IL practices. First, the value of "sharing of student work via platforms like OA institutional repositories and Wikipedia" offers "an unparalleled means to engage students and turn the 'banking' model of higher education on its head," as Char Booth has "long preached" (Booth, 2013). Additionally, as student-creators move from creation to publication, students navigate all six of ACRL's frames. For instance, students must learn the processes of strategically searching for, creating, and sharing information to construct their own authority across applicable contexts, such as their classroom and the greater public who view their work.

Open education and open pedagogy

As an off-shoot of the open access movement, open education and open pedagogy similarly propel students to critically engage with IL through the use of openly licensed educational resources. Applying an open license to educational materials allows practitioners to practice open education advocate David Wiley's "5R" of open education, which are the rights to freely retain, reuse, revise, remix, and redistribute free or low-cost open educational materials (OER) (Wiley, 2013; Wiley & Hilton, 2018). Through Wiley's "5R" of open education, open educators can create, remix, share, and improve assignments, video tutorials, textbooks, and other instructional materials for their courses (Wiley, 2013). Examples of OER can be found in the MERLOT repository of pedagogical tools, stored in OpenStax or the Open Textbook Library, or simply stowed in an institutional repository under a Creative Commons license. By ensuring all students have free and ready access to their course materials from the first day of class, educators grant all students, especially traditionally marginalized

students, a greater opportunity to persist and complete college. OER use is an empirically proven equity strategy that improves course completion and grades (Hilton, Fischer, Wiley & Williams, 2016; Colvard, Watson & Park, 2018; Jenkins, Hannans, Sanchez, & Leafstedt, 2019). Building on their expertise in scholarly communication and IL, academic library workers are campus leaders of open education movement who store OER in institutional repositories, facilitate access to OER, recommend the adoption and creation of OER through grant programs, and use OER to teach various literacies, including IL (Adams, 2017; Robertson, 2010; West, Hofer & Coleman, 2018). This case study demonstrates how library workers can collaborate with course faculty to create and implement an open textbook.

The practices of teaching with an OER, open pedagogy, allows students to be directly involved in the creation and maintenance of an open textbook (Wiley, 2017; Wiley & Hilton, 2018). Central to open pedagogy is the dichotomy of “renewable” and “disposable” assignments (Wiley, 2013). Disposable assignments are only completed for a specific course and discarded by the student after receiving a grade (Wiley, 2013). Renewable assignments, on the other hand, are transparently constructed assignments that ask students to create “reciprocal learning” tools that can be used by their peers or other community members (Wiley, 2013). Wiley and John Hilton centralize the importance of openly licensing and sharing student work through OER because it allows students to actively learn as creators of information and from each other as consumers of each other’s work (Wiley, 2017; Wiley & Hilton, 2018). Open pedagogy allows for “students to do most of the learning work” (Doyle, 2011) by building upon active learning and other constructivist pedagogies (Dewey, 1922). Examples of renewable assignments include contributing to Wikipedia, Twitter chats, public research presentations, and, as in this case study, including student-created tutorials in a course OER. Educators

appreciate that renewable assignments support more transparent, holistic, authentic, and learner-driven educational experiences for students (Morgan, 2016; Huitt & Monetti, 2017; Hilton & Wiley, 2018; DeRosa & Jhangiani, n.d.). As will be shown in this case study, librarians can equally appreciate how renewable assignments sustainably involve students as critical peer educators of IL.

The social justice aspect of open education begins with the matter of open access, but, as Sarah Lambert has convincingly argued, open pedagogy allows practitioners to fully implement social justice principles in their teaching (Lambert, 2018). Lambert's three-part definition of open education focuses on redistributive, cognitive, and representational justices (Lambert, 2018, pp. 227-228). First, redistributive justice provides access to educational materials to marginalized groups whose access to and completion of education might be limited for socio-cultural reasons (Lambert, 2018, pp. 227-228). Redistributive justice is understood in the movement's promotion of high-quality, non-commercial, free, or low cost, and accessible education and educational materials for students of all backgrounds (Biswas-Diener & Jhangiani, 2017, pp. 4-5; Bliss & Smith, 2017). The team committed to this principle by making certain the OER would be free and freely accessible to students. Second, cognitive justice calls for the inclusion and legitimate recognition of socio-cultural diversity and associated experiences and views in OER through inclusive examples and open assignments as well as instructor feedback to students (Lambert, 2019, pp. 227-228). Finally, Lambert's representational justice promotes the "self-determination of marginalized people and groups to speak for themselves, and not have their stories told by others" through the incorporation of open assignments (Lambert, 2018, pp. 227-228).

The inclusion of marginalized voices in OER content is one tactic to ensure that OER do not perpetuate white patriarchal educational systems and tools that devalue them (Close, et al., 2020). Representational justice is particularly important in higher education where most learning materials

do not include the voices of students, who remain more diverse than their teaching faculty (Davis and Fry, 2019). Through the creation process, the team sought the voices of faculty, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students to represent their own experiences, garnering the perspectives of women as authors and including inclusive examples. The team strove to create an OER that would charge all students to be aware of their information privilege and biases while gaining the ability to critically assess information. The team, however, recognized the need for greater inclusion of more marginalized voices as white-identifying people at a predominantly white university. The team designed open pedagogy assignments to respectfully amplify the voices and experiences of marginalized peoples as co-creators of the OER.

When sharing student work, it is vital to be sensitive to the needs and rights of participating students and community members, particularly traditionally marginalized people, and communities. Responsively, Robin DeRosa and Rajiv Jhangiani founded *Open Pedagogy Notebook* website to support their vision of open pedagogy as “a site of praxis, a place where theories about learning, teaching, technology, and social justice enter into a conversation with each other and inform the development of educational practices and structures” (DeRosa & Jhangiani, n.d.). Informed by bell hooks and Freire, DeRosa and Jhangiani’s open pedagogy strives to level the power differentials between instructor and students by empowering students as creators of knowledge that can challenge cultural hegemonic powers. Empowering students in a digital world while checking your power as an instructor can be difficult, but Jhangiani’s “5Rs for open pedagogy” provides useful guidance (Jhangiani, 2019). Mirroring Wiley’s 5R of OER, Jhangiani identifies respect, reciprocate, risk, reach, and resist (Jhangiani, 2019). Jhangiani pushes us to resist exploiting students by supporting and respecting their agency and labor in creating and choosing to license and share their work (Jhangiani, 2019). For

personal and educational reasons it is not always to the student's benefit that their work be shared, and so instructors should allow for privacy and "private learning" (Cheney, 2018) to foster student safety and development. Additionally, Jhangiani reminds us to respect the risk instructor and student take in learning new skills or digital tools while reaching out to other learners and communities in support of reciprocal ways of learning and in resistance of racist, colonial, and other cultural forces that may "pit increasingly precarious faculty against increasingly precarious students" (Jhangiani, 2019). Jhangiani's framework was particularly useful to train future journalists to consider how sharing their work can impact individuals and communities.

This article discusses how OER and the use of open pedagogy facilitated the instruction of the Framework. Open pedagogy intersects with IL because it allows librarians to move beyond "a skills-based approach to a more conceptual form of teaching," and encourages students to critically engage with information to organize, create, and present new information, as others have convincingly argued about the relationship of digital pedagogy, digital humanities, and IL (Russell & Hensley, 2017; White, 2017). Open pedagogy is a conduit for other literacies because it requires students to learn digital tools, intellectual property, and discipline-specific knowledge. The team aligned open pedagogy with the Frames "scholarship as conversation," "information has value," and "authority is constructed and contextual" to create an OER, *Be credible: Information literacy for journalism, public relations, and marketing students* (Bobkowski & Younger, 2018). Creating the OER and implementing an open pedagogy assignment enabled librarians scaffold IL across an undergraduate journalism research course serving over 300 journalism majors every year. Finally, designing and implementing an open pedagogy assignment engaged and empowered student-creators in reciprocal learning. The inclusion

of student-generated IL tutorials was vital to creating an OER that remains current and relevant to diverse students' IL needs.

Course Context: the IL Problem

The course under discussion is JOUR 302: Infomania (JOUR 302). JOUR 302 is a required course for all journalism majors at a large public doctoral-granting university with very high research activity. The class is designed to prepare undergraduates to research and publish as professionals in the fields of journalism, public relations, marketing, and advertising. Like many high-enrollment courses, JOUR 302 has been taught by several different section instructors in the fall, spring, and summer semesters. Problematically, not all section instructors invited a librarian for a one-shot IL session. If instructors did ask a librarian to lead one session, instructors often assigned a type of scavenger hunt assignment that required students to locate one physical book and one article, regardless of whether the information was needed for the student's final project. There was a disconnect between instructors who used the skills-based Standards and librarians who wanted to implement the more conceptual Framework. Finally, the course textbook was out of date, irrelevant to the student perspective, and failed to critically engage with IL concepts. Recognizing a need for a pedagogical change, the lead course faculty member, who was already revising the course, agreed to partner with a team of librarians to fully integrate IL across all sections. The libraries team consisted of an undergraduate engagement librarian, a government and business information librarian, and an open pedagogy librarian. Intrigued by the pedagogical benefits of OER and seeking to reduce students' educational costs, the team determined that creating an OER would allow them to scale and customize IL instruction across the course sections and help further the campus's OER initiative.

Collaboratively creating an open textbook

Intensive week-long kickstart

The team's OER collaboration began with an intensive week as part of the libraries' Research Sprints (Wiggins, et al., 2019), during which the team established common goals and mapped the content of the OER to the Framework. The intent was to eliminate the need for one-shot IL sessions by creating an OER that would allow course instructors to continuously teach IL throughout the semester. To do so, the team needed to make certain the goals for the course aligned with ACRL's Framework. Conveniently, sectional instructors and the lead course faculty member, who is fluent in the Framework, drafted course learning outcomes, listed below, prior to the start of our week:

1. Students will identify a topic of interest, articulate its significance, explain the necessity of researching it, and plan a research strategy.
2. Students will identify diverse information sources to advance their understanding of a topic.
3. Students will use effective retrieval strategies, including search and interview techniques, to obtain information from these sources.
4. Students will apply critical thinking to evaluate their information sources, the information they collect, and their own assumptions about the topic.
5. Students will summarize and synthesize the information they collect and will articulate the results of their critical thinking evaluations.
6. Students will attribute information completely and consistently to its sources.

The team spent the first part of our week researching and discussing the course learning outcomes to fully align them with the Framework. Research began with the curriculum and instruction standards

set forth by The Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC), which mandates students learn to “think critically, creatively and independently” while also garnering skills to “conduct research and evaluate information by methods appropriate to the communications professions in which they work” (ACEJMC, 2013, section 2). The team contextualized ACEJMC’s standards within their experiences teaching undergraduate journalism students and current research indicating that undergraduates struggle to judge the accuracy of news (Head & Eisenberg, 2010; MacMillan, 2014; Wineberg & McGrew, 2017; Wineburg, McGrew, Breakstone, & Ortega, 2017). Though believing all six of ACRL’s Framework related to the desired outcomes, the team determined the “authority is constructed and contextual” frame most directly addressed the need to consider the “expertise and credibility” of information creators in the process of evaluating and creating information across different social, political, and cultural contexts (ACRL, 2015b). The team also found the “information has value” and “scholarship as conversation” frames would be vital to students’ understanding, evaluating, and contributing to credible information within the context of their information-producing professions. Looking for a single unifying theme, the team centered our OER on the concept of credibility because it is explicitly mentioned in the “authority is constructed and contextual” frame and the professor uses it when discussing information evaluation and creation.

During the second half of our week, the team outlined the open textbook, identifying themes, learning outcomes, and potential contributors. Our research of journalism students’ educational and professional needs was especially beneficial for our process of identifying topics, writing each chapter, and planning the chapter activities and final course assignment. For instance, based on the work of Margy MacMillan (2014), we understood we must align and scaffold IL with journalistic professional practices and requirements to ensure assignments would be able to meet students’ professional

needs. Additionally, the team knew that journalism students would need to be trained to continuously evaluate and use a variety of sources while remaining sensitive to their communities (Clark, 2013). In other words, the team would need to use critical examples throughout the textbook to help students question the structure and privilege of information, break down the barriers between scholarly and popular sources, and critically evaluate information to become aware of what excluded voices should be brought into their work as students and professionals (Downey, 2016, pp. 109-125). The representation of such excluded voices would further Lambert's concept of cognitive justice (Lambert, 2018, pp. 227-228) and better equip students for careers in multicultural societies. The chapters were chunked into searching, evaluating, and using information, and types of information sources. Chapters within these sections were intended to guide students through the journalistic process of creating information. The team decided the book should open with explaining the concept of credibility before delving into effective searching, attribution of sources, and keeping detailed research notes. Next, the team aimed to teach students evaluation skills, such as identifying bias and how to quickly read and verify the credibility of a source (Wineberg & McGrew, 2017; Wineburg, McGrew, Breakstone, & Ortega, 2017). The team then used backward design and the Framework to design learning outcomes for each chapter (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005; ACRL, 2015, Appendix 1). Finally, to reinforce the concepts presented in the OER, the team created end-of-chapter activities for students to immediately apply information seeking and evaluation skills.

The team capped our week by planning for the months ahead. The team discussed the recruitment of authors and how to prepare them to contribute. To encourage author agreement, the team decided points of contact should be team members most familiar with the contributor. For instance, the lead professor asked his journalism faculty colleagues and the librarians petitioned their

fellow library workers. Anticipating author questions, the team drafted a style guide, which asked authors to write in a friendly, first-person tone and to follow *Associated Press Stylebook* to model journalism's style guide for readers. The team also made tentative plans for additional course assignments that would require students to research a topic and defend the credibility of their chosen sources. The team also planned to assess the effectiveness of the OER through source evaluation pre- and post-tests. These aspects of the course redesign are the subject of ongoing research and future publications (Bobkowski & Younger, 2020; Bobkowski, Younger & Watson, forthcoming 2021). By the end of the intensive week, the team started writing chapters and invited colleagues in the libraries and journalism school to join the work.

OER creation process

Starting from the kernel of credibility, the *Be credible: Information literacy for journalism, public relations, and marketing students* team grew (Bobkowski & Younger, 2020). The process of creating the open textbook was adapted to contributors' collective schedules and lasted approximately a year. As first-time creators with competing work and life schedules, the team empathetically found allowing a flexible timeline helped gain buy-in from busy contributors. Authors were journalism faculty and librarians who taught advanced journalism courses, guest lectures for the course, or even sections of the class. In other words, chapter authors were invested in the course and had preexisting lesson plans or lectures that could easily convert into a chapter. For example, contributing journalism and library faculty and staff converted their lecture notes on Wikipedia, citing sources, and filing a Freedom of Information Act request into chapters. The team often tried to make contributors' loads as light as possible by drafting learning outcomes and activities for chapters and hiring a copyeditor to polish the text. To facilitate document creation, editing, and sharing with

contributors, the collective drafted the textbook in Google Docs. Once the writing and editing process was complete, the professor and one of the librarians created the textbook using Pressbooks. Pressbooks, with an interface similar to WordPress, supports OER creation with a “what you see is what you get” editing dashboard and the ability to upload Microsoft Word documents and embed pictures and videos, including YouTube videos. The responsive design and PDF function of Pressbooks allowed students to access the textbook across devices and download and print a hardcopy. Finally, Pressbooks’s cloning function and licensing denotation would make it easy for instructors at other institutions to adopt and adapt the OER.

Using an OER to teach information literacy

Be credible: Information literacy for journalism, public relations, and marketing students consists of 22 chapters divided into three sections that guide students through establishing an information workflow and learning how to evaluate information before diving into locating information using a variety of tools and resources. In each chapter, authors covered far more information tools and types in greater depth than possible in a traditional 50-minute class period. The team used examples and created tutorials specific to a variety of research tools and different career paths, such as marketing and public relations as well as news reporting. As seen in the chapter explanations below, the open textbook allowed the scaffolding of IL throughout the semester by using critical and relevant examples (Downey, 2016, pp. 109-125). The structure and content of chapters, “Keeping Detailed Research Notes” and “Contend with Bias” as well as the third section, “Information Sources,” are representative of the OER.

Keeping Detailed Research Notes

“Keeping Detailed Research Notes,” written by the open pedagogy librarian, is informed by the frame “scholarship as conversation.” In journalism, there is an established practice of reporters keeping a notebook of their interview and research notes. A reporter’s notebook often serves as proof to their editor that they have consulted all the necessary sources and accurately reported their findings. As similarly mandated by the “scholarship as conversation” frame, a notebook is an information professional’s evidence that they are aware of and participate in relevant scholarship and recent events. To promote this professional practice, the chapter is designed 1) to introduce students to the notion that their professional reputation depends on the accuracy of the information they present, and 2) to give students a bird’s-eye view of the mechanics of designing and maintaining a research collection system useful for them and their research collaborators. To meet these learning objectives, the chapter introduces research record keeping within the context of journalism and related subfields. It details note-taking practices and tools while explaining why using a methodical and transparent research process is a way to ensure professional credibility. For instance, the chapter discussed how the use and organization of detailed notes of ideas, keywords, source notes, and quotes, can help an editor or fact-checker easily make sense of a reporter’s research, which is paramount to establishing credibility in professional journalism. Additionally, the chapter provides examples of how transparent news practices demand that reporters’ notes and primary source materials are incorporated into stories and made available for public viewing as part of an effort to earn consumers’ trust. By making the connection between detailed search processes and the importance of fact-checking to journalistic integrity, the chapter argues for the necessity of documentation in building a strong professional reputation.

Contend With Bias

The “Contend with Bias” chapter is one of many to incorporate the frame “Authority is Constructed and Contextual.” Within the context of evaluating sources, the open pedagogy librarian and undergraduate engagement librarian introduce students to the concept of bias and its various forms. At the beginning of the chapter, the authors explicitly stated that bias is inherent in every information source. After an introduction to implicit and explicit bias, the authors then elucidated various categories of bias -- cognitive, gender, racial, ethnic, and corporate bias -- that are particularly salient to journalism, public relations, marketing, and advertising students. The chapter connected these concepts directly to many of the information sources and search engines that students use. This discussion naturally led to scholars such as Safiya Umoja Noble, whose work on algorithmic bias in Google was hugely influential on this chapter in particular and the book as a whole. By introducing types of biases and case studies that model bias in journalism, including journalists acknowledging their own biases in reporting, students can learn to be more self-aware of how biases impact their evaluation and creation of information.

After presenting case studies on bias in journalism, the authors presented a way forward. The authors recommend students be more intentional in the sources they use, citing people of color, using a variety of diverse sources, and turning to organizations, such as the National Association of Black Journalists or the National Association of Hispanic Journalists, which provide journalistic guidance and promote equity in this area. Again, the authors grounded recommendations in examples of professional practice. For instance, the chapter discussed the ways journalist Ronan Farrow was mindful of his bias in his reporting of sexual assault allegations waged against disgraced Hollywood mogul Harvey Weinstein. Specifically, Farrow shared how his own sister’s sexual assault made him an

empathetic but skeptical champion of survivors of sexual assault and catalyzed him to write the article despite facing threats from Weinstein’s allies (Guthrie, 2018). This example was to demonstrate the importance of admitting and being mindful and skeptical of biases to encourage students to better understand the balancing of biases in information creation. The chapter closed with suggested activities, which include taking the Harvard Implicit Bias Test and evaluating the types of biases in a news story of the student’s choice. These exercises prompt students to immediately apply lessons learned and to question the authority of information.

Information sources and privilege

In the final third of the book, the team frequently relied upon the Frame “Information Has Value” to structure conversations about strategically accessing, exploring, and using information sources and types as professionals in journalism, marketing, public relations, and advertising. The team followed Char Booth’s example of helping students question their “information privilege” (Booth, 2014). Booth charges library workers to recognize and challenge the privilege of having access to proprietary information to “combat the division between those who can and cannot access what we create and curate” (Booth, 2014). To encourage undergraduates to appreciate their privilege in accessing proprietary and subscription library databases and their potential post-graduation information poverty, the authors often categorize information sources as open, privileged (available with costs, such as library resources), and closed (not accessible, such as private company information), and explain why governmental, scholarly, professional, and corporate practices and policies can help or hinder access to information and even how access may influence the credibility of information. For instance, in the news chapter, the open pedagogy librarian discussed how some news organizations are putting up paywalls and adopting a subscription model to increase their revenue

streams. The open pedagogy librarian pushed against any perceptions that privileged or closed sources were more reliable or a marker of credibility. To illustrate this, the chapter explored how the owner of many newspapers, Digital First Media, is harming journalists' ability to produce the news by cutting reporting staff at a number of newspapers, including *The Denver Post*, while widening profit margins. Through discussions of information credibility, collective authors walk students through the research and reporting process, modeling professional practices of transparency.

Students' perceptions and effectiveness of the OER

The team fully implemented *Be credible: Information literacy for journalism, public relations, and marketing students* in the fall 2018 semester and have assessed whether the use of an OER is improving students' educational experience and have gathered student perceptions of the open textbook. The journalism professor and open pedagogy librarian found the OER was pedagogically effective in teaching IL concepts (Bobkowski & Younger, 2020). In pre- and post-tests students were asked to evaluate the credibility of a news article by identifying and researching key credibility cues, such as the publication, author, and sources. The journalism professor and open pedagogy librarian designed a rubric to score the number of identified credibility cues and how well students 152 of 164 participating students supported their evaluation with research over the course of two semesters (Bobkowski & Younger, 2020, pp. 827-831). Early in the semester, students generally failed to research their evaluations in favor of their personal knowledge of a publication or rote knowledge, such as an overly skeptical distrust for commercial top-level domains, to determine the authority of a source (Bobkowski & Younger, 2020, pp. 834-836). At the end of the semester, students were not fully immune to "flawed reasoning," but did significantly improve their ability to research and reason their defense of source credibility (Bobkowski & Younger, 2020, pp. 836-838).

The effectiveness of the OER may be because students actually use the OER. Over 2018 fall and 2019 spring, 264 students responded to a survey based on the assessment themes from the Open Education Group's cost, outcomes, use, and perceptions (COUP) framework (Open Education Group, 2013). Respondents shared that they appreciated the textbook being free (99.60%) and accessible online (99.20%), that they either always or most of the time read the assigned chapters (85.33%), and that they "agreed or strongly agreed that the OER supported their learning, scoring the examples (96.91%) and video tutorials (88.46%) presented in the OER as helpful" (Bobkowski, Younger, & Watson, forthcoming). Finally, "most students (93.03%) thought that this open textbook was either slightly or much better than other (commercial) textbooks they had used" (Bobkowski, Younger, & Watson, forthcoming). Students' qualitative feedback elucidated their appreciation for the OER. Working students expressed appreciation for the cost savings, and others noted the informal writing style, "real world" examples, and familiarity with the OER authors assured them that their education was relevant to their future careers and being offered by supportive faculty whom they could approach with additional questions (Bobkowski, Younger, & Watson, forthcoming). Finally, students appreciated the video tutorials and advocated for the inclusion of student-created tutorials, reinforcing the team's open pedagogy and representative justice plans to include more student voices (Bobkowski, Younger, & Watson, forthcoming).

Open pedagogy

By incorporating student work into the textbook, the redesign team involved students in the maintenance of the textbook and empowered them to engage classmates in scholarly and professional conversations across semesters. For the final assignment of this course, students were given two open pedagogy options. They could create a tutorial for the OER or contribute an entry for the professor's

blog of historical downtown buildings, [Block-by-Block](#), which is published on the city's tourism website. This article will focus on the OER option because librarians played an active role in the student experience for that assignment.

Student copyrights and informed consent

To prepare students to share their work, student copyrights were iteratively taught, beginning with a discipline-specific copyright lecture from a journalism professor, the “Licensing Published Work” OER chapter written by the open pedagogy librarian, and the professor’s explanation of the licensing of the OER. Such a process of developing informed consent aims to foster students’ understanding of the retention of their copyrights and their options to publish anonymously or to not publish without fear that their grades would be impacted. So far, no participating students have requested anonymity because, the redesign team anecdotally believes, journalism students wish to build their professional portfolios. Finally, students completed and turned in a licensing and consent form with their final assignment. Asking students to complete the consent form after they have completed their project helps them make an informed decision. It is also fair and equitable to offer students the opportunity to withdraw their consent after receiving their grades or when notifying them that their work has been accepted to the OER. As white people in positions of authority, positionalities of the open pedagogy librarian and professor could precariously fail to motivate or unfairly pressure students to share their work. The process of informed consent and options to withdraw were important checks against such power imbalances.

Library instruction and consultations

Next, because the professor used the OER to iteratively teach IL throughout the semester, the open pedagogy librarian focused her class visit on the open pedagogy assignment, visiting the class 4-6 *Journal of New Librarianship*, 6(2021) pp. 84-126 10.21173/newlibs/10/11

weeks before the end of the semester. The open pedagogy librarian focused the session on the characteristics of a tutorial appropriate for the OER. The class collaboratively created selection criteria including presentational elements, accuracy of information literacy concepts, and the novelty of a topic. The open pedagogy librarian then shared a short list of tutorial production tools freely available to the students for their evaluation and use. The remainder of the time was used for topic development and brainstorming.

After the session, students emailed the open pedagogy librarian for topic approval and scheduled a consultation to discuss their tutorial concept. During such consultations, the open pedagogy librarian noticed students were well prepared to have in-depth conversations about IL, but most students struggled to properly scope their topic. Commonly students entered the conversation thinking they should summarize an entire chapter (defining and explaining public records, for instance) but left knowing they should focus on only a particular element (how to verify an establishment's liquor license). Positively, though, all students were able to explain difficult concepts, often relating their planned concepts to experiences from an internship or other learning experience. Students' ability to integrate and reinterpret core concepts indicated that they genuinely understand what they learned (Wiggins and McTighe, 2005, pp. 82-104, 152-156; Meyer and Land, 2003; Meyer and Land, 2005).

Selecting tutorials for publication

It is important to understand why not all tutorials created were published in the OER. The professor and open pedagogy librarian evaluated student tutorials and updated the textbook at the end of the academic year. In fall 2018, approximately one-third of the 170 students submitted tutorials, and in spring 2019 there was an increase of submissions, with slightly less than half of students completing a tutorial. Many students creatively demonstrated their learning in their tutorials. While

there were many search demonstrations, such tutorials often were broken up with “b-roll footage” of students researching or studying and voice overs of critical reflections. It was also apparent students relied upon pre-existing skills in animation and film-making.

The evaluation of tutorials was an iterative process involving two rounds of review by the open pedagogy librarian and professor. First, the open pedagogy librarian evaluated submissions based on the approved topic’s relevance to the OER, the credibility and transparency of research, and quality of presentation -- the criteria agreed upon in the class session. Next, the professor reviewed the librarian’s selection, and the librarian and professor discussed their opinions. Tutorials were commonly excluded for factual inaccuracies and illegible screenshots. Twenty-two student tutorials were added to the OER by the end of spring 2019.

It is important to understand how the decision not to share student work factors into the theory of open pedagogy. Not publishing all tutorials was a crucial marker of respect for the students, as Rajiv Jhangiani (2019) and Matthew Cheney (2018) have argued. Jhangiani’s “5Rs of open pedagogy” stipulates that educators respect the risk their students take in learning in the public eye (Jhangiani, 2019). “Not everything could or should be open,” Jhangiani argues, because students, particularly those “marginalized by the academy,” may be exposed to “criticism and judgment” for openly sharing their “unpolished ideas and practices” (Jhangiani, 2019). Students wish to identifiably publish a portfolio to demonstrate that their work is “of substance, achievement, and expertise” (Cheney, 2018). Publishing work that falls short of such qualities can harm students’ online and professional reputations (Cheney, 2018). Educators should particularly consider how harmful sharing poor examples of work may harm traditionally marginalized students seeking to enter a predominantly white profession (Clark, 2020; Arana, 2018; Cobb, 2018). In this vein, librarians and instructors leading

open pedagogy projects must be mindful of power differentials between students and themselves and students' eagerness to build their portfolios. In other words, open pedagogists must understand, respect, and protect students' "private learning" space, in which students may experience the messy process of learning in the privacy of a classroom (Cheney, 2018). As mentioned, students should be given multiple opportunities to opt out of publishing their work, even after they sign a consent form.

Positively, it appeared that students helped empower each other to share their work. The increase of submissions after the first year and anecdotal evidence indicated that students were more willing to share their work once they saw their peers doing the same. A good example of anecdotal evidence included a conversation the open pedagogy librarian had with one African American woman. The student told the open pedagogy librarian that she felt encouraged to create a tutorial after surprisingly seeing a tutorial created by a friend, a white woman. The open pedagogy librarian and professor believed students were able to connect with each other and form a more inclusive, asynchronous learning community because there are fewer power differentials among students than between students and their professor.

Conclusion

The OER and open pedagogy allowed the redesign team to integrate IL into an undergraduate journalism course and to effectively empower students as learners and peer teachers. Our open textbook, *Be credible: Information literacy for journalism, public relations, and marketing students*, scaffolded the Framework throughout the semester in alignment with journalistic principles and practices. Through the use of open pedagogy, students created, shared, and learned from tutorials in the OER. The OER and open pedagogy assignment created an iterative and authentic educational experience and improved student information literacy. Finally, the redesign team valued how students'

tutorials gave students an outlet to share their work, teach each other, and experience more diverse voices than those of their instructors.

Areas for improvement

Teaching with open pedagogy is an iterative process, and after the initial year the open pedagogy librarian continued to modify her practices to better anticipate and meet students' needs in a sustainable manner. To lessen the librarian's workload, the open pedagogy librarian created a Google form for students to submit their proposed tutorial topic, creation tools, rough outline, and any questions. This allowed the open pedagogy librarian to conduct some preliminary consultations over email before holding more in-depth consultations with students. Additionally, anecdotal student feedback indicated a need to close the gap between students' comfort levels with digital tools. This will necessitate teaching students how to critically select and use the digital tools that will best support their learning and project goals (Morris and Stommel, 2018). Finally, the redesign team hopes to implement a process of peer-review to further empower students as co-creators of the OER and to lessen the power differentials between students and the professor and open pedagogy librarian.

Opportunities for librarians

This article has outlined how librarians and course faculty can partner to create and implement OER and open pedagogy to integrate IL into a course. While library workers can play key roles in advocating for the adoption of OER (Okamoto, 2013), it also is important to value OER use and creation to integrate information and other literacies. Library workers can consider the various ways they can incorporate OER and open pedagogy into their work and instructional partnerships. Aside from creating OER as detailed here, library workers can help instructors adopt OER accessible from the

repositories and search engines such as [Open Textbook Library](#), [The Mason OER Metafinder](#) (MOM), the [Pressbooks Directory](#), or [Merlot](#). Library workers could also adopt or remix OER for their own information literacy instruction. Assigning a short OER or chapter from an open textbook could help flip a one-shot instruction session, for instance. Library workers also could incorporate elements of open pedagogy into their one-shots. Asking students to anonymously share their research findings and tips in a Google Document that can be shared across semesters is one of many examples of open library instruction. Those seeking ideas can draw from a growing body of literature, from The Open Pedaogy Notebook to Kimberly Davies Hoffman and Alexis Clifton's *Open Pedagogy Approaches: Faculty, Library, and Student Collaborations* (2020). Collaborating with instructors and students to teach information literacy through OER and open pedagogy is an important step in making education more accessible and achievable for all students.

References

- Accardi, M., Drabinski, E., & Kumbier, A. (2010). *Critical library instruction: Theories and methods*. Duluth, Minn.: Library Juice Press.
- Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (ACEJMC). (2013). *ACEJMC Accrediting Standards*. <http://acejmc.ku.edu/PROGRAM/STANDARDS.SHTML#std2>.
- Adams, C. (2017, April 14). *Successful OER adoption: Academic libraries leading the way*. SPARC. <https://sparcopen.org/news/2017/successful-oer-adoption-models-academic-libraries-leading-way/>.
- Affleck, M. A. (1996). Burnout among bibliographic instruction librarians. *Library & Information Science Research*, 18(2), 165–183. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-8188\(96\)90018-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0740-8188(96)90018-3).

Allen, E. E. (1995). Active learning and teaching: improving postsecondary library instruction. *Reference Librarian*, (51–52), 89–103. https://doi.org/10.1300/J120v24n51_10.

Arana, G. (2018, Fall). Decades of failure. *Columbia Journalism Review*.

https://www.cjr.org/special_report/race-ethnicity-newsrooms-data.php

Arellano Douglas, V. (2017, May 5). “Burn out. It’s real” [blog post]. *Libraries + Inquiry*.

<https://veronicaarellanodouglas.com/big-picture-librarianship/burn-out-its-real/>.

Arellano Douglas, V. & Gadsby, J. (2017). Gendered labor and library instruction coordinators: The undervaluing of feminized work. *At the Helm: Leading Transformation* (pp. 266-274). Chicago: American Library Association.

<http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/conferences/confandspreconfs/2017/GenderedLaborandLibraryInstructionCoordinators.pdf>.

Arellano Douglas, V. & Gadsby, J. (2019). All carrots, no sticks: Relational practice and library Instruction coordination. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*.

<http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2019/all-carrots-no-sticks-relational-practice-and-library-instruction-coordination/>.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2000). *Information literacy competency standards for higher education*. American Libraries Association.

<https://alair.ala.org/bitstream/handle/11213/7668/ACRL%20Information%20Literacy%20Competency%20Standards%20for%20Higher%20Education.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>.

Association for College and Research Libraries. (2003). *Principles and strategies for the reform of scholarly communication 1*

<http://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/whitepapers/principlesstrategies>.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2010). *Value of academic libraries: A comprehensive research review and report*. Researched by Megan Oakleaf. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value/val_report.pdf.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2011). *Information literacy competency standards for journalism students and professionals*.

http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/standards/il_journalism.pdf.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2013). Working Group on Intersections of Scholarly Communication and Information Literacy. *Intersections of scholarly communication and information literacy: Creating strategic collaborations for a changing academic environment*. Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries. <http://acrl.ala.org/intersections>.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2015a). *Academic library contributions to student success: Documented practices from the field*. Prepared by Karen Brown. Contributions by Kara J. Malenfant. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value/contributions_report.pdf.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2015b). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. American Libraries Association. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2016). *Documented library contributions to student learning and success: Building evidence with team-based Assessment in Action campus projects*. Prepared by Karen Brown with contributions by Kara J. Malenfant. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value/contributions_y2.pdf.

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2017). *Academic library impact on student learning and success: Findings from Assessment in Action team projects*. Prepared by Karen Brown with contributions by Kara J. Malenfant. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.
http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value/findings_y3.pdf.

Association of College and Research Libraries Information Literacy Competency Standards Review Task Force. (2012, June). *Recommendations to the ACRL Information Literacy Standards Committee*. Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries.
http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/standards/ils_recomm.pdf.

Ball, C.E. (2015). “Pirates of metadata” or, the true adventures of how one journal editor and fifteen undergraduate publishing majors survived a harrowing metadata mining project. In R. Biswas-Diener & R.S. Jhangiani (Eds.). *Introduction to open: The philosophy and practices that are revolutionizing education and science* (pp. 3–7). London: Ubiquity Press. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.5334/bbc.a>.

Bliss, T. J. and Smith, M. (2017). A brief history of open educational resources. In R. Biswas-Diener & R.S. Jhangiani (Eds.). *Introduction to open: The philosophy and practices that are revolutionizing education and science* (pp. 3–7). London: Ubiquity Press. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.5334/bbc.a>.

Bliss, T. J.; Robinson, T. J.; Hilton, J.; & Wiley, D. A. (2013). An OER coup: College teacher and student perceptions of open educational resources,” *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 1, art. 4.
<https://jime.open.ac.uk/articles/10.5334/2013-04>.

Bobkowski, P., & Younger, K. (2018). *Be credible: Information literacy for journalism, public relations, and marketing students*. <https://oen.pressbooks.pub/becredible/>

Bobkowski, P., & Younger, K. (2020). News credibility: Adapting and testing a source evaluation assessment in journalism. *College & Research Libraries*, 81(5), 822.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.81.5.822>.

Bobkowski, P., Younger, K., & Watson, J. [expected fall 2021]. Redesigning a journalism course to integrate IL: A case study,” *portal: Libraries and the Academy*.

Booth, C. (2014). “On Information Privilege,” *info-mational* (blog, Dec. 1, 2014),
<https://infomational.com/2014/12/01/on-information-privilege/>.
Booth, C. (2013). “open access as pedagogy,” *info-mational* (blog, July 29, 2013),
<https://infomational.wordpress.com/2013/07/29/open-access-as-pedagogy/>.

Bowles-Terry, M., and Donovan. (2016). Serving notice on the one-shot: Changing roles for instruction librarians. *International Information and Library Review*, 48(2), 137-142.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2016.1176457>.

Bryant, T., Bussell, H., & Halpern, R. (2019). Being seen: Gender identity and performance as a professional resource in library work. *College & Research Libraries* 80(6), 805.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.80.6.805>.

Cheney, D. (2004). Problem-based learning: Librarians as collaborators and consultants. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 4(4), 495-508. <http://www2.lib.ku.edu/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.www2.lib.ku.edu/docview/216176923?accountid=14556>.

Cheney, M. (2018). “How public? Why public?,” *Finite Eyes* (blog, July 27, 2018).
<https://finiteeyes.net/pedagogy/how-public-why-public/>.

Church-Duran, J. (2017). Distinctive roles: Engagement, innovation, and the liaison model. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 17(2), 257–271. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2017.0015>.

Clark, L. S. (2013). Cultivating the media activist: How critical media literacy and critical service learning can reform journalism education. *Journalism*, 14(7), 885–903.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884913478361>.

Clark, M.D. (2020). *2018 newsroom diversity survey*. American Society of News Editors.

<https://members.newsleaders.org/diversity-survey-2018>

Clement, G., & Brenenson, S. (2015). Theft of mind: An innovative approach to plagiarism and copyright education. In S. Davis-Kahl & M.K. Hensley (Eds.), *Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication* (pp. 55-84). Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Close, C., Egan, J., & Thompson, E. (2020, December 30). Interrogating and supplementing OER through a decolonized lens. *OER & Beyond: The Official Blog of International Journal of Open Educational Resources*. <https://ijoenrdbeyond.org/interrogating-and-supplementing-oer-through-a-decolonized-lens/>

Cobb, J. (2018, November 5). When newsrooms are dominated by white people, they miss crucial facts. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/commentisfree/2018/nov/05/newsroom-diversity-media-race-journalism>

Davis, L. & Fry, R. (2019, July 31). College faculty have become more racially and ethnically diverse, but remain far less so than students. *Pew Research Center* (blog).

<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/31/us-college-faculty-student-diversity/>.

Davis-Kahl & M.K. Hensley (Eds.), *Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication*. Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries.

DeRosa, R. & Jhangiani, R. (ND). Open Pedagogy. In Elizabeth Mays (Ed.), *A guide to making Open textbooks with students.*

<https://press.rebus.community/makingopentextbookswithstudents/chapter/open-pedagogy/#footnote-111-4>.

Dewey, J. (1922). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Doherty, J. (2007). No shhing: Giving voice to the silenced: An essay in support of critical information literacy. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 133. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/133/>.

Downey, A. (2016). *Critical information literacy: Foundations, inspiration, and ideas*. Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.

Doyle, T. (2011). *Learner-centered teaching: Putting the research on learning into practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Drabinski, E. (2013). Queering the catalog: Queer theory and the politics of correction. *The Library Quarterly*, 83(2), 94–111. <https://doi.org/10.1086/669547>.

Duckett, K. & Warren, S. (2015). Exploring the intersections of information literacy and scholarly communication: Two frames of reference for undergraduate instruction. In S. Davis-Kahl & M.K. Hensley (Eds.), *Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication* (pp. 35-54). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Elmborg, J. (2006). Critical information literacy: Implications for instructional practice. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(2), 192–199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2005.12.004>.

Freire, P. (1968/2017). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Penguin Classics.

Garrison, D. (1972). The tender technicians: The feminization of public librarianship, 1876-1905. *Journal of Social History*, 6(2), 131–159.

Gilman, I. (2015). Scholarly communication for credit: Integrating publishing education into undergraduate curriculum. In S. Davis-Kahl & M.K. Hensley (Eds.), *Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication* (pp. 85-102). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Guthrie, M. (2018, Jan. 10). Ronan Farrow, the Hollywood prince who torched the castle. *The Hollywood Reporter*. <https://www.hollywoodreporter.com/features/ronan-farrow-hollywood-prince-who-torched-castle-1073405>.

Hare, S. & Evanson, C. (2018). Information privilege outreach for undergraduate students. *College & Research Libraries*, 79(6), 726-736. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.79.6.726>.

Hattwig, D., Lam, N., & Freidberg, J. (2015) Student participation in scholarly communication and library digital collections: A case study from the University of Washington Bothell Library, *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 22(2), 188-208. DOI: 10.1080/10691316.2014.950781.

Head, A. J. & Eisenberg, M. B. (2010). *Truth be told: How college students evaluate and use information in the digital age*. Project Information Literacy.

http://projectinfolit.org/images/pdfs/pil_fall2010_survey_fullreport1.pdf.

Hensley, M.K. (2015). The poster session as a vehicle for teaching the scholarly communication process. In S. Davis-Kahl & M.K. Hensley (Eds.), *Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication* (pp. 123-144). Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries.

- Hilton, III, J., Fischer, L., Wiley, D., & Williams, L. (2016). Maintaining momentum toward graduation: OER and the course throughput rate. *International Review of Open and Distributed Learning*, 17(6). Retrieved from <http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl/article/view/2686/3967>.
- Hoffman, K. D. & Clifton, A., (2020). *Open pedagogy approaches: Faculty, library, and student collaborations*. Geneseo Authors. 11. <https://knightscholar.geneseo.edu/geneseo-authors/11>.
- hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- hooks, bell. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom*. New York: Routledge.
- Howard, K., Nicholas, T., Hayes, T., & Appelt, C. W. (2014). Evaluating one-shot library sessions: Impact on the quality and diversity of student source use. *Community & Junior College Libraries*, 20, 27-38. DOI: 10.1080/02763915.2014.1009749
- Huitt, W G, & Monetti, D M. 2017. Openness and the transformation of education and schooling. In R. Biswas-Diener & R.S. Jhangiani (Eds.), *Introduction to open: The philosophy and practices that are revolutionizing education and science* (pp. 3-7). Ubiquity Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/bbc.a>.
- Jaguszewski, J. M., & Williams, K. (2013). *New roles for new times: Transforming liaison roles in research libraries*. Association of Research Libraries. <https://www.arl.org/resources/new-roles-for-new-times-transforming-liaison-roles-in-research-libraries/>.
- Jenkins, J.J., Hannans, J., Sanchez, L., & Leafstedt, J. (2019). Textbook affordability and student success for historically underserved populations at CSUCI. Open CI. <https://www.csuci.edu/tli/openci/openci-white-paper.pdf>.
- Jhangiani, R. (2019, April 11). 5Rs for open pedagogy, *Rajiv Jhangiani, Ph.D.* <https://thatpsychprof.com/5rs-for-open-pedagogy/>.

Johnson, A. (2019). Connections, conversations, and visibility: How the work of academic reference and liaison librarians is evolving. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 58(2), 91-102.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5860/rusq.58.2.6929>.

Johnson, A. M. (2003). Library instruction and information literacy. *Reference Services Review*, 31(4), 385–418. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00907320310505672>.

Johnson, M., Buhler, A.G., & Gonzalez, S.R. (2015). Communicating with future scholars: Lesson plans to engage undergraduate science students with open access issues in a semester-long course. In S. Davis-Kahl & M.K. Hensley (Eds.), *Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication* (pp. 163-190). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Johnson, M. & Daley, M. (2015). Sparking creativity: The sparky awards and mind mashup at the University of Florida. In S. Davis-Kahl & M.K. Hensley (Eds.), *Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication* (pp. 145-162). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Joint, N. (2005). Traditional bibliographic instruction and today's information users. *Library Review*, 54(7), 397–402. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530510611884>.

Katz, S. (2020). Opening the conversation: Getting started. *Journal of New Librarianship*, 4(1), 142-144. <https://doi.org/10.21173/newlibs/6/8>.

Kenney, B. F. (2008). Revitalizing the one-shot instruction session using problem-based learning. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 47(4), 386-391.

Lambert, S. R. (2018). Changing our (dis)course: A distinctive social justice aligned definition of open education. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 5(3), Article 3.
<https://jl4d.org/index.php/ejl4d/article/view/290>

Linares, R. H., Sproles, C., McClellan, S., Johnson, A. M., & Detmeling, R. (2015). Library instruction and information literacy 2014. *Reference Services Review*, 43(4), 533–642.

<https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-07-2015-0037>

Logue, S., Ballestro, J., Imre, A., & Arendt, J. (2007). *Liaison services*. SPEC Kit 301. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries. <https://doi.org/10.29242/spec.301>.

MacMillan, M. (2014). Fostering the integration of information literacy and journalism practice: A long-term study of journalism students. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 8(2) pp. 3-22.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11645/8.2.1941>.

McElroy, K. & Pagowsky, N. (2016). *Critical library pedagogy handbook, volume 1: Essays and workbook activities*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Meyer, J.H.F. and Land, R. (2003). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practising. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving student learning -- ten years on*, (pp. 1-16). Oxford Center for Staff and Learning Development.

Meyer, J.H.F. and Land, R. (2005.) Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge (2): epistemological considerations and a conceptual framework for teaching and learning, *Higher Education* 49(3), 373-388. <https://doi.org/www2.lib.ku.edu/10.1007/s10734-004-6779-5>.

Morgan, T. (2016, December 21). Open pedagogy and a very brief history of the concept," *Explorations in the edTech world*. <https://homonym.ca/uncategorized/open-pedagogy-and-a-very-brief-history-of-the-concept/>.

Morris, S. M. & Stommel, J. (2018). *An urgency of teachers*. Hybrid Pedagogy, Inc.
<https://criticaldigitalpedagogy.pressbooks.com/>.

- Mounce, M. (2010) Working together: Academic librarians and faculty collaborating to improve students' information literacy skills: A literature review 2000–2009, *The Reference Librarian*, 51:4, 300-320, DOI: 10.1080/02763877.2010.501420.
- Okamoto, K. (2013) Making higher education more affordable, one course reading at a time: Academic libraries as key advocates for open access textbooks and educational resources. *Public Services Quarterly* 9:4, 267–83.
https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1104&context=jj_pubs.
- Open Education Group (n.d.). *The COUP framework*. <https://openedgroup.org/coup>.
- Pagowsky, N. & DeFrain, E. (2014). Ice ice baby: Are librarian stereotypes freezing us out of instruction? *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*. <http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2014/ice-ice-baby-2/>.
- Patterson, C. D., & Howell, D. W. (1990). Library user education: Assessing the attitudes of those who teach. *RQ*, 29(4), 513–524.
- Pelikan, M. (2004). Problem-based learning in the library: Evolving a realistic approach. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 4(4), 509-520. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.www2.lib.ku.edu/10.1353/pla.2004.0070>.
- Reynolds, L., Johnson, A. M., & Jent, S. (2007). Library instruction and information literacy 2006. *Reference Services Review*, 35(4), 584–640. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00907320710838408>.
- Robertson, J. R. (2010). What do academic libraries have to do with open educational resources? Theme: Long term sustainability of open education projects. In Open Ed 2010 Proceedings. Barcelona: UOC, OU, BYU. <https://oerknowledgecloud.org/content/what-do-academic-libraries-have-do-open-educational-resources-theme-long-term-sustainability>.

Russell, J. & Hensley, M. K. (2017). Beyond buttonology: Digital humanities, digital pedagogy, and the ACRL Framework. *College & Research Libraries News*, 78(11).

<https://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/16833/18427>.

Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC). (2018). <https://sparcopen.org/open-access/>.

Shulte, J., Tiffen, B., Edwards, J., Abbott, S., & Luca, E. (2018). Shaping the future of academic libraries: Authentic learning for the next generation. *College & Research Libraries*, 79(5), 685-696.

<https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.79.5.685>.

Sheesley, D. F. (2001). Burnout and the academic teaching librarian: An examination of the problem and suggested solutions. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 27(6), 447.

[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(01\)00264-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(01)00264-6).

Sloniowski, L. (2016). Affective labor, resistance, and the academic librarian. *Library Trends*, 64(4), 645-666. <http://dx.doi.org.www2.lib.ku.edu/10.1353/lib.2016.0013>

Spence, L. (2004). The usual doesn't work: Why we need problem-based learning. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 4(4), 485-493. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.www2.lib.ku.edu/10.1353/pla.2004.0072>.

Stoddart, R. A., Bryant, T. W., Baker, A. L., Lee, A., & Spencer, B. (2006). Going boldly beyond the reference desk: Practical advice and learning plans for new reference librarians performing liaison work. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(4), 419-427.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2006.03.009>

Tewell, E. C. (2018). The practice and promise of critical information literacy: Academic librarians' involvement in critical library instruction. *College & Research Libraries*, 79(1), 10-34. Retrieved from <https://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/16616>.

Townsend, L., Hofer, A. R., Hanick, S. L., & Brunetti, K. (2016). Identifying threshold concepts for information literacy: A Delphi study. *Communications in Information Literacy* 10(1).

<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1103398.pdf>.

University of Arizona Libraries. (2018, October, 19). University of Arizona Libraries' instruction program.

<http://libguides.library.arizona.edu/instruction>.

West, Q., Hofer, A., & Coleman, D. (2018, April 25). Librarians as open education leaders: Responsibilities and possibilities. *Open Education Global Conference 2018*.

<http://resolver.tudelft.nl/uuid:749d9863-896c-42ce-8702-70911f883ed3>.

White, K. (2017). Visualizing oral histories: A lab model using multimedia DH to incorporate ACRL framework standards into liberal arts education. *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 24(2-4), 393-417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2017.1325722>.

Wiggins, B., Hunt, S. L., McBurney, J., Younger, K., Peper, M., Brown, S., Albin, T., & Orozco, R. (2019). Research sprints: A new model of support. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.01.008>

Wiggins, G. & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*, 2nd ed. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wiley, D. (2013). What is open pedagogy? (blogpost, 2013). *Iterating toward open*.
<https://opencontent.org/blog/archives/2975>.

Wiley, D. (2017). OER-enabled pedagogy (blogpost, 2013). *Iterating toward open*.
<https://opencontent.org/blog/archives/5009>.

Wiley, D. & Hilton, J. (2018). Defining OER-enabled pedagogy. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 19(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v19i4.3601>.

Wineburg, S., & McGrew, S. (2017). *Lateral reading: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 3048994). Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network. <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3048994>

Wineburg, S., McGrew, S., Breakstone, J., & Ortega, T. (2017). Evaluating information: The cornerstone of civic online reasoning. <https://purl.stanford.edu/fv751yt5934>