Exploring Sustainability in Library Support for Open Pedagogy Collaborations

Kate McNally Carter
University of Houston, kmcarter@central.uh.edu

Ariana Santiago
University of Houston, asantia2@central.uh.edu

Exploring Sustainability in Library Support for Open Pedagogy Collaborations

Kate McNally Carter, University of Houston

Ariana Santiago, University of Houston

Abstract

The literature in open education has thoroughly examined the implications of labor and staffing for initiatives around open educational resources (OER). However, less attention has been paid to the reliance on librarian labor for open pedagogy support. This article describes a collaboration between librarians and faculty to support an open pedagogy assignment in which students co-created an open textbook describing the history, politics, and culture of several East Asian cities. Special attention is paid to the scope and level of the support from the Libraries, which included faculty consultations, several instruction sessions, managing the publishing platform, and developing processes to ensure students' rights as authors. The collaboration provides context for a discussion about our current work of developing an open pedagogy service model. Lessons learned can inform similar collaborations at other institutions.

Keywords: open educational resources, OER, open pedagogy, open education, labor, library support, faculty–librarian collaboration, assignment design

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

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

Exploring Sustainability in Library Support for Open Pedagogy Collaborations

The past decade has seen tremendous growth in the open education movement, primarily through the increasingly widespread use of open educational resources (OER). While many faculty are leveraging OER to reduce financial barriers for their students, studies have consistently demonstrated the benefits of OER beyond cost savings, particularly for student achievement, retention, and persistence (Clinton & Khan, 2019; Colvard et al, 2018; Winitzky-Stephens & Pickavance, 2017). However, while adopting open resources alone substantially benefits students, open pedagogy has even greater potential to enrich student learning.

Open pedagogy is an educational practice that encourages students to synthesize their existing knowledge and experiences with course content, inviting them to consider how they can contribute to the knowledge creation process by repurposing, remixing, and creating openly-licensed content. In many cases, open pedagogy empowers students to create new resources that they can subsequently license and publish as they choose. Open pedagogy leverages open content to promote greater student engagement with course content by envisioning students as knowledge creators rather than information consumers.

Though much attention has been devoted to the subject of labor in open education concerning OER adoption and creation from a faculty perspective and the programmatic and consultative support from the library, little has specifically addressed the labor involved with library support for courses using an open pedagogy model. This paper describes an open pedagogy project with particular attention paid to the consultative, technical, and instructional support provided, and how this experience informs the development of an open pedagogy service model to define support for future courses. This work toward an open pedagogy service model contributes to the body of literature in this area and can assist other libraries with similar goals in increasing support for open pedagogy.

Background

Open Pedagogy

The definition of open pedagogy has been a subject of much debate in open education scholarship due to its dynamic and contextual application. However, open pedagogy is closely related to a broader term, open educational practices (OEP), as the two share many qualities. Cronin and MacLaren (2018) traced the evolution of OEP, describing its roots in social constructivist pedagogy, connected learning, critical digital pedagogy, and more, and explored its various formal definitions to identify a common theme of "OER and collaborative pedagogical practices as a means of transforming education" (p.132).

DeRosa and Robison (2017) also pointed to the critical connection between OER and open pedagogy, indicating that students' participation in the development and revision of course texts is essential to redefining students' relationship to knowledge, driving them to reconsider knowledge as a static product but instead as "a process in which students can engage," critique, and contribute beyond the scope of their course (p. 117). OER are particularly suited to this learning process because of their uniquely dynamic format; the texts are "not just repositories for content, but platforms for learning, collaboration, and engagement with the world outside the classroom" (DeRosa & Robison, 2017, p.117). By leveraging open resources and encouraging students to contribute to the public knowledge commons, open pedagogy seeks to center access and autonomy in the conversation of teaching and learning (DeRosa and Jhangiani, 2017).

Another critical underpinning of open pedagogy was established by Wiley (2013), who described a requisite transition away from "disposable assignments" (para. 4). Frustrated by the lack of consensus around the terms *open pedagogy* and *open educational practices*, Wiley (2017) proposed an alternative term, *OER-enabled pedagogy*, to underscore the important role of OER in developing and implementing teaching and learning practice. This term was further defined by Wiley and Hilton (2018) with a four-part test to determine the extent to which a specific practice or assignment qualifies as OER-enabled pedagogy. Assignments where students create artifacts alone are *disposable assignments*; if the artifact has value beyond supporting the students' learning, and students are invited to share it publicly with an open license, then this is considered a *non-disposable* or *renewable assignment* (Wiley & Hilton, 2018).

Carter & Santiago
Exploring Sustainability in Library Support for
Open Pedagogy Collaborations   [INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

In this article, we engage the definition associated with *OER-enabled pedagogy*, but, for simplicity, we will use the term *open pedagogy* to describe our project, with the understanding that these various definitions are nuanced and complex.

Labor in OER Initiatives

The concept of labor in OER-related work has only recently been critically examined in the literature. Historically, discussions regarding workload have focused on the time needed for faculty to engage in OER adoption, adaptation, or authorship as a barrier to faculty involvement in this work; in many cases, librarians and other professionals, such as instructional designers, are positioned as mainstays to mitigate workload increases for faculty engaging with OER (e.g., Nagashima & Hrach, 2021). However, a recent critical analysis of OER efficacy studies found that the impact on workload was often minimized or entirely overlooked as a factor in many studies in favor of highlighting student success outcomes (McDermott, 2020).

While many OER initiatives are led primarily by libraries (Salem, 2017), a handful of studies have focused on workload distribution between faculty and librarians in developing programmatic support for OER adoption (e.g., Dozier, 2021; Goodsett et al., 2016). Studies have also explored instructional design staff support for faculty work with OER and associated workload impacts (Harrison & DeVries, 2019; Ren, 2019). Other studies have evaluated librarian labor in developing service models for OER support for faculty and staff. For example, Smith and Lee (2017) described time and an increasingly "diverse workload" as barriers to librarians taking on well-suited roles as OER advocates (p. 110). Santiago and Ray (2020) discussed OER publishing services and emphasized the need for libraries to develop formalized support for OER initiatives, asserting the importance of naming and recognizing the labor involved "to prevent staff burnout and allow for incremental change" (p. 409). In a broader programmatic context, McGeary et al. (2021) described the transition of their OER program from a labor-intensive training model, which involved heavy participation from librarians, to a more sustainable supervisory model in which the library partnered with faculty and student assistants to produce OER projects, enabling them to better utilize staffing and other resources to contribute to more substantive, in-depth projects that resulted in greater engagement with academic departments.

Although the role of libraries in OER initiatives is well-established, more recent discussion has considered the specific expertise of librarians in OER work and its consequential

impacts on workload and staffing. For example, Kimball et al. (2022) discussed the benefits of hiring a specialized OER librarian to coordinate an OER program and the compounding benefits of including subject librarians in the initiative. However, the authors seem to minimize the staffing implications in this approach by asserting that for subject librarians, who already possess many of the skills needed for OER work, the additional training to participate in OER initiatives has minimal impacts on these librarians' workloads (Kimball et al., 2022). We believe this assertion overlooks critical evaluations of librarian roles and workload that can lead to job creep and burnout (Ettarh, 2018). This is further complicated by the nature of academic labor in open education, which has even greater potential to be undervalued, uncompensated, or otherwise invisible (Almeida, 2017; Champieux et al., 2020; Crissinger, 2015). Another counterpoint to the assertion made by Kimball et al. (2022) is that it does not account for libraries with different organizational models that do not include subject liaison roles. Though it is reasonable that some libraries with more or specialized staff may associate less importance with reducing labor demands, as noted in McGeary et al. (2021), libraries of all sizes and organizational structures need to intentionally build sustainability into planning OER initiatives, and this requires careful consideration of workload for all staff involved, regardless of employees' pre-existing skills.

Librarian labor in supporting open pedagogy projects has yet to be examined critically in the literature. Recent case studies have described librarian partnerships with specific courses (Fields & Harper, 2020; Johnson & Hooper, 2019), with some focusing on collaborative open pedagogy projects related to information literacy instruction (Goodsett, 2022; Younger et al., 2021). In one example, Hare et al. (2020) emphasized that open pedagogy projects, although student-led, were not consequently less work for the instructors and librarians involved. The authors posited that "librarians must figure out how to make this kind of outreach sustainable and balance it with their existing workload" (Hare et al., 2020, p. 462), highlighting the existing gap in the literature regarding the sustainability of open pedagogy support by librarians.

Given the evident prominence of the librarian's role in supporting open pedagogy, it is important to consider the impacts on a librarian's workload. The collaborative project described in this article enabled us to explore potential service models that would leverage partnerships both within and outside University of Houston Libraries (UHL), with the goal of engaging sustainable services that could be scaled to meet future needs.

The Open Pedagogy Collaboration: Tales of East Asian Cities

The University of Houston—an R1, public university with an enrollment of 47,031 in fall 2021 (University of Houston, 2022a)—launched an OER program led by UHL in 2018. UHL's open educational services have grown significantly since that time. In addition to formal award programs incentivizing the use and creation of OER, the Open Education Services (OES) department recently expanded its scope of support to include more immersive, collaborative activities with the potential for greater pedagogical impact.

In the fall of 2022, the OES department collaborated with the instructor of the Tales of East Asian Cities course to implement and support an open pedagogy assignment. As the first open pedagogy course supported by UHL, this served as a model for future partnerships. The OES department aims to prioritize sustainability when establishing workflows and capacity. As we supported this project, it became clear that we needed to critically evaluate the labor involved to develop a sustainable service model that can be scaled and applied to future projects.

In the Tales of East Asian Cities course, which is cross-listed in the Chinese Studies program and the World Cultures and Literatures program at the University of Houston College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, students examine "the literary and visual representations of various cities in East Asia: Shanghai, Beijing, Hong Kong, Taipei, Tokyo, and Seoul" and "extensively discuss the cultural representations of East Asian metropolises" (University of Houston, 2022b). In the fall of 2022, the course enrolled twenty-two students, primarily undergraduate and some graduate students.

The course instructor implemented an open pedagogy model in which students created an OER textbook as the final project for the course. This assignment built upon work completed in earlier assignments, making the OER textbook a scaffolded, semester-long project. The OER textbook includes a section covering each city examined in the course. As part of an earlier assignment, students completed a group presentation in which they acted as "tour guides" of their assigned city, providing classmates with background information about the city's history, culture, and landmarks. This group presentation was transformed into the introduction for each city in the OER textbook. In addition, each student wrote a critical analysis of a text or movie related to their assigned city. With these components combined, the OER textbook is a comprehensive, student-created resource providing

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

Carter & Santiago
Exploring Sustainability in Library Support for
Open Pedagogy Collaborations

background, historical information, and critical analyses of several East Asian cities (Dr. Li's Tales of East Asian Cities Class, 2022).

The sections below describe the librarian labor that supported the OER textbook assignment, broadly categorized as consultative, technical, and instructional support. Appendix A summarizes the staffing and division of labor for each support category, including contributions from the head of OES, the OER librarian, and the head of Teaching and Learning (T&L).

Consultative Support

The head of OES consulted with the instructor on the design and implementation of the open pedagogy assignment, totaling approximately four hours of consultation prior to the start of the fall 2022 semester. These consultations began as general support for OER adoption in the upcoming semester and shifted to focus on open pedagogy at the instructor's initiation. Due to the instructor's previous experience with adopting OER in other courses, the consultations did not need to cover foundational concepts of open education. This series of consultations drew on the existing expertise of the head of OES and included the following considerations:

- Motivations for incorporating open pedagogy, such as enhancing student engagement and participation and allowing student-created work to live beyond and outside the confines of the course.

- Feasibility of different approaches and assignment designs within the context of the course curriculum, which led to the use of the existing assignment structure to scaffold towards the OER textbook.

- Ensuring students' agency and author rights are honored by allowing them to opt out of publishing their work openly and select how their work is licensed and attributed if they choose to publish.

- Planning UHL's support for this project, including several OER class sessions, facilitating the use of the Pressbooks publishing platform, and developing OER questions for quizzes.

Technical Support: Ensuring Student Agency

The head of OES and the OER librarian provided technical support by facilitating a process to ensure student agency throughout the project and by administering and delivering training for the publishing platform.

In considering how to ensure students would retain full control over their work, we consulted with external resources (Rebus Community, 2017) and sought advice from a librarian at another university with more experience supporting open pedagogy. This librarian shared her template and process for distributing a Student Agreement Form in which students select their licensing and attribution preferences. By completing the form, students could opt out of publishing their work openly, select which Creative Commons or copyright license to apply to their work (if applicable), and identify how they would like to be attributed in the work (if applicable, and including the option to remain anonymous).

To implement this process locally, we adapted the form's contents and determined the appropriate timing to distribute the form and collect responses. We also decided that it would be the librarians' responsibility, rather than the course instructor's, to review form responses and apply students' selections to the final textbook. This decision was made because we anticipated encountering unknown nuances to the process that the librarians may more easily navigate due to our existing expertise with Creative Commons licensing and the publishing platform. Thus, ensuring student agency through this process entailed: creating an online survey form; communicating to students the nature of the Student Agreement Form (in collaboration with the instructor); distributing the online survey form, compiling the results, and carefully reviewing students' responses; and following up with some students to clarify and confirm their selections (for example, this was necessary when we realized that there was not a clear option on the form for students to publish their work online using an All Rights Reserved copyright license).

Technical Support: Publishing Platform

The head of OES and the OER librarian also provided technical support for using the Pressbooks publishing platform. We selected Pressbooks early on as the platform for publishing the completed work, as UHL had an existing subscription and experience in supporting the use of the platform. Additionally, Pressbooks met the needs of this project, including the ability to publish text-based and multimedia content and to easily differentiate

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

Carter & Santiago
Exploring Sustainability in Library Support for
Open Pedagogy Collaborations

between multiple authors and Creative Commons licenses across various chapters of the work.

We determined that each student would be responsible for formatting their own content in the platform (rather than the instructor, librarians, or a designated student). This is consistent with UHL's approach to supporting Pressbooks use, in which we provide training and troubleshooting but do not directly edit or format users' content due to staffing and capacity limitations. However, this approach, and that this was our first experience supporting Pressbooks for student-created OER, impacted the nature and level of technical support needed for the project. For example, we encountered new considerations regarding settings for user accounts and the Pressbooks webbook. Additionally, because users may discover several ways to achieve the same task (such as migrating content into the platform, inserting images, or formatting citations and attributions), we developed recommendations for these tasks to minimize potential confusion for students. This at times required our deeper exploration of Pressbooks' capabilities in order to determine the appropriate processes and develop instructions around our recommendations for students.

While some tasks associated with supporting the use of the publishing platform are relatively straightforward—such as generating user accounts, managing webbook settings, applying selected licenses to each chapter, entering book-level metadata, and finalizing the publication—we found that each step required additional consideration and communication when working with a new audience. Additionally, technical support for Pressbooks was closely tied to instructional support, in which we introduced students to the platform early on and facilitated hands-on experience.

Instructional Support

The head of OES, the OER librarian, and the head of T&L provided the primary instructional support for the open pedagogy assignment. The Libraries led six face-to-face class sessions distributed throughout the semester. The head of OES and the OER librarian collaboratively developed and taught five of the six sessions, collaborating on the sixth session with the head of T&L, who led the instruction for that session. The course instructor actively participated in the library-led sessions, reinforcing open education and information literacy concepts and clarifying assignment details for students. Appendix B

provides an overview of the library-led class sessions, including learning outcomes and session activities.

Developing and leading six class sessions required a significant time investment by the librarians. However, we believed it was worth the time to ensure full support of this complex and innovative assignment. This work encompassed developing six new lesson plans and maintaining communication with the instructor throughout the semester in order to assess student needs and adapt the planned instruction accordingly. The sessions emphasized active learning and were thoughtfully designed to scaffold and reinforce learning outcomes throughout the semester. Several learning outcomes were closely related to the technical support provided. In addition, we consistently communicated to students the options available to them in terms of licensing and publishing their work and aimed to be transparent about how their selections would be implemented in the Pressbooks publishing platform.

In addition to in-person instruction, the head of OES was present in the course in the Blackboard learning management system and could share resources via an OER module and directly email students to reinforce and clarify content covered in class. The head of OES also created a few quiz questions based on concepts covered in library-led class sessions for the course instructor to assign to students.

Discussion

Assessing the Collaboration

This was the first time in which UHL supported open pedagogy instruction, and this collaboration was a valuable learning experience for us. One important lesson we learned about open pedagogy is the need to balance flexibility, accommodating different student needs and interests, with structured expectations for students to follow. For example, about halfway through the semester, students expressed confusion about the specific expectations of the final assignment, prompting the instructor to clarify the assignment by standardizing the outline of the book. Although this helped us understand the guidelines and answer student questions, it also involved additional class time reviewing the changes. Ensuring students understand what a successful artifact looks like will help them engage more fully in the learning process. This aligns with a finding from Thomas et al. (2021), who noted a similar lesson learned after encountering a high degree of variance in the quality and

completeness of student work. In the future, we plan to help instructors develop clear guidelines from the outset to help set student expectations.

Using Pressbooks for a student-authored textbook was new territory for us, and we gleaned valuable insights into different approaches for this. One of the biggest takeaways was the importance of having students use the platform early in the semester. Also, although the group aspect of the project was valuable for student learning, it introduced some complexities regarding the webbook structure and settings and the specific Creative Commons license for jointly-authored content. Fortunately, the standardized outline established mid-semester, with students assigned to individual chapters, helped to simplify this process, and we plan to take this approach in future semesters.

Collaborative relationships with UHL's T&L department further enhanced our support for this project. Informing the head of T&L about the assignment led to a discussion about students' information literacy needs and a collaborative instruction session for the course. This collaboration extended into ongoing discussions with the head and assistant head of T&L, in which we explore ideas and questions related to open pedagogy and learn from each other's expertise in open education and information literacy. As Goodsett (2022) noted, information literacy becomes even more critical for students creating openly-licensed content and who "are often exploring a new and unfamiliar role in the information generation process" (p. 148). During this open pedagogy collaboration, we found that the intentional focus on information literacy was critical to the students' success, particularly in helping them identify different types of content and understand how it could be used or reused based on its license, and this provided important context for the lesson on citation and attribution. After her session, the head of T&L helped us identify potential ways to clarify the students' expectations for the assignment, as described earlier in this section. This enriched the support we provided for the course.

We assessed the project's outcomes and determined that students successfully engaged with the open publishing process. Most students elected to publish their work using an open license, and two opted to keep their work private; a few students also took advantage of the opportunity to use a pseudonym or be credited as an anonymous contributor. Given that students engaged in this process and availed themselves of the various publication options, we assessed that the students came away from the course understanding their rights and responsibilities as authors. We anticipated that some students would express anxiety about

publishing their work openly, as described by Hollister (2020). Some students asked questions about their rights over their work, but only one directly expressed feelings of unease related to making her work public; after some discussion, we learned her apprehension was primarily associated with the dynamic of the group project. Fortunately, these concerns were resolved when the instructor modified the requirement to split jointly-authored sections into distinct chapters that could be licensed and published individually. We speculate that reinforcing students' publication options throughout the semester contributed to their overall confidence in their agency.

The instructor praised the quality and creativity of the student work produced for the open textbook, noting that the students learned how to use Pressbooks quickly and took advantage of many of its features to craft unique content that she could use in future semesters. In addition, she indicated interest in continuing to collaborate during the following semester for her course on Chinese popular culture. The lessons learned from this pilot project greatly informed the modified approach we developed for that course.

Toward Developing a Service Model for Open Pedagogy

In reflecting on this collaboration, we found impacts on workload and the potential for scalability to be two primary considerations. The course provided rich opportunities to work closely with students on open publishing and information literacy topics that would otherwise not be possible in a one-shot instruction session. However, the time we dedicated to planning, preparing and delivering lessons, and providing support through Pressbooks required substantial coordination between the OES department, the course instructor, and the T&L department. The course design allowed several opportunities for us to work directly with the class, providing time throughout the semester for us to consider various approaches to scaffold session content, but it also required more work from us and our active participation in the course.

To address these considerations, we compiled the resources and documentation we created for the course to streamline future collaborations. In addition, we restructured the lesson plans in a more generalized format to make them easier to remix and repurpose in other courses; for example, the lessons around open licensing, citation and attributions, and the Pressbooks workshop could easily become standalone sessions. We also discussed with the T&L department how these lessons might be adapted into short videos or interactive tutorials to assign as asynchronous support for future classes.

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

Carter & Santiago
Exploring Sustainability in Library Support for
Open Pedagogy Collaborations

In determining how our growing department could scale open pedagogy support, we developed a framework of criteria to use for future collaborations. The first criterion requires clear parameters or guidelines for the open pedagogy assignment, which will enable us to maximize our time in the classroom and ensure we can provide research instruction and assistance at the time of need. Second, we will discuss the faculty member's purpose for using open pedagogy; this will help us provide recommendations on their approach and ensure it will meet their intended outcomes and expectations for the course. Finally, in alignment with our departmental values of inclusive teaching, students should be informed of their open licensing options and can opt out of the assignment without impacting their grade, either by completing an alternative assignment or opting not to publish their work. This ensures that students retain agency and fully engage in learning. We plan to apply and refine these criteria as we engage with other faculty and courses.

Our goal is to balance open pedagogy advocacy with sustainable growth. We recognize that open pedagogy is, by nature, not a monolithic teaching method requiring standardized support from UHL. Conversely, we also acknowledge that we may be unable to continue supporting open pedagogy projects to the degree described in this paper. As Ettarh (2018) noted, job creep can manifest when new tasks that are performed voluntarily become part of the expected in-role job responsibilities; though our department exists to support open education endeavors, we need to ensure that the services we provide are formalized and built into our existing workflows to avoid our overcommitment of time and resources. This project inspired us to explore how to design an inclusive, flexible service model that can accommodate and enrich other open pedagogy collaborations without resulting in staff overcommitment and burnout.

Defining a single open pedagogy service model that can be adapted for various contexts is challenging because there is no one-size-fits-all method to provide support. However, the literature related to building capacity in other information literacy and research endeavors has helped us investigate options for moving forward. For example, McKeown and Ross-White (2019) described a tiered model for formalizing the delivery of systematic review services to meet increased demand for support, enabling them to identify collaborators and maximize librarian time and expertise more efficiently. In another case, Lacy and Hamlett (2021) described a teach-the-teacher model to assist faculty with integrating information literacy instruction in their own courses by identifying and intentionally scaffolding

research skills in their syllabi. This enables faculty to embed information literacy in subject-specific content, enhancing students' engagement with research in their disciplinary context while allowing librarians to maximize their instructional capacity through outreach and training (Lacy & Hamlett, 2021).

The two models described above could be adapted for an open pedagogy service model to achieve similar results. For example, the OES department could consider establishing a tiered model of service, where an instructor's initial proposal for open pedagogy could help us determine the degree to which we can provide support. Similarly, a teach-the-teacher model could enable us to build capacity, particularly for instructors interested in repeating open pedagogy integrations in future semesters. These considerations will help us maximize our impact on student learning while ensuring our services are sustainable.

Conclusion

Librarians are vital partners in open pedagogy projects. Jhangiani and Green (2019) described librarians' central role in establishing an institutional home for open pedagogy, emphasizing how they can effectively build formal and informal networks in their institutions to raise awareness, assist with adaptation and use of resources, and inspire educational practices. However, it is essential to account for the labor involved in these different roles and ensure that the library has the necessary resources to broaden open education services.

The extent of support we could provide for this project depended on our existing resources and expertise. We hope our collaboration with the Tales of East Asian Cities class will inform other libraries planning to support open pedagogy assignments and provide inspiration for how librarians can partner with faculty and students. Librarians should adapt the support outlined in this article to fit their contexts and capacity and consider training needs to develop the expertise necessary to successfully support open pedagogy. For example, libraries with fewer staff could scale the approach described here by focusing on delivering essential information literacy skills. Open pedagogy projects could also be streamlined by selecting a publishing platform with broader accessibility and familiarity for students. Much of the instruction time was spent on Pressbooks because we knew it would be new to students, and facilitating the student account and webbook creation process accounted for much of the staff time spent outside the classroom. In this case, the technical

instruction and support we provided may not apply to all open pedagogy contexts, which could simplify other projects.

As Walz (2017) noted, "there is no single model for librarian involvement in open education" (p. 153), and librarians must leverage their autonomy to establish their own models of engagement based on institutional needs and other responsibilities. Librarians involved in open education work should articulate a service model that defines the extent of support that can be provided. By prioritizing the considerations of staffing and workload, open pedagogical practices can enrich student learning and make the labor of dedicated educators more visible, sustainable, and rewarding.

References

Almeida, N. (2017). Open educational resources and rhetorical paradox in the neoliberal univers(ity). *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.24242/jclis.v1i1.16

Champieux, R., Thomas, C., & Versluis, A. (2020). Using outreach weeks to examine labor, assessment and value in open advocacy. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, *8*(1), eP2371. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2371

Clinton, V., & Khan, S. (2019). Efficacy of open textbook adoption on learning performance and course withdrawal rates: A meta-analysis. *AERA Open*, *5*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/2332858419872212

Colvard, N. B., Watson, C. E., & Park, H. (2018). The impact of open educational resources on various student success metrics. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, *30*(2), 262–276.

Crissinger, S. (2015). A critical take on OER practices: Interrogating commercialization, colonialism, and content. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*. https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/a-critical-take-on-oer-practices-interrogating-commercialization-colonialism-and-content/

Cronin, C., & MacLaren, I. (2018). Conceptualising OEP: A review of theoretical and empirical literature in open educational practices. *Open Praxis*, *10*(2), 127–143. https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.10.2.825

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/

DeRosa, R., & Robison, S. (2017). From OER to open pedagogy: Harnessing the power of open. In R. S. Jhangiani & R. Biswas-Diener (Eds.), *Open: The philosophy and practices that are revolutionizing education and science* (pp. 115–124). Ubiquity Press. https://doi.org/10.5334/bbc.i

Dozier, V. (2021). An embedded librarian's experience piloting a subject-specific OER initiative. *Education Libraries, 44*. https://doi.org/10.26443/el.v44i1.364

Dr. Li's Tales of East Asian Cities Class. (2022). CHIN/WCL 3342: Tales of East Asian Cities. https://uhlibraries.pressbooks.pub/chin3342fa22/

Ettarh, F. (2018). Vocational awe and librarianship: The lies we tell ourselves. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*. https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2018/vocational-awe/

Fields, E., & Harper, A. (2020). Opening up information literacy: Empowering students through open pedagogy. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, Innovative Pedagogy*, *2*, 4–15. https://digitalcommons.humboldt.edu/sotl_ip/vol2/iss1/1

Goodsett, M., Loomis, B., & Miles, M. (2016). Leading campus OER initiatives through library-faculty collaboration. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, *23*(3), 335–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2016.1206328

Goodsett, M. (2022). Supporting open pedagogy with information literacy instruction for multimodal composition projects. In M. A. Cullen and E. Dill (Eds.), *Intersections of Open Educational Resources and Information Literacy* (pp. 145–166). Association of College and Research Libraries.

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

Harrison, M., & DeVries, I. (2020). Open educational practices advocacy: The instructional designer experience. *Canadian Journal of Learning and Technology / La Revue Canadienne de l'apprentissage et de la Technologie, 45*(3). https://doi.org/10.21432/cjlt27881

Hollister, C. (2020). Using open pedagogy to engage LIS students: A case study. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication, 8*(1), eP2357. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.2357

Jhangiani, R., & Green, A. G. (2019). An open athenaeum: Creating an institutional home for open pedagogy. In A. Langley, J. Lashley, & A. Wesolek (Eds.), *OER: A field guide for academic librarians | Editor's cut.* Pacific University Press. https://boisestate.pressbooks.pub/oer-field-guide/chapter/an-open-athenaeum-creating-an-institutional-home-for-open-pedagogy/

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

Kimball, R., Halling, D., Neville, B., & Herbert, B. (2022). OASES: The role of subject librarians in an effective campus OER program. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 48*(3), Article 102518. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102518

Lacy, M., & Hamlett, A. (2021). Librarians, step out of the classroom!: How improved faculty-led IL instruction improves student learning. *Reference Services Review, 49*(2), 163–175. https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-09-2020-0062

McDermott, I. (2020). Open to what? A critical evaluation of OER efficacy studies. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe.* https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2020/open-to-what/

McGeary, B., Guder, C., & Ganeshan, A. (2021). Opening up educational practices through faculty, librarian, and student collaboration in OER creation: Moving from labor-intensive to supervisory involvement. *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research, 16*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v16i1.6149

McKeown, S., & Ross-White, A. (2019). Building capacity for librarian support and addressing collaboration challenges by formalizing library systematic review services. *Journal of the Medical Library Association, 107*(3), 411–419. https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2019.443

Nagashima, T., & Hrach, S. (2021). Motivating factors among university faculty for adopting open educational resources: Incentives matter. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education, 2021*(1), Article 19. https://doi.org/10.5334/jime.678

Rebus Community. (2017). Licensing. 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/licensing/

Ren, X. (2019). The undefined figure: Instructional designers in the open educational resource (OER) movement in higher education. *Education and Information Technologies, 24*(6), 3483–3500. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-019-09940-0

Salem, J. A. (2017). Open pathways to student success: Academic library partnerships for open educational resource and affordable course content creation and adoption. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 43*(1), 34–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.10.003

Santiago, A., & Ray, L. (2020). Navigating support models for OER publishing: Case studies from the University of Houston and the University of Washington. *Reference Services Review, 48*(3), 397–413. https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-03-2020-0019

Smith, B., & Lee, L. (2017). Librarians and OER: Cultivating a community of practice to be more effective advocates. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning, 11*(1–2), 106–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/1533290X.2016.1226592

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

University of Houston. (2022a). *University of Houston facts at a glance: Fall 2021.* https://uh.edu/about/uh-glance/final-uh_facts.pdf

University of Houston. (2022b). *University of Houston publications: 2022-2023 Undergraduate catalog.* http://publications.uh.edu/content.php?catoid=44&navoid=15983

Walz, A. (2017.) A library viewpoint: Exploring open educational practices. In R. S. Jhangiani & R. Biswas-Diener (Eds.), *Open: the philosophy and practices that are revolutionizing education and science* (pp. 147–162). London: Ubiquity Press. https://doi.org/10.5334/bbc.l

Wiley, D. (2013, October 21). What is open pedagogy? *Improving Learning.* https://opencontent.org/blog/archives/2975

Wiley, D. (2017, May 2). OER-enabled pedagogy. *Improving Learning.* https://opencontent.org/blog/archives/5009

Wiley, D., & Hilton, J. L., III. (2018). Defining OER-enabled pedagogy. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 19*(4), 133–147. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v19i4.3601

Winitzky-Stephens, J. R., & Pickavance, J. (2017). Open educational resources and student course outcomes: A multilevel analysis. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning, 18*(4), 35–49. https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v18i4.3118

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

Appendix A: Summary of Staffing and Division of Labor

Type of Support	Head of Open Education Services	Open Educational Resources Librarian	Head of Teaching and Learning
Consultative Support	• Advise instructor on open pedagogy assignment design and implementation • Maintain regular communication with instructor throughout the duration of the project to assess implementation and support needs	• Contribute to advising on implementation, communicating with instructor, and assessing needs	• N/A
Technical Support: Ensuring Student Agency	• Contribute to creation of the Student Agreement Form and follow-up communications with students • Distribute Student Agreement Form and send reminders to students	• Adapt the Student Agreement Form template, create the online survey form • Compile and carefully review responses from the Student Agreement Form and follow up with students when necessary	• N/A
Technical Support: Publishing Platform	• Create student accounts in Pressbooks and share login information and resources • Create the webbook for the assignment and add students, course instructor, and librarians as users/contributors on the webbook • Determine appropriate user and book settings • Research Pressbooks' functionalities and capabilities to inform recommendations for students • Assist with ensuring students' publication preferences are accurately applied to the webbook	• Create student accounts in Pressbooks and share login information and resources • Determine appropriate user and book settings • Research Pressbooks' functionalities and capabilities to inform recommendations for students • Apply students' selected licenses, preferred names, and publication preferences to their completed chapters in the webbook	• N/A
Instructional Support	• Collaboratively develop lesson plans for six instruction sessions • Lead and co-teach five instruction sessions • Create OER quiz questions, add OER resources to Blackboard	• Collaboratively develop lesson plans for six instruction sessions • Co-teach four instruction sessions; lead the instruction for one session	• Collaboratively develop lesson plan for one instruction session • Lead and co-teach one instruction session

Appendix B: Overview of Library-led Class Sessions

Library-led Class Session	Librarian Instructor(s)	Learning Outcomes	Session Activities
Session 1 Week 2 (60 minutes)	Head of Open Education Service Open Educational Resources Librarian	LO #1: Describe your role in open publishing in order to confidently participate in the OER textbook project LO #2: Distinguish between Creative Commons permissions in order to select an appropriate license to apply to your work	• Provide overview of open publishing, open licensing, and rights as authors • Brief introduction to the Pressbooks publishing platform • Small group activity to explore and discuss examples of student-created OER
Session 2 Week 5 (80 minutes)	Head of Open Education Services Open Educational Resources Librarian	LO #3: Use the Pressbooks publishing platform in order to share your examinations of East Asian cities	• Ensure students are able to log into their Pressbooks accounts • Provide more in-depth overview of Pressbooks • Individual activity to practice creating and editing a chapter in Pressbooks
Session 3 Week 7 (80 minutes)	Head of Teaching and Learning Head of Open Education Services	LO #4: Decide when to reuse/adapt existing OER components and when to create your own content LO #5: Identify library and non-library resources that will help you locate multimodal sources relevant to your city research LO #6: Develop search strategies to find sources relevant to your information needs	• Share factors to consider regarding when to reuse OER and when to create new content • Brief overview of select library and non-library resources • Group activity to identify potential sources to consult for various sections of OER textbook chapters and time to explore sources

Library-led Class Session	Librarian Instructor(s)	Learning Outcomes	Session Activities
Session 4 Week 11 (60 minutes)	Head of Open Education Services Open Educational Resources Librarian	LO #7: Ethically incorporate information with citations and attributions LO #3: Use the Pressbooks publishing platform in order to share your examinations of East Asian cities	• Provide overview of citations and attributions with guidance on when to use each • Discuss best practices for including images/media and demonstrate using Pressbooks' functionalities to add attribution information • Independent workshop time to find openly-licensed images, write citations and attribution statements for identified sources, and/or continue research
Session 5 Week 13 (80 minutes)	Open Educational Resources Librarian	LO #8: Evaluate your progress and additional research needs	• Think-Pair-Share activity to discuss progress, additional resources needed, and questions about the final project • Independent or group workshop time to practice adding content into Pressbooks, find openly-licensed resources and images, and continue research
Session 6 Week 15 (80 minutes)	Head of Open Education Services Open Educational Resources Librarian	LO #3: Use the Pressbooks publishing platform in order to share your examinations of East Asian cities	• Independent or group workshop time to transfer final chapter into Pressbooks and review the transferred text for formatting needs (including images, attribution information, and citations) • Brief review of concepts covered in earlier sessions at points of need

Note: Semester Length = 17 Weeks; Class Length = 80 minutes

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

Carter & Santiago
Exploring Sustainability in Library Support for Open Pedagogy Collaborations