OER and Social Justice: An Honors Colloquium at Oregon State University

Stefanie Buck & Maura L. Valentino

External Data or Supplements:

Valentino, M., & Buck, S. (2017). Open Educational Resources and Social Justice Course Syllabus. https://ir.library.oregonstate.edu/concern/open_educational_resources/s1784r903

OER and Social Justice: An Honors Colloquium at Oregon State University

Stefanie Buck
Ecampus/Instructional Design Librarian/OER, Oregon State University

Maura L. Valentino
Scholarly Communications and Copyright Librarian, University of Nevada, Reno

INTRODUCTION Librarians are most likely to address issues of scholarly communication, including information economics and information privilege, with faculty and graduate students who are researching and publishing. However, undergraduate students, being both consumers and creators of information, should also be aware of these issues and can become advocates for open access. While they may not be publishing, the high cost of information directly affects students. They are often unaware the economic models that drive the price of information creation and access. Scholarly communication is not often included in basic information literacy instruction. Including undergraduates in discussions or activities surrounding open access and social justice topics is one way to help create future advocates. **DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM** Two librarians developed a 2-credit, 10-week Honors College course on open educational resources and social justice targeted at undergraduate students. The purpose of the course was to raise awareness among undergraduates on issues of scholarly communication through activities, discussion, and reflection. Course activities were designed to help students discover, synthesize, and reflect on social justice and information access. **NEXT STEPS** Feedback from the students indicated that the course content was appropriate and that students had a better understanding of these issues and could formulate arguments both for and against open access. Some changes to the course structure and content are under development to give students more opportunities to act as advocates and informed citizens.

INTRODUCTION

As is the case at many higher education institutions, faculty and staff at Oregon State University (OSU) actively work to incorporate open educational resources (OER) into university courses. In keeping with the university's land-grant mission, Open Oregon State, a part of Extended Campus, works with faculty to create textbooks and other open educational materials and makes them freely available under a Creative Commons license. Oregon State University has an open access (OA) policy and, through the library, hosts an institutional repository (Scholars Archive) where theses, dissertations, and faculty publications are openly available. Librarians at the Oregon State University Library and Press work with faculty to incorporate existing open materials and library-purchased resources in courses. There is also an active course reserves program in the library through which students can borrow textbooks for short periods. The University Press, a department in the library, has worked with Open Oregon State to develop open access textbooks for university courses. These and other partnerships develop based on need and opportunity.

There have been some outreach activities regarding OER and the high cost of information aimed at OSU student leadership. It seems logical that students, who are affected so strongly by the high cost of textbooks, would be advocating for more open or low-cost alternatives in their courses, and the Associated Students of Oregon State University has sponsored some activities for students regarding the high cost of textbooks specifically. However, as with many other institutions, undergraduates have not been very active in advocating for open education resources in the classroom as an alternative to expensive textbooks. The library has not promoted OER or open access in general to undergraduates, working primarily with instructors and faculty.

While undergraduates are not often exposed to these issues (Davis-Kahl, 2012; Warren & Duckett, 2010), there are good reasons to focus on undergraduates, given that they are current and future scholars and active creators and consumers of information. Like many undergraduates, students here at Oregon State are interested in social justice (Lopez & Brown, 2006); the university offers a wide variety of courses, certificates, and minors with this theme. There is a social justice minor and an undergraduate certificate in food culture and social justice. There is also a colloquium in Italy on information and social justice and a University Experience seminar on social justice leadership, as well as various department-sponsored retreats on topics emphasizing social justice (OSU, n.d.-b). Linking social justice with OER was a combination that we hoped would lead to an interesting and meaningful course. It would give us the opportunity to work with undergraduates on this topic, something that we had not done before, and ultimately help students to become well-informed citizens in this area. The library does have a library and information science (LIS) course

designator under which we could have offered the course, but instead we chose to submit the course to the university's Honors College. The Honors College offers colloquia, which are one or two credits, and can be taken as pass/no pass or for a grade. The purpose of the colloquia is to offer students an experience "outside of the academic comfort zone or as an introduction to a potential area for research and scholarship" (Oregon State, "Course Proposals," n.d.). The interdisciplinary nature of the topic made us feel that this was a good fit, and we submitted a course proposal that the Honors College accepted. In this article, we will describe our process in developing the course, students' responses to the course, and reflections on what we will do differently in the future.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Students, at whatever stage in their studies, need to understand how and where information comes from, who creates it, and what barriers exist in our information economy that restrict or control access to it. The growing complexity of the information landscape and the issues of disparity in access that these barriers raise makes this understanding more imperative (Hare & Evanson, in press). Essentially, these issues and topics are subsumed under the umbrella term scholarly communication. For the purpose of this article, we will define scholarly communication as

> The system through which research and other scholarly writings are created, evaluated for quality, disseminated to the scholarly community, and preserved for future use. The system includes both formal means of communication, such as publication in peer-reviewed journals, and informal channels, such as electronic listservs. (Association of College & Research Libraries [ACRL], 2006).

Unfortunately, in the past, undergraduate students have not always been included in campus discussions about the cost of information creation (Davis-Kahl, 2012; Warren & Duckett, 2010). Even though the definition of information literacy, as defined by the ACLR, has always included an understanding of how and where information is created and accessed, information literacy instruction has often been limited to skills-based instruction on how to search for and locate information using library resources (Warren & Duckett, 2010). Including a discussion of scholarly communications is often outside the realm of a traditional "one-shot" session (Sutton, 2013). However, a number of factors or "intersections" are changing what librarians are emphasizing to undergraduate students about information creation and dissemination (Elmborg, 2006; Riehle & Hensley, 2017).

The Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (Association of College and Research Libraries [ACLR] 2016) includes several frames that clearly point to students

needing a basic understanding of the scholarly communication process, including "scholar-ship is a conversation" and "information has value" (ACRL, 2016). In the past, the audience for these conversations have been faculty and graduate students who are actively publishing their research. However, as Riehle and Hensley (2017) argue, many undergraduates are likely to continue to conduct research and engage in scholarly conversations. If they do not learn about scholarly communications now, when will they learn and from whom? Davis-Kahl (2012, p. 212) notes that "undergraduates are a prime audience for outreach and education efforts around scholarly communication." Teaching critical information literacy early helps include undergraduates in the conversation about scholarly communication. Critical information literacy emphasizes that students need to understand where and how information is created and that information is created with a specific purpose (Warren & Duckett, 2010, p. 351). There is a strong emphasis on how information works, not just how to locate it (Elmborg, 2006). In addition, critical information literacy has a strong social justice component, focusing attention on the impacts of restricting access to information. (Hare & Emerson, in press).

Undergraduate students are not often aware of the distinctions between paid and open resources and who creates these distinctions and why. They know the cost of higher edu-cation, they have student loans and debts, and they pay for expensive textbooks, but the economic models behind these costs are usually unclear to them. Information economics is a term used to describe "the exchange of money that takes place in the creation and dissemi-nation of information" (Warren & Duckett, 2010, p. 353). Booth and Miller (2014) have made the case that one component of information literacy that we often overlook is that of "information privilege." While information economics is in itself important (information is not "free"), the idea that this reduces access to resources is not always clear to research-ers and users of resources, such as undergraduates. Information privilege is "the affordance or opportunity to access information" which some may have while other do not (Hare & Evanson, in press).

Librarians are uniquely situated to help students learn about scholarly communication is-sues, including issues of information privilege and open access, and we are quite clearly encouraged by the ACRL to do so. Warren and Duckett (2010, p. 352) note that librarians are called upon by the current publishing model to "act as arbiters," balancing the need for expensive research publications with the limited acquisitions budget. This puts librarians in a position to help students understand the intricacies of the information economy and publishing landscape. Previous and current examples of librarians engaging undergradu-ates in conversations about scholarly communications include supporting undergraduate research programs, poster sessions, undergraduate journals, tutorials, outreach activities, and games (Davis-Kahl, 2012; Hare & Evanson, in press; Warren & Duckett, 2010; Weiner

& Watkinson, 2014). Undergraduate research is a high-impact practice (HIP) promoted by George Kuh (2008) and identified by the Association for American College & Universities (AAC&U) as a pedagogically sound activity that can significantly improve both student academic success and student retention. More and more, undergraduates are becoming content creators, not just users, so it is to their benefit to understand the issues surrounding ownership of information and the publishing process. One of the best ways to involve students in scholarly communication and help them to develop critical information literacy skills is through the undergraduate research process (Hensley, Shreeves, & Davis-Kahl, 2014).

Another potential way to engage students in this conversation is through a course designed to teach students about scholarly communication. There are a few examples of undergraduate classes that focus on scholarly communication, including information privilege, but not specifically social justice. Warren and Duckett (2010, p. 357) describe their work on a course (ENG 333: Communication for Science and Research) where approximately half the course focused on topics related to scholarly communication and information economics. By asking the question "Why does Google sometimes ask for money?" they were able to engage the students in issues of scholarly communication from a perspective that was meaningful to the students.

Gilman (2013) at Pacific University developed another course focused on teaching undergraduates about scholarly communication. The course is part of a minor in editing and publishing. Riehle (2014) describes a course designed to help undergraduates in the Honors College at Purdue University learn about scholarly publishing, but no emphasis on social justice, with the course culminating in a student-edited publication.

Description of Program

After the course proposal was accepted by the Oregon State University Honors College, we spent the summer and fall of 2016 designing the course and offered it in winter 2017 as an Honors College colloquium. Within the Honors College, the students are required to take six credits of colloquia with each colloquia being one or two credits. Students enrolled in the Honors College come from all disciplines, and while some might be studying aspects of social justice, they are unlikely to be studying the OER aspect of it as an academic discipline. Twelve students participated in the two-credit, ten-week course titled "Open Educational Resources and Social Justice." The class met twice per week for fifty minutes each session. The students presented their final projects during the Week 10.

The specific learning outcomes for the course are listed in the Supplementary Materials. One of our main hopes for this course was to give students the skills to become informed advocates

for OER and OA. In this, we were following the recommendations of the ACRL (2013, p. 15) Intersections of Scholarly Communication and Information Literacy white paper, which encourages us to help students become "advocates for changing the broader system, by, for example, passing student and faculty OA resolutions, and supporting legislation." As advocacy is difficult to measure and most likely will occur after the course, it was not a formal learning outcome.

As we developed the course, we determined to make the course as active as possible and to provide different viewpoints and experiences. Given that the subject of the course is a topic that is not necessarily one that advances the student in their degree program but is an area that affects the students' personal and future professional lives, we looked to create significant learning experiences within the course. Fink (2013, p. 7) defines significant learning experiences as "something that should results in something others can look at and say, 'the learning experience resulted in something truly significant in terms of the students' lives.'" Significant learning is "learning that makes a difference in how people live," which includes enhancing how we live, our social interactions, and becoming more informed and thoughtful citizens (pp. 7–8). Our overall goal of helping students become aware of OA issues, in particular to how they relate to social justice, certainly falls into the category of becoming more informed and thoughtful citizens. In addition, access (or lack thereof) to information is something that affects students' lives inside and outside the classroom.

The Honors College is a degree-granting college with its own set of two learning outcomes. These are "the ability to engage in pursuits that create new knowledge and contribute to one or more scholarly areas of study" and "the capacity to fully engage in meaningful dialogue, which incorporates cross-disciplinary and multidisciplinary perspectives" (OSU, n.d.-c). As we designed the course, we also kept these learning outcomes in mind, offering plenty of opportunity for discussion, activities, discovery, and reflection.

The goals of the course include:

> Explore the Open Access movement and its educational, social, political, and cultural impacts; examine the many issues surrounding the use of Open Access materials in education and research; formulate ideas regarding the future of open access materials; and consider the role of the open access movement within the larger social justice movement.

We offered the course face-to-face but we also relied heavily on the Course Management System (CMS) to share resources and as a place for students to reflect on the week's activities and their own learning. As we created the broad outline of the course, each librarian took a

lead role developing one week of content, activities, and reflection questions. Given that the course was all about OER, we did not have the students purchase a textbook, but used articles from the library and openly available materials. Each week students had between two to three articles to read or videos to watch that further expanded on the topic for the coming week. Each reading or video was selected to give the students multiple perspectives on the topic, and the choice of reading materials was a direct reflection of the specific learning outcomes for each week (see Supplementary Materials).

Before we could begin an in-depth discussion on OER and the OA movement, we needed to frame the problem in the first week in a way that would make the topic relevant to students' daily lives (Swanson, 2004). We started with the high cost of textbooks, which directly affects almost all students. This allowed us to expand on the topic in later weeks to include the bigger framework of how information—not just textbooks, but also scholarly research—is created and distributed, leading to discussion about OER and the principles of OA. In addition, the students read an article defining social justice and then decided on their own definition of social justice in a class discussion.

In designing the course, active learning principles guided us in the development of the course activities. Course content delivery included a mix of readings, some lectures, and much discussion and reflection on the part of the students. Significant learning requires that students engage in various kinds of thinking (Fink, 2013). Keeping all this in mind, we developed several activities for the students to do both inside and outside the class. We did not feel testing would be relevant or useful to synthesize the information provided to them; rather we used projects, activities, and written reflections.

Several of the activities we developed included having the students interview others on their perspectives on, or understanding of the high cost of, information and its impact. Fink (2013) notes that the human dimension—that is, the understanding of issues from other perspectives—is a major component of significant learning. Early in the quarter, to really bring home the problem of expensive textbooks, we had the students go out into the library and interview other students. They asked the students to estimate the average cost of textbooks per year and then asked them if they had ever decided intentionally not to purchase a required textbook. (For a complete list of questions, see Table 1.) Later, the students were charged with interviewing faculty about open textbooks, their view of OA publishing, and what issues they had encountered accessing research publications (see the questions in Table 2). Students commented on the faculty and student interviews and linked the interview responses to social justice in their weekly class reflections. These reflections help students integrate the course content, develop critical thinking skills, and make meaning of what they have learned (Fink, 2013, p. 117).

1. What do you think the average student pays for textbooks at OSU every year?
2. Have you ever taken class and not bought the book? How did you get around it?
3. Have you ever not taken class because of cost of book?
4. Do you have an idea of how much you spent on textbooks this quarter?
5. If you could not afford the textbook for a class, what would you do?

Table 1. Questions for interviews of students on textbook cost

1. Have you heard about open textbooks?
2. Have you ever used an open textbook? Why or why not?
3. Have students ever complained about the cost of the textbook? What did you recommend?
4. What does the average student spend on textbooks?
5. Do you publish in Open Access journals?
6. Have you ever run into problems accessing research articles? What did you do?

Table 2. Questions for faculty interviews on textbook cost

Another activity emphasized the cost of library materials. These materials to students to be freely available for all, and we thought it was important for students to understand the amount of money that academic libraries pay for access to scholarly journals and databases and why. Upon leaving the university, students will lose access to the many resources the library offers. While our students were generally aware of this phenomenon, we had the students cost out retrieving several scholarly articles without access to the university and the resources for which it pays. We also had them compare the cost between an individual and an institutional journal subscription. In their reflections, we asked students to consider how this phenomenon may impact them after they leave the university and to consider the implications for those who do not have access to these resources at all, due to financial constraints or technological barriers. Combined with readings, this gave the students a firm grasp of the economic models of publishing and how the models to create open resources are different but must still exist.

We created several activities to help the student create their own understanding, a key feature of active learning. For example, once the students understood the OA model and its benefits to students and researchers, we wanted them to understand how OA benefits the advancement of science. The students divided into pairs, and each pair gave a presentation on scientific advances that depended upon OA. The OA movement is global, so we asked

the students to pair up and present on how a country other than the United States is or is not promoting OA. Here, the students had to summarize the information they found and draw direct comparisons to what they had learned in class.

Other examples of courses in scholarly communication, previously discussed, culminate with a project that allows the students to put their knowledge to practical work. Unlike other courses, we chose not to have the student create a journal publication, simply because of time and the nature (two-credit) of the course. However, we wanted the student to be engaged in the course content and create a meaningful product, thus producing information, an important function if significant learning is to take place (Fink, 2013). To help student develop into OA advocates, we asked the students to create a resource to help faculty understand OER, make locating OER materials for a course or discipline easier, and, if adopted, save future students money. We decided on a LibGuide project in which teams of students would create a LibGuide recommending OER for the course of their choice. We chose Lib-Guides because the library already uses LibGuides, it is easy to use, and we are able to create individual student accounts for it. In this way, students and instructors have access to content during creation. Each group chose a course and determined what type of information and resources to include. The assignment, along with the scoring rubric, is included in the syllabus in the Supplementary Materials. We also had them create promotional materials to include in the LibGuide (see Supplementary Materials).

While both course instructors are advocates of OA and OER, there are valid issues and concerns surrounding publishing in OA journals (Beaubien & Eckard, 2013). These issues include predatory journals, vigorousness of peer review and acceptance for tenure and promotion. In our culminating in class activity, students explored the counterarguments in the OA debate and participated in a debate on the pros and cons of OA. We randomly assigned students to one side of the debate or another just before the activity started. This way each student had to research both sides of the argument, giving them the opportunity to synthesize what they had learned over the course of the class. They later reflected in writing on any points made that altered their opinion.

While we tried to limit lecturing, we made the decision early on in the course design process to involve guest speakers. Students gain more from multiple perspectives, rather than having all the information filtered through our own perspective and bring more relevance to the topic (Li & Guo, 2015). A major objective of the course was to help students understand the high cost of information creation and dissemination, including textbooks, as well as the impact this has on them, their classmates, and those who have less information access, such as rural and transient communities. We invited a guest speaker who runs a successful Massive Online Open Course (MOOC) and another who has written an open textbook

that is currently in use at the university. Both spoke about the creation process and about the supporting u nits, such as their departments and Open Oregon State and the challenges of managing the costs to create the resources. We also had a speaker from Open Oregon State, a unit on campus that helps faculty create open resources. Again, she emphasized that there is a cost to creating open materials, including faculty time and commitment.

Assessment

Before the course started, we sent out a pre-assessment to the students to determine what they already knew about issues of scholarly communication and the cost of information. While we did not adjust our course content significantly because of the survey results, it did give us a good idea of what the students knew and did not know. Not surprisingly, most underestimated how much the average student spends annually on textbooks. Most estimated the cost between $500 and $1,000. The estimated cost of textbook varies by source, because it varies by institution, major and purchase source. The College Board estimates the cost at between $1,220 and $1,420, depending upon the type of college (College Board, n.d.). The Oregon State University Financial Aid office states $1,200 for books and supplies (Oregon State University [OSU], n.d.-a). The National Association of College Stores (NACS) puts the figure at $579 for books and an additional $506 for technology and school supplies (National Association of College Stores [NACS], 2017). The students also underestimated how much the cost of textbooks had increased over the last decade and how frequently publishers release new editions of textbooks. They did seem more aware of the high cost and increase of journals but grossly underestimated how much the library spends on journals annually. They were mostly aware that they would lose access to the online journals and databases once they graduated. They did, however, have some knowledge about OA, and their interest in social justice was also clear. We asked them what had prompted them to take the class. Most of the students seemed to be prompted to sign up for the course by curiosity about the topic. Only one student, with some experience in OA, saw this as an opportunity to become an advocate. Still, just a small amount knowledge about the topic prompted many of our students to learn more.

Throughout the course, students provided feedback through reflections and discussions. It was clear from the beginning that the students understood the relationship between the high cost of textbooks and social justice. By interviewing other students in the first week, the students drew the conclusion that a basic unfairness or stratification exists in classes where some students can afford to buy the textbook and others cannot. They also realized that there might be disciplinary differentiation in the relative cost of the texts. For example, some students pointed out that a student majoring in a science might have a very different experience than a student in the humanities, and therefore their understanding of the issues surrounding OER may be very different.

Students also quickly came to the realization that even open resources are not barrier free; most require access to the Internet and the vast majority are produced in English. These technological and linguistic barriers can significantly affect some populations and geographic regions more than others. In significant leaning, recognizing the human dimension of a topic, in this case, the inequality of information access, is a fundamental outcome (Fink, 2013).

After interviewing the faculty, students mostly realized that faculty underestimate the costs of textbooks for students per year almost as much as students do and, while many of the faculty members they interviewed expressed an interest in and support for OA, in reality only a few had actually made the change. Instructors raised issues such as a lack of quality control and a perceived lack of peer review, and they were not clear about the economic side of the OA publishing model. Clearly moving to an open textbook is not a quick and easy process. On the other hand, students discovered that many of the instructors they interviewed already were taking steps to reduce the cost of textbooks, including permitting the use of older editions, encouraging students to rent or use copies on course reserves, and supplementing the textbooks with other readings from the library collection. They also asked instructors about issues the instructor might have encountered accessing scholarly resources or research materials online, which some instructors acknowledged to be a concern. These discoveries led us to have conversation in the class about scholarly publishing in journals, OA journals, and the role the tenure process plays in keeping the status quo.

In the week when we discussed MOOCs and Open Education, many of our students, while mostly acknowledging that education for everyone is generally a good thing, recognized that there are still significant barriers in place to making education openly available. In their reflections, they recognized that issues such as language barriers, technological limitations, accreditation, and copyright restrictions still make it difficult for everyone to access a higher education. We wanted the students to reflect fully on the possibilities and problems of offering open education. MOOCs are not a topic often included in courses that deal with scholarly communication, but since the focus of the course was OER and social justice, we felt this was a logical component for the students to ponder. Several students pointed out that much of the research on open education focuses on the west and western values and questioned if the push for open education from the West amounted to a sort of technological colonialism, privileging western methods and values in the OER materials.

Some of the reflections from the students were more "practical." In Week 5, we asked students to locate an OER that they thought would have helped them and to use a rubric provided by the instructors to score the OER. In part, this exercise helped them prepare for the final LibGuide project but also underscored some of the challenges their professors would

face when moving from a commercial textbook, and all of the additional teaching materials that usually come with it, to an open textbook, which may or may not include supplementary materials. It also brought home the idea that students can go and seek out OER for themselves and that, in many cases, they are already utilizing OER in their daily learning. Many of the students evaluated an OER they had found helpful in previous courses. By asking the students to evaluate the OER using a standard rubric, in this case either the Achieve Rubric for Evaluating OERs or the TEMOA Rubric, they discovered that selecting and evaluating OERs is a time-consuming process and requires a great deal of thought.

As the weeks progressed, the students came to the conclusion themselves that OA speeds up the progress of science; therefore, slowing down the dissemination of solutions offered by open science that could potentially solve world problems is another matter of social justice. In Week 6, in particular, we asked them to reflect on the social and economic repercussions of the academic publishing model. Finally, in Week 8, the students participated in a debate about OA. In the previous week, we had spent considerable time discussing the "dark side" of OA and scholarly publishing, focusing on predatory journals and the economic models that require authors to pay to publish. Students enjoyed this opportunity to synthesize their learning and draw their own conclusions about OA. Some students concluded that the debate made them realize that the wider adoption of OA is a long-term process and not quickly or easily implemented. Others felt they had learned more about the nuances of OERs and that both the pro and con side of the debate made important, relevant points. While the pro side is very optimistic and wants to improve the lives of individuals through access to educational resources, the con side rested on valid concerns about quality and equity of access. Students did not necessarily change their position on OA, but overall felt they had a better understanding of the issues surrounding OA, which is what we had intended.

At the end of the course, all the students had the opportunity to provide formal feedback. As this was a credit course offered through the university, students used the School-Wide Evaluation Tool (SET), which is standard at this institution. In additional to the scale point, students can offer feedback through two open-ended questions. Since this was a small class, the feedback is limited but useful nonetheless in helping us to reshape the course in the future. While the feedback on the course was generally positive (an average of 4.8 out of 5), students did provide us with the following suggestions. They liked the class debate, but wanted more time on the actual debate itself. They also liked the discussions as thought provoking but would have liked more interaction here. We had deliberately not told students they had to reply to another student's posting because we know that this is not very effective or appreciated by the students. The class is very small and it is not possible for us to know if these students will go any further in exploring OA and OER issues. We do feel that the course was successful in that it exposed students to the concepts of open access and

OER and the issues surrounding access to information. We also feel that there was some significant learning in the course in that the students gained foundational knowledge about the topic, applied many of the things they learned, and integrated ideas from the course into their concepts of social justice.

My level of interest in the material studied in this course was high	4.7
Student interaction and participation were encouraged in this course	4.9
I would recommend that other students take this course with this professor	4.9
The number of hours needed to prepare properly for this course was appropriate	4.4
The grading procedures were adequately explained	4.7
The grading procedures were applied fairly	4.7
On the whole, and in comparison with other Oregon State University courses, this was a valuable course, worthy of Honors credit	4.7
The professor was dedicated to teaching and Honors-level learning	4.8
I would recommend that this professor teach this course again for Honors	4.9
Total Average	4.8/5

Table 3. School-Wide Evaluation Tool responses

NEXT STEPS

One of the challenges of this type of colloquia is that the university is on the quarter system, which limits us essentially to nine weeks. Each week we met with the students for a total of 1:40 minutes. Week 10, which falls right before finals and is commonly referred to as "dead week," is when students are getting ready for finals and the Honors College encourages instructors to consider students' other academic obligations at this time, especially seniors who are also working on their Honors College thesis. As this is a two-credit P/NP course and, quite honestly, not the highest priority for students, we chose to have them present their final project in Week 10, giving us nine weeks of content. This leads to some compression on content in addition to the fact that we set aside some of that class time for students to work on their final project.

Another challenge for us was keeping the definitions of OA and OER clear. We frame open access as a philosophy, from which Open Education Resources are one product. However, it often happens that these terms are often used interchangeably, in both the literature and our class discussions. In the future, we will provide more clarity about this issue and have students develop these definitions more thoroughly.

Experience is the greatest teacher and now that we have taught the course once, there are some things we will be doing differently in the future. While we did not necessarily use the framing term information privilege, that is certainly what the colloquium was about. Social justice was a key part of this colloquium, and we want to emphasize this further. In significant learning, two of the components, "the human dimension" and "caring," are what lead student learning. Social justice fits into both of these components; students must look outside of their own experiences and "discover the social and personal implications of what they have learned" and, to some degree, care about these issues (Fink, 2013, p. 36). We had the students look outside their own experience with some of the activities, and in the discussions and debates, the students clearly demonstrated their understanding of both the benefits and limitations of OA. With more time, we could have incorporated an activity to solidify this connection. Nevertheless, we hope that these students, even if they do not go on to a higher degree or a career in academia, can continue to be advocates. In the future, we may build in some activities to help students develop more advocacy skills that would be useful outside the university.

The students appreciated the guest speakers. We may incorporate additional speakers, but only to a certain degree because students also asked for more interactivity and less "lecture." One critical partner we did not invite to the course was the bookstore. Involving a bookstore representative would offer an excellent opportunity for students to understand more about the textbook industry and the bookstore's place in it. It also might help create a feeling of partnership between the library and the bookstore in the discussion of textbook costs. At our institution, we have a nonprofit bookstore that has been open to working with us; we realize this is not the case at all institutions.

The culminating debate was an opportunity for the students to pull together everything we had discussed over the previous eight weeks. Many students responded very positively to this activity but would have liked more time for the actual debate and we plan to build that into the class. The debate is the best opportunity we have for students to synthesize and process the material covered in the rest of the course, and it will play a more significant role in the class in the future.

In the next iteration of the course, we will build in more reflection and online discussion via the CMS platform. We did get some feedback from the students at the end of the course indicating they would appreciate the opportunity for more online conversations outside of simply posting reflections. Getting students to read and post a substantive response to the other students' comments is always tricky and often mandated; forcing it is something we had hoped to avoid. However, we are willing to take that into consideration in future iterations of the course.

CONCLUSION

The connection between OER and social justice is strong, and we were fortunate to be able to offer this course. The Honors College courses are meant to offer topics "outside of the academic comfort zone or as an introduction to a potential area for research and scholarship" (OSU, n.d.-d). Certainly, there are no other courses offered at this institution that focus on these scholarly communications issues. The Honors College offers us an excellent partnership for bringing courses to students that are outside the "norm." It is also a potential partner for integrating this topic into courses where students are conducting and publishing research.

The course also fits well into the strategic goals of the library, including to "develop new curriculum offerings that expand our educational impact" and "develop knowledge creation and dissemination opportunities" (OSU, 2012). In the current process of revising the strategic plan, further emphasis will be placed on scholarly communication and undergraduates. The course also is in keeping with the values of the university, including "social responsibility," which is defined as contributing "to society's intellectual, cultural, spiritual, and economic progress and well-being to the maximum possible extent" (OSU, 2014). Finally, as a land-grant university, students who study here are part of the mission that we have to provide education across the state, which includes making our research openly available. For this reason, we are adding our instructional course materials to the institutional repository and licensing them under Creative Commons.

The feedback we received from students indicates that we succeeded in raising students' awareness of issues in scholarly communication and, in particular, the issues surrounding OA. We created an engaging course and our students now understand how scholarly information is created and, more importantly, how it effects their lives and society at large. While not all librarians have the opportunity to create and teach credit bearing courses, we hope the idea of a course combining social justice with OA and OER is one others will use in their own ways to create their own student experiences.

REFERENCES

Achieve. (2011, November 8). *Rubrics for evaluating open educational resources (OER) objects.* Retrieved from https://www.achieve.org/files/AchieveOERRubrics.pdf

Aguilar, J. V. B. (2011, February 15). *TEMOA. A rubric to evaluate open educational resources.* Retrieved from www.temoa.info/sites/default/files/OER_Rubrics_0.pdf

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2006, September 1). *Principles and strategies for the reform of scholarly communication 1*. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/publications/whitepapers /principlesstrategies

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

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2016). *Framework for information literacy for higher education.* Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework

Beaubien, S., & Eckard, M. (2014). Addressing faculty publishing concerns with open access journal quality indicators. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.7710/2162.-3309 .1133

Booth, C., & Miller, C. (2014, March 26). Open access as undergraduate pedagogy | Backtalk. *Library Journal.* Retrieved from http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2014/03/opinion/backtalk/open-access-as -undergraduate-peda gorgy-backtalk/#

College Board. (n.d.). Trends in higher education. Average estimated undergraduate budgets, 2017–2018. Retrieved from https://trends.collegeboard.org/college-pricing/figures-tables/average-estimated-undergraduate-budgets-2017-18

Davis-Kahl, S. (2012). Engaging undergraduates in scholarly communication: Outreach, education, and advocacy. *CRL News*, *73*(4), 212–222. https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.73.4.8744

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

Fink, L. D. (2013). *Creating significant learning experiences: An integrated approach to designing college courses.* Revised and updated ed. San Francisco, CA: Wiley & Sons.

Gilman, I. (2013). 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*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Hare, S., & Evanson, C. (in press). Information privilege outreach for undergraduate students. *College & Research Libraries.* Retrieved from http://crl.acrl.org/index.php/crl/article/view/16767/18305

Hensley, M. K., Shreeves, S. L., & Davis-Kahl, S. (2014). A survey of library support for formal undergraduate research programs. *College & Research Libraries*, *75*(4), 422–441. https://doi.org/10.5860/ crl.75.4.422

Keane, E. P. (2012). Librarian viewpoints on teaching open access-publishing principles to college students. *Serials Librarian*, *63*(3–4), 333–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/0361526X.2012.724377

Kuh, G. D. (2008). Excerpt from high-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. *Association of American Colleges and Universities*. Retrieved from http://ueeval.ucr.edu/teaching_practices_inventory/Kuh_2008.pdf

Li, L., & Guo, R. (2015). A student-centered guest lecturing: A constructivist approach to promote students learning. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, *15*, 1–7.

Lopez, M. H., & Brown, B. (2006, October). Fact sheet: Civic engagement among 2-year and 4-year college students. Retrieved from http://www.civicyouth.org/PopUps/FactSheets/FS06_comm_coll.pdf

National Association of College Stores. (2017, August 7). New report from National Association of College Stores shows decrease in overall spending on course materials by students. Retrieved from https://www.nacs.org/advocacynewsmedia/pressreleases/tabid/1579/ArticleID/635/New- Report-from-National-Association-of-College-Stores-Shows-Decrease-in-Overall-Spending-on-Course-Materials-by-College-Students.aspx

Oregon State University. (n.d.-a) Financial aid: Cost of attendance. Retrieved March 2, 2018 from http://financialaid.oregonstate.edu/review_costofattendance

Oregon State University. (n.d.-b). General catalog and schedule of classes. Retrieved December 26, 2017, from http://catalog.oregonstate.edu/Default.aspx

Oregon State University. (n.d.-c). Honors College: About. Retrieved December 26, 2017, from https://honors.oregonstate.edu/about

Oregon State University. (n.d.-d). Honors College: Course proposals. Retrieved December 26, 2017, from http://honors.oregonstate.edu/course-proposals

Oregon State University. (2012). Oregon State University library strategic plan, 2012–2017. Retrieved from http://osulibrary.oregonstate.edu/sites/default/files/osulpstrategicplanrevisedfall2015_0.pdf

Oregon State University. (2014). Oregon State University strategic plan. Core values. Retrieved from http://leadership.oregonstate.edu/strategicplan/strategic-plan-21st-century

Riehle, C. F. (2014). Collaborators in course design: A librarian and publisher at the intersection of information literacy and scholarly communication. In *2014 LOEX Conference Proceedings*. Retrieved from http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/lib_fsdocs/119/

Riehle, C. F., & Hensley, M. K. (2017). What do undergraduate students know about scholarly communication? A mixed methods study. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *17*(1), 145–178. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2017.0009

Sutton, S. C. (2013). Time to step on the gas in approaching the intersections of scholarly communication and information literacy. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, *1*(3), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1076

Swanson, T. A. (2004). A radical step: Implementing a critical information literacy model. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *4*(2), 259–273. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2004.0038

Warren, S., & Duckett, K. (2010). "Why does Google Scholar sometimes ask for money?" Engaging science students in scholarly communication and the economics of information. *Journal of Library Administration*, *50*(4), 349–372. https://doi.org/10.1080/01930821003667021

Weiner, S. A., & Watkinson, C. (2014). What do students learn from participation in an undergraduate research journal? Results of an assessment. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.7710/2162-3309.1125