Starting with Students: Open Course Design

Chris Friend*   Robin DeRosa   Jesse Stommel

18 December 2019

Pedagogy is recursive. It ends (literally or figuratively) with a question and waits (sometimes impossibly, breathlessly long) for an answer. Pedagogy makes manifest our values. With widespread interest across the academy in openness of various kinds—open source code, open educational resources, and open access journals as the most prominent examples—we examine how openness applies to the practice of our teaching and how it reflects both our disciplines and our priorities. Because academic endeavors are often expressed through the courses used to introduce students to the ways of thinking in a particular discipline, we believe thoughtful, critical course design must be a primary concern for the digital humanities—indeed, that the identity of the digital humanities is defined by its course design.

In "What is Digital Humanities and What's It Doing in English Departments?" Matthew G. Kirschenbaum (2010) suggests that "the digital humanities today is about a scholarship (and a pedagogy) that is publicly visible in ways to which we are

generally unaccustomed...a scholarship and pedagogy that are collaborative and depend on networks of people" (p. 60). Kirschenbaum's definition includes pedagogy and collaborative public work, but it is worth noting that the first use of the word "pedagogy" is in a parenthetical. The article provides thorough reviews of the technologies and projects driving academic research in the field, while little coverage is given to teaching or pedagogical work. He is certainly aware such teaching work exists, noting that "the University of Victoria hosts the annual Digital Humanities Summer Institute to train new scholars" (p. 55). We—Chris, Jesse, and Robin—facilitated several courses at that institute in an effort to bring greater attention to the importance of pedagogical work to DH as a field. That effort will be unending, as DH continues to redefine itself in form as well as substance, constantly training new scholars and finding new opportunities for research.

In "The Digital Humanities is About Breaking Stuff," Jesse (2013) discusses the importance of dialogue in DH work. Specifically, he says the interactions between a text and reader/researcher provide the foundational engagements for the humanities. The nature of those engagements changes over time as new perspectives and tools develop, but the humanities' lifeblood comes from the way people

interpret—and respond to—texts. This approach extends to pedagogy, as well. Sean Michael Morris (2016) calls modern courses "an act of composition," meaning they, too, can be read as texts. As DH is a primarily academic endeavor, its supply of courses may at times seem as limitless as its supply of books. Turning our attention inward toward the courses that advocate for, propagate, and *do* the work of the digital humanities allows us to see the values and purposes of digital humanities. Morris (2016) therefore rightly claims that "the course itself is one of the central texts we must consider, a collection of stories about reading and writing that can be actively hacked and remixed." As such, we argue for examining classes as texts and course design as a process of composing those texts. We offer here a guide to "close reading" our courses—a resource for understanding and creating courses that are sensitive to the needs of both DH as a discipline and the students who compose those courses.

In 2014, Jesse Stommel and Sean Michael Morris presented a talk, "If Freire Made a MOOC: Open Education as Resistance," at the annual Open Education Conference. The talk pulled a rich history of liberationist and constructivist pedagogical theory into a dialogue with current discourse around the effects of technology on pedagogy and on the structures of higher education. Though it focused on MOOCs (and meta-MOOCs about MOOCs), it transcended both its own framing focus on MOOCs and the larger OER-concentrated focus of OpenEd14 to catalyze conversation about the broader project of open education and its relationship to social justice. In this chapter, we will revisit some of the basic premises that surround "critical digital pedagogy" as it was first outlined in that talk and related publications and think about how those premises relate to current debates about the role of pedagogy in the open education movement. We offer a broad framework for applying critical pedagogy to modern DH courses, including examples from our own experiences facilitating a DHSI seminar about critical pedagogy for digital-humanities scholars.

At the heart of this piece is a series of questions: What systems and structures in higher education are challenged by working in open ways? What foundational philosophies should guide open education, and how are those philosophies enacted or subverted by the tools and techniques that we employ in our teaching practices? What tensions exist in the open education movement, how are they related to power dynamics that pervade all of education, and how can making these tensions visible serve to empower more learners? And finally, how can we leverage the connections around these issues to design courses that are more accessible, engaging, empowering, and impactful?

1   Critical Digital Pedagogy

We might start exploring these questions by trying to trace a brief outline of critical pedagogy as it informed our starting point years ago. But of course, that starting place was always already inflected by much earlier theories and philosophies that have informed progressive pedagogical practices (and progressive digital pedagogical practice) in the twentieth century. As machination grew commonplace and factory work became the expected employment for students leaving the public education system, that system grew to treat students as standardized as well. In his 1915 text *Schools of To-morrow*, John Dewey argues for the importance of the context surrounding tools and content, saying that students "must have some understanding of the physical and social facts behind and ahead of the material and appliances with which they are dealing" (p. 246). Though Dewey feared students were being trained to become very

literal cogs in the machinations of then-modern factories, his century-old worry still applies today. For how often do we speak of skills as "marketable," degrees as "career-focused," and students as "employable"? The idea of school as a commodifier that adds value to the students passing through its halls evokes the "banking model" of education (Freire, 2000, pp. 71–75). As John Seely Brown and Paul DuGuid (2002) put it, "Teaching, in this view, is a delivery service, and schools a loading site" (p. 206). Despite the urge to "on-board" students into existing practices or skills used within the digital humanities, we must view education as an opportunity for *personal* growth, even liberation.

To counteract the widespread—and growing—use of banking-model education, theorist-educator Paolo Freire (2000) argues that "knowledge emerges only through invention and re-invention, through the restless, impatient, continuing, hopeful inquiry human beings pursue in the world, with the world, and with each other" (p. 72). That drive toward inquiry exists in even the smallest of children but too often gets eliminated by the very education systems built to support their development. According to Freire, *dialogue* between learners is the heart and soul of education. His views are echoed by bell hooks (1994): "As a classroom community, our capacity to generate excitement is deeply affected by our interest in one another, in hearing one another's voices, in recognizing one another's presence" (p. 8). Critical digital pedagogy has grown from these foundations: context, dialogue, and critical evaluation.

Because the term is so key to the conversation, it is worth pausing to explain more what we mean by "critical." As it is used in "critical pedagogy," the term takes on several distinct yet interrelated aspects:

- Critical, as in mission-critical, essential;

- Critical, as in literary criticism and critique, providing definitions and interpretation;

- Critical, as in reflective and nuanced thinking about a subject;

- Critical, as in criticizing institutional, corporate, or societal impediments to learning;

- Critical Pedagogy, as a disciplinary approach, which inflects (and is inflected by) each of these other meanings (Stommel, 2014).

In 2011's *On Critical Pedagogy*, Henry Giroux clarified the politics of the field of critical pedagogy and expanded the conversation into digital terrains: "Intellectuals have a responsibility to analyze how language, information, and meaning work to organize, legitimate, and circulate values, structure reality, and offer up particular notions of agency and identity. For public intellectuals, the latter challenge demands a new kind of literacy and critical understanding with respect to the emergence of the new media and electronic technologies, and the new and powerful role they play as instruments of public pedagogy" (p. 175). In more recent work, he presses beyond notions of media literacy into a suggestion that students, in particular, must be encouraged to use technologies to shift and shape the knowledge culture, to move past passive consumers, past critical consumers, into the role of what he calls "cultural producers": "This suggests developing alternative public spheres, such as online journals, television shows, newspapers, zines and any other platform in which different modes of representation can be developed. Such tasks can be done by mobilizing the technological resources and platforms that many students are already familiar with" (Giroux, 2020, pp. 9–10). At the core

of Giroux's understanding of critical pedagogy is a move toward critical analysis of media and technologies and the ways that they shape knowledge, but also a move toward a reclaiming of media and technologies as tools for learners to use to shape knowledge themselves.

Using Freire, Giroux, hooks, and others to knit together a foundational philosophy for critical pedagogy, we see it as particularly interested in how technologies inflect, hinder, and/or enable authentic learning. In short, Critical Digital Pedagogy:

- centers its practice on community and collaboration;

- must remain open to diverse, international voices, and thus requires invention to reimagine the ways that communication and collaboration happen across cultural and political boundaries;

- will not, cannot, be defined by a single voice but must gather together a cacophony of voices;

- must have use and application outside traditional institutions of education (Stommel, 2014).

This approach to education expects openness and community-building using platforms that allow participants (students and teachers) full agency over their learning. Student agency, at the heart of critical pedagogy, finds a modern advocate in open education—but that advocacy does not happen automatically. We must first look at open education through the lens of critical pedagogy to build that connection.

2   Connecting Critical With Open

The question of how the ideals of critical pedagogy interact with the primary themes and investments of the open education movement as it now exists in 2017 is a complex one. "Open Education" as a phrase has been in operation at least since the 1960's, and its history as a term is certainly related to the ways in which it is utilized today[1]. In recent years, however, open education has become increasingly associated with "Open Educational Resources," ever since that term was coined at UNESCO's 2002 Forum on Open Courseware. In many ways, the open education movement now coheres around a focus on OERs, and how they can drive down textbook costs for students.

To clarify, OERs are learning materials that make use of what David Wiley (2014) has termed "the 5R" permissions. This means that not only are the materials free to access online, but they are also licensed to ensure that they can be reused, redistributed, retained, revised, and remixed. Of course, OERs have the ability to lower textbook costs to zero; we know that high textbook costs are a direct barrier to student success and that OERs increase students' ability to pass and do well in courses[2]. Part of this is no doubt because students have reliable access to learning materials from the first day of class. But OERs also change the relationship be-

---

[1] See, for example, early work from the 1960's by Ronald S. Barth, or from the 1970's by Claude Paquette (available in French, or see Tannis Morgan's (2016) quick English translation of key ideas). Katy Jordan's digital timeline, "The History of Open Education: A Timeline and Bibliography" is a great work-in-progress that contains links to some of the earlier articles that use the term.

[2] See, for example, Hilton III et al. (2016), who found that "subject to the limitations discussed, students who use OER perform significantly better on the course throughput rate than their peers who use traditional textbooks, in both face-to-face and online courses that use OER."

tween students, teachers, and these learning materials. Regardless of whether students and faculty actively adapt OERs, the simple adoption of OERs accompanied by the acknowledgment of the open license casts knowledge as a commons-created experience rather than an ontological fact, and this, in turn, casts learners in the role of potential contributors to—not just consumers of—this knowledge. What becomes most interesting to us about "open pedagogy" is the way that it highlights connective nodes between liberationist, constructivist, and critical pedagogies, and then asks questions about how digital and connected learning, OER advocacy, and the open license inflect and expand those pedagogies.

Open education understates its value if it stays too stuck to the textbook cost issue. If we care about book costs, it's because we understand that the real cost of college goes beyond tuition. If we care about the real cost of college, then we should also care about childcare costs, transportation costs, lost opportunity costs, food insecurity, homelessness, the digital divide, and myriad other issues that prevent our students from accessing higher education.[3] The open license helps us reduce textbook costs, but it also symbolizes the belief that college costs—everything from tuition to transportation—should be addressed and reduced/covered as part of a strong public educational infrastructure.

Thus, OERs are part of a commitment to building a system in which the public pays itself for what it needs: the public funding of systems and structures that help students make it to and through college. And once we care about access in both

---

[3]On the real cost of college, see Sara Goldrick-Rab's *Paying the Price: College Costs, Financial Aid, and the Betrayal of the American Dream* For a framing discussion of the digital divide and digital redlining, see Chris Gilliard and Hugh Culik's (2016) "Digital Redlining, Access, and Privacy."

economic and socioeconomic terms, it's only logical to care about access more broadly writ. What other issues keep our students from accessing the knowledge they need? When we build new models and techniques for learning—for example, open textbooks—can we build them in ways that don't replicate the access failures of a system that sacrifices marginalized communities of learners in order to shore up profit margins? A commitment to universal design, to terms of use that protect privacy and prevent abuse, to edtech that exists to serve learners and not corporations: these are some of the commitments that are part of the access agenda that "open" can offer to educators looking for a mission-driven way to envision their daily practice.

3 Open as in People, not Content

Open educational resources are not just "free" resources but also an opportunity to engage students as engaged participants in their own learning. David Wiley argues in "Open Pedagogy: The Importance of Getting in the Air," "Simply adopting open educational resources will not make one's pedagogy magically change to take advantage of the capabilities of the internet. Adding legal permission to technological capacity only creates possibilities—we must choose to actively take advantage of them." We would argue further that what happens in the classroom can (and should) push on the edtech and open communities in important ways, demanding that we keep inventing new permissions, new licenses, new content, new understandings of what learning content is and how it functions.

Learning is the opposite of content. Content is a closed circuit, a mechanism. Learning is an open circuit, a field. The open education commu-

nity has only begun to grapple with what it would truly mean to displace content from its place at the center of education. Much of the OER movement, for example, still privileges textbooks that maintain the status quo of education as transactional. Content is collected by teachers and disseminated for deposit into the brains of students. These books are "free" only as in "free lunch," and the "open door" of education remains mostly a one-way door. Gathering together these books into a monolithic "open publishing" movement exacerbates the delivery-model problem by coagulating expertise in ways that feed institutional structures and corporate monetization plans at the expense of student agency (and transformative learning). In brief, where profit drives education, content is privileged. Where gatekeeping mechanisms fuel publishing, already entrenched hierarchies are maintained.

This isn't to undermine the efforts we've described within the open education community to counter these market forces, but these attempts will be at least partly frustrated so long as content is privileged as the stuff of teaching and learning. Robin has previously written, "stop thinking of knowledge as information to be downloaded into the student brain (the repository-based storage unit), but instead think of it as knowledge to be uploaded to the world." Ultimately, our call here is for a rigorous rethinking of student-centeredness. Not merely that a course or education more broadly would center on student engagement with content—but that students would bring *and are* the essential content of the course.

In this way, open pedagogy isn't just about copyright or the "5R" permissions. These matters and our insistent reliance on them are inspired by the very pedagogies we're describing. But the importance of the open license is symbolic as much as it is legal, encouraging thoughtful, critical choices about how the content of our classrooms gets made and shared. What we have discovered is that much of the stuff of teaching and learning is ephemeral—pre-license, pre-copyright, emergent thinking. The key to the open license is both in the artifacts and processes it enables through its permissions *and* in the philosophies and approaches that inspire our resistance to commodified or stable end products in learning.

Open pedagogy pushes, then, on the very notion of static publishable "resources" in favor of flexible tools that emphasize student contribution and dialogue. People can't be copyrighted. People can't be licensed. If the stuff of education is people and relationships—if we emphasize learning that happens in community—then the debate around open pedagogy must be a debate about more than just how we create and share content.

This is the crux (and the heart) of the full open education ecosystem. It defies business plans, hype cycles, double-blind peer review, and neatly ordered tenure dossiers. It doesn't fit tidily into rubrics, best practices, learning outcomes, or predetermined models. Just as the best courses overflow their containers.

There are a wide array of examples we could point to, each very different from the next, exactly because there is no generic template for this kind of work. Stock syllabi, cut-and-pasted learning outcomes, required institutional policies all have made the course as a thing feel increasingly contained, increasingly static. The models we look to for open pedagogy are as far-ranging as DS106—the open digital storytelling course started at University of Mary Washington, Al Filreis's Modern Poetry MOOC (ModPo), our own experiments with "living syllabi" constructed and adapted by students in real time (and often on the open Web), and even something seemingly static (because it exists as a PDF) like the "Lemonade Syllabus" by Candice

Benbow (2016). Each of these examples demonstrates a reimagining of the course, or the syllabus, as something that launches community and allows students to co-construct content.

Because the syllabus is the backbone of most college and university courses, it provides a good starting point for faculty who want to think about "opening" their courses. What happens to learning outcomes if we ask students to participate in creating them, if we ask them to think critically about the parameters that are often pre-set by accreditors or institutions, if we hold open spaces in our goals for unexpected epiphanies or unplanned explorations? Can course policies be generated by learners with no punitive goals at all, and can they only facilitate and never preclude learning? Can the schedule of the course be flexible, emergent, responsive to individual student lives and rhythms of working? Can students create assignments, and can they always be nondisposable and relevant to a world beyond the immediate classroom? Can we focus on feedback instead of grading, and employ peer-to-peer and self-assessment models to encourage the sharing of authority and the development of evaluative skills? What are the ways that our current syllabi close down connection, prevent students from shaping the world they are learning about, or treat learning as a passive transaction, and how can we address those closed doors?

Open pedagogy demands content, Open Educational Resources, that are not just available and accessible but also open to student contribution. The resources we use in our classes must be open to what students bring with them to the learning environment, what they build within the learning environment, and how those things change all our approaches, in the moment, sometimes on the fly.

It's important to know what OERs are and how we might use them. But it's just as important to pause and take stock—to think carefully about when and why we might have students working openly on the web. What kinds of sharing can only a roomful of students make possible? And what new possibilities emerge only from within classrooms (whether on ground or online) where the walls are permeable to much larger, intercultural learning communities?

And when we do need to close our (literal or figurative) classroom door, we should take these opportunities as a moment to talk to students about the rhetoric of the room. What are the affordances of a closed door? What different affordances exist only inside a closed space? And who gets left outside the room? There are no easy answers to these questions, which is why open education is social justice work—and why we can offer philosophical approaches more than best practices. To start moving past open spaces and into open pedagogy, we offer these points of guidance:

1. Find and create content that is self-undermining. Content with space on the page for student contribution. Content that is less neat and tidy than the average textbook. When content wears its authority too plainly on its sleeve, it is less likely to be hacked, than content that is more unassuming or even overtly playful.

2. Student-generated content is the stuff of learning. It can't be populated into a learning management system in advance of their arrival to the course. Kris Shaffer (2013) writes in "Open-Source Scholarship," "Hacking is a core part of what we do as scholars and pedagogues. We are unapologetic tinkerers who neither invent the wheel, nor are satisfied with the wheels already at our disposal." Our role as teachers is also to draw students into this work—to help them see the classroom as an emergent space that responds to their inputs.

3. Content should never be delivered at the expense of questions or openings to discussion. Coverage is a myth. Too often, the more we cover, the less students know. So, put more energy into starting the discussion and less anxiety into determining where ends up. Sean Michael Morris and Jesse Stommel (2015) write in "The Course as Container: Distributed Learning and the MOOC," "The walls of the course circumscribe subject matter, project timelines, written work, and assessment. The quarter, the semester, and the *course* dictate almost everything we understand about education" (p. 167) The bureaucracies of education shouldn't stand in for education.

4. Realize that content is not actually a marker of expertise. From the first moments of our courses, relinquish some (perhaps not all) authority and model uncertainty. Say directly that the course will focus less on the expertise of a teacher and more on the growing expertise of students.

5. There is no plagiarism in pedagogy. The first thing to open is our own approach—to other teachers that can put them to use—they won't work in every class, or for every student, but good pedagogy is not something we ought to hoard. Give credit but worry less about taking it.

4 Critical Pedagogy and Digital Praxis in the Humanities

Constructing anything from a course to an institution involves a series of conscious choices. Each option provides opportunity to create courses that grant agency, opportunity, and access to students.

All the toggles and switches in education should default to open, not closed—everything including office doors, learning management systems, academic journals, rubrics, and institutional policies. When any of these are closed, they automatically limit agency to only those who currently hold power. The inverse, however, does not hold: When any of these are open, they do not automatically bestow agency on the powerless. Openness does not guarantee fairness. Liberatory empowerment takes willful action and political/pedagogical commitment. As Audrey Watters (2014) writes:

> We act—at our peril—as if "open" is politically neutral, let alone politically good or progressive. Indeed, we sometimes use the word to stand in place of a politics of participatory democracy. We presume that, because something is "open" that it necessarily contains all the conditions for equality or freedom or justice.

It is up to us as educators to ensure that our politics and our pedagogies are just as aligned with the goal of student agency as the openness of our policies, our resources, and our tools.

At the 2016 and 2017 Digital Humanities Summer Institutes, the authors of this chapter offered a course-as-laboratory titled Critical Pedagogy and Digital Praxis in the Humanities. In that course, we applied critical pedagogy to a course about critical pedagogy, allowing every conversation we held the opportunity to step back and "go meta" to discuss either the topic at hand or how it applied to the class as it existed. The stated goal of the week-long seminar sounded simple: We would brainstorm, build, deploy, and assess an open online course. That simple plan grew exponentially more complicated as the course formed because of the content—its participants. The roster filled with every manner of digital humanist from a variety of

fields, institutions, and experience levels. Merely choosing a topic for the online course we would build necessitated dialogue.

Dialogue, then, formed the core of this course's activities. By putting the participant's interests and needs at the center of our efforts and decision-making as course instructors, we enforced a level of responsiveness and flexibility that cannot come from a predetermined syllabus or pre-built "canned course" so common in today's online learning environments. Instead, our plans and discussions developed organically in response to participant needs and interests. Our Coursepaks (the DHSI equivalent of a course syllabus with required readings) were dynamic documents—Google docs with editing permission granted to any viewer. Those documents became the focal point of our work throughout each of the seminars, with note taking, decision-making, and project organization all taking place in those files.

The goals stated above—that students build their own textbooks, their own syllabi, their own learning outcomes—defined our goals for the week. We knew we wanted to deploy on online course, and the process of developing that course provided opportunity to explore our content. Participants in each instance of the seminar determined what that year's open online class would be about. Those in the 2016 seminar created "A Course is a Course is a Course," designed to "help participants better understand how pedagogical practices and structures impact (digital) learning environments and frame educational experiences for multiple audiences" (Friend & Stommel, 2016).[4] Those in the 2017 iter-

ation created "Oh, the Places You'll "Know": Pedagogy, Environments, and Digital Praxis," which aims to "develop an online community of interested educators and create an ongoing conversation about place/space within our contemporary educational landscape" (Friend & DeRosa, 2017). Each seminar's participants created content based on their interests and discoveries, allowing the final products to reflect the people involved more than a specific predefined idea. Issues surrounding learning environments (central to the 2016 cohort) and place/space (central to the 2017 cohort) emerged organically through our in-class dialogues about the learning process and its influences. By "going meta" during class and asking what influenced the learning process of participants in that class, we drew from lived experience and ensured that the participants, not a textbook, provided the course content.

To be sure, the DHSI seminars had readings and other source material used throughout the week. Selections from Freire, hooks, Papert, and others sparked our dialogue about critical pedagogy. Brief presentations from the instructors helped clarify topics based on our experiences with critical digital pedagogy (Jesse), open education and publishing (Robin), and assessment (Chris). Those presentations happened when participants deemed them most useful. As facilitators, we let students know that we had presentations—which we called "mini-lectures"—ready to go once they became relevant to the group's needs for their project. Our schedule for the week responded to the situation created within the class. The content brought by the instructors merely served as stepping-off points for

---

[4]This circumstance highlights how the fifth point in "From Open Content to Open Doors" resists traditional expectations of content and scholarship. Standard citation methods compel us to cite the course by crediting the DHSI seminar instructors as authors, as a consequence of the existing hierarchical structures. However, the topic, title, and content of the on-

line course—the material we are referencing and citing here—was all created by the seminar *participants*, not the instructors. Yet traditional citation methods prove cumbersome at best—if not patently insufficient—when faced with collaborative work with some twenty collaborators.

explorations and further dialogue as participants drew from their experience to build the content of their online class. The content of each course reflects the dynamic discovery process of its respective seminar as surely as the style of each module reflects the personalities of its group of creators.

These seminars demonstrate what we see as the essence of DH work expressed through enacted pedagogy. Seminar participants were given agency over the content of the course, the work they would do to complete it, and the means by which they assessed their participation and learning. The products they created demonstrated the process of their thinking and a desire to share their created knowledge with the rest of the community of educators—work done truly for the public good.

The Digital Humanities provides richness and variety in its projects and research work, and it consistently embraces openness in its tools and projects. We cannot demand openness and accessibility of our tools without implementing them in our teaching, too. Applying the principle of openness to the content, resources, and pedagogy of DH courses demonstrates the values of the digital humanities through instruction. By reinforcing those values through our pedagogy, we build trust among DH practitioners. As we strengthen that trust and solidify the personal relationships within the field, the real content of our work can emerge: the students who join us.

Ralph Waldo Emerson (1901) writes in *The American Scholar*, "Books are the best of things, well used; abused, among the worst … I had better never see a book than to be warped by its attraction clean out of my own orbit and made a satellite instead of a system" (p. 16). Certainly, some of the books we read with students are decided in advance by us. Content is brought by us to the class, like our own knowledge and expertise, as a series of entry points, not cut paths. And we leave space for students to question the approach, space for students to hack our syllabi, recognizing all the while that education is always contextual—and that the contexts are different every time we teach. The recursive work of an open pedagogy is not just the work of a teacher. It is not merely that we acknowledge the unique contexts of students in the classroom, but that we allow those contexts to guide the learning in explicit and implicit ways.

And so we might start by finding and making content openly available on the web, but we also ask students to create, remix, and hack content on the web. Students build their own textbooks, their own syllabi, their own learning outcomes. They also work within a perforated community—a networked group of learners that extends beyond the bounds of those officially enrolled in a term-based class. And ultimately a community that outlives the course that gave birth to it.

References

Barth, R. S. (1969). Open education–assumptions about learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *1*(2), 29–39.

Benbow, C. (2016). Lemonade syllabus. *Issu*. https://issuu.com/candicebenbow/docs/lemonade_syllabus_2016

Brown, J. S., & Duguid, P. (2002). *The social life of information*. Harvard Business School Press.

Dewey, J., & Dewey, E. (1915). *Schools of to-morrow*. EP Dutton.

Emerson, R. (1901). *The American scholar*. Laurentian Press.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Friend, C., & DeRosa, R. (2017). *Oh, the places you'll "know": Pedagogy, environments, and*

digital praxis. https://dhsi2017.chrisfriend.us

Friend, C., & Stommel, J. (2016). *A course is a course is a course*. http://dhsi2016.chrisfriend.us

Gilliard, C., & Culik, H. (2016). Digital redlining, access, and privacy. *Common Sense Education*. https://www.commonsense.org/education / articles / digital - redlining - access-and-privacy

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Giroux, H. A. (2020). Thinking dangerously: The role of higher education in authoritarian times. *Chowanna*, *1*(54), 1–12.

Goldrick-Rab, S. (2016). *Paying the price: College costs, financial aid, and the betrayal of the American dream*. U of Chicago Press.

Hilton III, J., Fischer, L., Wiley, D., & Williams, L. (2016). Maintaining momentum toward graduation: OER and the course through-put rate. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, *17*(6), 18–27.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.

Jordan, K. (2017). The history of open education: A timeline and bibliography. *Shift and Refresh*. https://shiftandrefresh.wordpress.com/2017/06/19/the-history-of-open-education-a-timeline-and-bibliography/

Kirschenbaum, M. (2010). What is digital humanities and what's it doing in English departments? *ADE Bulletin*, *150*(55), 55–61.

Morgan, T. (2016). Open pedagogy and a very brief history of the concept. *Explorations in the Ed Tech World*. https://homonym.ca/uncategorized / open - pedagogy - and - a - very-brief-history-of-the-concept/

Morris, S. M. (2016). Courses, composition, hybridity. *Personal website*. https : //www.seanmichaelmorris.com/courses-composition-hybridity/

Morris, S. M., & Stommel, J. (2015). The course as container: Distributed learning and the MOOC. In *Global innovation of teaching and learning in higher education* (pp. 167–180). Springer.

Paquette, C. (1979). Quelques fondements d'une pédagogie ouverte. *Québec français*, (36), 20–21.

Shaffer, K. (2013). Open-source scholarship. *Hybrid Pedagogy*. https : / / hybridpedagogy . org/open-source-scholarship/

Stommel, J. (2013). The digital humanities is about breaking stuff. *Hybrid Pedagogy*. https : / / hybridpedagogy . org / the - digital - humanities-is-about-breaking-stuff/

Stommel, J. (2014). Critical digital pedagogy: A definition. *Hybrid Pedagogy*. https : / / hybridpedagogy . org / critical - digital - pedagogy-definition/

Stommel, J., & Morris, S. M. (2014, November 21). *If Freire made a MOOC: Open education as resistance* [Presentation]. 11th Annual Open Education Conference, Washington, DC. https : / / openeducation2014 . sched . com / event / 1lWShys / if - freire - made - a - mooc-open-education-as-resistance

Watters, A. (2014). From "open" to justice #Open-Con2014. *Hack Education*. http : / / hackeducation . com / 2014 / 11 / 16 / from - open-to-justice

Wiley, D. (2014). *Defining the "open" in open content and open educational resources*. http://opencontent.org/definition/

Wiley, D. (2015, January 31). *Open pedagogy: The importance of getting in the air*. https : / / opencontent.org/blog/archives/3761