



Renewable Assignments: Comparing Faculty and Student Perceptions

RESEARCH ARTICLE

JULIE LAZZARA 

MATTHEW BLOOM 

VIRGINIA CLINTON-LISELL 

*Author affiliations can be found in the back matter of this article



ABSTRACT

This study examined faculty and student perceptions of renewable assignments within an OER-enabled pedagogy framework. Building on Wiley and Hilton's (2018) framework, this study focused on the subset of practices that result in renewable assignments. Renewable assignments leverage OER permissions (reuse, redistribute, retain, remix, revise) to produce student work with value beyond the classroom. The study compared college students' (N = 24) perceptions of value, interest, motivation, and reward for renewable assignments versus those of the instructor (N = 1) in one online class. Students reported that the value, interest, motivation, and reward of the renewable assignment were somewhat better than traditional assignments. However, the professor viewed the renewable assignment as more rewarding than the students did. In open-ended responses, students indicated that the benefits of the renewable assignment were enhanced motivation and the development of teamwork skills. However, students also indicated that the drawbacks of the renewable assignment were challenges with their group and that the project was lengthy and complicated. Overall, students and the instructor recognized the potential value of renewable assignments as well as their challenges. Recommendations include highlighting the importance of careful design and clear communication when implementing such assignments.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Julie Lazzara

Paradise Valley Community
College, USA

Julie.lazzara@paradisevalley.edu

KEYWORDS:

oer-enabled pedagogy;
renewable assignments;
open educational resources;
student perceptions; faculty
perceptions; open pedagogy;
scholarship of teaching and
learning; student motivation;
college students; open
educational practices

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Lazzara, J., Bloom, M., &
Clinton-Lisell, V. (2024).
Renewable Assignments:
Comparing Faculty and
Student Perceptions. *Open
Praxis*, 16(4), pp. 514–525. DOI:
[https://doi.org/10.55982/
openpraxis.16.4.706](https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.4.706)

Open educational practices include the use and creation of open educational resources (OER; Cronin & MacLaren, 2018). OER are teaching and learning resources with usage permission through the 5R framework, which includes the ability to retain, reuse, revise, remix, and redistribute appropriately licensed materials (Heck et al., 2020; Wiley, n.d.). This emphasis on the 5Rs has encouraged educators to consider how pedagogical approaches can empower learners to engage with and contribute to the creation of knowledge. This process of knowledge creation with students is termed open pedagogy (Bali et al., 2020). With open pedagogy, students are tasked with demonstrating mastery of skills by creating artifacts with renewable value outside of the immediate educational context (Hegarty, 2015). Examples of open pedagogy assignments include creating websites, editing existing OER textbooks, making visuals, co-developing syllabi, preparing auxiliary materials such as question banks, and recording videos (Biddle & Clinton-Lisell, 2023; Clinton-Lisell & Gwozdz, 2023; Gilpin et al., 2023; Hilton et al., 2019, 2020; Kelly et al., in-press; McKenney et al., 2024; Schultz & Azadbakht, 2023). Wiley and Hilton (2018) propose that:

The function of copyright prohibits people from engaging in broad categories of activity (e.g., making copies or creating derivative works) without permission from a rights holder. If students learn by doing, and copyright makes it illegal to engage in certain things without a license, then copyright necessarily functions to limit how students can learn—the permissions to engage in the 5R activities that are granted in association with OER lift these restrictions (p. 135).

Based on the affordances of licensing, OER-enabled pedagogy enables freedom to engage in activities and more opportunities for learning than traditional copyrights that restrict what students are permitted to do with course materials (Wiley & Hilton, 2018). The benefits of students sharing their work beyond the course setting are not a new concept (e.g., Barak & Rafaeli, 2004; Kaufman, 2009; Tarantino et al., 2013). However, open licensing models like Creative Commons now provide a clear legal framework for sharing student-generated resources widely – across classes, institutions, and globally – without the limitations of “fair use” restrictions (Kim, 2007). Wiley et al. (2017) estimate that each semester, students collectively waste roughly 2 billion hours on assignments that are never used again. Seraphin et al. (2019) argue that by empowering students to co-create materials designed for broader sharing, instructors make their assignments less disposable and more impactful. In this space of OER-enabled pedagogy, faculty may involve students in assignments that leverage the permissions of open licensing to facilitate the sharing of creative works beyond the classroom (Van Allen & Katz, 2019). However, there is a need to consider whether openness in educational practices leads to meaningful learning (Koseoglu & Bozkurt, 2018). Without such inquiry, it is uncertain whether the opportunities afforded through OER-enabled pedagogy are beneficial in practice. Specifically, it is unclear how faculty and student perceptions of OER-enabled pedagogy compare with each other (Tillinghast, 2020). The gap in research on the comparison between student and faculty perceptions led to the current study. The purpose of this study is to examine and compare student and faculty perceptions of an OER-enabled pedagogy course project.

LITERATURE

A systematic review of empirical findings concluded that students generally have positive experiences with open pedagogy (Clinton-Lisell, 2021). Students report higher levels of motivation for open pedagogy projects compared to traditional assignments (e.g., exams or essays that only their professor reads; Clinton-Lisell & Gwozdz, 2023). Importantly, students view open pedagogy projects as providing more opportunities to engage in social justice advocacy than traditional assignments (Clinton-Lisell & Gwozdz, 2023; O'Reilly, 2024). Moreover, students express that they have more autonomy and a sense of pride in their work with open pedagogy, which may be due to opportunities to be involved in OER improvement and creation (Baran & AlZoubi, 2020; Clinton-Lisell & Kelly, 2024; Zhang et al., 2020). Interviews with students indicate they appreciate being able to help others by publicly sharing their work (Williams & Werth, 2021). Open pedagogy projects may provide opportunities for meaning

and cultural connections as students need to consider how to communicate with those who would benefit from their work (O'Reilly, 2024). Students generally indicate that they would recommend courses with open pedagogy projects to their peers (Williams, 2022).

Not all of the evidence regarding student experiences with open pedagogy is positive. Students may not understand the ethical issues involved in publicly sharing and licensing work and may be concerned about not providing and receiving appropriate attribution (Baran & Al Zoubi, 2020; Flinn, 2020). The creative and exploratory nature of open pedagogy projects may be uncomfortable, particularly for students accustomed to very clearly defined, traditional course assignments (Bonica et al., 2018). Students also expressed concern that they lack the expertise to create materials and may create materials with inaccuracies (Hilton et al., 2019). This could be due to a lack of self-efficacy (i.e., beliefs in one's own skills) as scholars (Hare, 2020). It should also be noted that student perceptions of open pedagogy projects vary depending on what the projects involve (Hilton et al., 2020). Students also may be overwhelmed by the logistics of creating and sharing projects depending on the complexity and number of technological tools involved (Zhang et al., 2020). Therefore, it is helpful to have focused examinations of a single course project and how students perceive it.

Faculty also tend to have positive experiences with open pedagogy (Clinton-Lisell, 2021). Faculty perceive open pedagogy projects as encouraging pride in students (Al Abri & Dabbagh, 2019). Moreover, faculty see that open pedagogy provides opportunities to personalize learning (Paskevicius & Irvine, 2019). Particularly important was the acknowledgment by faculty that open pedagogy may afford diverse, culturally relevant learning opportunities. Faculty also note that students may perceive their work as more valuable and important when it is publicly shared (Short et al., 2024). However, faculty have expressed concerns that students may be resistant to open pedagogy.

Moreover, faculty also express uncertainty about how to best support students in their open pedagogy projects (Cronin, 2017). Therefore, there is a need to better understand student experiences with open pedagogy so that projects are designed optimally for students. Furthermore, there is a lack of comparison between faculty and students for the same open pedagogy project. Such a comparison would be useful in determining whether the benefits faculty intend for students are indeed experienced by the students.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

Open pedagogy and related terms for similar approaches can be challenging to define as they vary between practices (Cronin & MacLaren, 2018). For clarity, this study followed the framework provided by Wiley and Hilton (2018) for what they define as OER-enabled pedagogy. This is based on a "continuum of criteria" that involves added value, public nature, and licensing of the materials produced by students. Their scale addresses the openness of assignments, ranging from "disposable" to "authentic" to "constructionist" and then, finally, to "renewable." They suggest a four-part test to determine the extent to which a specific teaching and learning practice qualifies as OER-enabled pedagogy):

1. Are students asked to create new artifacts (essays, poems, videos, songs, etc.) or revise/remix existing OER?
2. Does the new artifact have value beyond supporting the learning of its author?
3. Are students invited to publicly share their new artifacts or revised/remixed OER?
4. Are students invited to openly license their new artifacts or revised/remixed OER? (Wiley & Hilton, 2018, p. 137)

If the answer to each of these questions is "yes," the authors posit, then the assignment can be considered "renewable." Therefore, by following this framework, this study focused on comparing faculty and student perceptions of the added value of assignments that are renewable by their definition. According to this framework, the key distinguishing factor is not only the public nature of the work the students produce but precisely whether or not that work is potentially publishable under an open license according to the assignment requirements (Wiley & Hilton, 2018).

The purpose of this research study was to compare faculty and student perceptions about assignments that involve students in the creation or co-creation of OER and other learning artifacts. Their four-step framework for identifying an assignment as “renewable” and “OER-Enabled” informed this study (Wiley & Hilton, 2018). Additionally, their call for further research on whether students find renewable assignments more valuable, interesting, motivating, or rewarding than other forms of assessment aided the development of the online survey.

The following questions guided this current research:

- Research Question 1: How do faculty and student perceptions of the benefits of renewable assignments compare?
- Research Question 2: How do faculty and student perceptions of the drawbacks of renewable assignments compare?

METHODS

RESEARCH METHOD AND DESIGN

This study used a mixed-methods design to investigate the perceptions of a renewable assignment. This approach enabled a richer understanding of the phenomenon by combining and comparing insights from both quantitative and qualitative data.

The multi-phase assignment tasked students with creating an interactive guidebook focused on mental well-being for college students. In Phase 1, students collaborated in groups to write a chapter for the guidebook, choosing a topic related to their course materials. They were required to incorporate openly licensed research and local community resources. In Phase 2, groups used H5P, an open-source tool for creating interactive educational content, to design a component that would enhance the learning experience of their chosen topic (Magro, 2021). This interactive section incorporated various H5P tools and required a peer-reviewed reference. Finally, in Phase 3, students participated in a peer-review process, providing constructive feedback on the content, structure, and organization of their assigned peers' work. The overall goal was to create a comprehensive and engaging open-source resource to help college students better understand and manage their mental well-being while navigating the challenges of college life. The complete directions for the assignment and the final product are available online.

DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

An online survey was designed, consisting of both closed-ended and open-ended questions. Closed-ended questions asked students to rate the value and motivation of the renewable assignment compared to other kinds of assignments. Responses were on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, with 1 indicating much less than other assignments and 5 indicating much more than other assignments. Open-ended questions aimed to gain additional insights into participants' experiences and perspectives. Two parallel surveys were created, one designed for faculty and one for students. The questions related to the perception of the assignment's value, interest, motivation, and reward were closely worded between the faculty and student surveys. The surveys had four sections: four questions on a five-point Likert scale gauging perception, a set of four statements to be rated on a five-point Likert scale of agreement, open-ended questions about the potential benefits and drawbacks of renewable assignments, and a final section collecting demographic information. The faculty survey included Wiley and Hilton's (2018) four-part test to ensure the assignment given was categorized as renewable. The complete surveys are included in Appendix A (student) and Appendix B (faculty).

SAMPLING

All participants were undergraduate college students in the age group of 18–23 years old. In terms of gender identity, 45.8% reported they were women, 33.3% reported they were men, 4.2% reported they were non-binary, and 16.7% declined to respond. Reported ethnicity included 45.8% white, 16.7% Asian, 16.7% Hispanic/Latino, 4.2% Biracial, and 16.7% declined to respond. Lastly, 18% of the participants reported being first-generation college students.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

Descriptive statistics were calculated for closed-ended survey questions (see Table 1). One-sample *t*-tests were performed to investigate relationships between the faculty and student responses.

Data were also collected from two open-ended questions in the survey. The questions included: “What benefits did you find in completing the open/renewable assignment?” and “What do you see as the major possible drawbacks to this kind of assignment?” Thematic analysis, a qualitative research method suitable for smaller sample sizes (Braun & Clarke, 2006), was employed to analyze the textual responses.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

The study was approved and declared exempt by the Institutional Review Board (details withheld for review). All participants provided informed consent prior to their participation. Data were deidentified and stored securely to protect confidentiality.

FINDINGS

The first research question asked, “How do faculty and student perceptions of the benefits of renewable assignments compare?” We first addressed this question by conducting a one-sample *t*-test comparing the students’ responses to their instructor’s response. As can be seen in Table 1, the mean averages of the students’ responses were generally lower than that of their instructor. The differences were not statistically significant for the categories of value, interest, and motivation. However, the *t*-test results indicated that there was a significant difference between the ratings of the students and the instructor in the reward category. The instructor perceived the assignment to be more rewarding than that of their students.

	FACULTY (<i>n</i> = 1)	STUDENTS (<i>n</i> = 24)	<i>t</i> -TEST
Value			
Q1: How valuable do you think your students found/did you find the work on the renewable assignments?	4.00	3.83	−0.89
Q5: The renewable assignment was more valuable to my students than other kinds of assignments./I found the renewable assignment to be more valuable than other kinds of assignments	4.00	3.75	−1.19
Interest			
Q2: How interesting do you think your students found/ did you find the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?	4.00	3.75	−1.93
Q6: The renewable assignment was more interesting to my students than other kinds of assignments./I found the renewable assignment to be more interesting than other kinds of assignments.	4.00	3.88	
Motivation			−1.14
Q3: How motivating do you think your students found/ did you find the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?	4.00	3.58	
Q7: The renewable assignment was more motivating to my students than other kinds of assignments./I found the renewable assignments to be more motivating than other kinds of assignments.	4.00	3.63	−0.72
Reward			
Q4: How rewarding do you think your students found/ did you find the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?	5.00	3.71	−7.21***
Q8: The renewable assignment was more rewarding to my students than other kinds of assignments./I found the renewable assignment to be more interesting than other kinds of assignments.	5.00	3.83	−6.23***

Table 1 Comparison Survey for Students and Faculty.
Note: ****p* < .001.

We also compared student and faculty perceptions by examining the open-ended responses about the perceived benefits of the renewable assignment in the course. The coding of open-ended responses from the students about the benefits of the renewable assignment with examples is in [Table 2](#). The instructor's response is in [Table 4](#).

THEME	FREQUENCY	EXAMPLE
Valuable	5	"I enjoy doing this kind of assignment even if it takes a lot of time and effort. Also working in a wider audience made me think my work is more valuable to others."
Engaging	5	"I think it's better because you were able to talk about things that the class seemed passionate about. You didn't have to base what you taught on a book from 1993."
Deep-learning	4	"I learned a lot more due to a feeling that I needed to provide deep and well-informed information about my topic to others."
Teamwork	3	"Somebody had knowledge someone didn't know so they shared, and everybody's knowledge increased because of it."

Table 2 Examples and Frequency of Themes of Perceived Benefits.

N = 24.

The second research question asked, "How do faculty and student perceptions of the drawbacks of renewable assignments compare?" We addressed this question by examining the open-ended responses about the perceived drawbacks. The coding of open-ended responses from the students about the drawbacks of the renewable assignment with examples is in [Table 3](#). The instructor's response is in [Table 4](#).

THEME	FREQUENCY	EXAMPLE
Issues with group work	5	"Working in groups when you can't meet up is impossible."
Lack of motivation	4	"It was hard to motivate myself to continue working on the assignment because it was spread out over the whole semester."
Potential to cheat	3	"Students might cheat."
Complicated	2	"It can be kind of stressful and came across as complicated at first."

Table 3 Examples and Frequency of Themes of Perceived Drawbacks.

N = 24.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
Have you involved your students in open/renewable assignments before this semester?	Yes
If so, was it in this same course, a different course, or both?	Both
Were the primary learning materials in this course open educational resources?	Yes
Were students asked to create new artifacts or revise/remix existing OER as part of this assignment?	Yes
Did the new and/or adapted artifacts created by the students have value beyond supporting their learning as individuals?	Yes
Were students invited to publicly share their new artifacts or revised/remixed OER?	Yes
Were students invited to openly license their new artifacts or revised/remixed OER?	Yes
What benefits did your students find in completing the open/renewable assignment?	"Their work had a higher impact since it impacted more than just themselves. They are able to share this work as a part of a student portfolio as an example of good work that they have completed. They understand a bit more about Creative Commons permissions."
What do you see as the major possible drawbacks of this kind of assignment for your students?	"It was time-consuming. There was a large learning curve at the beginning. Some had trouble working with their group members. They did not understand the Creative Commons licensing at first."

Table 4 Faculty Reflection.

N = 1.

PERCEIVED BENEFITS OF RENEWABLE ASSIGNMENTS

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare the perceptions of students and their instructor for a renewable assignment. Our first research question asked how faculty and student perceptions of the benefits of renewable assignments compare. This was first addressed by examining quantitative responses regarding the value, interest, motivation, and reward of the renewable assignment compared to traditional assignments. The instructor ratings were higher than the average for the students but only significantly different in terms of how rewarding the assignment was. Importantly, student responses were, on average, above the scale midpoint, indicating more positive perceptions of the renewable assignment than the traditional assignments overall.

Qualitative analysis of open-ended responses provided further insights. Students frequently framed the benefits of renewable assignments in terms of engagement. Comments such as “I felt involved and like I was not just doing busy work” and “my work had an identifiable benefit and purpose” echo prior research findings that open pedagogy projects can enhance student motivation and sense of ownership (Clinton-Lisell & Gwozdz, 2023; Werth & Williams, 2021). The perceived value of contributing to a wider audience aligns with the notion of empowering learners to create knowledge with lasting impact beyond the classroom (Hegarty, 2015; Wiley et al., 2017).

Additionally, students reported learning benefits beyond the immediate course content. These ranged from practical skills development (“It educated me on how to write textbook style paper”) to personal growth (“I found out more about myself”) and the collaborative construction of knowledge (“everybody’s knowledge increased because of it”). Such findings support the idea that open pedagogy can foster diverse learning opportunities and facilitate meaningful knowledge exchange (Paskevicius & Irvine, 2019).

The instructor’s comments also emphasized the value of the wider audience afforded by renewable assignments, stating that students’ work had a “higher impact” and could be showcased in public portfolios. This aligns with previous research suggesting that faculty perceive open pedagogy as increasing the value and visibility of student work (Short et al., 2024). Moreover, the instructor’s observation that students gained a better understanding of Creative Commons permissions highlights the potential of these assignments to promote awareness and application of open licensing principles.

PERCEIVED DRAWBACKS OF RENEWABLE ASSIGNMENTS

The second research question compared the differences between faculty and student perceptions of the drawbacks associated with renewable assignments. The analysis of open-ended responses revealed both shared concerns and unique perspectives.

Both students and faculty identified the time-intensive nature of renewable assignments as a significant drawback. Students noted the challenge of sustaining motivation over an extended period, while the instructor acknowledged the “large learning curve” at the beginning of the assignment. The instructor’s observation that the renewable assignment was time-consuming echoes similar feedback from other faculty (Short et al., 2024). Additionally, both groups expressed concerns about group work dynamics. Students reported difficulties collaborating in virtual environments, while the instructor noted instances of students struggling to work effectively with their group members. Lastly, both students and the instructor alluded to the assignment’s complexity as a possible drawback. The theme of complexity came up in student responses and the instructor highlighted difficulties in students understanding Creative Commons licensing,

Notable differences emerged in the perceptions of academic integrity. A significant proportion of students voiced concerns about the potential for cheating in renewable assignments, a concern not directly mentioned by the instructor. One student noted the potential for “making up random stuff and still getting credit,” raising concerns about the lack of accountability in open-ended projects. This aligns with previous research highlighting the need for explicit

instruction on ethical considerations in open pedagogy (Baran & AlZoubi, 2020; Flinn, 2020). Incorporating discussions about plagiarism, attribution, and responsible reuse of information could address this concern and foster a deeper understanding of open licensing among students.

LIMITATIONS

The study's primary limitation lies in its limited scope, encompassing a single online course with a small sample size of students and only one faculty member. This narrow focus raises concerns about the generalizability of the findings to other educational contexts, as it may not adequately represent the diverse perspectives and experiences of students and faculty in different disciplines, course formats, or institutional settings. It is also important to note that even within the definition of renewable assignments, significant differences may still exist in each assignment that instructors deploy (Hilton et al., 2020). Lastly, the study's reliance on self-reported perceptions also introduces potential bias. While the findings offer valuable preliminary insights into the potential of renewable assignments, the limitations of this research underscore the need for further investigation. A future study with multiple instructors' ratings compared to their students would be useful to better understand the findings noted in this small pilot study.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, this study highlights the promising nature of renewable assignments. Both the students and the instructor reported that the value, interest, motivation, and reward of renewable assignments were somewhat better than those of traditional assignments. Students may see themselves more engaged when completing an assignment in which they create something that might be public and used by others Gilpin et al. (2023). Students expressed care about the quality of the work, not only in their comments about how engaging the work was but also in their concerns about cheating. However, the assignment was not without challenges. McNally and Christiansen (2019) acknowledge that "opening" an assignment may be complicated for both students and instructors. Similar to the results that Bloom (2019) found, students may simultaneously find renewable assignments exciting and frustrating. After all, completing any new assignment for students takes considerable work. Students may also not always perceive learning as enjoyable compared to something easier to complete.

The comparison of the faculty and student survey results suggests that students may be less likely to perceive assignments, renewable or not, as rewarding than faculty. It is also possible that students may not have fully understood how their work contributed to OER, which was also a limitation cited by Tillinghast et al. (2020). Al Abri and Dabbagh (2019) report that students may lack a complete understanding of OER, a precursor to understanding OER-enabled pedagogy. Katz and Van Allen (2020) offer a framework for instructors to follow when designing a new renewable assignment. Providing explicit instruction and guidance to students about the value and broader implications of their contributions to OER could be crucial for enhancing their perceived reward and overall engagement in renewable assignments.

Future research should expand beyond the current study's limitations by including multiple courses across various disciplines and educational levels, with a more extensive and diverse sample of both students and faculty. This approach would enhance the generalizability of findings and provide a deeper understanding of the factors influencing perceptions of renewable assignments. Additionally, longitudinal studies tracking student performance and engagement over time could illuminate the long-term impact of these assignments on learning outcomes. Exploring how individual differences, such as prior experience with OER, moderate the effectiveness of renewable assignments could further refine our understanding. These findings underscore the importance of educators thoughtfully designing renewable assignments, ensuring they are well-scaffolded, clearly communicated, and aligned with course objectives (Baran & AlZoubi, 2020). Fostering open communication between faculty and students is crucial for managing expectations, addressing challenges, and maximizing the benefits of renewable assignments. By addressing these gaps, future research can contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of renewable assignments and their potential to enhance learning and engagement in higher education.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Likert Scale – Less to More – 1 to 5 – Much Less to Much More

1. How valuable did you find the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?
2. How interesting did you find the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?
3. How motivating did you find the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?
4. How rewarding did you find the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?

Likert Scale – Agree with Statement – 1 to 5 – Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree

5. I found the renewable assignment to be more valuable than other kinds of assignments.
6. I found the renewable assignment to be more interesting than other kinds of assignments.
7. I found the renewable assignment to be more motivating than other kinds of assignments.
8. I found the renewable assignment to be more rewarding than other kinds of assignments.

Free answer (optional)

9. What benefits did you find in completing the open/renewable assignment?
10. What do you see as the major possible drawbacks of this kind of assignment?

APPENDIX B**FACULTY QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. How valuable do you think your students found the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?
2. How interesting do you think your students found the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?
3. How motivating do you think your students found the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?
4. How rewarding do you think your students found the work on the renewable assignment to be, as compared to other kinds of assignments?

Likert Scale – Agree with Statement – 1 to 5 – Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree

5. The renewable assignment was more valuable than other kinds of assignments.
6. The renewable assignment was more interesting than other kinds of assignments.
7. The renewable assignment was more motivating than other kinds of assignments.
8. The renewable assignment was more rewarding than other kinds of assignments.

Free answer (optional)

9. What benefits did your students find in completing the open/renewable assignment?
10. What do you see as the major possible drawbacks of this kind of assignment for your students?

ASSIGNMENT DETAILS

11. Have you involved your students in open/renewable assignments before this semester?
12. If so, was it in this same course, a different course, or both?
13. Were the primary learning materials in this course open educational resources?

14. Were students asked to create new artifacts or revise/remix existing OER as part of this assignment?
15. Did the new and/or adapted artifacts created by the students have value beyond supporting their learning as individuals?
16. Were students invited to publicly share their new artifacts or revised/remixed OER?
17. Were students invited to openly license their new artifacts or revised/remixed OER?

DATA ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

ETHICS AND CONSENT

IRB approval was acquired for this study by MCCCC IRB Protocol ID:2020-11-812, and the review was considered Exempt.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The assignment was designed along with Stephanie Green as a part of the UN Sustainable Development Goals Open Pedagogy Fellowship.

FUNDING INFORMATION

This paper was funded by the Open Education Group and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation. We thank the University of North Dakota Alumni Association for supporting Dr. Clinton-Lisell's effort on the manuscript through the Rose Isabella Kelly Fischer Professorship.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS (CREDIT)

Julie Lazzara; formal analysis, project administration, writing—original draft preparation, writing—review and editing. Matthew Bloom: Conceptualization, supervision, methodology, investigation, data curation, visualization, writing—original draft preparation; Virginia Clinton-Lisell: writing—review and editing. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

AUTHOR NOTES

This paper was reviewed, edited, and refined with the assistance of Gemini (Pro model as of May 2024), complementing the human editorial process. The human authors critically assessed and validated the content to maintain academic rigor. The authors also assessed and addressed potential biases inherent in the AI-generated content. The final version of the paper is the sole responsibility of the human authors (Bozkurt, 2024).

AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS

Julie Lazzara  orcid.org/0000-0001-5870-0841
Paradise Valley Community College, USA

Matthew Bloom  orcid.org/0000-0002-5080-1784
Scottsdale Community College, USA

Virginia Clinton-Lisell  orcid.org/0000-0002-4705-2217
University of North Dakota, USA

- Al Abri, M. H., & Dabbagh, N. (2019). Testing the intervention of OER renewable assignments in a college course. *Open Praxis*, 11(2), 195–209. <https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.11.2.916>
- Bali, M., Cronin, C., & Jhangiani, R. S. (2020). Framing open educational practices from a social justice perspective. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 2020(1). <https://doi.org/10.5334/jime.565>
- Barak, M., & Rafaeli, S. (2004). Online question-posing and peer-assessment as means for web-based knowledge sharing in learning. *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, 61(1), 84–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2003.12.005>
- Baran, E., & AlZoubi, D. (2020). Affordances, challenges, and impact of open pedagogy: Examining students' voices. *Distance Education*, 41(2), 230–244. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2020.1757409>
- Biddle, A. M., & Clinton-Lisell, V. (2023). "The pictures allowed me to connect to the material more": Student perceptions of a diversity-focused open pedagogy assignment. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 9(4), 405–418. <https://doi.org/10.1037/stl0000385>
- Bloom, M. (2019). Assessing the impact of "open pedagogy" on student skills mastery in first-year composition. *Open Praxis*, 11(4), 343–353. <https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.11.4.1025>
- Bonica, M., Judge, R., Bernard, C., & Murphy, S. (2018). Open pedagogy benefits to competency development: From sage on the stage to guy in the audience. *Journal of Health Administration Education*, 35(1), 9–27. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327670570>
- Bozkurt, A. (2024). GenAI et al.: Cocreation, authorship, ownership, academic ethics and integrity in a time of generative AI. *Open Praxis*, 16(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.1.654>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Clinton-Lisell, V. (2021). Open Pedagogy: A systematic review of empirical findings. *Journal of Learning for Development*, 8(2), 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.56059/jl4d.v8i2.511>
- Clinton-Lisell, V., & Gwozdz, L. (2023). Understanding student experiences of renewable and traditional assignments. *College Teaching*, 71(2), 125–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2023.2179591>
- Clinton-Lisell, V., & Kelly, A. E. (2024). Are scientific memes motivating and does public sharing affect motivation? *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, 23(1), 26–42. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14757257231197359>
- Cronin, C. (2017). Openness and praxis: Exploring the use of open educational practices in higher education. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 18(5), 15–34. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v18i5.3096>
- 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>
- Flinn, C. (2020). *Trades students' perceptions of their experiences in the co-creation of OER*. (Unpublished dissertation). Royal Roads University
- Gilpin, S., Rollag Yoon, S., & Lazzara, J. (2023). Exploring open pedagogy in online community college settings: Enhancing equitable access, engagement, and student persistence. *Online Learning*, 27(4), 448–375. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v27i4.4031>
- Hare, S. (2020). A critical take on OER practices: Interrogating commercialization, colonialism, and content. In M. Bali, C. Cronin, L. Czerniewicz, R. DeRosa, & R. Jhangiani (Eds.), *Open at the margins*. Pressbooks. <https://press.rebus.community/openatthemargins/chapter/a-critical-take-on-oer-practices-interrogatingcommercialization-colonialism-and-content/>
- Heck, T., Kullmann, S., Hiebl, J., Schröder, N., Otto, D., & Sander, P. (2020). Designing open informational ecosystems on the concept of open educational resources. *Open Education Studies*, 2(1), 252–264. <https://doi.org/10.1515/edu-2020-0130>
- Hegarty, B. (2015). Attributes of open pedagogy: A model for using open educational resources. *Educational Technology*, 55(4), 3–13. http://www.fachportal-paedagogik.de/fis_bildung/suche/fis_set.html?Fid=A30547
- Hilton, J., Hilton, B., Ikahihifo, T. K., Chaffee, R., Darrow, J., Guilmett, J., & Wiley, D. (2020). Identifying student perceptions of different instantiations of Open Pedagogy. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 21(4), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v21i4.4895>
- Hilton, J., Wiley, D., Chaffee, R., Darrow, J., Guilmett, J., Harper, S., & Hilton, B. (2019). Student perceptions of open pedagogy: An exploratory study. *Open Praxis*, 11(3), 275–288. <https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.11.3.973>
- Katz, S., & Van Allen, J. (2020). Evolving into the open: A framework for collaborative design of renewable assignments. In A. Clifton & K. D. Hoffman (Eds.), *Open pedagogy approaches*. <https://milnepublishing.geneseo.edu/openpedagogyapproaches/chapter/evolving-into-the-open-a-framework-for-collaborative-design-of-renewable-assignments/>
- Kaufman, D. K. (2009). A teacher educator writes and shares: Student perceptions of a publicly literate life. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(3), 338–350. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109336544>
- Kelly, A. E., Laurin, J. N., & Clinton-Lisell, V. (in-press). Making psychology's hidden figures visible using Open Educational Resources: A replication and extension study. *Teaching of Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00986283221108129>

- Kim, M. (2007). The Creative Commons and copyright protection in the digital era: Uses of Creative Commons licenses. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 187–209. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00392.x>
- Koseoglu, S., & Bozkurt, A. (2018). An exploratory literature review on open educational practices. *Distance Education*, 39(4), 441–461. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2018.1520042>
- Magro, J. (2021). HSP. *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA*, 109(2), 351–354. <https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2021.1204>
- McKenney, E. A., Gates, T. A., Goller, C. C., Tully, D., Leggett, Z., Lupek, M., Cross, W., & Krieg, C. (2024). Strategies to empower students through open pedagogy and citizen science. *The International Journal of Open Educational Resources*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.18278/ijoe.5.1.5>
- McNally, M. B., & Christiansen, E. G. (2019). Open enough? Eight factors to consider when transitioning from closed to open resources and courses: A conceptual framework. *First Monday*, 24(6). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v24i6.9180>
- O'Reilly, J. (2024). Exploring learners' perceptions of an open renewable assignment. [Doctoral dissertation, Athabasca University] <https://dt.athabasca.ca/jspui/handle/10791/453>
- Paskevicius, M., & Irvine, V. (2019). Open education and learning design: Open pedagogy in praxis. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 2019(1). <https://doi.org/10.5334/jime.512>
- Schultz, T., & Azadbakht, E. S. (2023). Exploring open pedagogy in a librarian-taught honors course. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 17(1), 221–237. <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2023.17.1.2>
- Seraphin, S. B., Grizzell, J. A., Kerr-German, A., Perkins, M. A., Grzanka, P. R., & Hardin, E. E. (2019). A conceptual framework for non-disposable assignments: Inspiring implementation, innovation, and research. *Psychology Learning & Teaching*, 18(1), 84–97. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1475725718811711>
- Short, C. R., Hilton, B., Hilton III, J., Wiley, D., Chaffee, R., Guilmett, J., & Darrow, J. (2024). Higher education instructors' perceptions of open pedagogy: an exploratory study of open pedagogy definitions in practice. *Open Learning: The Journal of Open, Distance and e-Learning*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680513.2024.2334237>
- Tarantino, K., McDonough, J., & Hua, M. (2013). Effects of student engagement with social media on student learning: A review of literature. *The Journal of Technology in Student Affairs*, 1(8), 1–8. <https://www.studentaffairs.com/Customer-Content/www/CMS/files/Journal/Effects-Of-Student-Engagement-With-Social-Media.pdf>
- Tillinghast, B. (2020). Developing an Open Educational Resource and Exploring OER-Enabled Pedagogy in Higher Education. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 8(2), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.8.2.09>
- Tillinghast, B., Fialkowski, M. K., & Draper, J. (2020). Exploring Aspects of Open Educational Resources Through OER-Enabled Pedagogy. *Frontiers in Education*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00076>
- Van Allen, J., & Katz, S. (2019). Developing open practices in teacher education: An example of integrating OER and developing renewable assignments. *Open Praxis*, 11(3), 311–319. <https://doi.org/10.5944/openpraxis.11.3.972>
- Werth, E., & Williams, K. (2021). What motivates students about open pedagogy? Motivational regulation through the lens of Self-Determination theory. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 22(3), 34–54. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v22i3.5373>
- Wiley, D. (n.d.). Defining the “open” in open content and open educational resources. Retrieved from <http://opencontent.org/definition/>
- Wiley, D., & Hilton III, J. (2018). Defining OER-enabled pedagogy. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v19i4.3601>
- Wiley, D., Webb, A., Weston, S., & Tonks, D. (2017). A preliminary exploration of the relationships between student-created OER, sustainability, and students' success. *The International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 18(4). <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v18i4.3022>
- Williams, C. (2022). Student perceptions of Open Pedagogy and community-engaged service learning. In *Active Learning—Research and Practice for STEAM and Social Sciences Education*. IntechOpen. <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.107099>
- Williams, K., & Werth, E. (2021). Student selection of content licenses in OER-enabled pedagogy: An exploratory study. *Journal of Copyright in Education and Librarianship*, 5(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.17161/jcel.v5i1.13881>
- Zhang, X., Tlili, A., Nascimbeni, F., Burgos, D., Huang, R., Chang, T. W., ... & Khribi, M. K. (2020). Accessibility within open educational resources and practices for disabled learners: A systematic literature review. *Smart Learning Environments*, 7, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-019-0113-2>

TO CITE THIS ARTICLE:

Lazzara, J., Bloom, M., & Clinton-Lisell, V. (2024). Renewable Assignments: Comparing Faculty and Student Perceptions. *Open Praxis*, 16(4), pp. 514–525. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55982/openpraxis.16.4.706>

Submitted: 17 May 2024

Accepted: 02 June 2024

Published: 29 November 2024

COPYRIGHT:

© 2024 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

Open Praxis is a peer-reviewed open access journal published by International Council for Open and Distance Education.