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Abstract

There is a common classroom refrain, “Don’t use Wikipedia; it’s unreliable.” Unfortunately, this simple dismissal of the world’s largest repository of information fails to engage students in a critical conversation about how knowledge within Wikipedia is constructed and shared. Wikipedia is available in almost 300 languages, it is the top result in most Google searches, and it provides free, well-sourced, information to millions of people every day. However, despite these positives, there is uneven geographic, historical, and cultural representation; there are well-known information gaps related to women, gender, and sexual identity; and the majority of Wikipedia editors are white, Western, men. Engaging students in complex conversations about this information source is one way to improve students’ information literacy skills. In 2019 we decided to meet students where they are by developing a two-credit course, Wikipedia and Information Equity, at Oregon State University that centers and critically examines Wikipedia as an information source and as a community of editors co-creating public knowledge. This article shares our experience teaching this two-credit course three times, with the ultimate goal of providing a template and starting point from which other instructors can develop similar courses and curricula about information equity through the lens of Wikipedia.
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Meet Students Where They Are: Centering Wikipedia in the Classroom

I remember that in almost every class in elementary, middle, and some of high school, I was told that, “Wikipedia is not a reliable source,” and I treated it as such. — Student

I always heard it was not to be trusted and that it was a bad source. But I use Wikipedia almost daily now.... I never outright cite a wiki page, but I use it as a sort of starting point. — Student

Even though people make Wikipedia into a joke or advise that we don't use the site as a credible source, it's almost always the first link to click on when searching something on the Internet. For me, this makes me want to click on it because it's right there. — Student

The popularity of Wikipedia is well-known, yet in the United States teachers, instructors and professors rarely have in-depth discussions about this information source with their students. Instead, they dismiss it as unreliable or not credible. Experiences like this are reflected in a recent US, multi-year, qualitative study of 175 students across six educational stages (elementary school, middle school, high school, community college, undergraduate, graduate), which found students, at the lower grade levels, had good/bad binary opinions about Wikipedia (Valenza, 2019). As students progressed into middle school and high school, Wikipedia played a “pervasive role in student’s workflow, but that role is often covert” (Valenza, 2019, So what? section). Negative messaging about Wikipedia from teachers and instructors at the K-12 level pushes student use of Wikipedia underground; as a result, students arrive at the university with little to no understanding of how Wikipedia works.

In 2019, knowing that students use Wikipedia, we, two librarians, developed an Honors College course at Oregon State University that centers and critically examines Wikipedia as both an information source and as a community of editors co-creating public knowledge. Although librarians have collaborated with discipline-specific faculty in the undergraduate classroom, we are unaware of any credit-bearing courses centering Wikipedia that have been solely developed and delivered by librarians. This article shares our experience teaching this
two-credit course three times, with the ultimate goal of providing a template and starting point from which other instructors can develop similar courses and curricula about information equity through the lens of Wikipedia.

**Background**

In our course, each student selects and creates a *Wikipedia* article, in order to engage with the *Wikipedia* community and share in the production of knowledge, which turns *Wikipedia* into a powerful teaching tool. A review of the literature, outside of librarianship, shows that many faculty, across various disciplines, have found success in teaching with *Wikipedia*. For example, Vetter (2013, 2018) and Vetter, McDowell, and Stewart (2019), argued that *Wikipedia*-based writing assignments are a type of service-learning or community-engaged pedagogy that increases motivation and a sense of civic engagement. Sweeney (2012) wrote that turning students from *Wikipedia* consumers to producers changes their relationship with *Wikipedia* and increases their information literacy skills. Ramirez and Marquez (2021) used *Wikipedia* to decolonize their classroom by having students claim authority, develop ownership of knowledge, forge identities as public scholars, and develop civic responsibility. And Lockett (2020) claimed, “if educators are committed to social justice, they will encourage students to edit *Wikipedia* as practical method for learning how to be leaders that advocate for equitable knowledge production in the twenty-first century.” (The Liberatory Potential of *Wikipedia* Editing section).

Many university and college instructors and professors have incorporated a *Wikipedia* editing assignment into their courses. In the US and Canada, Wiki Education (WikiEdu.org) began facilitating *Wikipedia* assignments in higher education through the *Wikipedia* Student Program (WSP). The WSP provides a specialized curriculum that guides students in editing *Wikipedia* via online modules. Instructors and students track progress through an online dashboard as modules are completed and *Wikipedia* contributions—in the instructor’s area of subject expertise—are added. In this way, Wiki Education has facilitated the contributions of 91,000 students via the WSP since 2010 (*Wiki Education Dashboard*, 2021). Although most instructors using the WikiEdu dashboard are disciplinary faculty, some, like us, are librarians. Librarians can, and have, taken a collaborative, supportive, and/or lead role in using *Wikipedia* as a pedagogical teaching tool in the undergraduate classroom.
There have been several recent articles and book chapters published about collaborations between librarians and disciplinary faculty. For example, at McGill University, two subject librarians collaborated with a professor in the field of educational and counseling psychology to create and manage a Wikipedia assignment (Kingsland & Isuster, 2020). A librarian and media studies professor at Temple University worked together to develop and manage Wikipedia assignments in courses like LGBTQ Media Representation and Technology and Culture (De Voe & Shaw, 2021). Lott and Sullivan (2021), an anthropology professor and a librarian at Southern Methodist University, created a Wikipedia assignment for an upper-level anthropology course, Gender, Sex, and Sexuality: A Global Perspective. At American University of Central Asia, two librarians, a sociology professor, and political science professor worked together in two courses, Introduction to Gender Studies and State and Society (Bekbalaeva et al., 2021). Finally, an information science professor, a librarian, and a Wikimedian, collaborated to deliver the course DigiComp: Core Competencies for Digital Citizenship at University College Dublin (Fulton et al., 2021).

The Course: Wikipedia and Information Equity

The course has been offered annually since 2019 through the University Honors College (UHC) as a colloquium. Each year we must reapply to teach our two-credit course because each year the Honors College "creates an entirely new curriculum...featuring some of OSU’s most inspiring teachers and serving many of OSU’s most talented and motivated undergraduates” (Oregon State University Honors College, n.d.). UHC students come from all majors at the university, and they must take 12 colloquium credits before they graduate.

Not only do we center Wikipedia in this course, but we also use the concept of information equity to frame the classroom readings and discussion. In the field of education, equity often refers to the concept of fairness (Great Schools Partnership, 2016). According to Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, all people have the right to “seek, receive and impart information and ideas” (United Nations, 1948). However, despite this fundamental human right, inequities in information creation and access persist because of numerous factors including English language hegemony, expensive paywalls, slow or no Internet access, censorship, and continued colonization (Bridges & McElroy, 2015). In our course, we explore these information inequities within Wikipedia. For example, we highlight language disparities between English Wikipedia and smaller language Wikipedias, such as Igbo.
Wikipedia or Catalan Wikipedia; we discuss the gender imbalance in editor-counts and in the number of biographical articles about women; and we explore how censorship of Wikipedia by governments and individual actors is used to silence dissent and diversity of opinion.

Each year students have been graded on participation and three assignments: (1) a short final reflective essay, (2) creating or substantially expanding a Wikipedia article of their choosing, and (3) final presentation. The learning outcomes appear in the course syllabus and are discussed on the first day of class. They are:

- Formulate ideas about the role of Wikipedia in society.
- Develop writing skills to communicate academic research to a public audience effectively.
- Develop criteria for evaluating Wikipedia articles and other online information.
- Recognize the importance of open access information.

By using Wikipedia as the lens to view information equity, students come to understand the value of a freely available and vetted information source, especially in an accessible language. Not only do they see the value of Wikipedia, but they are also able to recognize the impact they have on the public as Wikipedia editors.

The first time we taught the course, in 2019, it was in-person, but subsequent courses, in 2020 and 2021, were delivered online via Zoom due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Our university is on the quarter system, so each course was eleven weeks in length. Every iteration of the course was different in terms of the number of class meetings and synchronous versus asynchronous sessions. In 2019 the course met twice a week in person. In 2020, with the last-minute shift to online instruction, we decided only to hold synchronous sessions for the first and last classes, and the rest of the weeks were asynchronous. In 2021, based on feedback from the previous class, we decided to hold synchronous classes, with the first half of each class dedicated toward the topic for the week and the second half as an optional “lab” time for students to ask questions about their WikiEdu modules or Wikipedia article assignment.

During the 2020 course, we piloted an annotation tool, Hypothesis (https://web.hypothes.is/), to use as a substitute for in-person discussions about readings.
Instead of prompts in a discussion forum, Hypothesis led to more organic reactions to the task of reading. Students could highlight, comment, and respond to their classmates within a PDF of the weekly reading. Hypothesis was integrated into our university's Learning Management System (LMS), and students could use the tool without signing up for a separate account. Students who were less prone to speak up in class could still contribute to the discussion via Hypothesis, and we could then share their contributions during our weekly class sessions. The pilot of Hypothesis was successful, and we consequently used it in 2021. The student quotations we have used in this article were pulled from Hypothesis. In some ways Hypothesis is similar to a Wikipedia talk page (also known as discussion pages)—the conversation takes place online and is in response to key elements of an agreement or disagreement in relation to an article.

Getting to Know the Students

In our experience, students from all academic disciplines are interested in learning more about Wikipedia; as evidence, we have had students enroll in our course who were majoring in engineering, education, humanities, computer science, business, health, and biology, just to name a few. Although students are interested in learning more about Wikipedia, most students have come to our course with little to no understanding of editing Wikipedia. So, we begin each course with a brief survey about students’ prior experiences with Wikipedia and technology. We then share the results of the survey in the second class (but remove identifying names). In this way, students can see that most of their peers are not experienced with Wikipedia and are not tech experts. And we, as the instructors, can identify the individual students who may need some extra hand-holding in the process of learning wikicode. The survey we administer is relatively brief, and we have included responses to three of the questions in Table 1 (aggregate data from the three courses for a total of 32 responses).
Table 1: Wikipedia and Technology Experiences Survey Results (N=32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before enrolling in this course had you ever edited a Wikipedia article?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your experience with HTML?</td>
<td>What’s HTML?</td>
<td>No experience</td>
<td>Beginner</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Definitely not</th>
<th>Probably not</th>
<th>Might or might not</th>
<th>Probably yes</th>
<th>Definitely yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you consider yourself a “techie” person?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weekly Course Topics**

The course is structured to highlight a different topic related to *Wikipedia* and the Internet each week. We begin with topics that introduce students to *Wikipedia* as a community of editors by focusing on Internet trolls and neutral point of view, then transition to readings and conversations about *Wikipedia* and information equity, and end the course by bringing in an outside speaker to discuss the broader topic of internet privacy. The weekly readings and podcasts (see Appendix) critically examine various aspects of how information is created and curated in *Wikipedia*, and we encourage students to build their own opinions on the relevance, quality of information, and usefulness of *Wikipedia* in their academic careers.

**Week 1: Course Introduction and Internet Trolls**

It may seem depressing to start a course with readings about Internet trolling. However, this prepares students for the negative side of the *Wikipedia* editing community, possible trolling. The readings for the week focus on specific cases of harassment in *Wikipedia* and steps the Wikimedia Foundation has taken to address the issue. In each iteration of the course (2019–2021) students have expressed dismay that trolls exist in the *Wikipedia* community and this revelation seems to pique their interest in learning more about the editorial process that usually remains invisible to the average *Wikipedia* user.

This week the students are introduced to the WikiEdu Dashboard and create their *Wikipedia* accounts. Creating their usernames relates to the topic of trolls, as trolls may
target usernames that identify an editor as part of a marginalized demographic. We also have a discussion about how to best support each other in case of trolling during the course timeline. This discussion culminates in the shared creation of community guidelines for everyone in the course.

Week 2: Neutral Point of View

This week the students learn more about the background of Wikipedia and the “Five Pillars.” One of the pillars of Wikipedia is that all content must reflect a neutral point of view. This is an essential tenet for students to understand because it might influence their article topic choice. Students are assigned to read the Wikipedia article on Neutral Point of View (NPOV), and the in-class discussion focuses on how this principle affects how content is written in Wikipedia. As an in-class group activity, students are assigned one of two Wikipedia articles that have been marked as not adhering to the NPOV guideline. Students read through the corresponding Wikipedia talk pages to see how editors have debated the NPOV guidelines.

Students go through training modules in the WikiEdu Dashboard to learn how to evaluate articles and sources. They learn about the characteristics of a good article, the importance of citing information, and what constitutes plagiarism in Wikipedia. In addition, there is a module that goes over the more technical aspects of how to edit a Wikipedia article. Talk pages are introduced, and students are shown how talk pages can be used as an indicator of the quality of an article and as a discussion page for Wikipedians to give feedback to one another. Talk pages also demonstrate the concept of scholarship as conversation in a venue outside of academia. Talk pages can serve as a form of peer review for Wikipedia articles and also demonstrate to students how Wikipedia pages are not edited in isolation but as part of a larger community.

Week 3: Disinformation and Reliable Sources

The topic of disinformation, misinformation, and fake news has been popular in many fields of librarianship. Classes and workshops on fake news have been growing in popularity over the past few years. Wikipedia is not exempt from people trying to spread disinformation, knowingly or unknowingly. Because anyone can edit Wikipedia, many teachers have deemed the website not credible over the years. The readings for this week focus on the work Wikipedia is doing to battle disinformation and a chapter from a textbook on college research that focuses on disinformation. This week the students learn more about the
credibility of the information present in Wikipedia and how disinformation can hinder their research as they start to think about writing their articles. During class time, students work in groups on a lateral reading activity to learn more about fact-checking and how it can be used to evaluate information found on the Internet.

The WikiEdu module for this week is relevant to the discussion of disinformation and reliable sources. Students learn about the technical aspects of including citations in a Wikipedia article and the types of reliable sources that should be included in an article. Students are also expected to come to class with a tentative article topic.

Week 4: The Internet and Inequality

This week we focus on information creation and dissemination. The readings for this week focus on how content in Wikipedia, and on the Internet, is skewed toward a white, Western perspective and how that affects communities outside this demographic. Many students are surprised when they learn how much content in Wikipedia is skewed and how policies such as “notability” and “no original research” make it difficult to change the status quo. Differences in policies between different language Wikipedias are introduced to prepare students for the guest lecture the following week on languages in Wikipedia.

As students start to research and write their own Wikipedia articles, the WikiEdu module goes more in-depth on plagiarism and how to avoid it. Students also learn more about how to use the sandbox feature to start their article drafts.

Week 5: Languages

While most of our course content is focused on English Wikipedia, we wanted to acknowledge the work being done in other languages. This week, we invite a guest speaker from the Wikimedia Foundation to bring their insider perspective of the various Wikimedia projects that aim to create and improve content in non-English languages. In addition, the speaker provides insight on how English Wikipedia can benefit from the content from other languages and vice versa. Students learn more about various tools to help with translation, which might be helpful if they decide to translate an article instead of writing a new article for their final assignment. The perspective provided by our guest speaker helps students expand their outlook and consider what is available to non-English speakers on Wikipedia and the Internet, and what content is geared to a non-Western audience. Students also examine their role as creators of information in the United States and how their topics fit in the information landscape.
There is no WikiEdu training module this week, but we expect the students to spend their time researching and writing. Students are encouraged to ask for help if they are stuck on either process. We remind them that the following week is peer review, and they will need to have something to share with their classmates.

Week 6: Gender Bias

When discussing gender bias in Wikipedia, two separate but related issues are the content gender gap and the editor gender gap. Both issues are well-documented and researched areas. The articles for this week include an examination of the technical infrastructure of Wikipedia to see how even the technical atmosphere of Wikipedia contributes to the lack of women participating in Wikipedia. Trolling and harassment are also brought back into the discussion as we consider how participation in Wikipedia may be hindered when there are so many barriers in place. Wikimedia projects like Women in Red and Art + Feminism are introduced. Students learn about the efforts of women and allies to increase representation in Wikipedia and make the environment a more welcoming place.

This week the students peer review at least one of their classmates' articles. Peer review is an important part of any writing assignment, Wikipedia articles included. The feedback received from classmates during the peer review process serves two purposes: first, students are able to make changes based on any feedback related to grammatical errors; and second, any feedback on content serves as a proxy for receiving feedback on a talk page. The WikiEdu Dashboard has a great tool to assign student peer reviewers for an article randomly. The module for the week goes over what helpful critique looks like.

Week 7: Algorithms

A module on algorithms may seem out of place when discussing Wikipedia, but this week the class continues examining the larger online environment that cannot be separated from Wikipedia. Wikipedia is one of the first results in many online searches. Google uses Wikipedia to fill its infobox in search results. We examine how algorithms work and discuss the neutrality argument. The readings for this week go into the history of algorithms and how bots have changed the editing landscape of Wikipedia. Students consider how algorithms have affected their online interactions. As a fun in-class activity, students perform various searches to see how algorithms are tailored to their personal search histories.
This week the students focus on completing their peer review feedback and responding to any feedback they receive. Students also go through a module on moving their articles out of their sandbox and into the publicly accessible article mainspace.

Week 8: Censorship

Like many websites, Wikipedia has a long history of being censored by various governments. Until the HTTPS protocol was implemented, specific articles could be blocked by governments. However, once the switch happened, there was only the option to block the entire site. Our guest speaker, an international lawyer, focuses on human rights in the digital environment and leads the class with information on various censorship cases in Wikipedia. She discusses the different cultural contexts when considering censorship and how those contexts affect the information that is censored or not in Wikipedia.

As we near the end of the term, students continue to improve their articles. The final training module explains how to add images or media files to their articles. Adding images or other files is optional, but many students have enjoyed going through this extra step. This process also reintroduces copyright and how to find images that can be freely used. For some students, the lack of relevant images motivates them to upload their photos to Wikimedia Commons and use the respective images in their articles.

This week is also when the reflective essay is due. The assignment is purposefully kept short and informal. We ask the students to be honest and reflect on new information learned in the class, the article research and writing process, and any observations they would like to share. The essay also provides a foundation for the class presentation. Although this essay is not an assessment tool, we have discovered that students have been thoughtful and offered helpful feedback on the class, more so than a typical course evaluation form. The essays have been an avenue where students have relayed any connections to the learning goals. As one student from the 2020 class wrote, “I found so many stub articles that relate to my major, and now I feel empowered to work on them.... The only thing I fear is that I will lose my access to OSU’s library and the connected library systems after I graduate; this is why we need organizations like Wikipedia so that we can access information without a $60 paywall for each article.”

Week 9: Privacy

A guest speaker, a librarian who volunteers with the Library Freedom Project, leads a discussion on privacy in the digital age for the last week of course content. Students may not
be aware of how editors have privacy concerns in Wikipedia. After all, usernames help keep people anonymous, unlike editing without an account, which results in one’s IP address being tracked. The readings for this week discuss mass surveillance by the National Security Agency (NSA) and how this act can lead to a chilling effect for Wikipedia users reading and editing certain articles.

There is no training module this week, but students are expected to publish their articles in the mainspace. This part can be tricky, as other Wikipedia editors challenge some work published by the students, and this process can be discouraging.

Week 10: Wrap-up and Final Presentations

The last day of class is a bit of show-and-tell with the students. Each student has three to five minutes to present their article. In the past, students have shared challenges they encountered, fun anecdotes, and future Wikipedia editing plans. Some students repeat what they mentioned in their reflective essay but usually add additional information. At this point in the term, students have had about a week to see how other Wikipedia editors have received their work, and students are often excited to share how their articles have been improved since publication. Some students also experience frustration and disappointment if other editors have challenged their work. Successful completion of the assignment is not contingent on the content being accepted by other editors. Instead, we discuss how the article might be changed to appease concerns from other editors. We do not administer a final exam for this course, so this is the last meeting with the students.

Thoughts for Future Improvement

We have taught this course three times, and each time we have reworked the syllabus based on feedback from our students, our desire to continually improve, and an unanticipated move to online learning. In the future, one change we hope to implement is a more formal assessment. We currently do a pre-survey at the beginning of the course to assess student familiarity with technology and Wikipedia, but we would like to do a more in-depth assessment of their information literacy skills and habits. Their reflection essays provide some data on their learning process, growth, and new discoveries, but the parameters of this assignment do not necessarily guarantee that the same information is collected from all students. Moving forward we would also like to include a post-survey at the end of the
course to better gauge student growth and change in perceptions of Wikipedia. A similar data collection method by Ramirez and Marquez (2021) found that students generally felt more satisfied with their work on Wikipedia assignments than on other writing assignments and by the end of the course felt empowered as scholars and writers. Our students have expressed similar sentiments in passing, and we would like to formally collect this data.

Feedback from course evaluations has been primarily positive. One area for improvement is facilitating effective online discussions. Many students told us they enjoyed hearing from their classmates on the various topics, but they wished there had been equal participation from their peers. We found leading discussions in a Zoom environment challenging, and many of our teaching colleagues have shared similar struggles. In the future we will work to incorporate more small groups and partnered discussions.

A part of the course that has been difficult in every iteration has been the peer review process. During week 6 of the course, students are assigned a peer review module in their WikiEdu Dashboard. Instructors have the option to use the built-in peer review assignment that has guidelines on the type of feedback that is useful to their fellow editors. The module goes through the process of peer review in Wikipedia and offers guidelines on what kind of feedback to give their classmates. Students are reminded that peer review is approaching and that participating successfully means having a draft available for their fellow editors to review. However, this process has many downsides. Even with reminders, not all students have content in their sandbox ready for review. Possible approaches for future classes include requiring the peer review work to be done during class time, building in more writing and research time, and having the peer review process include a review of ideas and sources that are not yet in the student’s sandbox.

One of the most crucial improvements we will make in the future is in regard to the content of the course. Much of the research on systemic bias in English Wikipedia has been done on the gender gap. Work on racial gaps and the treatment of BIPOC editors has been lacking (Adams et al., 2019; Bjork-James, 2021; Pharao Hansen, 2016; “Racial Bias on Wikipedia,” 2021; Smith, 2021). As creators of this course, we also focused more on gender bias and not enough on race and racism in Wikipedia. As we critically examine our course to prepare for a future term, we will include race and racism as a central topic. While the research was lacking for many years, new information is constantly being published. In addition, in 2020, for the first time, the Wikimedia Foundation asked about race and ethnicity when surveying active participants (Wikimedia Foundation, 2021).
Similarly, after an assessment of the readings in 2021, we realized the course syllabus included very few perspectives from BIPOC voices. The majority of course content (readings, videos, and podcasts) was created by white authors/creators, and we have made it our goal to include more work by authors/creators of color for when we next teach this course.

Course Adaptations

For librarians or other instructors that are interested in adapting this course, we are glad to see you join us! *Wikipedia* as an educational tool is underutilized. We understand that not every institution will allow librarians to teach a term-long course, so here we suggest a few alternatives:

- Partnering with a disciplinary faculty member on a *Wikipedia* assignment (see the relevant examples in the background section of this article).
- A one-shot edit-sprint focused on adding citations to a *Wikipedia* article (Oliver, 2015).
- An exercise to evaluate a *Wikipedia* article to check for biases, relevant content, and citations (Oliver, 2015).
- Using *Wikipedia* at the start of a one-shot session to do background reading on a potential topic.

While our *Wikipedia* course was initially taught in-person, we have successfully adapted it for an online environment. The pivot to online teaching in March 2020 was sudden, but we found that the WikiEdu Dashboard and Hypothesis tools worked well for the online environment. There are challenges in conducting large online classroom discussions. Still, we encourage instructors to experiment with small groups or partners to lessen the pressure on students to speak up in a larger group setting.
Conclusion

While the number of students who have participated in our course is small, this course and our outside work with Wikipedia have impacted our campus. Outreach in conversations, presentations, and Wikipedia edit-a-thones have led to other academic faculty consulting with us on incorporating a Wikipedia assignment in their courses. Faculty that had already used the WikiEdu Dashboard to include a Wikipedia assignment in their courses are happy to have more faculty join this community of Wikipedia educators.

Academic faculty are often surprised at the amount of preparation a single Wikipedia assignment requires. This surprise may stem from their own bias in how information is created and valued in Wikipedia. Librarians can be influential in changing this perspective. Many of the lessons in teaching Wikipedia match up handily with the Association of College and Research Libraries (2015) Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education, and using the frames as a foundation can be the start of a collaboration in building a Wikipedia assignment (Dowell & Bridges, 2019; Jacobson, 2020). We know students are using Wikipedia for their classwork, and librarians and instructors can help by meeting them where they are and providing information literacy instruction in a familiar environment.

Wikipedia is considered the “last best place on the Internet” (Cooke, 2020). We acknowledge Wikipedia is not a perfect space, and we are critical of the content gaps, lack of diversity among editors, and Wikipedia’s policy on notability. In our classroom, we discuss why Wikipedia is not a perfect place and the many areas needed for improvement. Still, we, and our students, believe the work being done to edit and contribute to Wikipedia is an effort to improve the information landscape of the Internet. Students can demonstrate their understanding and growth of information literacy skills as they research and write an article. Using Wikipedia as a teaching tool allows students to build information literacy skills for life, not just one class paper.
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