From The President

Hello to you all.
Summertime is almost upon us and another school year is about to conclude. There is a whirl of last minute questions — the industry profiles for projects that are due or articles for research papers that must be written and then they are done. Students are still here, but they are studying for finals. As a librarian, you feel that your usefulness is over for the semester.

For many of us, once instruction classes are done, we can (briefly) catch our breathe. Now is the time we work on all those projects that have eluded us over the weeks and months since school began. Students leave for home and we are left with time on our hands. We begin to plan for the coming fall semester and recharge our instruction programs. June presents us with two excellent opportunities to do this.

Please plan on coming to ALA Annual in New Orleans. While you are here, you will be able to connect with other LIRT members and learn how to jazz up your instruction with helpful information about technology. The PR/Membership committee will be presenting a Membership fair Sunday morning. This will be immediately before the LIRT program in rooms 353-355 in the Morial Convention Center. Right after this, stay and take in our LIRT Program entitled “Jazz up Your Teaching with Technology". This will be a terrific program that you will not want to miss! Don't forget about Bites with LIRT. Bites with LIRT is a great opportunity to have lunch with other LIRT members and met new friends.

The close of Annual 2006 will bring an end to my term as president of LIRT. I would like to thank several people for making this a great experience. Thank you to Cynthia Akers and Stephanie Michel for their support in the past year. Thank you also to the chair of this year's program committee, Julie Elliott. This year’s program involved a great deal of commitment and planning. The Conference Program committee, along with the Teaching, Learning and Technology committee, has worked hard to bring us an outstanding program this year. Our incoming President is Vibiana Bowman. It has been a pleasure to work with Vib this past year. With her dynamic personality, LIRT will go forward in the coming year.

I look forward to seeing you all in New Orleans for ALA Annual,
Have a great summer and travel safe!
Carol Schuetz

2006 Conference Program in New Orleans

Jazz Up your Teaching with Technology!

The LIRT Annual Conference Program Committee is collaborating with the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Committee on a Technology Fair for the 2006 Annual Conference in New Orleans. Dr. Tim McGee, Associate Professor and Director of the Instructional Design and Technology Program at Philadelphia University's School of Design and Media, will open the fair with a 45-minute presentation on “Instructional Design for Teaching and Learning in Libraries." The Technology Fair will follow with demonstrations by vendors and e-Posters.
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Hello everyone! As I write this, I am in the last week of classes for spring semester, and what a thrilling week it is. It’s research paper time! Our reference desk statistics are through the roof and I am answering questions about citation styles in my sleep.

It’s also a time when I find myself less rigorous in my bibliographic searches for my students. Mind you, by “less rigorous” I mean that rather than helping students to find and select sources with the most scholarly authority, I am instead helping them find sources that conform to parameters such as:

- It’s not checked out.
- It can be in their hands in five minutes (the paper is due in class in twenty minutes and it takes fifteen minutes to get there).

Oh well, at least they came in to see me, right? Besides, who am I to judge? This column was due in he hands of the Production Editor five days ago!

In this issue, we’ve got the LIRT Top 20 for you as well as some important information on Annual in New Orleans. I found four excellent articles in the LIRT Top 20 that I’m already putting to use!

Safe travels to New Orleans, everyone. I look forward to seeing you there!

-- Jeff Knapp, editor

Keeping Up to Date with Technology

Attend conferences.
Attending conferences is a wonderful way to pick up new ideas and reinvent stale techniques, and you can learn both in and out of the sessions. The formal presentations are great, but so is networking with colleagues and talking to the vendors. This is a great time to ask vendors about free trials of new software or databases.

Experiment!
Don’t be afraid to experiment with technology and applications. You can learn a lot by playing with new hardware and software. It is okay to try and it is definitely okay to fail—just don’t give up on the new technology until you’ve determined its value to your library and your patrons.

by Jeanne Holba Puacz
jpuacz@uiuc.edu

---
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How many times have you asked questions in your instruction sessions only to be answered with uncomfortable silence? Looking over the faces in the audience, you may see individuals who would like to answer, but are often too timid to speak. Or perhaps you want to conduct immediate and non-intrusive audience assessment. A solution to either dilemma may be to implement an electronic classroom response system (hereafter known as CRS).

An alternative to eliciting feedback verbally, CRS—also known as electronic, audience, student, or interactive response systems—allow individuals to instantaneously communicate their responses via remote control-like transmitters (often referred to as clickers) or computer stations. CRS products have a wide array of classroom applications from grading to pre- and post-session assessment of responses, but the greatest potential is for instantaneous communication and feedback from the audience. Through the system, an instructor displays questions on the main screen; in turn individuals in the audience will submit their answer through the clicker. Results are automatically compiled for the instructor to gauge the audience's understanding of the material and to display results to facilitate discussion. Instructors using CRS found increased audience attention and engagement resulting in individuals becoming more active in the classroom by verbalizing responses and asking questions.

While specific functionality varies among products, most systems allow individuals to use clickers to answer multiple choice, yes/no, and true/false questions. Other CRS products allow for essay responses by connecting an individual's computer station with the instructor's station through CRS software. In either instance, the gathered information is automatically tabulated for the instructor to display class responses anonymously. The CRS software gathers and organizes data with some software applications easily moving the information to Microsoft PowerPoint or Excel. Instructors can immediately display results on the screen using text, chart, and/or graph representations of collective responses to prompt the audience to consider and discuss the results.

Many CRS products require specific hardware and software to organize the responses. Systems require individual transmitters (clickers), receiver units to collect data from the transmitters, and software. The clickers often have a numeric pad and/or lettered buttons, and transmit in one of three ways: one-way infrared (IR), two-way infrared, or radio frequency (RF). RF technology is replacing infrared as the preferred transmission method because of its greater flexibility. The data submitted via one of these frequencies is collected by a receiving unit, which in turn is connected to an instructor's computer. Conversely CRS products using individual computer workstations often submit data via the Internet eliminating the need for clickers and receivers. There are a number of CRS products available. The article by Johnson and McLeod outlines a variety of these systems with the unique features of each product as well as the approximate cost of transmitters, receivers, and software.

When considering which CRS is right for your instruction classroom, there are a number of issues to consider. For instance, will the system be used for program assessment, grading, and/or ad hoc audience feedback? There are also questions of cost, technical support, and classroom size your library will need to consider. Chris Johnson outlines many more issues to investigate when choosing a system in his article "Clickers in the Classroom." While there are numerous issues in purchasing and implementing a classroom response system, the benefits of increased audience engagement and feedback can alleviate the concerns.
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Bites with LIRT in New Orleans!

Bites with LIRT will be scheduled on Saturday, June 24 and Sunday, June 25. Watch LIRT-L and ILI-L in the next few weeks for information on restaurant locations and how to sign up. We look forward to seeing you there!
Cynthia Akers

Cynthia Akers’ involvement with LIRT dates back to the 1995 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago, where she attended the LIRT Conference Program about learning and teaching styles. She says she was “incredibly impressed not only with the quality and content of the program, but also with the enthusiasm of LIRT members.” She decided to join LIRT as soon as she could. And in her teaching she continues to use the principles of learning styles from that program.

Cynthia’s first committee appointment in LIRT came in 1999, when she was appointed to the Conference Program Committee. Following her service on that committee, she was elected Vice President in 2004, and served as LIRT President for the 2004-05 term. As Immediate Past President, Cynthia currently chairs the LIRT Organization & Planning Committee.

Cynthia said, “I have found LIRT to be the most rewarding professional experience of my career. I’ve met so many wonderful colleagues who share a love for library instruction and who are dedicated to making sure that all patrons regardless of library type become familiar with information retrieval, evaluation, and use in a time of changing technologies.”

Keeping Up to Date with Technology

Technology presents many incredible opportunities to libraries and librarians; however, it also presents many challenges. One of the biggest challenges to librarians is how to keep up with technology’s rapid and unceasing evolution. And, we must try diligently to keep up to date if we hope to be able to assist our patrons with their technological information needs. Here are some strategies that librarians in the field have developed in an effort to stay current:

Go back to school.
Take a tech class, either in person or via a distance education option, at the college level. See what the library schools are offering and also investigate what schools of education, computer science, and business have to offer. If you don’t have time for a full semester course, think about shorter seminars or workshops from ALA or your state library association.

Read up on it.
If formal classes really don’t fit into your time frame, your budget, or your style, take a look at the syllabus of a course in which you are interested and then do the reading. Use your databases to access the readings or ILL the books and articles. Also, make sure to read the library literature as well as general interest technology materials. Read Computers in Libraries and Library Journal and see what the Library & Information Technology Association (LITA) has to offer, but also read magazines like Wired, MIT Technology Review, and Smart Computing.

Learn from your colleagues.
Talk to the people you work with everyday, but not just other librarians. Talk to your IT staff and your part-timers too. You can learn a lot about what is hot technologically from your computer lab attendants and your shelvers. You can also learn from the colleagues that you don’t see every day, and even from colleagues you don’t know! Blogs, wikis, chat, IM, even e-mail, can help you learn about new trends and developments that are headed your way. There are some interesting and fun library technology blogs out there and we should take advantage of them. Check out things like the Library Journal Tech Blog (http://www.libraryjournal.com/blog/670000067.html), ALA’s TechSource (http://www.techsource.ala.org/), The Shifted Librarian (http://www.theshiftedlibrarian.com/), and Liblog (http://www.rcpl.info/services/liblog.html). Remember to take advantage of the time savers that are available to us today like RSS feeds, digests, and database alerts.
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The list below was selected and reviewed by the Continuing Education Committee: Susanna Cowan, Tiffany Hebb (co-chair), Corliss Lee, Camille McCutcheon, Harry Meserve, Ericka Arvidson Raber, Leslie Sult (co-chair), Esteban Valdez, Leanne VandeCreek, and Teri Weil. The committee reviewed over 130 articles this year, looking at library instruction from a practical and theoretical viewpoint, in various library settings. Although this year’s list focuses heavily on instruction in academic library settings, the committee believes that many of the ideas presented are readily applicable to K-12 as well as public library settings.

1. Badke, William B. “Can’t Get No Respect: Helping Faculty to Understand the Educational Power of Information Literacy.” The Reference Librarian 89/90 (2005): 63–80. This article offers an interesting look at tactics that academic librarians can use to integrate information literacy instruction more thoroughly into college and university curricula. The article begins by discussing the cultural differences between teaching faculty and librarians and provides some examples of the misunderstandings that often pervade the relationship. The author then goes on to explore the various methods that librarians have used, including collaboration, evangelism, and demonstration of skills, to encourage teaching faculty to integrate information literacy instruction into the curriculum. After critiquing the approaches listed above, the author presents an argument for embedding for-credit information literacy courses into departmental curricula. The author concludes the article by providing an example of how he was able to successfully work with the Communications Department at his institution to develop a credit-bearing information literacy course and provides a compelling argument for instructional librarians to invest the time and energy necessary to move in this direction.

2. Brown, C. “Where Do Molecular Biology Graduate Students Find Information?” Science & Technology Libraries 25.3 (2005): 89–104. Secondary only to traditional scientific journals, bioinformatics databases such as GenBank and the Protein Data Bank (PDB) are the primary research tools used by graduate students in molecular biology. Graduate students rely on these “data warehouses” much more than they do on the bibliographic databases commonly held by academic libraries, with the exception of the National Library of Medicine’s PubMed database. Despite this, few information professionals address bioinformatics databases in library instruction—most students are introduced to these tools by faculty or other graduate students. Consequently, many molecular biology graduate students do not take advantage of the vast resources available through research databases such as Web of Science and Biological Abstracts. Brown argues that science and technology librarians should educate themselves in these bioinformatics resources and must actively incorporate these resources into their instruction. The author also argues that information professionals must continue to build bridges to this scholarly community both by improving the transparency of library instruction and by recruiting more molecular biologists into librarianship.

3. Burke, Gerald, Carole Anne Germain, and Xu Lijuan. “Information Literacy: Bringing a Renaissance to Reference.” portal: Libraries and the Academy 5.3 (2005): 353–70. The authors of this study analyzed the increase in student transactions at the reference desk following the start of for-credit information literacy (IL) classes at the University of Albany. Specifically, the study was designed to measure student use of the reference desk before, during, and after such a course. Results indicate increases in not only visits to the reference desk overall but in multiple visits by individual students during IL courses. Additionally, a clear connection could be made between what resources (reference books, databases, etc.) were pushed in IL classes and the content of reference desk questions. The data further suggested that most students who had been to the reference desk as part of taking an IL class stated that they would return to the reference desk for help in the future. The authors use this study as validation for the implementation of for-credit information literacy programs. The study is particularly interesting for its discussion of the direct impact of IL instruction on a key library service.

4. Bury, Sophie, and Joanne Oud. “Usability Testing of an Online Information Literacy Tutorial.” Reference Services Review 33.1 (2005): 54–65. Bury and Oud include a review of the literature of usability testing in libraries, noting that there are few articles specifically covering usability testing of online tutorials. Although the tutorial they were studying included various evaluation tools that indicated there were problems with the tutorial, usability testing allowed the developers of the online tutorial to define the nature of the problems much more precisely. The authors discuss the differences between the way a library Web site is used and the way tutorials are used and how this affected their methodology. The tutorial, the methodology of the usability testing, and the changes made to the tutorial based on the results of the usability testing are all discussed in detail.

continued on page 6
LIRT's Top 20  continued from page 5


Buschman and Warner re-examine some recent studies on student use of the Internet for research. They argue that “the programmatic emphasis on information literacy is currently seen as the answer to both the academic promise and perils of the Web” and that this framework shapes the conclusions drawn in these studies while alternate conclusions are ignored. Among their criticisms of the literature: too much data is drawn from students’ perceptions about their own skills; we ignore the differences in background and skill levels between faculty and students; the commercial nature of the Web is downplayed and the Web is not as effective as traditional library resources in providing access to quality research materials. The authors conclude that “[o]ur framework of analysis of academic information seeking on the Web must become broader, deeper, and more thoroughly connected to the economic and social realities in which we operate.”


In this article, the authors outline the steps of a pilot program at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries, that was designed to enhance the effectiveness of library instruction through emphasizing peer coaching, team teaching, and the use of active learning techniques. An enhancement team, comprised of the head of instruction and several other librarians, worked with colleagues who were interested in modifying techniques used in teaching library instruction sessions. The enhancement team designed this pilot program as a five-step process. The team held a meeting to introduce the instruction librarians to this program and to talk about various styles of teaching and learning. Next, the team held brainstorming sessions with these librarians to discuss classroom teaching modifications, such as incorporating active learning techniques into their lesson plans. Then, using these revised lesson plans, the librarians taught the instruction sessions, with assistance, if needed, from enhancement team members. After the instruction sessions had concluded, the librarians completed a questionnaire concerning their perceptions of the project. Finally, there was a wrap-up session for the team and for the librarians who participated in the project.


Today more and more adult learners are entering our classrooms. They are often “reentry” (i.e. older) students, with jobs and families, and also perhaps not as comfortable with electronic and computerized information systems as the traditional student body. Ms. Gold’s article looks at this population of students as a group that has different social and developmental needs and suggests some useful ideas to create effective instruction for them. In the course of describing a specific course of IL instruction, Gold points to the need for creating an active learning environment and to adjust our instructional techniques to the individual learning needs of our students, regardless of their background. A well thought out and useful contribution to the discussion on “how to teach”.


The literature of information literacy is replete with discussion about how to work more closely and more effectively with teaching faculty in order to promote the goals of information literacy. Mr. Hearn’s article is a welcome addition to this area of concern. Though he writes from the perspective of a small college, his plan for “embedding a librarian in the classroom” (in a specific class) is detailed and specific enough to be of help to any librarians who want to develop a collaborative model for relations with teaching faculty. Although this is a very specific teaching situation, many of his ideas are applicable to other schools and other classes. The article raises and explores issues related to assessment and evaluation of effective use of librarian time. Both of these areas will be of concern to those who want to repeat in whole or in part the model presented here. This is a valuable article for the clarity of its presentation and its possible use by other institutions.


Throughout the course of this article, Karen Hogenboom makes a compelling argument for the usefulness of government documents as a teaching tool that can be used across a number of disciplines. She argues that government documents can be used to teach students how to identify and evaluate a particular author’s point of view, purpose, and intended audience. She also believes that government documents provide an excellent means by which to teach students how to evaluate the way different media outlets interpret the same government report. She concludes the article by offering suggestions for incorporating government documents into both in-person and online instructional sessions. Although this article is focused on instruction to college and university students, the wide availability of government documents as well as the types of higher-order thinking skills that can be taught to students make the ideas suggested here applicable to middle and high school libraries as well.


continued on page 7
Psychology professors Larkin and Pines present a case study as a model for incorporating library research instruction into course work. Context for an out-of-class library assignment was provided by a research project in which the class posed the question: "Do girls prefer 'bad boys'?") To minimize the amount of in-class library instruction, students were given written instructions on locating the library's databases and searching the literature. Librarians were provided with copies of the assignment, and they were given advance notice that students might be seeking assistance. Data from an assessment of the students' performance on a subsequent library assignment demonstrated the effectiveness of the hands-on research project. This article provides much food for thought and support for well-constructed library research assignments. Despite the noticeable absence of collaborative faculty-librarian efforts in the development of the research project, the article may, as the authors suggest, help to "pave the way for greater faculty-librarian collaboration."

11. Lightman, Harriet and Ruth N. Reingold. "A Collaborative Model for Teaching E-resources: Northwestern University's Graduate Training Day." portal: Libraries and the Academy 5.1 (2005): 23–32. Lightman and Reingold present a successful collaborative effort between Northwestern University's teaching faculty, librarians, and information technology/computer systems personnel. The groups came together to bridge the gap between teaching research skills and computer skills—sets of skills which are often viewed as dichotomous. The organizers designed a mandatory one-day set of classes for first-year humanities doctoral students, in which they were taught a variety of things, from using EndNote software to advanced searching in subject-specific databases. Additionally, a 90-minute faculty forum session was added, whereby six faculty digitally-enabled projects were showcased. The purpose of the forum was to "amaze and inspire" the students, thus demonstrating specific examples of a seamless merger of technology and research. The Office of the Dean provided funding for food, supplies, advertising, and some staff time. The university's Center for the Humanities contributed a small sum from a Mellon Foundation grant. The vast majority of staff time was donated, as was server space and physical space, thus keeping overall costs for such a large-scale project at a minimum. This project serves as an excellent example of how best to bring together and utilize the expertise of individuals from different departments to achieve a common goal.

12. MacMillan, M. "Open Resume: Magic Words for Assessment." College & Research Libraries News 66.7 (2005): 516–20. In her article, MacMillan describes a unique and insightful way to evaluate information literacy skills from the user's perspective. MacMillan's idea is to have students develop and refine an information skills resume, known as the I-SKILLS resume (Information Skills and Knowledge Inventory for Lifelong Learning Success) over the course of a three year period. They are encouraged to reflect upon and articulate in their own words the skills they know or related tasks they can do (and do so in a familiar format: a resume). The advantages to this are that the students can focus on their strengths, thus promoting self-efficacy, rather than struggling with jargon-laden questions they often can't decipher, as is often the case with many pre- and post-test information literacy exercises. The end product is a document they may be able to use in developing professional resumes and portfolios. The sample I-SKILLS resume included in this article is extremely helpful in illustrating for readers the value of this tool as an exercise and information literacy assessment component.

13. Markey, Karen, et al. "Testing the Effectiveness of Interactive Multimedia for Library-User Education." portal: Libraries and the Academy 5.4 (2005): 527–44. In the October 2003 issue of Portal, Markey described the LUMENS (Effectiveness of Multimedia for Library-User Education) Project, whereby librarians from four different universities were trained to build interactive multimedia tutorials using Macromedia Flash software. This follow-up article summarizes the project's training and development phases and presents statistical and anecdotal evaluation results of the overall project and the specific tutorials that were produced.

Through empirical research, the authors demonstrate the benefits of using interactive online tutorials as a form of effective, student centered instruction, such as reaching remote users and accommodating different learning styles (visual v. hands-on, slow or fast-paced). The authors are honest and realistic in describing some of the obstacles they encountered (primarily time constraints and complexity of the Flash software). This project serves as an excellent example for librarians seeking opportunities to merge and apply their reference/instruction skills with their technological skills.

14. Nichols, Janet W., Lothar Spang, and Kristy Padron. "Building a Foundation for Collaboration: K-20 Partnerships in Information Literacy." Resource Sharing and Information Networks 18.1/2 (2005): 5-12. The authors discuss efforts at the Wayne State University David Adamany Undergraduate Library to develop successful collaborative partnerships with K-12 educators and school library/media specialist students. These efforts include, but are not limited to: workshops developed collaboratively by K-12 and university library staff; a continuing education course in information literacy for teachers and school librarians; and a graduate level library science course in information literacy for school library/media specialist students. The authors provide eight suggestions that will ensure successful collaborations, and offer information on future avenues of collaboration between K-12 educators, school librarians, and academic professionals.

In this article, Scales and Lindsay describe the final project for their online undergraduate information literacy class. The assignment calls for students to reflect on the definition of information literacy and its role in their lives. After an introductory section, in which the authors discuss how their course uses a learner-centered philosophy geared toward online learners, the project is described in greater detail. The instructors asked the students such questions as “Where does it [information literacy] begin?” “Where does it end?”, and “How will you use information literacy in your future?” Scales and Lindsay also describe the process by which they evaluated the student responses, using “ATLAS/ti,” a qualitative analysis software package. They found that while the students had varying attitudes and beliefs about information literacy, the vast majority of them thought about the concept globally, not as something that was only tied to the library or their schoolwork.


This article outlines the issues faced at Washington State University when revising their information literacy course to meet new state general education standards. There were several challenges to the collaborative process. These challenges include assumptions (by librarians and by faculty), authority (who had final say), group dynamics, and language (lack of commonality). This article provides a unique insight to collaboration of librarians of differing backgrounds and faculty outside of the library. The issues raised in this article affect all institutions in the process of developing information literacy standards, improving programs, and incorporating information library into the general education curriculum.


Simmons posits that faculty are often too close to a discipline to fully understand the difficulties students have in grasping the language of a particular discipline. She argues that academic librarians, especially subject specialists, are in a unique position to act as mediators between the “non-academic discourse of entering undergraduates and the specialized discourse of faculty.” Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the profession, Simmons contends that librarians are both insiders and outsiders in a discipline and are positioned to facilitate students’ understanding of disciplinary discourses.


This article serves as an excellent model for developing system-wide standards and incorporating information literacy into the curriculum. It discusses the Legal Information Skills Tutorials (LIST) program at the University of Melbourne Law School. The authors describe the process by which the LIST was developed, instituted and evaluated. Included in the description of the LIST program was the formation of the Council of Australian University Literacy Standards (CAUL IL Standards). Aspects of the LIST program include a library orientation and an online tutorial containing sections on research, location, evaluation, planning, documentation, writing, collaboration, and quizzes.


In this must-read article for all instruction librarians, Tao brings to light the challenges in reaching international, ethnic, and returning and non-traditional students during a library instruction session. The author outlines the challenges and offers techniques to improve the instruction process. The techniques include understanding cultural competencies, recognizing different learning styles, and improving communication. Suggested readings on how to enhance the learning experience for each student are also included.


In a predominantly Hispanic community in the Texas Rio Grande Valley, a group of librarians from the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio was looking for ways to improve health information literacy skills of the residents. Through NLM funding, they embarked on a project to train peer tutors at a regional health sciences magnet high school, with the knowledge that these students often served as a bridge to family and other community members. The small group of students, along with the high school librarians, took part in extensive training on the use of MedlinePlus, using case studies and other experiential learning methods. After their training, they taught MedlinePlus to other students, teachers and administrators at their school. The students also trained parents and other community members at an open house. The project was evaluated through surveys, focus groups, and interviews, and was found to be a success. Among the positive outcomes, the tutors claimed a higher comfort level with adults and with public speaking, the school found increased usage of MedlinePlus in assignments, school librarians felt more involved in the curriculum, and students reported showing MedlinePlus to family members.

Please see our online committee volunteer form at http://www3.baylor.edu/LIRT/volform.html
Dear Tech Talk: A recent message on a listserv made reference to “SUSHI.” From the context of the message, I don’t believe that this term refers to Japanese dietary habits, but I don’t fully understand what SUSHI is or its value (if any) to reference and instruction librarians.

—Seeking SUSHI Sagacity

Dear SSS: SUSHI, Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative, is “a protocol that would allow machine-to-machine transfer of usage reports.” (Automating Usage Statistics Harvesting Requirements) Before discussing the protocol itself, a bit of background is needed to inform the discussion.

Since the advent of online resources more than 10 years ago, most vendors have provided some form of usage data: number of searches; number of logons; number of web pages viewed; number of full-text articles downloaded; etc. Initially, these usage statistics gave library staff a measuring stick which they used to confirm the usage of the resources. Ten years ago, these resources made up a very small portion of a library’s collection and initially were databases, with no full-text options. Through the years, major changes have taken place: access to full-text changed significantly with the development of database vendors aggregating full-text from publishers; the “big deal” from major journal publishers emerged; the availability of full-text “free” with print subscriptions became an option; the first e-books materialized; digital archives of historic and/or primary resources developed; standard reference works became available digitally; and so on.

Today library staff can easily spend 50% of the library’s materials budget on electronic resources, such as databases, e-journals, e-books, digital archives, etc. With a high percentage of library funds expended on electronic resources, librarians need to assess the value of electronic resources to their constituents and make well-informed decisions on which resources they should continue to provide access to. Major vendors have continued to supply usage statistics, with little or no effort to standardize. This lack of standardized data among vendors has hindered librarians’ abilities to perform comparative analyses of usage data from multiple vendors.

To address this issue, a group of interested parties developed and launched COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources) in March 2002, “an international initiative designed to serve librarians, publishers, and intermediaries by facilitating the recording and exchange of online usage statistics.” (http://www.projectcounter.org/about.html) Release 1 of the COUNTER Code of Practice for Journals and Databases in 2003, followed by Release 2 in 2005, provides basic principles to which publishers must adhere in order to be “COUNTER-compliant,” including:

- Definitions of Terms Used: Clear definitions of language such as “aggregator,” “searches,” “sessions,” “turn aways,” “vendor,” etc.
- Usage Reports: Specifications for the content, format, and delivery of usage reports.
- Data Processing: Specifications on how to handle the data, such as counting only successful and valid requests, handling double clicks, handling multiple requests for the same document in a short time period, etc.
- Auditing: COUNTER-compliant vendors must have their COUNTER-compliant usage reports audited by an independent auditor before June 30, 2007 and annually from 2008 forward.
- Compliance: Details how to register COUNTER compliancy.

Now moving beyond journal databases, the COUNTER Project published Release 1 of the COUNTER Code of Practice for Books and Reference Works in March 2006. With the advent of COUNTER, librarians have been advocating the use of COUNTER-compliant usage statistics by either asking vendors if they provide COUNTER-compliant usage statistics or specifying compliancy in the license agreement. This push for standardized usage statistics has made it possible for librarians to perform analyses of usage data from multiple vendors, but a couple of other issues still remain. Even COUNTER-compliant usage statistics aren’t delivered in a consistent “data container,” in that the formatting of the delimited reports varies among the publishers (Chandler 1); and all these usage statistics must be collected and consolidated manually.

When only a handful of databases were available, the collection of usage statistics was a trivial activity. Today most libraries have hundreds of databases from a wide variety of vendors. Consequently, the collection and consolidation of this data takes a great deal of staff time and requires strong organizational skills and attention to detail. Even with COUNTER-compliant usage statistics for every single vendor, the staff person collecting this data will need to maintain multiple spreadsheets. If the very minimum of information is tracked, the number of searches, logons, and full-text downloads will still need to be tied together somehow to be useful. In many instances, librarians want all available title-by-title usage statistics on e-journals. Because of the database aggregators, this type of title-level information is often found in multiple resources from multiple vendors, and consolidating that information, without the use of a database, is extremely time consuming.

However, COUNTER-compliant statistics imply usage statistics that adhere to a standard, and once the presentation of data is standardized, the ability to automate processes between systems becomes viable. Now enter SUSHI, the Standardized User Statistics Harvesting Initiative. The goal of this protocol is to give librarians the ability to “harvest” usage statistics automatically using a common “data container,” (XML instead of delimited files) and depositing those usage statistics in a system in which they can help manage the ongoing process of evaluating the resources. The SUSHI protocol was developed in the summer of 2005, by librarians Adam Chandler and Tim...
Jewell, content providers EBSCO Information Services and Swets Information Services, E-Resource Management systems vendors Ex Libris and Innovative Interfaces, and Thomson Scientific.

Those developing the protocol believe that “Librarians are seeking a comprehensive solution to the management of licensed electronic resources that combines licensing, accurate holdings, orders, and statistics, among other important information from their entire life cycles. [They] believe models that set statistics apart from the rest of the life cycle of electronic resources are substantially less valuable, since so many factors must be considered when evaluating them.” (Chandler 1) Consequently, from their perspective, a library's electronic resources management system is the best system in which to place these usage statistics. SUSHI defines the communication protocol between the E-Resource Management System (ERM) and the vendor's COUNTER-compliant usage data, focusing on the transmission of COUNTER Journal Report 1 reports (number of successful full-text article requests by month and journal).

How might SUSHI work when implemented?
· A SUSHI-enabled ERM is set up to send requests for usage statistics to a SUSHI-enabled vendor;
· Both the messages from the ERM and responses from the vendor system will be well-formed XML (the data container);
· The vendor’s system will check the authentication of the ERM for access to that institution’s usage statistics;
· The vendor’s system will send an appropriate response to the request, perhaps: (1) the requested report, (2) an error report, or (3) a “ticket” that indicates the processing will take place at a later time; and
· Once the ERM receives the usage report, it parses the XML files and associates the usage data with the appropriate e-resources.

Ideally, the real beauty of integrating SUSHI with the local ERM is:
· Usage statistics are collected and placed into the ERM on a set schedule—automatically.
· Usage information for specific e-journals from different vendors is associated with those e-journal titles—automatically.
· Data collection errors due to the detail-oriented work or language misinterpretations is reduced or eliminated.
· Usage statistics are easily linked to subscription costs.
· Journal “impact factor” information is provided in COUNTER reports which can also be linked to the usage data.

The current status of SUSHI is:
· November 2005: Swets successfully exchanged COUNTER-compliant data with Innovative Interfaces and Ex Libris; EBSCO successfully demonstrated simple machine-to-machine transfer of journal-level usage; and the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) recognized the initiative and now hosts the SUSHI web site: (http://www.niso.org/committees/SUSHI/SUSHI_comm.html).
· In April 2006, the University of Nebraska successfully used a beta version of the Innovative Interfaces ERM module to transfer EBSCO statistics into their ERM.
· In mid-2006, Innovative Interfaces will release ERM Release 2006, which will have the SUSHI protocol integrated.
· Later this year, Ex Libris will integrate SUSHI into the Verde ERM product.
· Serials Solutions plans to incorporate SUSHI into their COUNTER product which is part of their “ERMS” product.

For those libraries that don’t have an ERM system, MPS Technologies has recently launched a new service, ScholarlyStats (http://www.scholarlystats.com/), and is partnering with Swets and Thomson Scientific. ScholarlyStats provides libraries with an opportunity to access their usage statistics through a single portal that has been tailored to the library’s specific electronic resources collections. ScholarlyStats collects the usage data and library employees view the data in consolidated reports or raw forms. The intent of ScholarlyStats is not to compete with the SUSHI protocol. But more than likely, as the SUSHI protocol develops and matures, ScholarlyStats will use the protocol to harvest usage statistics for others. (Caldwell, 4) Should reference/instruction librarians care about SUSHI? Because many of them are involved with collection development decisions, especially for e-resources. Usage data isn’t the only criterion for renewal decisions for e-resources, but in combination with other data, it leads to better-informed renewal decisions. With the implementation of COUNTER-compliant usage reports and the SUSHI protocol, the actual collection of usage data for electronic resources becomes secondary and librarians can focus on the analysis of consolidated data that is integrated with costs and other evaluative data.

Currently, the key issue for the continued progress of SUSHI is to encourage more content providers to participate, both by becoming COUNTER-compliant (if they aren’t already) and SUSHI-compliant. Reference/instruction librarians often discuss e-resources with sales representatives and vendors. During those conversations, ask them if their usage statistics are COUNTER-compliant and if they know about the SUSHI protocol. Encourage them to participate in these initiatives; explain the value of these tools in the renewal process; and let them know that your library is more willing to work with vendors who adhere to and implement these initiatives. Vendors’ participation in COUNTER and SUSHI is essential, and they need to hear this from all librarians—not just those who work closely with e-resource usage statistics.
**Tech Talk ......** continued from page 10

### Additional Resources


As always, send questions and comments to:

Snail Mail: Tech Talk
Billie Peterson-Lugo
Moody Memorial Library
Baylor University
One Bear Place #97148
Waco, TX 76798-7148

E-Mail: Billie_Peterson@baylor.edu

---

### LIRT Meeting Schedule

**Saturday June 24**

New Orleans Marriott Mardi Gras E

Executive Committee I 8:00am-9:00am

Steering Committee I 9:30am – 10:00am

All Committees I 10:30am – 12:30pm

**Sunday June 25**

Morial Convention Center (MCC) rms 353-355

LIRT Annual Program 10:30am – 12:00pm

LIRT Membership Fair/Conference Program comm. mtg. 8:00am – 10:00am MCC rms.353-355

**Monday June 26**

Sheraton New Orleans Grand Ballroom A/B

Steering committee II 10:30am – 12:30pm

All Committees II 8:00am – 10:00am

**Tuesday June 27**

Morial Convention Center rm. 277

Executive committee II 9:00am – 11:00am

Please do not follow the times listed in the conference proceedings!

---

### Check These Out ...... continued from page 13

Of further note:


As the “Check These Out” columnist, I am pleased to review recent literature on library instruction and information literacy. The articles in this column focus on gender and technology in the classroom. Do female and male students use technology differently? What are the gender dynamics of communication in an online educational environment? How can librarians help develop and support female students’ interest in technology? Check these out, and enjoy!


Agosto conducts a review of the literature on gender and technology, and ties the issues raised in the literature to school library media services. Agosto’s review reveals that while the gender gap in technology use is diminishing, girls and boys do continue to use and respond to technology in different ways. For example, research indicates that girls prefer to work collaboratively to complete technology-specific assignments; boys browse more than girls when searching for information online; and girls have more interest in the graphic features of online resources. In her literature review, the author also includes articles that explore strategies that librarians can use to make technology more accessible to girls. Such strategies include (among others): developing an online discussion forum for girls on a topic that interests them; creating computer clubs for girls; training computer lab monitors not to treat girls in a condescending fashion; creating collaborative exercises for teaching about online resources; and finding and selecting computer games and other online resources of interest to girls. Agosto asserts that school library media specialists can make a significant difference in developing female expertise in technology by fostering and supporting girls’ interest in computers. The author also advocates that school library media specialists should take an active role in designing technology that is attractive and accessible to both girls and boys.


In order to determine criteria for selecting Web sites of significant interest to girls and young women, Agosto reviewed relevant literature, developed a working model of criteria, and tested the model by soliciting feedback about Internet use and specific Web resources from thirty-three adolescent girls. The initial working model included the following criteria for Web site selection: “collaboration,” “social connectivity,” “flexibility and motility,” “inclusion,” “contextuality,” “personal identification,” and “graphic and multimedia concentration.” Through her interviews with adolescents, Agosto confirmed that girls do value online social connectivity: for example, the adolescent girls used the Internet most often to communicate with others via e-mail and chat software. On the other hand, regarding collaboration, the girls indicated that while they preferred to work cooperatively for educational activities, they also preferred to use technology alone for leisure activities, such as using e-mail and playing computer games. Regarding flexibility and motility, the girls did prefer sites with flexible navigation (such as a coloring book site that did not require completion of a section before moving to another one). The interviews confirmed that the girls valued contextuality: the adolescents appreciated sites that presented information within the framework of a story. Agosto also notes that the girls placed a strong emphasis on graphics and multimedia. Finally, while the adolescents preferred sites that presented information with which they could identify personally, they expressed less enthusiasm about sites that emphasized inclusion of adult women (for example, the girls indicated that a “Women of NASA” site was dull). Nevertheless, Agosto asserts that inclusion is an important evaluation criterion for selecting Web resources, for such sources can shape girls’ feelings of self-worth. Based on her research, Agosto created a revised model of evaluation criteria, as well as a list of questions for librarians and teachers to consider when selecting Web resources of potential interest to girls and young women. The evaluation criteria and questions are available on Douglass College’s “Girls Tech” site: http://www.girlstech.douglass.rutgers.edu/


Bostock and Lizhi analyze women and men’s participation in eighteen online discussion groups. Participation in the online forums was required for a one-semester Keele University course focusing on Web searching and evaluation, and the social impact of the Internet. Approximately twenty students participated in each online discussion forum. Seven online discussion groups included female students only; five groups included male students only; and six groups included equal numbers of male and female students. The authors found that the all-female groups were significantly more participatory than the all-male groups (in the wholly female groups, the numbers of messages per student was significantly higher than in the wholly male groups). In the mixed groups, women’s participation decreased, while men’s increased. The authors also solicited students’ views on their experiences and attitudes specific to online learning. Women (in significant numbers) expressed a preference for online (rather than face-to-face) discussions. On the other hand, women indicated that they were less confident about using computers generally, and they also preferred print to online information. Continued on page 13
Farmer examines various metasites and Web directories of Internet resources developed for and about teenage girls. Using Web search engines (such as Google), and directories (such as the Open Directory Project, Reference.com, and whatUseek), the author located numerous commercial and educational sites focusing on teenage girls’ interests and experiences. One of the sources that Farmer places in the commercial metasite category is the “Go-Girl” resource portal. Developed by the “CollegeBound” Network, this site provides links to information on a wide variety of topics, including recreational activities, dating, studying, and female teen celebrities (among others). An example of an educational site is smartgirl.org (supported by the National Science Foundation and the University of Michigan) which provides a forum for girls to share their ideas and concerns about personal experiences, and to express themselves creatively. Farmer also highly recommends Joan Korenman’s page of “Websites for Girls” (http://research.umbc.edu/~korenman/wmst/links_girls.html), particularly for its links to resources that encourage girls to pursue careers in engineering, math, science and technology. The author encourages school librarians to explore Web resources for girls, include them in library portals, and incorporate them into learning activities.


Do female students prefer software programs that are designed specifically for girls? Pinkard investigates this question, as well as other issues specific to gender and technology use. The author developed surveys to measure students’ use of technology at home; general attitudes, gender stereotypes, and self-confidence level regarding computer use; and personal preferences for specific software programs. African American students from one second-grade and one fourth-grade class participated in the study. Students used computers for assignments in both classes (although computers were emphasized less in the fourth-grade class), and each class had weekly 45-minute computer lab sessions which provided the opportunity for students to explore a wide variety of software programs. The author found that although the African American students were unlikely to have access to computers at home, they enjoyed using other recreational technologies (such as video games) at home. When asked whether girls or boys used computers more effectively, the female students responded either that “girls are better,” or “girls and boys are the same,” while the male students responded either that “boys are better,” or “girls and boys are the same.” The second-grade girls were especially adamant about female superiority and computer use. However, when asked to assess their own computer abilities, second-grade girls did not rank themselves more highly than the boys did. As expected, the author found a positive correlation between number of hours of computer use at home, and self-confidence using computers. Also, as expected, Pinkard found that the students who generally enjoyed using computers also reported feeling confident about their technology abilities. The author also asked the students to use, select, and rank their five favorite software programs (from a list of twelve). Girls and boys did rank programs differently. For example, the second-grade girls unanimously ranked the Arthur’s Reading Race program in their top three (compared to 17% of boys) while 75% of second-grade boys ranked the Smelly Mystery program in the top three (compared to 18% of the girls). Pinkard also asked students whether they thought boys, girls, or both girls and boys would prefer to use specific programs. The author found a high correlation between the students’ preference for a software program, and their perception that the program was designed for their gender. For example, second-grade boys thought that Smelly Mystery was specifically designed for boys (and they also ranked Smelly Mystery as one of their favorite programs). Based on the findings of her study, Pinkard asserts that while the social environment certainly helps to shape student attitudes regarding technology, software design also has a significant impact on student perceptions and use of technology.


In order to examine the dynamics of gender and communication in the online environment, Scheckler studies and analyzes female and male participation in the Inquiry Learning Forum (ILF), a professional development site designed to facilitate discussion about math and science teaching. The author examines two separate discussion forums on the ILF site (both forums focus on a specific book about high school math education). The ILF discussion forums list all of the participants’ true names, and they provide access to all posts of each participant. Consequently, the author could compare women and men’s contributions to each forum. Men posted messages more frequently than women did in both forums. Women never received responses when they initiated discussion threads, while men always received responses. When responding to previous posts, women tended to agree, while men tended to disagree more. In addition, more women expressed themselves tentatively (more frequently ending their posts with a question). Given the findings of her study, the author encourages school library media specialists to be sensitive to issues of subtle gender inequality in online forums, and to discuss such issues openly with students. The author also recommends that library media specialists encourage female students to make their presence known in online forums, and to express themselves confidently.
Library Instruction Round Table

**Standing Committees**

**Adult Learners** - Assists library professionals to understand, find information or promote ideas on learning styles, teaching methods, and training resources most often associated with adult learners.

**Conference Program** - Plans the LIRT program for the ALA Annual Conference. Makes arrangements for speakers, room, handouts, and activities during the program.

**Liaison** - This committee shall initiate and maintain communication with groups within the American Library Association dealing with issues relevant to library instruction and shall disseminate information about these groups’ activities.

**Newsletter** - Solicits articles, prepares and distributes the LIRT newsletter. The Executive Board of LIRT serves as the Editorial Board for the LIRT newsletter.

**Organization & Planning** - This committee shall be responsible for long-range planning and making recommendations to guide the future direction of LIRT. It shall monitor the structure of LIRT on an ongoing basis and recommend to the Executive Board, and through it to the membership of LIRT, the creation, responsibilities, and discontinuance of committees and task forces. It will review and update the LIRT Manual annually. The Past Treasurer shall prepare the Five Year Financial Plan report and present it at the second Organization & Planning committee at the Midwinter conference. The Past President shall serve as the chairperson. Nominations will be a subcommittee of this committee. The Nominations Subcommittee shall prepare a slate of candidates for election to LIRT office and shall maintain the Nominations checklist of procedures. The Past President serves as a member of the subcommittee.

**Public Relations/Membership** - Publicizes LIRT purposes, activities, and promotes membership in LIRT. Develops brochures and news releases to inform members, prospective members, and the library profession about LIRT activities. Sponsors an exhibit booth at the Annual Conference. Organizes BITES (meals for instruction librarians to meet for food and discussion) at conferences.

**Research** - Identifies, reviews, and disseminates information about in-depth, state-of-the-art research concerning library instruction for all types of libraries. Pinpoints areas where further investigation about library instruction is needed.

**Teaching, Learning, & Technology** - Identifies and promotes use of technology in library instruction, with special attention given to technologies that enhance learning and can be easily adapted to a variety of different learning environments.

**Top 20 Committee** - This committee shall be responsible for monitoring the library instruction literature and identifying high quality library instruction related articles from all types of libraries. Annually, this committee shall prepare and publish in the LIRT News a list of the Top 20 articles on library instruction.

**Transitions to College** - This committee builds and supports partnerships between school, public, and academic librarians to assist students in their transitions to the academic library environment.

[http://www.baylor.edu/LIRT](http://www.baylor.edu/LIRT)