From The President
By Vibiana Bowman

Dear Friends:
The LIRT Executive and Steering Committees only have two opportunities each year to meet face-to-face, at the Midwinter and Annual Conferences. As you can imagine, there is a lot of work that needs to get done. This Midwinter was no exception. I would like to bring you a status report on some of the issues that we worked on in Seattle. The Executive and Steering Committees would like to receive your feedback. Our email addresses are in the LIRT online directory: http://www3.baylor.edu/LIRT/directory.html.

Succession
There was an unexpected vacancy for the office of LIRT Vice President this year. At present, there is no provision for the succession of an elected officer in the LIRT bylaws. Steering and Executive Committees worked on wording for a bylaw amendment that would provide for emergency appointments until regularly scheduled elections. The proposed wording can be found in this issue, and we hope to have it on the ALA ballot as a bylaw change this spring.

Virtual Membership
The Teaching, Learning, and Technology and the Transitions to College Committees worked with the LIRT Webmaster on using online meeting software to have virtual members attend the conference "real time." To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that meeting software has been used at an ALA conference for virtual members. Congratulations to the committee chairs, Mitch Fontenot and Lisa Williams, and Billie Peterson, LIRT Electronic Resource Manager. These folks worked for almost two years planning and orchestrating this event. It is our goal to continue to look for innovative ways of fully engaging our virtual members in meaningful committee involvement.

A Virtual Member Task Force was appointed. The goal is to update and redefine what it means to be a virtual member. We will be looking at not only what LIRT expects of a virtual committee member, but at what support LIRT will provide for that member.

Outreach to Other Communities in ALA
The Liaison Committee is continuing to examine ways to forge relationships with other entities in LIRT. Lori Critz (Chair) and the members of the committee covered a lot of ground in Seattle, visiting the meetings of other organizations and extending the invitation to have their liaisons attend our meetings. Lori could use more committee members to reach more organizations at Annual. This is an excellent opportunity for new LIRT members who would like to get more involved and find out firsthand just how ALA works. You can check out the Liaison Committee at the LIRT web site (http://www3.baylor.edu/LIRT/committees.html#liaison).

Happy 30th Birthday to LIRT
This year LIRT turns 30. We are planning a birthday bash at the Annual Conference Program in Washington, DC. Plan to stop by to hear an excellent program and to have a piece of cake!

Tip of the Hat
Thanks to all of LIRT’s elected and appointed officers and chairs for making Midwinter 2007 the interesting and productive meeting that it was. Thanks also to our ALA liaisons, Lorelle Swader and Darlena Davis for all their hard work and problem solving in our behalf.

Cordially,
Vibiana

http://www.baylor.edu/LIRT/lirtnews/
From the Editor
by Jeff Knapp

Midwinter in Seattle was a lot of fun. And, as usual, I got to reconnect with old friends and colleagues at Midwinter. With all of the focus on ways to meet “virtually” these days, there’s still something to be said for being able to meet new people by walking up to them and shaking their hand. For me anyway, it definitely gets the creative juices flowing.

But that’s not to say that “virtual” meeting solutions are not worthwhile. As a matter of fact, the Teaching, Learning, and Technology Committee used “Elluminate,” an eLearning and collaboration software package, at Midwinter to include their Virtual Members in their committee meeting. They plan on hosting a discussion session at Midwinter 2008 on ways to use this software for virtual meetings and distance learning. This is a really great development! If software like Elluminate proves to be worthwhile, LIRT and other ALA organizations will be able to more effectively draw on the talents of librarians who do not have the luxury of a travel budget.

In other developments, the Newsletter Committee is considering a new feature for LIRT News, called “This Worked.” We envision it as a small, quick-to-read feature (1–2 paragraphs) where LIRT members can share some teaching strategy, tool, or resource that was particularly effective for them. Got something to share? Drop me a line (knapp@psu.edu) and let me know! We consider articles of all lengths and types for LIRT News—as long as it would interest our membership, it will be considered.

Finally, the Newsletter Committee is interested in your comments and suggestions. After the Annual Conference in D.C. this summer, we plan to send out a survey to the LIRT membership via LIRT-L, the listserv for LIRT members. If you have not subscribed to LIRT-L, it’s simple. Just send the following email message: “subscribe lirt-l [Firstname] [Lastname]” (leaving out my quotes) to this email address: listproc@baylor.edu. You can read more about LIRT-L at: http://www3.baylor.edu/LIRT/elecdiscl.html#lirtl

That’s all for now! Enjoy the issue.

Send Us Your Tutorials -
The Adult Learners Committee invites LIRT and ALA members to submit links and short annotations for online tutorials that they have created, which are geared toward Adult Learners. These include, but are not limited to, teaching methods, learning theory, adult literacy, or special populations within the adult community. Those selected will be added to the Adult Learners Resource Center Tutorials section. Send your links to Ted Chaffin, co-chair, at tchaffin@mailer.fsu.edu. Please include “LIRT Adult Learners – Tutorial” in the subject line.

Erin Ellis has been a member of LIRT since 2003. She has served on the Liaison and Conference Program committees. She is currently serving on the LIRT Executive Board as Secretary.

Erin has a BA in English from Pittsburg (KS) State University and an MLS from Emporia State University. While in the MLS program, she did a practicum at the university library and worked with Sherry Backhus, whom Erin describes as a wonderful mentor: “She was a great inspiration and a great teacher. From her, I learned so much and decided that Instruction would be the primary focus in any job I would have.”

What does Erin love about instruction? “Some people refer to it as the ‘a-ha’ moment. When a student ‘gets it,’ I feel like I’ve given them a small gift and sometimes, that’s actually how they react!” In her current position as Social Sciences Librarian (Sociology, Psychology, Applied Behavioral Sciences) and Liaison to Athletics at the University of Kansas, she has many opportunities to provide instruction. One of those opportunities in the past year has been working with an instructor in the Sociology department. Rather than have one or two 50-minute sessions, they developed mini-sessions that take place throughout the semester. Each mini-session lasts from 20 to 30 minutes, addresses the research process at the students’ point of need and, thus, ends up being more relevant to them. She says, “It’s been very rewarding and I hope to take this idea to other instructors in my departments.” Erin is also excited about the recent implementation of IM reference using Trillian software. In addition to her responsibilities as Social Sciences Librarian, Erin is Adjunct Instructor at the University of Maryland where she teaches sections of their required online course, LIBS150: Information Literacy and Research Methods.

When she’s not teaching, Erin enjoys traveling, photography, movies, reading, and taking care of her Schnauzer/Terrier mix, Ellie. Among her favorite things are chocolate, New York City, and “KU Basketball, of course.”

Why did Erin choose LIRT? She says, “When I got my first job, I was looking for anything and everything that would support my efforts in library instruction. I thought LIRT would be a great place to get involved because all types of librarians are in LIRT. What a great place to cross-pollinate!”
Annual Program Announcement:

It’s Showtime for Instruction Librarians!: The Making of Short Films for Marketing and Instruction

Noah Wyle may be The Librarian, but he’s not the only one who can be in a movie! Join us as librarians from Valdosta State University and Indiana University South Bend present their experiences as creators and directors of library instruction “videos.” Reference librarians Apryl Price; Yolanda Hood, Ph.D.; Deborah VanPetten; and Emily Rogers from Valdosta State University’s Odum Library will discuss their making of videos and other multimedia projects as tools for marketing the library’s services and educating students about such topics as plagiarism. They will also discuss the collaboration with faculty, students, and the community that is essential in the making of these short films. Nancy Colborn and Vincci Kwong, Indiana University South Bend, will also present their experiences in the making of library instruction videos and how these productions can be incorporated into Facebook.com and MySpace.com.
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CANDIDATES FOR SECRETARY

KRISTIN STROHMEYER
Candidate for Secretary


Experience: Reference Librarian/Coordinator of Instructional Services, Hamilton College (NY), 1988–present.


State and Regional Professional Activities: Eastern New York Chapter of ACRL, Communications Chair (1995–2000); Eastern New York Chapter of ACRL, Vice President/President/Past President (2001–2004)

Statement of Concerns: Not available at press time. See ALA ballot.

TIFFANY HEBB
Candidate for Secretary

Education: Indiana University, M.S. in Instructional Systems Technology, 2000; University of Southern Mississippi, M.L.S., 1995; Mississippi State University, B.S., 1992.


ALA Activities: LIRT: Top 20 Committee Member (2003–2007), Top 20 Committee Co-Chair (2005–2006); RUSA: Reference Services Section, Catalog Use Committee (2006–2008); ACRL: Instruction Section Member; College Library Section member; ACRL Immersion for Information Literacy Institute, University of Washington (2004)

Professional Activities: Part of NITLE grant to create First Year Information Literacy in the Liberal Arts Assessment of incoming students; Presented nine posters at ALA Annual Conferences since 2003; Presented at six other national and regional conferences; Co-taught week-long institute for Medical Library Association in 2006 on Developing Web-Based Instruction; Co-authored four journal articles; Received Let’s Talk About It: Jewish Literature grant, plus Mellon Dyad Grant for Strengthening Intellectual Communities for additional funding for the reading group.

Statement of Concern: Information literacy is possibly the most critical role facing libraries today. In this sea of information, it’s more important than ever that our patrons know how to find, evaluate and properly use resources. I’m proud to be part of an organization that addresses these concerns, and I look forward to becoming even more active in LIRT.

CANDIDATE FOR VICE-TREASURER/TREASURER-ELECT

LESLEY SULT
Candidate for Vice Treasurer/Treasurer-elect

Leslie Sult has spent the past eight and a half years being actively involved in promoting the value of library use and information literacy to a wide range of individuals. She began her professional life as a high school librarian in Chino Valley, Arizona. In 2000, she attended graduate school at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where she focused her studies on user services. After earning a Masters in Library Science in 2002, she returned to Arizona. In 2003 she began working at the University of Arizona Library as the Training Coordinator for the Information Commons. In 2005, she was given the opportunity to focus more of her job duties on using instructional design techniques to help the library reach and educate more students through scalable methods including, online tutorials and activities. She has served on the LIRT Top 20 committee since April 2003 and we co-chair from June 2005 to June 2006. She is also a member of the Reference and User Services Association Education and Professional Development for Reference Committee.

CANDIDATE FOR ALA COUNCILOR

TIMOTHY P. GRIMES
Candidate for Round Table Councilor


Experience: Manager, Community Relations Department, Ann Arbor District Library, 1995.
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Slate for LIRT Offices
2007-2008


Honors and Awards: Beta Phi Mu Award for Exceptional Achievement in Librarianship, University of Michigan, School of Information (1990); Margaret Mann Award for Professional Promise, University of Michigan, School of Information (1984); Graduated cum laude from the University of New Hampshire (1976)

Statement of Concerns: I have served LIRT for more than a decade in almost every capacity on the executive board (including LIRT president), in many other LIRT leadership roles and now for five years on ALA Council. My broad background in several types of libraries—a university library, a specialized urban library reference department and a public branch library—as well as my current position as a public library community relations manager, coupled with my strong LIRT organizational history, has greatly assisted in my Council work. I would like to continue my work in this capacity and further strengthen LIRT’s voice in ALA decision making.

Last semester the Horrmann Library at Wagner College in Staten Island, New York, was finally able to offer its faculty and students Electronic Reserves. For years the library had e-reserves on its wish list, but faced obstacles in creating this service. One obstacle, naturally, was budgetary due to the high cost of document management software, and another was administrative, as to who would moderate such software. So, when Wagner College’s Information Technology Department (IT) prepared to roll out its new Course Management system powered by Moodle, the library saw this as an opportunity to use Moodle to offer electronic reserves to its students and faculty. Moodle is an open-source program so unlike many e-reserve systems, it is free.

I made a plea to our director of IT to allow me to access Moodle and place digital content directly into the class folders on it, and she liked the idea. Michael Johnson, IT’s online resource developer and I decided to co-administer Moodle; therefore, I had access to the file folders in each of the classes that are used by our faculty and administrators. IT helped purchase the scanning equipment, an Epson XL10000 with sheet feeder and a used Minolta PS 3000 overhead book scanner.

Our workflow is easy and we have saved thousands of dollars on software. I scan articles and book chapters, and post them directly into the class files folder. I then create a link to that folder on the “desktop” of each class. Faculty members can add their own resources and links as well. Recently we have started to add MP3 format to the e-reserves. The students love it because the content is delivered right to their desktop. It helps them learn by having the information at their fingertips when they need it. Faculty members can place last minute readings for the students without having to notify them that it is placed in an external program.

This project also enhanced the working relationship between me, the library Web/ Instructional Designer, and Michael Johnson, our IT department’s online resource developer. Michael has already utilized “Drupal,” an open-source web content management tool, for Wagner College’s new web site, and we are working on a “Greenstone” site for the Edwin Markham Archives.

http://moodle.org/
http://www.greenstone.org/cgi-bin/library
http://drupal.org/

Jeffrey Gutkin is the Web/Instructional Design Librarian for Wagner College and is currently working on his PhD in Educational Psychology at the Graduate Center, CUNY
(Editor's note: Absence of a committee report indicates that it was not received by press time.)

Adult Learners Committee
Marya Shepherd, Chair, shephem@sunysuffolk.edu

Ted Chaﬁn volunteered to serve as committee chair for the 2007–2008 year. He will serve as co-chair with Marya Shepherd at the ALA annual meeting in D.C.

Committee discussed updating the Adult Learners’ Resource Center web page before the ALA Annual Conference by combining some categories to eliminate overlap. It was also decided to eliminate the Bibliography and possibly add a new independent section of “useful articles.” The Top 20 and Research Committees will be contacted to be sure there is no overlap with their committee work. A notice will be posted in LIRT News asking readers to forward links to their personal “how-to” tutorials.

Conference Program Committee, 2007
Kara Gust, Chair, gustk@msu.edu

A new program title and description for the 2007 Annual Conference program was presented since previously discussed speakers were unable to attend. The new program will be, “It’s Showtime for Instruction Librarians: The Making of Short Films for Marketing and Instruction.” The program description was submitted to, and approved by, the Steering Committee.

A task list was finalized, volunteers assigned, and ideas for giveaways were discussed.

Conference Program Committee, 2008
Barbara Hopkins, Chair, barbaraw.hopkins@gmail.com

A program topic was decided on for the 2008 program in Anaheim: “Animate Your Instruction: Keeping the Magic Alive for You and Your Audience.” The program title and description were submitted for approval at Steering II.

Victor Baeza was asked to be the Co-Chair for the 2008-2009 Conference Program Committee and he agreed.

Liaison Committee
Lori Critz, Chair, lori.critz@library.gatech.edu

Non-LIRT education-related events, programs, and meetings were reviewed to see if anything was missed. Members selected the meetings/events they wished to attend. The format for the summaries was reviewed. A review of the handbook was conducted, and members talked about ways to make contacts to establish liaison relationships with other units.
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Newsletter Committee
Jeff Knapp, Chair, jak47@psu.edu

Discussed the creation of a new feature for the newsletter called, “This worked.” It will be a brief item, no longer than two paragraphs, that will quickly describe a teaching technique, tool, or strategy that worked for someone. Ideas will be discussed with colleagues in hopes of preparing the first item for the next issue.

After running a reminder to all LIRT members to sign up on the LIRT-L listerv, we will send a survey out over LIRT-L to gauge how our readers like LIRT News, what specifically they like and/or dislike, etc.

Organization & Planning Committee
Carol Schuetz, Chair, Carol_Carson@baylor.edu

The LIRT Retreat and the advantages of having it on a ﬁve year schedule were discussed. A ﬁve year schedule would enable us to know when the last retreat was and when to plan for another. Based on the last retreat, this would have our next one occur in 2010 in Boston. The problem with ﬁnding members to run for ofﬁce was discussed and this remains a topic that we need to work on. The committee also looked at the possibility of having some type of event for the Top 20 authors at Annual. This was tabled for the present.

Web Advisory Committee
Stephanie Michel, michel@up.edu and Billie Peterson-Lugo, Billie_Peterson@baylor.edu

The committee met for the ﬁrst time to discuss our charge, our short term and long term goals, and how we should proceed. We determined that our ﬁrst step is to seek new members to form a full committee. An announcement seeking new members will be published in the March 2007 issue of LIRT News. The Web Advisory committee was also added to the LIRT web site so that new members can ﬁnd information about it.

We hope to have a full roster of members by Annual Conference, where we hope to discuss some of our goals, including examining our web site Standards, Policies, and Guidelines and ultimately get the site moved into ALA’s content management system.

Join the Web Advisory Committee:
LIRT’s new Web Advisory Committee is seeking members to assist us in providing oversight and overall direction for the LIRT web site. Join us and contribute your ideas to help evaluate and enhance LIRT’s web presence.
Fill out the Committee Volunteer Form at: http://www3.baylor.edu/LIRT/volform.html
Gaming in Library Instruction
ACRL Instruction Section Current Issue Discussion Forum
This IS Discussion Forum, lead by Justine Martin, Minnesota State University, and Robin Ewing, St. Cloud State University, provided participants with information on the educational role of digital gaming and whether gaming techniques could be applied to library instruction. The discussion began with a description of the characteristics of gamers: they often have the ability to multitask and they like to try a variety of ways to accomplish tasks. Since these skills are also important in the research process, librarians should retool their library instruction toward the learning styles of the new generation (who are often gamers). Some libraries have designed library tutorials as massively multiplayer online role-playing games with the hope that the familiar environment will engage students and help them learn. Building a digital game can be an expensive endeavor often costing more than $10,000. To get started, the discussion leaders recommended trying to incorporate digital gaming into library instruction by integrating active learning exercises within online tutorials or in the classroom. Many participants at the forum questioned whether students really want to play games about library principles. There was a general feeling that sometimes librarians try too hard to be “cool.” Most generally agreed though that digital gaming provides yet another avenue to teach students and librarians should always be ready to try new strategies. A digest of the discussion forum can be found at http://www.alanet.acrl/acrl/DiscForumMW2007a.htm
—Carrie Forbes, LIRT Liaison Committee

Course Management Systems
ACRL Distance Learning Section Discussion Group
The Distance Learning Section discussion covered a wide variety of material, but primarily focused on course management systems (CMS) as well as new tools and technologies for distance education. The morning began with a discussion of the various kinds of CMS applications and their benefits and limitations. Several librarians mentioned problems with integrating the library into online courses and confusion due to having too many different systems on one campus. The open source software Moodle (http://moodle.org/) was mentioned several times and many librarians felt that it was easier to integrate the library into this software as it can be customized for each campus. The discussion then moved on to handheld devices such as PDAs and smart phones which are being used by a large number of students. Participants mentioned that many catalogs and databases do not work well with these devices and libraries should continue to look for ways to provide better options. While the increase in new technologies is providing more and more options for distance library services, many at the discussion expressed concern that non-traditional students were being left behind. These students may not have the expertise necessary to contact librarians through IM software or watch podcasts online. Librarians should continue to provide reference and instruction over the phone and via email as well as use new technologies. —Carrie Forbes, LIRT Liaison Committee

ACRL Information Literacy Structure Review
ACRL Instruction Section
Any good system must, if it wishes to remain viable, assess, reevaluate, and review its structure at intervals. ACRL-IS is no different and is currently in the most embryonic stages of reviewing its current structure. To this end, a preliminary “pow-wow” session was chaired by Elizabeth Dupuis, ACRL-IS, on Saturday, January 20th, as part of ALA’s Midwinter program. The main topic of the session revolved around a preliminary examination of the current structure, focusing on what works well, what works less well, and how Information Literacy (IL) could be made less cumbersome and more collaborative. Participants were invited to share knowledge of the current structure as well as ideas regarding how it might be improved in the future. Some of the issues discussed included: tweaking the IL standards to make them work more smoothly in specific discipline areas; strategies to improve ACRL’s IL process; looking at how ACRL does IL programming and development; communication and awareness regarding how things are shared across groups; and standards and documents. In the final analysis, after much was examined, a lack of good communication and of acute awareness in ACRL seem to be two of the most egregious problems that seek redress. —Cynthia Dottin, LIRT Liaison Committee

RUSA History Section, Instruction and Research Services Committee Meeting
The Instruction and Research Services Committee of the RUSA History Section, was, when created in 2001, “the newest committee in the History Section, and is intended to prepare guidelines and assess resources that are relevant for instruction services to users of historical materials in academic or research libraries, regardless of geographic or chronological specialty.” The committee provides resources for librarians who provide library instruction and research service for history. On its Sunday, January 21st agenda were three important items: The HS website; its History Standards (Competencies); and a discussion on incorporating government documents into research and instruction in History. Several suggestions were made on improving a very viable website for historians. The site includes: History Instruction Guides, includ-
ing the indispensable “Using Primary Sources on the Web” section; Research and Writing Guides; and Tutorials. A suggestion was made to seek permission to link to other groups’ History Sections. The evolving History Standards are not connected with ACRL’s IL standards, but are geared toward an Assessment procedure that was born from discussions of committee members and the History Faculty at Georgia State University. The Georgia faculty evaluate their undergraduates with the idea that history majors should have certain skills when they graduate. It was suggested that these competencies, when completed, should be presented with a tutorial that would be useful to history departments, professors and librarians. “Incorporating Government Documents into Research and Instruction in History” was the group’s third topic of discussion. It was felt that government documents may sometimes be ignored in history research and that these should be made more visible. Collaborating with GODORT was offered as one of the vehicles for collecting government document websites. —Cynthia Dottin, LIRT Liaison Committee

ACRL Information Literacy Advisory Committee Meeting (ACRL-ILAC)

ILAC has the responsibility of monitoring developments in Information Literacy for ACRL. It is not involved in developing IL standards, but has the responsibility for making sure that the standards process is facilitated. On Sunday, January 21st, the main agenda item centered on “Subject-Specific Information Literacy Standards—Process Implementation Update and Plans.” The Committee has created a “Tip Sheet” for developing Information Literacy Standards that work more easily and seamlessly with their subject specific standards. Each discipline section, such as Anthropology and Sociology (ANSS), has the right to write its own standards, but must articulate with ACRL’s Standards (the “mother-document”) to do so. Subject sections may also decide not to write standards for their disciplines.

ILAC announced that IL consultants will be sought to work with persons in the various sections who are working on developing standards using the mother-document. The consultant must have IL expertise in order to help the specific disciplines work with the mother-document, in order to articulate the mother standards with those of the discipline. Those seeking to be consultants will be able to apply online in February. It is important to note that the consultant’s role will revolve around articulation of the mother-document. The consultants are not experts in the subject areas, but in the goals and objectives of the mother-document. Subject specialists are asked to look to their subject association for guidance, e.g., history would look to the American Historical Association.

The question as to whether it was time to review and revise the ACRL Standards was broached, in light of the fact that AASL is actively involved with rewriting theirs. It was revealed that there is no permanent Standards Committee—the original standards were crafted by a task force created solely for that reason. There is also a new website editor who will present the site as an information source for various things IL. Comments and ideas for the site are invited. Please send suggestions to: ecahoy@psu.edu —Cynthia Dottin, LIRT Liaison Committee

F2F (Face to Face): Teachable Moments During the Reference Interview

RUSA Reference Services Section

Every professionally trained librarian has been tutored in the reference interview and, indeed, it is an intimate part of the daily professional life of every reference librarian. The literature is replete with advice on the “dos and don’ts” of conducting a reference interview. On January 22nd, two experts, one a trained behaviorist and librarian, the other a reference librarian, discussed the idea of “teachable moments” during the reference interview. Adam, the behaviorist, prefers the term “information dialog” over “reference interview,” suggesting that what goes on is a dialog between two experts—the librarian, and the user.

He reminded librarians that patrons are more likely to return to the reference desk if they feel they’ve had a pleasant experience there in the past. This willingness to return is evidenced even if the patron had been given an incorrect answer. Adam is of the opinion that people want a fulfilling interaction with another human being, particularly in a world where people feel somewhat isolated. He chastised librarians for assuming that everyone who comes to the reference desk wants to be taught. Instead, he opined that having a simple human interaction may be of greater importance. Even if the librarian cannot answer a question fully, connecting with patrons so that they see a librarian as a colleague and not as an expert is a teachable moment—the patron will be willing to return because he or she feels that they have made a friend.

Librarians were cautioned against treating the interview as an interrogation. Instead, it was suggested that the patron needs to be led through a pathway on how to define their question. The face-to-face teachable moment here is in explaining to the patron what you are doing, while you are doing it. On discussing “approachability,” librarians were cautioned against both the “meerkat” and the “too busy to care” stance. The difficulty in striking a balance here was acknowledged, in that one does not wish to appear too eager or unapproachable. Librarians were reminded that, when at the desk, they should not appear to have something more important to do than helping patrons. “Do not
bring work to the desk” was the cautionary phrase. The audience was reminded that our society places value on not asking for help, and that presents a barrier for some patrons. In the final analysis, a reference interview can present many teachable moments for both patron and librarian.—Cynthia Dottin, LIRT Liaison Committee

Tests and Measures in the Social Sciences: Best Practices in Collection Development, Instruction, and Reference
ACRL Education and Behavioral Sciences Section, Psychology/Psychiatry Committee Current Topics Discussion Group
This EBSS discussion was conducted in four subgroups of 7–8 attendees, each lead by a committee member. Each subgroup was tasked to share experiences on establishing, maintaining, and using test collections in academic libraries. Most test collections in academic libraries are used mainly by education or psychology students and faculty, and most have controlled access. Instructional activities with these collections ranges from one-on-one instruction on specific resources at the reference desk, to class instruction on locating full-text tests in databases such as PsychInfo or ERIC, to group instruction on using the Mental Measurements Yearbook online. Attendees emphasized that there is a large gap between the expectations of students and reality. Students expect to find the tests they need online, and the majority are currently only available in print. Several librarians shared their instruction experiences and related the challenges of using test collections. One psychology subject librarian advised the group to contact their vendor if the Mental Measurements Yearbook (MMY) is to be used in a session. At her institution the resource is limited to 4 simultaneous users, but the vendor will permit training access for class instruction. A second participant indicated that a large portion of instruction time is spent in presenting copyright issues for test use, and a third shared the challenges in getting students to look beyond MMY to print resources in the collection. —Lori Critz, LIRT Liaison Committee

Suggested Wording for Handbook/Bylaws Regarding Succession:

“The LIRT Executive Board shall fill any unexpected vacancy in the elected membership of the Board by appointment. The appointee shall be a LIRT member in good standing who will serve until the next regular election.”

—Lori Critz, LIRT Liaison Committee

LIRT News is published quarterly (September, December, March, June) by the Library Instruction Round Table of the American Library Association. Copies are available only through annual ALA/LIRT membership.
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Dear Tech Talk: First it was “Web 2.0” and now it’s “Library 2.0.” What’s the deal – is there a connection between the two? Is Library 2.0 just a clever name for yet another fad? What is really meant by Library 2.0? —Leery of Library 2.0

Dear LLL: An interesting question. What is Library 2.0? This is a question that Walt Crawford decided to address in a Midwinter 2006 issue of *Cites & Insights*. What he thought would be a typical 3,500-word essay on the topic turned into a 26,000-word special issue. Why? Because the more he read about the topic, “the more confused [he] got – and the more [he] felt the need for a broad overview not written by an advocate or evangelist.” The result is a thought-provoking essay that delineates between Library 2.0 as a concept, and Library 2.0 as a movement. All of this to say, there is no simple definition of Library 2.0. As a matter of fact, Walt Crawford lists seven possible and somewhat conflicting definitions!

So rather than attempting to provide yet another definition of Library 2.0, perhaps it is more useful to provide some general themes common to many of the discussions:

- User-centered, evaluated, on-going change: Some describe this perspective as always in “beta.” but “beta” implies that a service, resource, or tool is in a testing phase before its “formal” release. Perhaps a better description of this perspective is one of evolution: ongoing gradual improvements with a survival of the fittest mentality, meaning some services, resources, or tools may cease to exist.
- Taking content/services to users: Both physically and virtually, go to where the users are. Whether it is in local neighborhoods, gathering places within academic departments, or virtual social networks found on the Internet.
- User-participatory content/services: Stretch beyond suggestion boxes, focus groups, and surveys. Provide users with the opportunities and tools to contribute content and ideas, and share those contributions with others.
- High levels of trust that go both ways: To ensure the viability of user participation, users must believe that library staff will respect their contributions and library staff must believe that users will make worthwhile contributions.
- Open technology (as opposed to proprietary): Most of the Web 2.0 technology is openly available for anyone to adopt and adapt. Libraries own the content in their bibliographic and patron databases but they often can’t access or manipulate the data effectively, if at all, because of proprietary Integrated Library Systems (ILS). Can/should libraries continue to rely on and pay ILS vendors to incorporate open Web 2.0 technology into their products? In his ILS customer bill of rights, John Blyberg suggests that libraries should not continue in this fashion and that ILS systems should provide:
  1. Open, read-only, direct access to the database.
  2. A full-blown W3C standards-based API to all read-write functions.
  3. The option to run the ILS on hardware of the library’s choosing, on servers that the library administers.
  4. High security standards.

And contrary to the last reference to open technology, one last theme often mentioned in context with Library 2.0 is the emphatic statement that Library 2.0 is not all about technology. It is quite possible to have a Library 2.0 mindset without introducing Web 2.0 initiatives. Web 2.0 technology factors in because of the new environments created by these technologies and the potential they may offer for reaching current and new users. At its core, Library 2.0 is about improving services to current and yet-to-be-known users, and in particular, keeping the users at the center of those improvements, even enabling their participation. Some argue—and perhaps rightly so—that Library 2.0 is nothing new. Libraries have had a user-oriented perspective for over 100 years, as illustrated by this quote from an 1896 *Library Journal* article written by John Cotton Dana:

> See that your library is interesting to the people of the community, the people who own it, the people who maintain it. Deny your people nothing which the bookshop grants them. Make your library at least as attractive as the most attractive retail store in the community. Open your eyes to the cheapness of books at the present day, and to the unimportance, even to the small library, of the loss of an occasional volume; and open them also to the necessity of getting your constituency in actual contact with the books themselves.

However, in spite of the perspective that Library 2.0 is not about technology, some of the most interesting and innovative ideas are direct results of the integration of Web 2.0 technology with library services, resources, and tools. So perhaps one does need to look at a more narrow definition of Library 2.0, like the one provided by Jack Maness: Library 2.0 is “the application of interactive, collaborative, and multi-media web-based technologies to web-based library services and collections.” To this point, some examples of real Library 2.0 implementations are listed below:

- Ann Arbor District Library online catalog (http://www.aadl.org/catalog): Labeled a “SOPAC” (Social OPAC) by John Blyberg because he’s provided “users the ability to rate, review, comment on, and
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If some of these examples are intriguing, consider some steps you can take to move along the Library 2.0 continuum. Bring library staff up to speed on social software with training opportunities. Look into the online course, “About Five Weeks to a Social Library” (http://www.sociallibraries.com/course/about), “the first free, grassroots, completely online course devoted to teaching librarians about social software and how to use it in their libraries.” Also, investigate “Learning 2.0” (http://plcmclearning.blogspot.com/). Developed at the Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County, this staff development program was “an online self-discovery program that [encouraged] the exploration of Web 2.0 tools and new technologies,” using a list of “23 Things,” activities that familiarized participants with social networking tools and resources. In true Web 2.0 fashion, the developers are open to sharing and have shared this model with others.

Whether time is spent in formal training environments or not, investigate some of the social networking environments and tools currently available, including:

- 37signals (http://www.37signals.com/): A variety of web applications are available at no cost, including applications that can be used for project management, planning/calendaring, chat, and many more.
- Blog, RSS, and Wiki technology (see previous Tech Talk columns: June 2003, September 2003, and September 2004 for more details).
- Facebook (http://www.facebook.com): Look at the Facebook groups, including “Librarians and Facebook,” “Library 2.0 Interest Group,” and “Librarians and Librarians.”
- Greasemonkey (http://greasemonkey.mozdev.org/): A Firefox extension that incorporates user scripts into web pages to change displays. For example, a script that uses information from an item found at Amazon and automatically checks for availability at a local library and then branches out to regional libraries if it’s not available. A database of Greasemonkey scripts is available at: http://userscripts.org.

Please share your experiences with LIRT.
Another interesting approach is one used by Bill Drew. Analyze how your library currently fits into a Library 2.0 model using a list of seven criteria found in Michael Casey’s blog entry, “Do Libraries Matter?” (four criteria are from the Tail’s white paper of the same name and three are Casey’s own):

1. The library is everywhere.
2. The library has no barriers.
3. The library invites participation.
4. The library uses flexible, best-of-breed systems.
5. The library encourages the heart.
6. The library is human.
7. The library recognizes that its users are human too.

When going through this exercise, consider using Casey’s and Savastinuk’s broader definition of Library 2.0: “What makes a service Library 2.0? Any service, physical or virtual, that successfully reaches users, is evaluated frequently, and makes use of customer input is a Library 2.0 service. Even older, traditional services can be Library 2.0 if criteria are met.” (Library Journal) Although Bill Drew didn’t do this, also think about using a SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis in relationship to the Library 2.0 services, resources, and tools. Use this approach to identify realistic issues to tackle, given the library’s resources and staff. For example, the integrated library system is most likely proprietary and not a “best-of-breed” system, and implementing an open-source ILS may not be the most useful to them. There is discussion on not implementing technology solely for the sake of technology, and there is discussion on not being afraid to experiment, along with “it’s okay” if experiments fail. But how do we establish what the run-of-the-mill user really wants, especially when many of these concepts are foreign to the run-of-the-mill user? The user may not know what she wants because she doesn’t know what might be possible!

Is Library 2.0 evolutionary or revolutionary; a fad or a long-lasting change; about technology or about service; needed or not needed? At this point, who knows? However, to quote Charles Bailey, “This is a trend worth keeping a close eye on.” (http://www.escholarlypub.com/digitalkoans/2006/01/08/library-20/). Begin by reading Walt Crawford’s article, experiment with different ideas, and keep informed on the topic by monitoring resources such as:

- Blogs: ALA Tech Source Blog (http://www.techsource.ala.org/blog/Library+2.0/); John Blyberg, Blyberg.net (http://blyberg.net); Michael Casey, LibraryCrunch (http://www.librarycrunch.com); Michael Stephens, Tame the Web (http://www.tamethesource.com) - Popular pages tagged with Library 2.0 at del.icio.us (http://del.icio.us/popular/library2.0) - The Library 2.0 Reading List on Squidoo (http://www.squidoo.com/library20/) - The LibraryCrunch Swiki (http://swicki.librarycrunch.com/) - a search engine specific to the world of Library 2.0

Additional Resources
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“Library 2.0 Meme Map - version 2.0 on Flickr.” <http://www.flickr.com/photos/42538191@N00/113222147/>.


As always, send questions and comments to Billie Peterson at Billie_Peterson@baylor.edu.
**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** - Is responsible for long range planning and making recommendations to guide the future direction of LIRT. Reviews, revises, and updates the organization manual of LIRT. Recommends to the Executive Board, and through it to LIRT members, the establishment, functions, and discontinuance of committees and task-forces. Maintains the Constitution and Bylaws of LIRT and recommends amendments to those documents. Prepares a slate of candidates for LIRT offices and maintains records on procedures, candidates, and election results. Solicits volunteers for LIRT committees and maintains files of prospective committee appointees dates, and election results. Solicits volunteers for LIRT committees and maintains files of prospective committee appointees.

**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.

**Publications** - Establishes, maintains, and disseminates LIRT Publication Guidelines. Solicits ideas for publications and advises as to the appropriate means for publication.

**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.

**Transition from High School 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.

---

**Please see our online committee volunteer form at**
http://www3.baylor.edu/LIRT/volform.html