From The Past President

By Linda Colding, LIRT Past President

What another terrific conference! The conference program really hit a home run with our guest speakers. I heard a lot of good feedback.

Since this is my last column as President, I want to thank the Executive Board, Steering committee, and all the committee members for their hard work during my term as president. You have made my term a most rewarding and pleasurable experience! I am so honored to have worked with so many wonderful and talented librarians.

If you would be interested in running for a LIRT office or you know of another LIRT member you would like to nominate, please let me know by mid-September. Just make sure you get your nominee’s approval first! The positions are: Vice-President/President-elect (three year commitment), Secretary (two year commitment), Vice-Treasurer/Treasurer-elect (two year commitment), and LIRT ALA Councilor (three year commitment). Please consider running for an office. It really is a fantastic experience and a great opportunity to guide LIRT into the future.
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The Annual Conference in the Windy City this year was very enjoyable, and I hope those of you who attended had as good a time as I had. Attendance didn’t appear to suffer a great deal, despite the economic downturn. I know many of my fellow librarians are going through some lean times, and I must say that I overheard the word “furlough” more often than I would have liked.

At a number of committee meetings I attended, both LIRT and non-LIRT, the subject of cost savings was raised. It seems that more and more, that ALA units are moving their newsletters to online-only delivery. There is good reason for this. The cost for printing and shipping the newsletter you’re holding costs LIRT almost $7,000 a year—our largest single expense. Imagine what we could do with that $7,000 for a conference program or other initiative!

Of course, there are some downsides. Reading is still a more pleasant experience in print, in my opinion, and there are plenty of times I get emails with links to a PDF document that I never get around to clicking on if I’m really busy. But I believe the upsides outweigh these. The primary benefit would be that we would no longer be limited to just the twelve pages we are allotted for print—we could do more with design and possibly add more content.

No decisions have been made yet, but we’d like to know what your thoughts are. Do you think LIRT News should take advantage of the cost savings and go entirely online? Or should we continue to produce a print edition? Drop me a line at knapp@psu.edu to let me know!

Have you created an instruction program or developed a unique classroom strategy? Please share your experiences with LIRT. Send your articles to Jeff Knapp (jeff.knapp@psu.edu)
The 2009 ALA-LIRT Conference Program, “Preparing Yourself to Teach: Touching all the Bases”, discussed what instructors can do before, during and after sessions to improve teaching. Over 230 attended the program to hear Lisa Hinchliffe and Beth Woodard, both of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Monika Antonelli, Minnesota State University Mankato, cover the bases.

Up first was Lisa Hinchliffe, Coordinator for Information Literacy Services and recently elected president elect of ACRL, who discussed Assessment as Learning. Hinchliffe reminded us that assessment should be performed for the purpose of improving instruction, rather than for purposes of accreditation or review. Assessing the effectiveness of the instructor improves both the instruction as well as the student’s learning. Hinchliffe argued that instructors should plan lessons by first identifying the desired outcome of the session. Then the instructor can decide what tasks student can complete in order to demonstrate they have reached that outcome, and which skills they need to gain to complete those tasks. Among the research discussed by Hinchliffe were the Information Literacy Instruction Assessment Framework of Deb Gilchrist and the “backwards design” model from Understanding by Design (Wiggins and McTighe, 2005).

Up second, Beth Woodard, Staff Development and Training Coordinator, made her pitch for Student-Centered Design. Woodard argued that instructors can facilitate learner-centered education in our classrooms by motivating students, engaging their interests and encouraging them to learn from and teach one another. “As teachers,” stated Woodard, “to be learner-centered we need to pay attention to the knowledge, skills, attitudes, preferences, and beliefs that learners bring to the educational setting.” By understanding and catering to varied student learning styles, we can better help them understand and process information. Woodard’s pitch highlighted the group sensory learning styles and Kolb’s Experiential Learning (1984) and offered practical teaching tips for many of these styles including Weimer’s seven principles to guide learner-centered teachers from Learner-Centered Teaching: Five Key Changes to Practice (2002).

Third up to bat was Monika Antonelli, Instruction Librarian, who had a lively fast pitch for Teaching as Performance. Antonelli argued that thinking of teaching as performance can help students maintain attention, retain and recall information, and make the experience more enjoyable for all. She suggests we keep in mind our bodies, voice and the stage (classroom) as we ‘perform’ instruction. She walked the audience through a technique for warming up one’s voice before instruction. She also reminded us that silence can be a beneficial part of our performance: it gives students time to process, reflect and incorporate new ideas into their own knowledge base. Silence can also serve to highlight points and lose the “ums” and “uhhs” that plague so many instructors. Antonelli encouraged instructors to rehearse and think of that rehearsal as a vital part of the preparation for instruction. Finally, she reminded us that it is not necessary to change drastically and all at once, rather she encouraged instructors to try one technique and add more as they feel comfortable. Small changes over time can lead to big improvements.

More information about the program, along with handout, bibliography, and the PowerPoint slides can be found at http://fleetwood.baylor.edu/LIRT/program.html
Committee Reports

Organization & Planning Committee
Committee Chairperson: Vibiana Bowman Cvetkovic

The main task for the committee remains planning of the LIRT retreat. The following action items were generated at the meeting:

The Retreat will be held on the Friday before Annual 2010 (Washington, DC). A question arose as to whether LIRT can call the retreat as “pre-conference” according to established ALA guidelines since we will not be charging an attendance fee. Vibiana Cvetkovic will check with LIRT liaison Darlena Davis for clarification before close on this Annual.

Giveaway items for the attendees will be purchased by Tiffany Hebb. The committee has agreed on bags, notebooks and pens. Tiffany will check back with the committee online by the target date of September 15. The committee needs to find and select a facilitator for the retreat. Vibiana Cvetkovic will ask ALA Conference planning office for recommendations. Committee will ask members of LIRT Exec for recommendations at Exec II this Annual.

There will be a maximum of 50 attendees at the retreat. Target date for sending out a “Hold the date” invitation is September 15. The new Organization and Planning Chair, Linda Colding, will oversee the mailing of the invites. Initial attendee list includes:
- Executive Committee (elected and appointed)
- Steering Committee
- Past Presidents for the past 5 years
- Appointed liaisons and representatives
- Organization and Planning Committee members
- The Emerging Leaders currently sponsored by LIRT
- Other LIRT members identified and recommended by Organization and Planning.

A second primary issue for the committee is finding members to run for office. This continues to be a challenge. Planning for “growing” future leaders will be a focus of the retreat.

In addition to “growing” future leaders, the O & P Committee discussed methods of using the talents of our retired LIRT members who continue to be active and involved in the organization. The creation of the category “member emeritus” was discussed. These members would serve on the Organization and Planning Committee. Mitch Stepanovich volunteered to investigate the cost and a methodology for providing LIRT membership for such members.

Archivist
Committee Chairperson: Kari Lucas

The committee did not formally meet. The chair confirmed with Camille that the committee will be working on our task force charge with two additional members who will be selected from among four volunteers. The committee will select two members for Archives Task Force. We will meet virtually to develop procedures. We will submit report to Executive Board for discussion at 2010 Midwinter Meeting.

Newsletter Committee
Committee Chairperson: Jeff Knapp

The committee discussed moving the LIRT News to an entirely electronic format. Other ALA groups, such as ACRL, are encouraging their sections to do this, and it can be surmised that it will be just a matter of time before LIRT is encouraged to do so. The chair discussed this with Kari Lucas, LIRT treasurer, and she supports the idea. Currently the production and shipping of the newsletter is LIRT’s highest budget item. The chair will be working with Kari in the coming year to get this included on the agenda for Exec at Midwinter. The editor will also solicit feedback from our readership throughout the year to see if any major objections to the change are raised.

Susan Gangl, Production Editor, will prepare two proposals for a new layout and appearance for LIRT News, and submit them for discussion and vote at Exec. at Midwinter.
Finally, the search for a new chair and newsletter editor was discussed. Rebecca Martin, a new committee member has expressed interest. The current chair will stay on until after Midwinter to assist with the transition if she is still willing to take on the task.

Adult Learners Committee
Committee Chairperson: Trina Nolen

The committee met to discuss future goals. We met with the President-Elect, Lisa Williams, about the committee’s obligations to LIRT. She informed us that other than submitting appropriate conference related forms on the LIRT website and hosting the discussion forum (Adult Learners hosted the forum at 2009 Midwinter), we were free to investigate any avenues related to the official committee.

Most of the members are new to the committee. We will procure the committee’s past minutes (if available) and committee reports in order to see what activities our predecessors engaged in. After brainstorming, we decided to investigate computer literacy competencies needed for adult learners to be successful (if this has not already been studied) because, in our collective experiences, technology is a great barrier to the progress of adult learners.

Seventy-five percent of our members are virtual members, thus we will need some avenue to meet electronically. The committee currently does not have a web presence on the ALA Connect site. Once we are sure ALA Connect is populated correctly, we will begin constructing a committee site. Until we are able to work in the ALA Connect workspace, we will communicate via email. We will also look into the possibility of using wikis and blogs for the committee to share information between conferences.

Research Committee
Committee Chairperson: Mardi Mahaffy

Three members of the Research Committee were present at the June 11th meeting. We discussed the use of Google Docs in developing the program bibliography, and everyone agreed that it had streamlined the process. We divided up tasks for the development of the Classroom Management Teaching Tips content, and set a goal for completing that work. We refined the description of the LIRT Midwinter Discussion, and compressed the number of discussion questions. Lisa Williams joined us to talk about the fact that we have no one able to take on the chair of the research committee once Mardi steps down to take up the LIRT Secretary position. Lisa indicated that the Executive Board would take up the question of how to proceed with the Research Committee.

Liaison Committee
Committee Chairperson: Cynthia Dottin

The Committee reviewed the Non-LIRT Education Related Programs/Events and Meetings. Each member verified the programs/events/meetings that s/he planned to attend for the purpose of reporting. All members, including the outgoing member, agreed to prepare two reports.

The Committee discussed the current status of the formal Liaison program. Members were asked to work hard to procure a formal Liaison Relationship, virtually, or face-to-face, with another ALA Instruction unit/entity by Midwinter 2010. Cindy Dottin has procured a relationship with ACRL IS Advisory, but has not been able to meet face-to-face due to Committee meeting time conflicts between LIRT and ACRL IS Advisory. She will ask if this relationship can be fostered in a virtual environment. Two Committee members, Carrie Forbes and Irene Ke, have agreed to contact CJCLS and PLA, respectively, for the purpose of forming a formal liaison relationship. It is hoped that these formal relationships will have been established by Midwinter 2010. The Committee members unanimously agreed to the edited wording of the Liaison Committee’s “Letter of Introduction” to include the willingness of the Liaison Committee members to meet virtually, with their chosen ALA unit/entity, if necessary.
Information Literacy Best Practices Committee Meeting / ACRL-Instruction Section

The Information Literacy Best Practices Committee held its annual meeting on Saturday, July 11th in Ballroom VII at the Sheraton Chicago Hotel and Towers. This Committee’s charge is to promote best practices in information literacy and library instruction by developing, maintaining, and promoting the “Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline” and its related web site. The BP document, first adopted in 2002, has a five-year recommended review process. To that end, the ACRL Executive Committee charged the ILBP Committee to review and revise the Document. The Committee is currently hard at work on this review and revision. Annual 2008 saw the undertaking of a survey designed to ascertain how the document was viewed and how much it was used. The results of which would, then, inform the review and revision process. The results of this seventeen-item survey on “Interest and Use”, whose target audience was instruction librarians, instruction coordinators, and those who participated in ACRL’s Immersion program, were disseminated and discussed as the main agenda item at Saturday’s meeting. Among the survey responses, one of the overarching requests was for a website with Best Practices examples. To this end, the Committee is considering charging a Task Force with the singular task of creating these examples. This use of a Task Force will allow the BP Committee to give its singular attention to the review and revision of the BP Guideline document. Also revealed in the survey’s responses was a result that was both pleasant and overarching. The BP document, often thought to have been one of information literacy’s best kept secrets, is known to and used by 42% of the survey’s respondents. If unfamiliar with the BP document, a pre-revision version is available at http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/characteristics.cfm. With Survey results in hand, the Committee’s next consideration is whether to undertake a “short” or “extended” revision of the BP document. Also under Committee consideration is a revision of the BP website, with an eye to making it more user friendly and navigable. Stay tuned for the unveiling of this Committee’s work by Annual 2010.

Reports of Instruction-Related Events at Annual

By the Liaison Committee

This BP document will continue to play a pivotal role in the work of those involved with IL, or who are thinking about becoming involved.

--Cynthia Dottin, LIRT Liaison Committee

Unleashing the Undigitized: Promoting and Accessing Traditional Historical Resources in The Age of Google / RUSA HS

Three discussants participated in this program which was organized by the Instruction and Research Committee of the RUSA History Section. They spoke to a well known fact, particularly among librarians, that students have, historically, shown great difficulty in finding, differentiating, and using primary source materials. They spoke to the importance of engaging new learners in the age of Google, and assisting them in the recognition that “it is not all on the Web.” In fact, when it pertains to history resources, most of it is not on the Web. Rodrique E. Gauvin, Sr. VP Publishing ProQuest, in his “Information Resources for Digital Natives” used a PowerPoint presentation to share ProQuest’s continuing efforts to close the divide between digital and non-digital resources, and pointed to its Historical Newspapers project, as an example of this initiative. Gauvin shared some informative statistical data to prove that “it is not all on the Web”: There are 4 billion pages of newspaper content, of which only 4-5% (110 million pages) has been digitized in the U.S. and Great Britain. 25 million pages of Historical Newspapers have been, currently, digitized by ProQuest. Digitization efforts, so far, are a drop in the bucket as it pertains to newspapers, journals, books, primary sources, etc. Some ProQuest offerings: SUM-MON, AquaBrowser and Digital Microfilm. A useful and instructive Gauvin quote: “Bibliographic Instruction is a Sisyphean Task, but if we continue to chip away at this issue—It is not all on the Web—we can make a measurable difference.” Miami University of Ohio History Librarian addressed the following impediments: access to primary sources has been a major problem for historical research; working with microfilm has been a struggle; students do not know how to find primary sources; students need linear help to find sources and are not fond of print sources; students live in a digital world, while librarians are trying to get them to use...
print; using the academic library, and the concept of a library and research is anathema. Some of the ways librarians can help: Know your collection (e.g. primary sources such as Colonial Newspapers); know what other libraries have by talking to other librarians; teach your students subject searching; have a clear idea of when to use print and when to use digital (remember many digital sources are selective and not comprehensive) in other words, get the students to think about the sources; digitize something to lead them to want more; let them think that digital means print by digitizing a page of Readers Guide, for example; use something digital that links to the non-digital. The speaker from the New York Public library suggestion for helping students discover primary sources was, simply, to introduce them to Archives, and use Special Collections to introduce them to what primary sources are, and how they can be used to write history.

--Cynthia Dottin, LIRT Liaison Committee

Using Discovery-Based Learning to Engage Students with Information Literacy / ACRL Instruction Section Current Topics Discussion II

Arianne Hartsell-Guny and Eric Resnis, Miami University, led the discussion group of these sessions. This technique was described as being student-centered technique with the instructor serving as a facilitator. Students are presented with information, and they work in small groups (assisted by the facilitator) to explore the information opportunities and challenges of using discovery-based learning (DBL) in library instruction and how to make it their own. After learning the basics of discovery-based learning, participants in the discussion forum were then given a handout which described the three stages of student development as it applies to DBL: external formulas, crossroads, and self-authorship. The discussion continued among small groups who considered how they might incorporate DBL into a one-shot 50-minute instruction session. These groups then reported to the larger group. In general, librarians felt that DBL would be hard to implement in a 50-minute session. There were also concerns about working with students at multiple levels of development. Some participants recommended the use of short, in-class exercises that could be used to ascertain why students came to a session, and what they hoped to learn. Others suggested that students could be asked to work in groups to answer questions, rather than relaying all the information through a lecture format. Several participants suggested that DBL was a new term for a decades-old discussion on student engagement. Whether using DBL or another technique, librarians should continue to enlist student participation in the classroom in order to make the research process interesting and engaging. –Carrie Forbes, LIRT Liaison Committee

Teacher Proficiencies: Applying Proficiency Standards for Instruction Librarians in Your Library / ACRL Instruction Section Current Topics Discussion Group I

All attendees were provided with a copy of the ACRL “Standards and Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators: A Practical Guide” brochure. Megan Oakleaf, of the Syracuse iSchool, and Jennifer Church-Duran, University of Kansas, described how these proficiencies can be used, and have been used, in various environments. The large group of attendees then broke into several smaller groups to discuss two of the four questions provided by the organizers. The first question: “Where does a teacher or library start in determining which proficiencies to use and how to prioritize them?” The second question: “How can teacher librarians get training in the proficiencies they want to develop? What library, campus, or online sources can help develop a specific proficiency?” The third question: “How can an instruction coordinator use the proficiencies to guide and evaluate an instruction program?” The fourth question: “How can teacher librarians evaluate their teaching using the proficiencies? How can the proficiencies be used to guide professional development and goal setting?” Upon completion of the small group discussion, the small groups reported to the large group. The overarching conclusion was that these ACRL proficiencies are very flexible and applicable in many arenas. The proficiencies can be used for advocacy, professional development, course design, career counseling, teaching in library school, mentoring, and many other purposes. An online version of the proficiencies document can be found at http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/profstandards.cfm.

--Russell Hall, LIRT Liaison Committee

Instruction Related Events, continued on page 8
Illuminating New Instruction Research: Applying Research to Practice / ACRL Instruction Section
The session began with the presentation of several awards from the ACRL Instruction Section, including the Miriam Dudley Instruction Librarian Award, which was presented to Trudi Jacobson of the University at Albany. The program, itself, was a panel discussion moderated by Merinda McLure. The panelists were: Randy Hensley of Baruch College, Heidi Julien of the School of Library and Information Studies at the University of Alberta, and Michelle Morton of Canada College in California. The panel discussion was based on a scenario in which librarians at University X and Community College Y are seeking to coordinate an effort from which both schools and students would benefit from a joint information literacy program. The panelists assumed the roles of a University X librarian, a Community College Y librarian, and a library school professor from University X. Their discussion focused on three recent research articles: Haras, et al., “(Generation 1.5) Latino Students and the Library: a Case Study” from the Journal of Academic Librarianship (2008); Lupton, “Evidence, Argument and Social Responsibility” from Higher Education Research & Development (2008); and MacMillan, “Watching Learning Happen” from the Journal of Academic Librarianship (2009). The panelists discussed each of these articles in turn, focusing on context for the research, methodology, findings, and how the research could be used in terms of the presented scenario. The panelists invited questions from the audience, and these furthered the discussion by bringing other perspectives into the mix.
--Russell Hall, LIRT Liaison Committee

New Minds, New Approaches to Library Research / ALA LRRT
Three LIS graduate students presented their award-winning research projects, which were selected by a LRRT sub-committee. The first project was an ethnographic study by Devin Becker and Shingo Hamadas at Indiana University. The project was aimed at finding out about graduate students’ expectations of library services and resources, and whether or not there was a disconnection between students’ expectations and their university library. They also looked at the ways in which graduate students use library resources and services and the barriers the students encountered. The results of their study indicated that the students' perception of the university libraries’ resources and services have transformed from a physical space/place, to a virtual space/place where they can find and access resources for research. In the meantime, students also appreciate having librarians as "human backing to digital resources." The second project was conducted by Clayton A. Copeland, at University of South Carolina. The investigator researched the perceptions of accessibility/inaccessibility issues at different libraries by differently-abled patrons. The preliminary result was based on interviews with five participants. The results showed that the concept of disability is socially constructed, and accessibility still needs to be improved in many libraries. Major barriers to providing sufficient accessibility were limited time and resources. The third project was conducted by Kyungwon Koh at Florida State University. Her study was on the new information behaviors of the young generation. Ms. Koh used Radical Change theory and Bayesian Networks to analyze youth information-seeking behavior, assess the effectiveness of those behaviors, and to suggest educational policy. The preliminary findings showed that younger students (teens) exhibited non-sequential information seeking; they developed self-defined and controlled paths during their research; and many collaborated among teams. The data, so far, did not show consistent ethnicity or gender differences among the cohort. –Irene Ke, LIRT Liaison Committee

Instruction Related Events, continued from page 7

--http://www.baylor.edu/LIRT/lirtnews/

LIRT News, September 2009
Providing information literacy instruction to graduate students provides unique challenges and opportunities. What are some techniques to assess the information needs of graduate students? How can we engage graduate students in the library instruction classroom? What do graduate students appreciate most about library resources and services? Check these out, and enjoy!


The authors summarize the assessment process for preparing a comprehensive series of information literacy programs for graduate students at the University of Western Ontario's Taylor Library. The librarians conducted a survey and met with graduate students and faculty in focus groups in order to assess the students' past experiences with library instruction, and to determine whether specific workshop topics would be useful. More than half of the survey respondents had received prior instruction specific to database searching, using library catalogs, formatting citations, and conducting a literature review. All of the students reported having challenges with finding information, such as identifying appropriate keywords and refining searches. Students expressed a distinct preference for online instruction (more than half indicated a preference for online tutorials). Students also indicated that both basic and advanced level workshops would be valuable. Most students also indicated that subject-specific workshops would be important. Overall, the students thought that the most potentially useful workshops would be "Introduction to RefWorks," "Keeping Current with Scholarly Literature," as well as sessions specific to information searching. Faculty members indicated that all workshop topics would be useful for the students, especially literature searching.


Kraus describes an information literacy session developed for graduate students enrolled in a Master's program in German at the University of Utah's Marriott Library. Two new German studies faculty members arrived at the university in the fall of 2006, and quickly discovered that their graduate students relied exclusively on Wikipedia and questionable Web resources for their research. Consequently, the new faculty members recruited the German studies subject librarian to team-teach information literacy sessions. The research instruction sessions involved exposing the students to a wide variety of high quality print and electronic research tools, such as, among many others, the Modern Language Association International Bibliography, and Bibliographie der deutschen Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft (the latter extensively indexes German literature not covered in MLA). After learning about the library resources, the graduate students submitted significantly higher quality research papers. The graduate students (particularly those from Germany) especially appreciated learning about refer-
Millennials in Graduate School: How Do We Support Them? / ACRL ULS

This program brought together three speakers to discuss the millennials’ expectations of their university/college libraries and suggested approaches libraries can adopt to engage them. Joan K. Lippincott, from the Coalition for Networked Information, began the program by presenting the characteristics of graduate students on U.S. campuses today. The unique characteristics of this cohort led Ms. Lippincott to suggest that academic libraries should offer collection/content for mobile devices, provide needed software and tools, and work with students in creating online resource guides. She also believes that libraries can help graduate students by acknowledging their research anxiety, offering study space, and by providing Q&A sessions and tutorials. Lippincott suggested providing social gathering opportunities for international students, who currently make up 30% of all Ph.D. students in the U.S. Susan Gibbons, University of Rochester, reported on their latest ethnographic study of graduate students, which was aimed at finding out how the library can better support graduate students. She reported that graduate students are the heaviest library users. University libraries can support this population by promoting the services of subject librarians, by introducing key tools to the students, and by putting advisors’ names in the library catalog’s bibliographic records. Barbara Dewey, Dean of Libraries at the University of Tennessee, suggested supporting graduate students by connecting them to their subject librarian very early on, providing study space, connecting them to graduate students in other disciplines, and accommodating the “graduate students cycle” through such accommodations as linking them to publishing and career opportunities. At the end of the sessions, the audience was shown a video montage of graduate students making their case for these accommodations and support.

—Irene Ke, LIRT Liaison Committee

Another class to teach?

LIP is pleased to announce the forthcoming title:

Teaching Non-Traditional Learners: Topics for Creative Instruction

See the website for focus and content. The ready-made, concept-focused lesson plans in all titles of the Active Learning Series will improve your IL efforts with tested, creative, and high-powered instruction.

www.library-instruction-pubs.com

Macauley and Green review two studies (based on their own doctoral research) that focus on information literacy in the context of multidisciplinary graduate studies. The first study explored quantitative data specific to approximately 2000 Australian doctoral students in the arts, humanities, social sciences, education, and sciences, as well as their supervisors. Qualitative research (interviews with sixty doctoral candidates and twelve doctoral supervisors) was also conducted for the first study. The second study involved interviewing academic librarians, doctoral advisors, and doctoral students in order to assess how Ph.D. students learn to conduct literature reviews, and what they learn from the process. The authors found that the students often developed information literacy skills independently, without seeking assistance from librarians (graduate students under 25 years of age were less inclined to consult a librarian than those over 55). The authors highly recommend that librarians engage graduate students in careful dialogue in order to assess their diverse needs.


Providing information literacy instruction at the graduate level presents many challenges. Faculty members often assume that graduate students have acquired research skills prior to starting their programs, and, consequently, they may not incorporate library instruction into their courses. Graduate students often rely on their peers for research advice, and time constraints limit their willingness to learn about new library resources and search strategies. In order to overcome such obstacles, librarians at Oregon State University (OSU) designed information literacy programs specifically for graduate students. The OSU library appointed a graduate services coordinator who researched such services at other libraries, and conducted a survey to assess the user needs of incoming graduate students. Next, the library developed a graduate student services committee to design and conduct programs for students at the graduate level. Based on a review of the research conducted by the graduate services coordinator, the committee decided to create workshops focusing on the literature review process. Promotion activities included advertising the workshops via e-mail (sent by the graduate advisors and subject librarians), and posting paper flyers on department bulletin boards. More than 150 students from the life sciences, social sciences, education, engineering, and physical sciences departments registered for the initial workshops. The sessions were offered during the morning and early evening to accommodate a range of schedules. Workshop activities included small group discussions about previous approaches to library research, and methods for organizing notes, papers, and citations. Librarians also demonstrated search tools and their applications (such as search alert services). The workshops also introduced students to strategies for keeping current with new research, such as using RSS feeds and social bookmarking. Librarians also advertised training opportunities for bibliographic management software. Due to the success of the workshops, OSU librarians also considered developing specialized sessions for international graduate students, returning students, and graduates enrolled in distance education programs.
Any factors, including professional standards, our institutions, and our own sense of librarianship create high expectations for library instruction programs. When one considers the five competency standards, it can be difficult to even consider attempting to squeeze that much information into two hours of class time (one in the Fall and one in the Spring). It’s really not possible. Some libraries with larger staffs have been able to convince faculty members to have their students come to the library for several sessions in a semester. If you have a small staff this is not feasible. You also must have faculty that are willing to give up those class hours to library instruction. Another option is to develop for-credit information literacy programs. This also takes support on several levels from your institution and may not be practical for every library. Fortunately, these are no longer the only options an instruction coordinator has when considering ways to increase and improve information literacy instruction.

At Samford, we are one of those libraries with a smaller staff. Our program is similar to most. We see a majority of freshmen in connection with a required core writing course. We found that the one-shot session at the beginning of the semester just was not sufficient. Many students still ended coming back to the reference desk with issues that were covered in the instruction session. We frequently received feedback from professors that resources being cited by their students were not in line with their expectations. In the students’ defense, it can be difficult to process and remember large amounts of unfamiliar information when stuffed into a 50 minute session. "Cramming in" all that wonderful information was not meeting our standards, so we needed to take a different approach.

We don't have enough reference librarians to cover two or three sessions per semester. Even if we did, it would be difficult to get buy-in from faculty to give up that much class time for library instruction. A for-credit course is not practical for us either. So we went to the literature to see what was working for similar libraries and crafted an approach that would enable more librarian interaction with students without using too much class time or staff time.

We approached the faculty of the core writing course and proposed embedding a librarian in their on-line course space (using Blackboard in our case). We still started with the traditional, in-person one hour instruction session. The next step was to embed a librarian in the Blackboard space to supplement information literacy instruction over the duration of the semester. This caused no extra work for the professor. They simply added the librarian to the course. The writing instructors were also asked to incorporate the library component into the students' participation grade. This step provided a clear and necessary incentive to get the students to participate in the information literacy instruction discussion. Each week the students were asked questions or prompted to respond to statements using the Blackboard discussion board feature. All questions were designed to make them think about information literacy, library resources, and the research process. When possible, questions were tailored to fit with their assignments. If they responded to the questions, they got a point for that week. The professor was given student performance information at the end of the semester. The other advantage to this method is that we would be interacting with the students on the familiar turf of Blackboard. They needed to be on Blackboard for their class, so they didn’t need to make any extra trips to the library or the library’s web site.

Our results show that the embedding project produced positive results. Students who participated in our pilot fared better than students who didn’t on an IL survey administered at the end of the semester.

We have also done a similar experiment with Blogspot in place of Blackboard. Results from that are promising as well. We will likely consider other Web 2.0 options going forward. It is exciting to think we may be able to meet the information literacy needs of our students in an efficient, affordable, and interesting way. More must be done but this approach may be one that works well in many institutions regardless of size, student demographics, or financial limitations. In my view this is an excellent solution to a very old problem. The success and promise of our pilot project has embedding on my mind!
Photos from ALA Annual 2009 in Chicago!
Dear Tech Talk-- I overheard a group of librarians discussing “digital storytelling”. At first I thought it had to do with some kind of children’s programming, but as I heard more of their discussion, I began to wonder if it was something of value for my library. So, what is “digital storytelling” and is it of value to libraries?  --Digital Storytelling Distress Syndrome

Dear DSDS-- A variety of definitions can be found for “digital storytelling”, but the University of Houston provides a particularly succinct one which they attribute to Daniel Meadows – “short, personal, multi-media tales told from the heart”. (http://digitalstorytelling.coe.uh.edu/) Further analysis of this definition provides additional insight: “short” – 3-5 minutes long; “personal” -- stories told in a first person narrative; “multimedia” – the integrated use of digital image, video, and audio files; and “told from the heart” – authentic, emotional, meaningful.

To get a better understanding of digital stories, explore some examples at:
- The Center for Digital Storytelling -- http://www.storycenter.org/stories/
- Educational Uses of Digital Storytelling – http://digitalstorytelling.coe.uh.edu/
- Stories for Change -- http://storiesforchange.net/
- Tell a Story in Five Frames – http://www.flickr.com/groups/visualstory/

The concept has been around for more than 15 years. It was conceived through the collaborative efforts of Joe Lambert (producer/dramatic consultant) and the late Dana Atchley (media producer and artist). They joined Nina Mullen to create the San Francisco Digital Media Center, which ultimately evolved into the Center for Digital Storytelling (http://www.storycenter.org/history.html and http://www.storycenter.org/timeline.html). The mission of the CDS is to, “assist youth and adults around the world in using media tools to share, record, and value stories from their lives, in ways that promote artistic expression, health and well being, and justice.” (http://www.storycenter.org/index1.html). To accomplish this mission, the CDS offers a variety of services, including multi-day workshops “to assist individuals, organizations, and institutions around the world in pursuing their own digital storytelling work.” (http://www.storycenter.org/services.html)

Three dynamics have converged, creating the perfect environment for digital storytelling to flourish. especially in academic environments. At the nascence of digital storytelling, the tools needed to create, integrate, and share digital image, audio, and video files were costly and challenging for most to use effectively. However, technological advancements and the birth of Web 2.0 technology have made it much easier for anyone to work with and share complex digital files. Additionally, today’s students are digital natives, born in a technology-infused society; most are adept with technology at an early age.
Last, there is a strong push to ensure that students have “21st century” literacy, which includes:
• Digital literacy – the ability to communicate with an ever-expanding community to discuss issues, gather information, and seek help;
• Global literacy – the capacity to read, interpret, respond, and contextualize messages from a global perspective;
• Technology literacy – the ability to use computers and other technology to improve learning, productivity, and performance;
• Visual literacy – the ability to understand, produce, and communicate through visual images;
• Information literacy – the ability to find, evaluate, and synthesize information. (Robin 224)

Consequently, in recent years numerous articles have been written to demonstrate the benefits (for both students and instructors) of digital storytelling as a teaching and learning tool (Benmayor; Coventry; Gregory and Steelman; Kulla-Abbott and Polman; Leon; More; Nelson, Hull, and Roche-Smith; Nixon; Oppermann; Royer and Richards; and Sadik). Some of these benefits include enabling the retention of information, developing critical thinking skills and improving communication.

Digital storytelling – by its very nature – is a social activity and, consequently, flourishes in a social environment. Therefore, learning the concepts of digital storytelling within a social context is the most appropriate technique. In the multi-day workshops provided by the Center for Digital Storytelling (http://www.storycenter.org/services.html), attendees have the opportunity to learn and implement digital storytelling processes (script development, storyboarding, production, editing, etc.) and use appropriate digital tools (software and hardware); but – more importantly – they have the opportunity to develop and share their stories with others (in story circles) and through this social interaction, they redefine and refine their stories into effective, if not powerful, statements.

If attendance at a digital storytelling workshop is not possible – at least initially – there are a number of tools available that can assist in the development and evaluation of digital stories, including:
• Alan Levine’s “50+ Web 2.0 Ways to Tell a Story” – http://cogdogroo.wikispaces.com/50+Ways
• Alan Levine’s “The 50 Tools” – http://cogdogroo.wikispaces.com/StoryTools
• American Film Institute ScreenNation -- Learn -- http://www.screennation.afi.com/Learn.aspx
• Create – http://digitalstorytelling.coe.uh.edu/getting_started.html
• Elements of Digital Storytelling – http://www.inms.umn.edu/elements/
• A Guide to Digital Storytelling –
  http://www.bbc.co.uk/wales/audiovideo/sites/about/pages/howto.shtml and
• Rubistar (search for or create rubrics for digital storytelling) – http://rubistar.4teachers.org/
• Seven Steps to Create a DigiTales Story – http://www.digitales.us/resources/seven_steps.php

However, perhaps the best resource to start with is the Center for Digital Storytelling’s Digital Storytelling Cookbook (http://www.storycenter.org/memvoice/pages/cookbook.html and http://www.storycenter.org/cookbook.pdf). In particular, this resource details 7 elements of digital storytelling (9-19):
• Point (of View) – the concept of a first-person narrative that brings a personal connection and an emotional impact to the story;
• Dramatic Question – the dramatic structure of the story, setting up a tension, rewarding or surprising the audience’s expectations, with the intent of defining the meaning of the story;
• Emotional Content – emotionally engaging the audience and also exposing the emotional vulnerabili-
ity of the storyteller;
• The Gift of Your Voice – the storyteller’s voice (literal voice) in the narrative;
• The Power of the Soundtrack – the power that music and/or sound effects can provide to a story –
which is a double-edged sword in that selected music makes a significant impact on a digital story, but
it also brings significant copyright issues to the table;
• Economy – stories are “effectively illustrated with a small number of images and videos and a rela-
tively short text”, through the use of implicit vs. explicit illustrations, metaphors, and symbolism;
• Pacing – the “timing”, “rhythm”, “beat” of the story.

Below is a list of libraries (and even one library vendor) that have experimented with digital storytell-
ing:
• Cengage Thomson Librareo – http://www.gale.cengage.com/librareo/
• Oakland Public Library – http://www.oaklandlibrary.org/PR/pr010509digitalstory.htm
• Ohio State University – http://www.storycenter.org/cds_osu.html and https://kb.osu.edu/dspace/handle/1811/6637
• San Diego Public Library – http://www.sandiego.gov/public-library/services/digitalstorytelling.shtml
• Scott County Schools and Scott County Public Library (Georgetown, KY) – http://www.dtc.scott.k12.
ky.us/technology/digitalstorytelling/ds.html
• Veria Central Public Library (Greece) – http://blog.libver.gr/en/?p=62
• Wilmette Public Library – http://www.wilmettelibrary.info/teens/teen_ds.php

Of particular note is the work done by two librarians (Anne Fields and Karen Diaz) at Ohio State Univer-
sity. After attending a CDS digital storytelling workshop in 2005, they were inspired by the potential of
digital storytelling “to allow the library to tell stories in ways we had not anticipated. We were con-
vinced that digital storytelling promised a means for the university community to tell the many, many
stories that lay untapped and, in telling, build community.” (Fields and Diaz 31)

They returned to OSU to form partnerships and develop digital storytelling opportunities on the cam-
pus. They’ve recently written a book (Fostering Community through Digital Storytelling: A Guide for
Academic Libraries) using their experiences to illustrate the value of digital storytelling in an academic
library. Although aimed at an academic audience, the content of this book easily applies to any library.
Specifically, chapter 5 focuses on the on different ways that digital storytelling can be used to promote
and advance a number of initiatives including information literacy, scholarly communication, collec-
tions, library as place, and the library within the community. (67-82) At the end of their book, they also
discuss the value of digital storytelling in fund raising initiatives.

If library staff decides to invest in digital storytelling, Fields and Diaz suggest that “creating a supportive
environment for digital storytelling, either within the library or across the campus [community], has to
be deliberate, collaborative and programmatic if anything meaningful is to result. . . For the library to
lead or engage in a digital storytelling program on campus, the library’s administration must support
that participation” (Fields and Diaz 83) Areas where libraries can provide that supportive environment
include housing digital stories on library servers, assisting with copyright issues, and showcasing digital
stories.
Should libraries make use of digital storytelling? All libraries have stories to tell and connections to build within their communities. Digital storytelling – if done effectively – can be a powerful tool. Ending with the words of Fields and Diaz:

“The final big lesson of digital storytelling is . . . the lesson of how transformational digital storytelling can be not only in telling the library’s story, but also in discovering the library’s story. Digital storytelling allows us to talk to each other reflectively and to engage our users in conversation about libraries.” (Fields and Diaz, viii)

Additional Resources


As always, send questions and comments to:
Snail Mail:
Billie Peterson-Lugo
Moody Memorial Library
Baylor University
One Bear Place #97148
Waco, TX  76798-7148

E-Mail: billie_peterson@baylor.edu
STANDING COMMITTEES

**Adult Learners**
This committee is charged with assisting library professionals to more effectively serve adult learners.

**Conference Program**
This committee shall be responsible for annual program preparation and presentation.

**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.

**Membership**
This committee shall be responsible for publicizing the Round Table’s purposes, activities and image; and for promoting membership in the Round Table.

**Newsletter**
The committee shall be responsible for soliciting articles, and preparing and distributing LIRT News.

**Organization and Planning**
This committee shall be responsible for long-range planning and making recommendations to guide the future direction of LIRT.

**Research**
The committee will identify, review, and disseminate information about in-depth state-of-the-art research about library instruction for all types of libraries.

**Teaching, Learning, and Technology**
This committee will be responsible for identifying and promoting the use of technology in library instruction.

**Top 20**
This committee shall be responsible for monitoring the library instruction literature and identifying high quality library-instruction related articles from all types of libraries.

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

**Web Advisory**
This committee shall provide oversight and overall direction for the LIRT Web site.
Please see our online committee volunteer form at http://www3.baylor.edu/LIRT/volform.html
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