Hello All!

I am excited and honored to start my term as your President of LIRT for 2018-2019. Thank you to the dedicated leaders and members for making this experience enjoyable and rewarding. The summer is winding down and we are all getting ready for the new school year. Among all this hustle and bustle I wanted to take a look back at Annual in New Orleans.

- LIRT said goodbye to Lorelle Swader as our ALA Liaison. Lorelle was our go to for the past 23 years and we will miss her dearly, but we are also happy for her new adventure as Associate Executive Director, ALA Offices and Member Relations and ALA-Allied Professional Association. Lorelle was able to attend our Executive meeting and Awards ceremony where we were able to express our gratitude in person.

- Danielle Alderson will be our new ALA Liaison, and she has already been so helpful to me as I on board as President of LIRT. Welcome Danielle!

- ALA is investigating its Organizational Effectiveness, and the Round Table Coordinating Assembly has been working to ensure that our voices are heard in this process. Ning Zou has been appointed to represent LIRT on a special Task Force that will author a report to be presented to the President’s Organizational Effectiveness Committee.

- Executive Board has voted to support continuing to offer a Pre-Conference session every other year at Annual. Our next Pre-Conference will be held at Annual next year in Washington DC! This will be coordinated by the Adult Learners committee, led by Mark Robison and Michael Saar. Pre-Conferences will be affordable, half-day sessions on library instruction and organized by selected LIRT standing committees on a rotational basis.

- LIRT takes over from LearnRT (Learning Round Table) on the Conference Program Selection Jury. With the new jury process, representation is alternated between Round Tables that have a similar mission.

Continued on Page 2
From the President

I want to thank everyone for volunteering their time to make all of the programs and resources successful. I love that LIRT brings together librarians of all types of institutions, who are interested or involved in instruction on any level. The more we work together the better we can serve our respective communities.

If you have served LIRT in the past and are looking to get back into helping spread the LIRT Mission, I will be accepting submissions to be appointed to the following ALA Assemblies/Task Force:

- LIRT Representative to Institute for Information Literacy Executive Board
- ALA Advocacy Assembly
- ALA Literacy Assembly
- ALA Membership Promotion Task Force
- ALA Recruitment Assembly

These are two-year appointments and require at least one year of service to LIRT on a committee level or above. Requirements of the position are to report back annually and will serve as a member of the Steering Committee. Representatives must attend at least one Steering committee meeting per year either at Annual or Midwinter to report on the activities of the assemblies. Serving on these Assemblies are another great way to engage in LIRT, build your resume, and advocate for your attendance at ALA Conferences. For more information on the requirements for assembly representatives, please see the LIRT Organizational Manual starting on page 31 (the manual can be found at http://www.ala.org/rt/lirt/leader-resources).

Please submit a short biography, Assembly interest, previous LIRT activity and short description of why you want to serve on the Assembly indicated to me at kedson@bossierlibrary.org.

Kristen

From the Past President

I am happy to report that LIRT has had another round of successful meetings and events at ALA Annual in New Orleans this summer. Kudos to the Conference Program, Awards, and Membership committees, as well as the strong leadership each committee chair and vice chair have demonstrated!

More good news: there has been a major increase in LIRT’s membership this past year, and we now have more than 1,700 members! Currently, we are one of the two largest Round Tables within ALA. I cannot give enough credit to all my colleagues on the Executive Board and Steering committee and, of course, my fellow LIRT members. Thank you for believing in us and sharing our vision on bringing together librarians who provide library instruction across all types of libraries—academic, public, school, and special libraries.

This past year, the Executive Board has approved several proposals presented by the Steering committee. To strengthen LIRT’s growth, we are moving forward to create a new Communications committee, consisting of Newsletter, Web Advisory, and Social Media responsibilities. Better communication between LIRT committees and to LIRT members and constituents will generate more synergy and diverse ideas. A significant reduction of the student membership fee will be added to the 2019 ballot to engage our future librarians and hear their voices. LIRT will also articulate the role of LIRT Archivist in our bylaws to preserve the history of our Round Table.

On a final note, please join me in welcoming LIRT’s President for FY2018-19, Kristen Edson. Kristen is not only my conference buddy, but also a talented leader with extensive managerial experience in public libraries, as well as a great advocate of LIRT’s values.

Thank you to everyone for your generous support during my presidency. It has been an amazing journey! I will lead the Organization and Planning committee this year, working with you to nominate next year’s LIRT leaders. Please be on the lookout for the call.

Ning
This summer has been hot, at least in the part of Kansas where I live. New Orleans was hot for Annual, and I don’t think I’ve cooled off since I got back. While I’m sad to see the long days and relaxed work atmosphere go, I look forward to cooler temperatures and getting back into the swing of another school year.

In this issue of LIRT News, make sure to read both the From the President and From the Past President letters—Kristen and Ning provide very informative recaps of what LIRT has been up to over the past year and where it is headed moving forward.

In addition, Billie Peterson-Lugo has written an insightful Tech Talk column on RA21, and we’ve included lots of pictures and information from ALA Annual, in case you missed it.

Here’s to hoping the next time you hear from me, I’ll be needing a jacket outside.

Best,

Sherri
What brought you to LIRT?

I joined LIRT with the hope of learning and sharing instruction tips and techniques with other academic librarians. I’ve been a professional librarian for five years, and instruction has steadily become a more integral part of my position. As time goes on, the more I want to connect with other professionals who are walking the line between librarian and educator.

What was your path to librarianship?

I began working in libraries when I was 18 and a freshman at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro. I applied for a work-study position at our campus library in the Access Services Department and fell in love with the place! When I graduated with my BA, I moved to Florida and accepted a staff position at the University of North Florida’s Thomas G. Carpenter Library. I’ve been here ever since—twelve years and counting. I received my MLIS from Florida State University in 2012, and was hired as a faculty librarian at UNF in 2013.

Tell us about your current position. What do you like most about it?

My current position is Student Outreach Librarian. My main responsibility is to plan student events, programs, and activities; we reached over 8,000 students last fiscal year during outreach events. I also run our social media accounts, create promotional materials, market library services around campus, provide research assistance, and teach classes. It’s a lot of work, but it all boils down to library advocacy. Yes, I may be planning a Welcome Week breakfast event for our incoming students, but what I’m really doing is finding creative ways to teach them about valuable library resources. Most of our major events include a learning objective or outcome, so it’s not all fun and games. My favorite part of my job is hearing a student say “Wow! I didn’t know that!”

In what ways does it challenge you?

Outreach is a long, drawn out process. I plan, assess, budget for, and participate in nearly 50 events every academic year, which eats up a lot of time and energy. I also teach about fifty one-shot classes and provide research consultations to nearly 100 students in the same time period. As an introvert, it is oftentimes draining to do all of these things, one after the other, but it’s worth it in the end.

Throughout all of your educational experiences, what teacher inspired you the most and why?

I’ve had several teachers inspire me, but honestly I always think of my fourth grade teacher who first encouraged my love of reading. If she hadn’t made me a lifelong reader, I wouldn’t have had the dream to work in a library. If I had never worked in a library, I wouldn’t be where I am now.

When you travel, what do you never leave home without?

A book, a water bottle, and a saved Google Map of the location on my phone. Lifesaver!

If you could change one thing about libraries today, what would it be?

We’re slowly getting there, but I would love to see libraries as a more diverse and inclusive space. Like many of us, I certainly don’t fit the stereotypical librarian profile. Our communities are changing and diversifying, and we need to reflect that in the people we hire, the services we offer, and the courses we teach.

Tell us one thing about yourself that most of us probably don’t know.

Although I have a BA and MA in English, I actually started off as a Theatre major. I went to a school of the arts in high school, so it made sense at the time. While my acting career didn’t exactly work out, the experience has shaped how I tackle both instruction and outreach. Presenting is just another form of performing, and even on days when I’m feeling more introverted than usual, or just a little “off,” I can dig into my acting background and make sure I’m the best version of myself for my audience.
Who’s Who in LIRT 2018-2019

LIRT Elected Officers

President:
Kristen Edson, Central Library Manager
Bossier Parish Library, Louisiana

Vice President/President Elect:
Rachael Elrod, Head, Education Library
Smathers Libraries, University of Florida

Immediate Past President:
Ning Zou, Learning Design and Research Librarian
Monroe C. Gutman Library, Harvard Graduate School of Education

Secretary:
Cynthia Ippoliti, Director and University Librarian
University of Colorado Denver

Treasurer:
Hui-Fen Chang, Academic Liaison Librarian,
Research and Learning Services Division
Edmon Low Library, Oklahoma State University

Vice Treasurer/Treasurer Elect:
Mardi Mahaffy, Head of Teaching and Learning
Miller Nichols Library, University of Missouri Kansas City

LIRT ALA Councilor:
Cynthia Dottin, Reference & Instruction Librarian
Green Library, Florida International University

Have you created an instruction program or developed a unique classroom strategy?
Please share your experiences with LIRT!

Send your articles to Sherri Brown (sherri.brown@ku.edu)
LIRT Committee Leadership

**Adult Learners**
Chair: Mark Robison, First-Year Experience Librarian, Valparaiso University Libraries
Vice Chair: Michael Saar, Interim Coordinator of Instruction and Assessment, Instructional Design Librarian, Mary and John Gray Library, Lamar University

**Awards**
Chair: Beth Fuchs, Undergraduate Learning Librarian, University of Kentucky
Vice Chair: Joshua Johnson Vossler, Head of Reference & Instruction, Morris Library, Southern Illinois University

**Conference Planning**
Chair: Ilka Datig, Head of Instruction and Outreach, Lorette Wilmot Library, Nazareth College
Vice Chair: Erica England, First Year Experience Librarian, Washington State University Libraries

**Liaison**
Chair: Laura Pearle, Director, Cox Library, Milton Academy, Massachusetts

**Membership**
Co-Chair: Kelly Ansley, Library Director, East Georgia State College Library
Co-Chair: Susan Mythen, Library and Learning Commons Manager, Florida State College at Jacksonville

**Newsletter**
Chair/Editor: Sherri Brown, Literatures & Humanities Librarian, University of Kansas Libraries
Production Editor: Rachel Mulvihill, Head, Teaching & Engagement, University of Central Florida Libraries

**Organization and Planning**
Chair: Ning Zou, Learning Design and Research Librarian, Monroe C. Gutman Library, Harvard Graduate School of Education

**Teaching, Learning, and Technology**
Chair: Cinthya Ippoliti, Director and University Librarian, University of Colorado Denver

**Top 20**
Chair: Katharine Macy, Business Librarian, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Vice Chair: Ann Marie Smeraldi, Head, Library Teaching and Learning Services, Michael Schwartz Library, Cleveland State University

**Transitions to College**
Chair: Matt Upson, Director, Undergraduate Instruction and Outreach, Edmon Low Library, Oklahoma State University
Vice Chair: Holly Luetkenhaus, First Year Experience Librarian, Edmon Low Library, Oklahoma State University

**Web Advisory**
Chair: Billie Peterson-Lugo, Director, Digital Library Services and Systems, Baylor University
Dear Tech Talk—The March 2018 Tech Talk column discussed IPv6. This topic made me wonder about possible alternatives to IP authentication for access to the online content acquired by libraries.

–Interested in Alternatives to IP Authentication

Dear IAIA—For many years, libraries have used IP authentication to provide access to online resources, which has worked well for end users accessing content from within the institution’s IP range. They click on a link and seamlessly have access to the content. (Note, throughout this article, “institution” will be defined broadly as an educational environment, including public, school, college, university, and corporate libraries, etc.) However, once outside of the institution’s IP range, all bets are off—especially if the end user encounters the content through Google Scholar or a comparable source. At this point, the end user often runs into a paywall; not realizing that the institution has a subscription to the content, the end user might (1) pay for access; (2) find another way to obtain the content (academia.edu or SciHub or the like); or (3) give up.

IP authentication was a great solution for its time, but the times have changed, technology has changed, and—most importantly—end users’ habits have changed. Many end users do not conduct their research at their institution; they use mobile devices (smart phones or tablets, not laptops), and they begin their research with Google Scholar. IP authentication has become more difficult to manage and content providers don’t always have the institution’s most current IP information; misuses of phished credentials can result in an institution losing access to content because the content provider cuts off access based on an IP range. Additionally, as asserted by Rich Wenger, E-Resource Systems Manager at MIT Libraries, “The assumption that an IP address = a physical location = an authenticated, authorized user is false. IP filtering is about where a user is (which is completely obscured by proxy servers and VPNs), not who the user is” (2018, p. 6).

In his issue brief, Roger Schonfeld (2015) states, “Instead of the rich and seamless digital library for scholarship that they need, researchers today encounter archipelagos of content bridged by infrastructure that is insufficient and often outdated. . . the researcher’s discovery-to-access workflow is much more difficult than it should be” (p. 3). Schonfeld (2015) ends by saying that the scholarly communication ecosystem of libraries, publishers, university IT, and intermediaries should commit to developing a single user account for all scholarly e-resources—an account that not only provides authentication via a researcher’s institutional credentials but also serves as the vehicle through which a variety of additional data-driven services could be provided on an opt-in basis and travels with the researcher when changing institutional affiliations (p. 15).

Enter a possible alternative, RA21, Resource Access for the 21st Century (https://ra21.org/), a joint initiative from the International Association of Scientific, Technical, and Medical Publishers (STM) and the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) that began late in 2016. In addition to STM and NISO, other key stakeholders communities (content providers, federations, publishers, universities, and university libraries) are participants (https://ra21.org/index.php/about/). Its goal is to facilitate “a seamless user experience for consumers of scientific communication” and “to solve long-standing, complex, and broadly distributed challenges in the areas of network security and user privacy” (https://ra21.org/index.php/what-is-ra21/).

The overarching goal of RA21 is to “recommend new solutions for access strategies beyond IP recognition in joint collaboration with software vendors, libraries, federation operators, publishers and service providers.” Specific goals include:

- Testing and improving solutions by organizing pilots in a variety of environments.
- Establishing best practices and publish them via the NISO Recommended Practice process.

Continued on page 18
Along with other treats, attendees at the 2018 LIRT President’s Program were invited to sample a piece of king cake – a New Orleans Mardi Gras tradition. Find out the history of king cake (and significance of the small plastic baby) at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/King_cake.
Awards Committee

Report by Beth Fuchs, LIRT Awards Committee Chair

The fifth annual LIRT Awards ceremony was held at the New Orleans Downtown Marriott at the Convention Center on Sunday, June 24, 2018. Beth Fuchs began the ceremony with an overview of the awards and an acknowledgement of those who served on the Librarian Recognition Award subcommittee and the Innovation in Instruction Award subcommittee. She then introduced the award honorees: Arieh Ress, senior librarian at The Science, Industry and Business Library (SIBL) branch of the New York Public Library and recipient of the 2018 Innovation in Instruction Award for the Picture Yourself Online! program; and Emily Rimland, Information Literacy Librarian and Learning Technologies Coordinator at the Pennsylvania State University Libraries and recipient of the 2018 Librarian Recognition Award. The honorees briefly spoke about their passion for information literacy and the achievements that earned them these awards. Ress spoke movingly about our professional obligation to meet the needs of library users as effectively as we can, whatever those needs might be, as he discussed the Picture Yourself Online! program. Rimland paid tribute in her speech to some of the most important and memorable teachers in her life through vignettes that were both humorous and poignant. Discussion continued among the attendees and honorees over refreshments through the conclusion of the event.

Conference Program Committee

Report by Meggan A. Houlihan, 2018 LIRT Conference Program Co-Chair

The 2018 LIRT Conference Program, Moving Beyond the Threshold: Next Steps in Critical Information Literacy, was held Saturday, June 23, 2018, at the New Orleans Ernest N. Morial Convention Center and featured three thought-provoking presentations that focused on the importance of critical information literacy in academic, school, and public libraries. Speakers discussed how librarians can better engage library users in library instruction and lifelong learning by utilizing critical information literacy.

The first presentation featured Ian Beilin, Humanities Research Services Librarian at Columbia University. Beilin stated that critical information literacy’s ‘next steps’ should be in part taking a step back in order to better understand what and who preceded us (and who we may have forgotten), and then to link our efforts with ideas and movements beyond librarianship proper so that we can better ensure the permanence of our efforts within it.

The second presentation featured Amita Lonial, Learning, Marketing and Engagement Principal Librarian at San Diego County Library, who provided perspectives on current practices of critical information literacy in public libraries along with possibilities for the future.

The last presentation featured Tiffany Whitehead, Upper & Middle School Librarian at Episcopal High School in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. She is also known as the Mighty Little Librarian. Tiffany provided critical perspectives on the fake news crisis and examples of how school librarians can and are helping fight the fake new battle.

A special thanks to the LIRT Conference Planning Committee for all of their hard work and to various LIRT members who helped welcome attendees, distribute materials, and collect assessment information.

For more information about the program and access to presenter’s slides, please see: http://www.ala.org/rt/lirt/conference-program-2018
LIRT Librarian Recognition Award Winner Emily Rimland, and LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award Winner Arieh Ress, on behalf of New York Public Library

Photos by Rachel Mulvihill
**Membership Committee**

Report by Susan Mythen, Membership Committee Co-Chair

The membership committee has been working on getting systems in place to welcome new LIRT members and follow up with exiting members. We are now sending regular monthly emails as we receive roster information from ALA. Our membership committee is thinking about how we can expand our presence and visibility at conferences... any ideas from LIRT members are welcome! We continue to plan social events such as Bites with LIRT at conferences. While we are one of the largest round tables in ALA, we strive to maintain that warm and friendly feel and to make sure that all our members feel valued and appreciated.

**Newsletter Committee**

Report by Sherri Brown, LIRT Newsletter Committee Chair

The Newsletter committee has had a very productive 2018 thus far. In addition to production of our quarterly newsletters, we created a LIRT communications survey that was distributed to LIRT members and subscribers to the LIRT listserv in June. Print copies of the survey were also available at the LIRT President’s Program at ALA Annual. We received 352 survey responses and would like to thank everyone who took the time to provide their feedback about engaging with LIRT. The committee is currently reviewing survey responses and will draft a report to be shared with the LIRT steering and executive committees. Responses will help the committee as we continue to prepare for the transition to a Communications committee that will include the newsletter, social media, and web communications. Committee members are planning for the creation of a new committee charge and communication plan for LIRT.

**Teaching, Learning, and Technology (TLT) Committee**

Report by Cinthya Ippoliti, LIRT TLT Committee Chair

The LIRT TLT committee prepared the LIRT discussion at ALA Midwinter 2018, and it was very well received. We had two sets of panelists and the topic was “App-etizing Instruction: Practical Tips for Teaching Emerging Technologies.”

Emerging technologies pose new pedagogical challenges as libraries grapple with assessing their role and impact on learning and scholarship. The committee hosted a lively and practical exploration of the issues surrounding the integration of tools ranging from 3D printers to virtual reality software into our instructional repertoire. This session featured a panel of librarians from various types and sizes of libraries followed by group activities and interaction, where we examined topics such as developing lesson plans and assessment methods, collaborating with faculty and other partners, analyzing formats and modalities of delivery, and contending with varying levels of support and funding.

The following folks prepared the discussion materials and presented: Stan Trembach, University of Northern Colorado; Liya Deng, Eastern Washington University; Rachael Elrod, Neelam Bharti, and Sara Gonzalez, University of Florida. Committee members moderated the session.

**Transitions to College Committee**

Report by Matt Upson, 2018 LIRT Transitions to College Committee Chair

After a very busy 2017, the LIRT Transitions to College Committee slowed down a bit. We have worked to update components of our Connecting Librarians for K-20 Transitions Map (http://www.ala.org/rt/lirt/connecting-librarians-k-20-transitions) and are seeking to promote more connections and communications through this resource. We are also working on updating a bibliography for those interested in student transitions. The previous version of this list is about ten years old and needs to be refreshed. If you have suggestions on additions to this list, please contact committee co-chair Matt Upson at matthew.upson@okstate.edu. Our committee will also be offering a discussion session during the ALA Midwinter Conference in Seattle, so be on the lookout for more information as we plan this event. I would also like to thank our committee for their continued work and ideas and offer my appreciation to outgoing co-chair Beth West. I would also like to welcome our new vice chair Holly Luetkenhaus. We are very excited to continue developing our resources and to offer an excellent program in January.
High Impact Librarianship: A Showcase of Collaborative and Experiential Learning Initiatives

Report by: Michael Saar, Lamar University

Panelists:
- Hazel McClure - Associate Librarian, Grand Valley State University (mcclureh@gvsu.edu);
- Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra – Liaison Librarian, GVSU (scrippsl@gvsu.edu);
- Gayle Schaub - Liaison Librarian, GVSU (schaubg@gvsu.edu);
- Vinicius Lima - Associate Professor of Graphic Design, GVSU (limav@gvsu.edu);
- Mark Schaub - Associate Professor of Writing, GVSU (schaubm@gvsu.edu)

Date: June 24, 2018

Audience: Academic librarians (especially four-year academics)


Summary: Librarians and faculty from Grand Valley State University discussed four programs they enacted that represent high-impact practices in libraries. These projects were partially inspired by the University push for high-impact practices across the campus. Hazel McClure served as moderator for the program and began the discussion by noting the relative dearth of research on high impact education practices in librarianship. Despite that, the ten high-impact education practices outlined in Kuh and Schneider’s seminal 2008 publication on the topic clearly show many areas of intersection between the practices and what librarians do.

Lindy Scripps-Hoekstra discussed two initiatives that allowed the library to participate in community-based learning, which she defined as giving students direct experience with the issues they are studying in the curriculum and with the opportunity to apply their learning in real-world settings. The first initiative was with the Challenge Scholars program, which gives financial support to students with low socioeconomic status in order to develop a college-going culture by building baseline information literacy skills. The library partnered with an education professor whose students worked with sixth graders and would conduct weekly workshops focusing on low-level research skills. The second initiative was through the TRIO program, which provides after-school learning opportunities for high school students. Working with Upward Bound staff, librarians trained current college students to visit their former high schools and share experience and research tips. Both of these initiatives allowed librarians to share their skills and expertise with the community.

The second program discussed was the Summer Scholars program, a relatively new program (based on one at the University of Miami) in which a small cohort of students (3–4) work with a library faculty mentor on a library-related research project. The students come with their own question or problem and work with a librarian intensively in a project that results in a deliverable for the library community. Some examples thus far include a video installation examining the library as a third space and an information literacy session for an underserved academic area.

The third program was a collaboration between Mark Schaub and Hazel McClure for a business writing course. Moving the course to an online, five-week setting caused the instructor to re-think the course and text. Dissatisfied with the open education resources available, McClure suggested having the students write and re-publish an existing OER under its creative commons license. This process was conducted under the librarian’s guidance. McClure stated that the program not only helped the students learn to do research but also caused them to think about their role as consumers and producers of information.
The final program was a collaboration with graphic design students. The library conducted research on terminology and students’ understanding of it. Based on that information, Gayle Schaub asked Lima if his students would create a visual glossary to assist library users in understanding terminology. This made the library an actual client for these graphic design students and taught the students about both information literacy and how to communicate with clients.

**Biggest Takeaway:** Overall this discussion was an inspiring demonstration of relatively easy-to-implement programs that can occur at any institution as long as librarians seek opportunities and collaborators are interested in providing students meaningful research experiences.

**How you might use this information:** Academic librarians can utilize these examples as models to conduct their own programs.

---

**Libraries and Learning Analytics: Identifying the Issues**

Report by: Michael Saar, Lamar University

**Moderator:** Abigail Goben – Associate Professor, University of Illinois-Chicago (@hedgielib)

**Presenters:**
- Dr. Kristin Briney – Data Services Librarian, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (@kristinbriney);
- Dr. M. Brooke Robertshaw – Assistant Professor & Assessment Librarian, Oregon State University (@mbrookerob)

**Date:** June 23, 2018

**Audience:** All librarians interested in learning analytics


**Summary:** This program was related to the upcoming ARL SPEC Kit on Learning Analytics that will be published in August of 2018. The Moderator, Goben, began the program with introductory remarks on the wealth of data available. Libraries have a great deal of data ranging from collections to circulation stats to instruction and beyond. Increasingly all of this data is associated on a one-to-one level with individual students. This raised the question of how do we align this data capture with our own professional ethics? Additionally, the recent news stories on data breeches at Equifax and the privacy concerns of Cambridge Analytica indicate that this is not just an issue facing libraries but one that is increasingly in the minds of our patrons.

Libraries are put in a difficult place when administrative demands are increasingly looking for the quantification of the university versus the library ethical side that values patron privacy and intellectual freedom. In the middle of this is our desire for student success and retention and our role in being a resource to teach students about privacy and big data.

Following the introductory remarks, Dr. Robertshaw spoke on ethics issues related to IRBs (Institutional Review Boards) and FERPA. FERPA (The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) was passed in the early 1970s to clarify parents’ rights to education data in schools. One issue with FERPA has been disagreement of what falls under the educational record. For example, where does student health data fall? This is further complicated by a 2012 amendment allowing institutions of education to share data as long as the data has an educational purpose and the data is identified. This means that third-person parties (such as BlackBoard) can have access to the data without telling the student.
IRBs are concerned with who data is being collected from and how it is being collected. IRB review is often seen as the gold standard in ethical research. But one area that IRBs generally are not concerned with is following up on the reality of what happens to data after it is collected. Librarians need to be more involved in this process, serving on IRBs and talking to students and researchers about the ethical issues surrounding data collection.

Dr. Briney then discussed practical issues regarding data handling in learning analytics. One problem is that, just like other researchers, librarians are not often taught data management skills despite being asked to utilize them in learning analytics. This presentation largely stemmed from a research project studying 54 quantitative learning analytics articles. The key findings were that almost all “anonymous” library data was only seemingly anonymous; the number of studies gaining consent or allowing students to opt in is very small; and not many of the studies discuss security, yet they exhibit practices that would require good security. The presenter recommended responding to these issues in the following ways: refer to data as de-identified instead of anonymized; secure data properly; seriously examine consent opt-ins; and be more transparent about security practices.

**Biggest Takeaway:** Despite libraries’ desire to use learning analytics to improve our instruction and services and administrations desire for us to use it as well, we have an ethical and professional obligation to seriously consider how we enact these practices.

**How Might You Use This Information:** The presenters concluded with three practical tips to use this information. First, enact privacy by design. Have a specific question that leads to only collecting data that is needed and think of privacy throughout the process. Once the question has been answered, delete the data. Second, push back on vendors. Ask vendors how they are using the data they are collecting and how it can be accessed. Third, respect student autonomy. Keep in mind that these data are linked to people that can be both assisted and/or harmed with this information.

---

**Liaison Reports, continued**

**ALA Annual in review**

---

**Bites with LIRT**

LIRT members and friends met for lunch at Crescent City Brewhouse on Sunday, June 24, during the ALA Annual Conference in New Orleans. We had sixteen people attend Bites with LIRT, and we all enjoyed the “traditional New Orleans cuisine with a modern flair” in the historic French Quarter. Alligator bites have a whole new meaning now! Thanks to everyone who joined us in NOLA, and we look forward to seeing you all again at the next Bites.
Call for Nominations

We are pleased to invite nominations for the 2019 LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award. The Innovation in Instruction Award is given in recognition of a library’s contributions to the development, advancement, and support of information literacy and instruction in any type of library. Self-nominations are welcome.

The award will be given to a library that has done one (or more) of the following:

- Revamped its public instruction program in response to a new technology, an assessment report, etc.
- Initiated a public program that utilizes best practices of instruction in combination with new methods of delivery.
- Created an original type of instruction, e.g., team-taught interdisciplinary research sessions, a novel form of outreach, etc.
- Practice(s) will be prioritized over scholarship with preference for innovative practices that are low-cost and can be easily reproduced elsewhere.

Nomination Materials

To nominate a library for the LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award, please submit a nomination packet that includes the following:

- Completed nomination sheet (available on LIRT Awards website)
- Letter from the nominator addressing the award criteria (see rubric on LIRT Awards website), providing concrete examples
- 3 letters of support

Other supporting materials that show the library’s contributions to information literacy and instruction are encouraged. Only one member of the library nomination group needs to be a librarian. Electronic submission of nomination materials is expected. Further information regarding the award and the selection process can be found on the LIRT Awards website: http://www.ala.org/rt/lirt/awards

Deadline

Send all LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award nomination materials by January 15, 2019 to:
Joshua Vossler  jvossler@lib.siu.edu

The award winner will be notified following the ALA Midwinter Conference, no later than February 15, 2019. The award will be presented at the 2019 ALA Annual Conference. Award winners will receive a $1,000 cash award, a plaque, and a $500 travel stipend to be used toward attending the ALA Annual Conference. Awards are sponsored by the Library Instruction Round Table.

If you have questions, please contact the LIRT Awards Committee Chair, Beth Fuchs (beth.fuchs@uky.edu).
We are pleased to invite nominations for the 2019 LIRT Librarian Recognition Award. The Librarian Recognition Award is given in acknowledgement of a librarian’s contribution to the development, advancement, and support of information literacy and instruction in any type of library. Self-nominations are welcome.

The award will be judged based on the following:

- Contributions to library literature on topics related to instruction/information literacy. These contributions can consist of both formal and informal publications (peer-reviewed articles and book chapters, blog postings, newsletter contributions, etc.). Non-traditional forms of publishing will be considered.
- Key role in the creation of an instruction/information literacy program or project that has shown potential for wide-spread sharing and replication.
- Impactful participation within local, regional, national, and/or international level professional organizations that are devoted to the support and promotion of library instruction and information literacy in any type of library.

Nomination Materials

To nominate a librarian for the LIRT Librarian Recognition Award, please submit a nomination packet that includes:

- Completed nomination sheet (available on LIRT Awards website)
- Letter from the nominator addressing the award criteria (see rubric on LIRT Awards website), providing concrete examples
- 3 letters of support
- Resume or CV for the individual being nominated

Other supporting materials that show the individual’s contributions to information literacy and instruction are welcome. Electronic submission of nomination materials is expected. Further information regarding the award and the selection process can be found on the LIRT Awards website: [http://www.ala.org/rt/lirt/awards](http://www.ala.org/rt/lirt/awards)

Deadline

Send all LIRT Librarian Recognition Award nomination materials by January 15, 2019 to:
Beth Fuchs  beth.fuchs@uky.edu

The award winner will be notified following the ALA Midwinter Conference, no later than February 15, 2019.

The award will be presented at the 2019 ALA Annual Conference. Award winners will receive a $1,000 cash award, a plaque, and a $500 travel stipend to be used toward attending the ALA Annual Conference. Awards are sponsored by the Library Instruction Round Table.

If you have questions, please contact the LIRT Awards Committee Chair, Beth Fuchs (beth.fuchs@uky.edu).


**Tech Talk continued from page 7**

- **New:** Preparing for post-project phase by identifying potential parties to operate any necessary centralized infrastructure. (Flanagan, 2018, p. 3)

The cornerstone of this initiative lies with three “where are you from” (WAYF) pilots:
- P3 (Privacy Preserving Persistent) WAYF Pilot (http://ra21.org/index.php/pilot-programs/p3-wayf-pilot/)

Below is a broad overview of how RA21 with WAYF might function:
1. The end user is working at her local coffee house, searching for information using Google, Google Scholar, or something similar on her tablet.
2. She finds an article of interest and clicks on the link.
3. The article is in Journal XYZ, from Publisher ABC; she clicks on the link for the full text.
4. Instead of hitting a paywall, she is presented with an option to “Access Through Your Institution.”
5. She clicks that link, searches, finds, and selects her institution.
6. She’s taken to her institution’s standard login page and provides her credentials—proving “where she is from.”
7. An authentication “token” is delivered back to Publisher ABC, and if her institution subscribes to the content, she immediately gets access to the full text.
8. A “token” is also placed on her browser so the next time she tries to access full text from Publisher ABC using that browser, the publisher’s site will recognize the token and automatically provide her with a direct link to her institution for authentication.

For purposes of user testing, the RA21 pilots have developed a working mock-up of this process: https://ra21.mnt.se/google_scholar.html. This scenario is a vast improvement over the current approach as is demonstrated by Roger Schonfeld, who works through a typical research scenario in this presentation: https://youtu.be/U2xEGxVqgVo, starting at 6:50.

For a better understanding of both the pros and cons of RA21, it is helpful to have a bit of knowledge about the technology that runs behind the scenes. RA21 depends on using federated identity systems and SAML. These technologies reference IdPs (identity providers = institutions) and SPs (service providers = publishers/vendors). Delory (2018) provides a glossary of RA21 terms and some of the more significant terms are highlighted below:

- “Federated authentication system provides a single access point to multiple systems across different organizations that provide access control via a shared infrastructure. These systems gather identity data and then validate requests for access based on information about the user and the rights that an organization has access to materials.”
- “SAML (security assertion markup language) is an open standard for exchanging authentication and authorization data between parties—in particular, between an identity provider (e.g., an identity federation, a library or institution) and a service provider (e.g., a publisher, software provider or website).”
- “Shibboleth is a single sign-on (login) system for computer networks and the internet. It allows people to sign in using just one identity to various systems run by federations of different organizations or institutions. It is one application of SAML technology for providing federated access to content among members of the consortium.”
- “OpenAthens develops and supports identity and access management software for institutions and provides access to more than 2 million end users of library resources worldwide. OpenAthens is part of Eduserv (www.eduserv.org.uk/), a UK-based nonprofit organization.”
- “WAYF (where are you from) services are used for online interactions of identity management, with the purpose of guiding a user to his/her identity provider. A WAYF service presents the user a list of identity providers to whom identity credentials can be sent and redirects the user’s web browser to the selected identity provider and then back to the subscribed content.”

In short, Shibboleth and OpenAthens are federated authentication systems that use the SAML standard to enable the exchange of authentication and authorization data between two parties, and that exchange of data verifies where you are from in a way IP authentication cannot.

The InCommon Federation (https://incommon.org/federation/) is the identity federation used by many U.S. institutions.
of higher learning, government entities, and other partners (https://incommon.org/participants/). A key benefit of an InCommon membership is that each member agrees to adhere to a set of baseline expectations (http://doi.org/10.26869/TI.34.1). If Institution X wants to enable Shibboleth with Entity Z and both are members of InCommon, establishing that integration becomes almost trivial. Through their InCommon membership, they automatically agree and adhere to the baseline expectations. Alternatively, if Entity Z is not a member of InCommon, then both organizations must jump through a series of hoops, so personnel at Institution X believe they can “trust” Entity Z to meet and adhere to the appropriate expectations. As a matter of fact, the “hoop jumping” process is such that some institutions simply won’t implement Shibboleth if the intended partner is not a member of the InCommon federation.

The heart of all three pilots is the use of a SAML-based federated authentication system. In an interview, Todd Carpenter, Executive Director of NISO, states, “Essentially SAML is a structure for describing how information is exchanged about the rights that allow someone to access something. It’s a simple messaging protocol. We have chosen it because it has the ability to protect privacy and allow the user and their institution to decide what personal information, if any, is released to the content provider [emphasis mine]” (DeLory, 2018).

A bit more about the three pilots. One pilot is specifically for the pharmaceutical industry and its corporate libraries (Corporate Pilot) — this is the community that originated the RA21 initiative; the other two pilots target the academic research community, with one using browser knowledge of past login to an institution to identify WAYF (P3 WAYF Pilot), and the other one using a cloud-based system to pass people from one system to another (WAYF Cloud Pilot). Again, from Todd Carpenter, the goal of RA21 is to “use these pilots to test various alternatives and then make a recommendation to the industry. And this recommendation will not take the form of a single portal” (DeLory, 2018). This is an important detail—RA21 will not provide a “standard” to be implemented; RA21 will, instead, propose best practices for enabling RA21 based on the data garnered from user experiences during these pilots.

The RA21 initiative appears to have value for both libraries and researchers:

- Eliminating the time-consuming monitoring/updating of IP address information to multiple resource providers;
- Reducing barriers to off-site access for users, thereby maximizing use of library-acquired content;
- Enabling more granular reporting of usage to libraries, while allowing libraries to protect users’ identities;
- Identifying and resolving instances of illegal or fraudulent activity more easily and quickly; and

From the publisher’s perspective, the advantages of RA21 include:

- Providing better, more customized user experience (with the user’s consent);
- Providing granular and differentiated access for better reporting to governing bodies and customers;
- Working with purchasing departments to more carefully manage licensed access and target fraudulent or illegal activity; and
- Increasing their ability to ensure the integrity of content on both institutional and commercial platforms. (https://ra21.org/index.php/what-is-ra21/faq/#Publishers)

Nevertheless, RA21 does have some significant issues for consideration:

- Its target audience appears to be research institutions. Public libraries and many K-12 schools are less familiar or totally unfamiliar with using a federated authentication system. Whereas K-12 schools may have user names/ passwords for students, public libraries are less likely to go this route, choosing to use a unique identifier from the user’s library card to enable off-site access to their content.
- With the complete elimination of IP authentication, at least two issues would surface for all types of libraries: (1) researchers physically present at the institution would need to authenticate in the same way they would if off-site, which is a step backward from the user’s and librarian’s perspective; and (2) non-affiliated “walk-ins” would have no way to access the content, unless the library set up something “special” for them.
- Small publishers/resource providers are not in a good position to implement something like RA21. They are less likely to be members of InCommon and less likely to have the technological “chops” to implement something like Shibboleth.
- RA21 does not eliminate the incentive for fraudulent actors to use phishing schemes to obtain login credentials.
- RA21 does not eliminate the need for user education related to accessing online content. Users still need to be aware of what to expect and what kind of personal information is/is not shared via RA21, phishing schemes, the ramifications of providing “consent” on a publisher’s site, etc.
As those milestone dates approach.

As far as RA21 goes, be mindful of the milestones identified in the RA21 Roadmap and watch for announcements as those milestone dates approach.

However, the most significant concerns raised are those of user privacy and the sharing of the user’s personal data. Laura Hinchliffe (2018) expresses, “I acknowledge that the SAML approach embraced by RA21 is more privacy-protecting than, for example, adopting a Google or Facebook OpenID option [logging in with Google or Facebook credentials]. It is not, however, more privacy-protecting than IP authentication.” Both Hinchliffe (2018) and Roger Shonfeld (2018) have expressed concerns that the SAML-based federated identity system will provide data to the service provider (publisher) that extends beyond simply verifying WAYF.

It is true that SAML technology can pass all kinds of data about a person to the service provider: name, e-mail address, institutional status and/or rank, department, major, etc. However, the identity provider—Baylor University in my case—has complete control over what data is provided in a Shibboleth transaction. The service provider can request additional data beyond the verification needed to access the content, but the identity provider can choose whether to provide that data. In this age of heightened concern over compromised data, most identity providers (universities/corporations) will only share enough data to authenticate the user. Shame on the IT department that blindly sends any and all data with no questions asked. However, it bodes well for librarians to be aware of how their institutions enable Shibboleth and what data is provided to the service providers. On the other hand, if the service provider requests additional user data as a requirement for access to their content, that is an entirely different scenario and one to be concerned about.

Those advocating for the RA21 initiative consistently stress the importance of user privacy, even stating that privacy was a reason they didn’t pursue OpenID options (logging in with Facebook, Google, LinkedIn credentials). Todd Carpenter clearly states that “SAML is a structure for describing how information is exchanged about the rights that allow someone to access something. . . [which they] have chosen. . . because it has the ability to protect privacy [emphasis mine] and allow the user and their institution to decide what personal information, if any, is released to the content provider” (DeLory, 2018). England (2018) mentions that “Shibboleth. . . uses tokens to authorize access, which protects a user’s privacy. Attributes can be associated with tokens without sharing the user’s identity” (p. 2). With this approach, it would be possible to garner more specific usage information without compromising individual identities. For example, the aggregated number of undergraduates, graduates, and faculty from which departments or majors that use a specific discipline-based resource. Additionally, the privacy regulations associated with the GDPR implementation actively dissuade service providers from wanting to hold and mine any data from these transactions (https://youtu.be/eSGb3hnp4nQ).

The flip side is the value of personalization to individual researchers. If their personal account is associated with their institutional credentials, their account is immediately available to them upon authentication into the service. However, this function is best managed by each individual and not integrated with the authentication process, which provides the user control over opting-in to personalization and tailoring that personalization. The “institution needn’t—and maybe shouldn’t—be involved in mediating the user’s disclosure of their individual identity to the service provider should the user so choose” (Carpenter, Flanagan, & Shillum, 2018).

In a comment on Hinchliffe’s (2018) blog post, Todd Carpenter suggests, “if there were community norms about what data should be conveyed—say the minimal amount to provide a service, with the option personalization data if the users want to share it—then we could point to violations of norms. Ideally, this is where RA21 will end up, with sensible privacy-protecting services and guidance on how to best implement them.” Continuing this theme, Carpenter, Flanagan, and Shillum (2018) suggest that “work needs to be done to set norms and establish best practices in this area, building on efforts being done at Internet2, Duke University, and elsewhere on the Scalable Consent framework.” One final observation before leaving privacy and personal data concerns—at the 2018 ALA Annual Conference, Todd Carpenter announced the elimination of the cloud-based WAYF, because this solution checked a few more boxes related to security and privacy issues that would have to be addressed than with the P3 WAYF pilot (Carpenter, Ayala, & Anderson 2018, pp. 10-11).

As librarians, we need to be aware of and follow the RA21 initiative. Even if the best practices and recommendations from RA21 take a while to develop or if nothing comes of the initiative at all, issues associated with IP authentication will persist and interested parties will continue to look for solutions. For example, Digital Science and Research Solutions recently announced Anywhere Access (https://www.anywhereaccess.com/launch/), which bears monitoring, as well.

As far as RA21 goes, be mindful of the milestones identified in the RA21 Roadmap and watch for announcements as those milestone dates approach.
Consider some of Lisa Hinchliffe’s (2018) strategies:

- “Reach out to the campus technology unit that manages identity-based authentication systems (e.g., InCommon or OpenAthens) and engage in an ongoing discussion about privacy, user control, minimal sharing of identifiable data, etc., with the goal of developing local principles to guide data release.
- Watch carefully for licensing terms that dictate user data sharing requirements for access to content and be prepared with responses. If IP authentication is no longer an option, seek to minimize the user data that is demanded in exchange for user access.
- Review library privacy policies to make certain that the library is transparent about what data is being passed to third-party systems and what alternatives users have if they want to try to opt-out of data sharing and tracking.
- Regularly use library resources without using IP address authentication to monitor the user experience of identity-based authentication and the messaging from platforms to users.”

Similarly, Don Hamparian (2018), Senior Product Manager at OCLC (oversight of EZproxy) also suggests that libraries need to be planning: “Does the library have the IT relationships necessary to start the conversation? Does institution IT have a plan? Be ready to participate and guide. Watch trends in the identity management space—it’s evolving too. Don’t withdraw from the institution-level conversation about identity management — libraries have valuable insight. Get involved with your federation operators. Get involved with RA21” (p. 29).

In the end, as Hamparian (2018) suggests, RA21 is “a long migration not a hot cutover” (p. 31). Today, IP authentication is a clear barrier to off-site access to online content. IP authentication won’t go away overnight and may never go away entirely; the collection of user’s personal data is always an issue, but not necessarily an issue specific to RA21. School and public libraries, in particular, need to understand how RA21 could impact access to their online content. Yes, RA21 is of interest to publishers because their intellectual property appears for “free” on SciHub and similar sources, but it’s not the only driver for the initiative. If it comes to pass, RA21 will provide best practices and guidelines; it’s up to librarians to work with their IT departments to implement the solution that works best in their environment for their constituents. Quoting Jill Emery (2018), “Librarians need to join into this conversation sooner as opposed to later to insures the representation of all need cases with resource access” (p. 57).
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Get Involved with LIRT

LIRT Standing Committees

Use the online form to volunteer

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

**Awards**
This committee is charged with selecting the recipients for the LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award and the LIRT Librarian Recognition Award.

**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.

**Teaching, Learning, & 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.

For more information about our committees, visit: [http://www.ala.org/lirt/committees](http://www.ala.org/lirt/committees)