To state the obvious, this is a weird year for everyone, including LIRT. With the cancellation of ALA Annual 2020, LIRT’s many normal June activities are on hold. Still, I’ve been impressed by your commitment to our Round Table and by just how much work we can still accomplish in a time of crisis. We might not be holding our LIRT Awards Reception this year, but the Awards Committee nevertheless selected two incredible winners: Melissa Bowles-Terry for the Librarian Recognition Award and the Brooklyn Public Library for the Innovation in Instruction Award. We might not be holding a 2020 conference program, but the Conference Program Planning Committee has one amazing program lined up for Annual 2021, to discuss how librarians collaborate across library types to support patrons in moments of transition. Our standing committees might not be meeting in person this month, but members’ interest in joining committees remains strong as ever. And although traveling to Chicago isn’t a possibility, the LIRT Steering Committee will still be holding a virtual edition of its five-year planning retreat, to take stock of LIRT’s work and to strategize about how better to serve our members. In short, I’m proud of our Round Table for everyone’s adaptability, innovation and commitment.

The same words could be used to describe our entire profession these past few months. Although COVID-19 might have closed most of our workplaces, it couldn’t stop our commitment to our patrons. Rather, libraries got more creative than ever. Curbside services, Zoom-based instruction sessions (“Hey, whose dog is barking?”), and virtual storytimes and birthday parties are just a few examples of the explosion of library experimentation in the past few months. It is a testament not only to our own (and our administrations’) commitment to our patrons, but also to our professional values. We believe in access. We believe in equity. We believe in the power of community. And in a time of adversity, our profession showed that upholding these values was more important than ever. As we gradually but surely return to offering in-person services and welcoming patrons back to our buildings, I hope we’ll remember just how powerful and vital our profession still is in 2020.

-Mark
From the Editor

I hope this issue of *LIRT News* finds you and your families safe and healthy amidst this ongoing pandemic. Although we will not be physically meeting in Chicago this June, LIRT is sending you content to help you think about your instruction in the coming months. The 2019 Top 20 articles have been selected by our stellar committee, and you’ll find the complete list with annotations starting on page 9, so start adding to your summer to-read list. Our LIRT Councilor, Victor Baeza, has shared with us a podcast on warming up your audience before presentations or instruction, and I encourage you to listen and learn from that as well. Also in this issue, find out more about LIRT’s 2020 Emerging Leader, Heather VanDyne, in our Member A-LIRT feature, and read about this year’s amazing LIRT Award winners on pages 3 and 4.

May you have a lovely summer,

Sherri
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LIRT Librarian Recognition Award 2020

LIRT has chosen Melissa Bowles-Terry, Associate Director of the Faculty Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, as the 2020 recipient of the LIRT Librarian Recognition Award. The Librarian Recognition Award was created to recognize an individual’s contribution to the development, advancement, and support of information literacy and instruction.

Professor Bowles-Terry began her career at the University of Wyoming Libraries, and is the former Head of Educational Initiatives at UNLV Libraries. A tenured member of the library faculty, she currently coordinates programming to support faculty teaching, research, and career development. She is also a member of the Association of College and Research Libraries Immersion faculty, a national training program for librarians who teach and assess student learning. Her scholarly work has been significant, including a co-authored book (Classroom Assessment Techniques for Librarians, ACRL 2015) and an article in College & Research Libraries that was selected as one of LIRT’s Top Twenty articles for 2016. Her service to the profession has been extensive and impactful; her work as Chair of the Greater Western Library Alliance (GWLA) Student Learning Outcomes Task Force has been especially notable for making an impact on member institutions and supplying a model upon which other institutions are basing their own assessment initiatives. The Awards Committee made particular note of the strength of her nomination letters, which praised her dedication to the profession, her service, and excellent research.

“I'm so grateful to my colleagues for nominating me for this award and pleased that the work we've done at UNLV in the realm of library instruction merits the attention of the profession. I'm honored to be the award recipient this year and hope to continue to learn and grow with my friends and fellow librarians who are working to enhance information literacy.” – Melissa Bowles-Terry, Associate Director of the Faculty Center, University of Nevada, Las Vegas

2020 marks the seventh year the Librarian Recognition Award has been awarded. Melissa Bowles-Terry will be presented with a $1,000 cash prize and a plaque commemorating the award. Visit LIRT's website to find out more about the awards. This year’s winner will be provided with a $500 travel stipend to attend ALA Annual 2021, where she will be recognized at the LIRT Awards Ceremony.

The LIRT Librarian Recognition Awards Subcommittee included Joshua Vossler of Southern Illinois University Carbondale (Chair & LIRT Awards Committee Chair), Rebecca O’Kelly Davis of Simmons University, and Wayne Finley of Northern Illinois University.
LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award 2020

LIRT is pleased to announce that the 2020 Innovation in Instruction Award has been presented to the Brooklyn Public Library (BPL). Created to recognize a library that demonstrates innovation in support of information literacy and instruction, this year’s award recognizes The Teacher Lab course, Brooklyn Public Library’s effort to connect library resources with as many teachers as possible.

Developed by Amy Mikel, BPL’s Coordinator of School Outreach, The Teacher Lab is a free, self-paced online course that introduces fundamental library, research, and information literacy skills to K-12 educators and guides them to a rich variety of resources for use in their classrooms. The course features foundational library skills, such as navigating a library collection and using the online catalog, and builds to more advanced topics, such as finding primary sources in an archive, working with databases, using Google and Wikipedia as research tools, citation, and evaluating sources. The course culminates in the creation of an annotated bibliography. Since the course launched in July 2017, over 2,000 teachers and school librarians from over 20 states and Canada have enrolled. More than 250 graduates have earned 12 hours of New York State-certified credit, applicable towards their teaching license requirements. Developed in partnership with teachers and accredited through the New York State Education Department as well as the Department of Education, the Awards Committee found this program to be an outstanding example of how libraries can reach beyond their walls to build productive and mutually beneficial relationships with other professionals responsible for education and information literacy within our communities.

“I live in Brooklyn. It’s striking how diverse the communities served by Brooklyn Public Library are, covering an amazing range of socioeconomic groups, ethnicities, languages, education levels, English language literacy, and every characteristic in between. By creating this train-the-trainer style of openly available instructional program, Brooklyn Public Library has created a program that would be useful to every community they serve, regardless of their particular demographics. It’s an excellent use of library knowledge and resources to elevate the community as a whole.” -- Amy Mikel, Coordinator of School Outreach, Brooklyn Public Library, and developer of The Teacher Lab

The emphasis on free access to the course was another factor in the selection of this program for the LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award. There is no charge for teachers, librarians, or even parents or caregivers engaging in home schooling, to take the course. This means that information literacy skill support is available to any educator with access to an internet connection and a desire to expand their teaching toolkit.

2020 marks the seventh year the Innovation in Instruction Award has been awarded. The Brooklyn Public Library will be presented with a $1,000 cash prize and a plaque commemorating the award. Visit LIRT’s website to find out more about the awards. This year’s winner will be provided with a $500 travel stipend to attend ALA Annual 2021, where they will be recognized at the LIRT Awards Ceremony.

The LIRT Innovation in Instruction Awards Subcommittee included Emilia Marcyk of Michigan State University (Chair), Melissa Ann Fraser-Arnott of the Library of Parliament, Yolanda Hood of the University of Wyoming, and Lore Guilmartin of the Pratt Institute.
2021 ALA Elections

Call for Nominations

Do you ever think to yourself, “Wow, LIRT is so amazing! I want to be involved in its leadership.” Or maybe something more like: “What are those LIRT officers thinking? I could do their job so much better!” Either way, we’re looking for you! LIRT is seeking nominations for officer positions to begin after ALA Annual 2021. The following positions are available:

- Vice President/President-Elect (three-year term)
- Vice Treasurer/Treasurer-Elect (two-year term)
- Secretary/Archivist (two-year term)

Self-nominations are encouraged! Successful candidates will:

- Be current LIRT members who have served on a LIRT committee for a minimum of one year (currently or in the recent past);
- Attend both ALA Annual and Midwinter conferences for the duration of their term;
- Attend all in-person and virtual meetings of the LIRT Steering and Executive Committees.

If you would like to nominate someone (or yourself), please complete the Nominations Form (http://www.ala.org/lirt/lirt-request-nominations) or contact Mark Robison at librarianmark@nd.edu.
Member A-LIRT
Heather VanDyne

Library Support Specialist
Allen Community College
Iola, Kansas

What brought you to LIRT?
I signed up for LIRT because instruction was my biggest desire in my transition to academic librarianship. I felt that joining organizations such as LIRT would help me learn more about how to succeed in taking the next steps and answering questions an early career academic librarian may or even may not consider asking.

What was your path to librarianship?
I considered becoming a librarian before, but circumstances led me down other paths. Then, when working at a clerical job that was steady but led nowhere, I started looking at other possibilities. While doing a job search, I saw an opening for a librarian position, and it made me curious about the field again. I then spent several hours combing through the ALA Job Bank reading about jobs that were available and what requirements were needed for jobs that I was really interested in doing one day. The trends in qualifications convinced me to take the plunge to go back to library school. Not long after, I got a job at my local library. Being in the library felt like I was completely in my element. On top of that I did a practicum at a community college library to gain academic library experience. The one-shot information literacy class I assisted with was my favorite part of my time there. After that it became more and more clear that education and instructional librarianship is where I want to be.

Tell us about your current position. What do you like most about it?
What I like about my current position is that I have so many opportunities to learn about the academic world. I work for a community college in a rural area surrounded by colleagues who have been there for several years. They share their knowledge with me, allow me the chance to pursue my interests in research and speaking to classes about how I can best serve them, and we can collaborate on new ideas that serve not only our own professional desires, but the students and the institution as well.

In what ways does it challenge you?
It’s challenged me in the fact that my first library job was in youth services. Now, working with college students, they are independent adults with many more options and also many more distractions to keep them from considering the library as a place to go for assistance. Finding ways to engage with students, while competing with all the other things that grab their attention, forces one to try and get creative. Especially now with COVID-19 safety precautions limiting student interaction, our library is continuously brainstorming and thinking outside the box to figure out how we can best serve students in their ever-changing needs.

Continued on next page
Heather VanDyne  
Library Support Specialist  
Allen Community College  
Iola, Kansas

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

At Emporia State University, I was able to take a course on Teaching for the Information Profession with Dr. Brenden Fay. I never had any teaching experience, so this seemed perfect in seeing if instruction was for me. Going through the whole process and meeting in person to give information literacy presentations, creating a syllabus and a teaching philosophy, it showed me what the world of instruction was really about. And Dr. Fay was so informal and casual about his teaching style and approach to the subject, that the idea of being an instructional librarian didn’t seem as intimidating as it once did. Plus I tend to take myself too seriously, and his honesty about the profession and about academia helped calm my nerves and made the transition from public librarianship to academic seem not so out of reach.

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

My phone and earbuds. That seems pretty obvious, but if I’m traveling and I have to fly, I have to have an audiobook downloaded because I get motion sickness and can’t read or watch anything without feeling nauseous.

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

I am a big planner. I have several planners, calendars, specialized lists and journals about anything and everything. I also have multiple reminders on my phone to keep me on track with my schedule, which drives my family crazy. I am someone that has lots of things I want to accomplish and doesn’t want to limit myself, so I will schedule and get ridiculously happy over any and every completed task or project, no matter how small.
Easing on Down the Road

The 2020 LIRT President’s Program has been postponed to the 2021 ALA Annual Conference in Chicago. Please join us for the *Smooth Transitions: Developing Information Literacy in the In-Between Places* panel discussion on how public, academic, and school libraries work together to support information literacy skills during different stages of life, and how these library partnerships may have changed due to the current pandemic.

Warming Up Your Audience Podcast


Victor Baeza, LIRT Councilor, Graduate Initiatives and Engagement Coordinator & Business Librarian, Oklahoma State University

Whether labelled instruction, programming, or a workshop, librarians are typically only given an hour to cover all manner of material. At first, an hour can seem like a long time, but as more activities or material are added to the session, it becomes evident that one hour is just not enough. So, where to find extra time? Listen to this Library Leadership Podcast interview of LIRT’s Councilor, Victor D. Baeza, as he discusses using the 10-15 minutes before your presentation to “warm up” the attendees.

Branch’s research study uses the transformative research paradigm and concept mapping methodology to generate learning outcomes for the frame, “Information has Value.” Her overarching goal was to develop a process for identifying locally relevant learning outcomes that emphasize social justice and critical thinking. This study also examines the effectiveness of using a collaborative process to reconceptualize information literacy as it is presented in the Framework and fostering teaching and assessment practices that embrace critical librarianship.

Branch thoroughly describes the research process in which 11 academic librarians participated: 1) an initial virtual focus group meeting to brainstorm the social justice and critical thinking elements of the frame and to develop learning outcome statements; 2) usabiliTEST for card sorting exercises and Qualtrics for rating learning outcomes; 3) mapping the sorting and rating of statements using multidimensional scaling and hierarchical cluster analysis; and 4) the final virtual focus group to discuss and review the draft concept map and statements. A list of learning outcome statements grouped by cluster was completed by the end of the study. Some of these clusters include “Value of Information Communities,” “Information Agency & Responsibility,” and “Information is power(ful).” The results suggest that learning outcomes and the research process, itself, align with the transformative research paradigm. The author discusses the effectiveness and limitations of the study. She concludes that the concept mapping methodology is a viable transformative approach for the development of learning outcomes. This article is helpful to anyone exploring methodologies that align with transformative research paradigms for assessment practices in higher education. YH

Burkholder’s intellectually engaging article takes a theoretical look at the ACRL Framework through a rhetorical lens. He focuses on rhetoric’s “social turn,” meaning how a theory or idea is created and understood by specific social constructs and how these social constructs vary depending on the discourse community.

The crux of Burkholder’s argument is that the social context of a discipline will influence how the discipline conducts research. In teaching research skills, library instructors need to acknowledge and understand their own disciplinarian discourse as well as those of the faculty who intersect with information literacy instruction. This article examines each frame, detailing how the frame helps faculty in various disciplines create and maintain their specific dialogue around theories and ideas. Overall, Burkholder presents a thorough and organized argument of how a rhetorical understanding of the ACRL Framework can improve librarian-faculty collaborations and enhance teaching. EL


Both the Association for College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and the American Association for School Libraries (AASL) undertook significant revisions of their foundational information literacy documents in recent years, culminating in the official adoption of the ACRL Framework in 2015 and the AASL National School Library Standards in 2018. Together, these two documents represent a continuum of lifelong learning from Pre-K through Higher Education, yet they were drafted independently utilizing separate governance structures and processes. This article aims to map a relationship between these documents by examining their degree of alignment and revealing areas of inconsistency. Through a one-way crosswalk analysis, the authors provide detailed methodology and limitations sections, offering a clear and transparent review. The complete crosswalk, which maps each of the six ACRL Frames to the “Shared Foundations” of the AASL Standards, is found in the appendix for interested readers.

The article gives a brief history of each document’s drafting process and core concepts before examining the strength of relationships between the AASL Standards and the ACRL Frames. Both documents are found to share a non-linear perspective of IL, a flexible approach to classroom adaptation, and some overlapping concepts; however, the crosswalk did not reveal a direct
equivalence. Discrepancies between the documents are clearly noted. For instance, the Standards place greater emphasis on collaborative learning, which is not readily addressed by the Framework. The authors also give attention to inconsistencies in terminology and perspectives that could potentially impact teaching approaches. While they acknowledge that both documents are in early implementation phases and further research is required to assess their impact on learning, this study offers a key basis for comparison from which to begin bridging approaches to IL across educational settings. MK


Carroll and Klipfel take on the concept of “naturals” in the field of instruction and teaching. In a substantial review and analysis of classical to contemporary literature, they unpack the notion of “natural” talents and the impact and (troubling) implications that accompany the belief that there is an inherent talent for teaching that some possess, while others do not.

Although many will not see this discussion as new, it delves deeply and brings together a strong case for improving the professional development and support of librarians. By relying on their perceptions of an individual as a naturally talented or inspired teacher, administrators risk undervaluing the need to train for expertise. This belief also reinforces existing biases often found in other places in our education system by favoring a particular style or attribute among teachers. As the authors keenly note, an example of this can be found in job descriptions for instruction librarians where the placement and salary often reflect entry level positions. This same phenomenon also plays out with faculty colleagues, whose expectations of expertise over a discipline are often quite different than librarians’.

In response, the authors suggest new frameworks for teaching expertise development. Combining the Smith-Ragan instructional design approach with an action research assessment model, the authors suggest that a well-crafted teaching environment can help individuals develop the teaching expertise required to fulfill the role academic librarians could and should play in the classroom. This section is particularly helpful, as the reflective nature of action research seems well suited for helping an individual focus on actionable goals while also aligning with institutional goal setting and development activities in which librarians are frequently asked to participate. As the authors note, this piece invites library administrators to open conversations with their instruction librarians. There is likely a great opportunity here for dialogue about assessment and development and finding common ground. CG

In this article, Cromartie details how inquiry—including question creation and writing—was taught in a fifth-grade social studies unit. Cromartie begins her article by explaining how the ability to ask questions is a central part of information literacy, with inquiry serving as one of the foundations of the American Association of School Librarians’ National School Library Standards. She notes that inquiry is also a core foundation in other disciplinary K-12 standards, including those for science, mathematics, and social studies. Despite this, information literacy instruction seldom focuses on inquiry, with librarians more frequently being asked to teach students to search for and evaluate information sources instead of being involved in teaching students about the creative process of inquiry.

To teach students about this important topic, Cromartie collaborated with a fifth-grade social studies teacher. Together they worked to reinvent a research project for a social studies unit with the goal of inspiring students to explore global issues and pose solutions that would benefit their community. To engage students in learning, the teaching team developed a set of lessons that introduced students to different skills needed to pose stronger questions. These skills included categorizing questions, identifying closed and open-ended questions, brainstorming what information might be needed to answer the questions being posed, and developing more complex vocabulary in order to ask deeper questions. Through this process, the teaching team rotated between whole classroom instruction, student group work, and peer-to-peer and student-to-teacher discussions.

This article explores an important but not frequently taught aspect of information literacy. The practical and thoughtful lessons shared by Cromartie will serve as a useful guide to other librarians interested in incorporating instruction around inquiry in their classrooms. BF


This article presents findings from a phenomenographic study undertaken to discover which information literacy concepts are the most important to faculty (in their own words), how they align to the ACRL Framework, and if any gaps between the two exist. Twenty-four faculty from a range of disciplines, genders, and ranks, all of whom taught three-hour credit courses for first-year students, were interviewed using a semi-structured format. The interview transcripts were analyzed for themes, which were discussed in a previous publication by the author. The focus of this study is on two questions from the semi-structured interviews: “Can you think of any key
concepts or big ideas that you think your students struggle to understand in relation to information use in your class?” and “How do you know when students have used information effectively in your class?” Three frames emerged as the most important to faculty: “Scholarship as Conversation,” “Research as Inquiry,” and “Authority is Constructed and Contextual.” Dawes suggests that librarians should begin to have conversations with teaching faculty around these frames, which can open the door to collaborations and instruction opportunities.

Faculty indicated that they saw instruction related to “Searching as Strategic Exploration” as skills students already possess, but the author suggests that librarians should approach this frame with faculty as discipline-specific searching and strategies related to finding information in their field. A few faculty conflated subject knowledge with information literacy concepts and could not separate the two as distinct. Faculty in this group would benefit from discussions with a librarian to help identify information literacy skills and their benefit to the curriculum. Overall faculty in the study value and are interested in teaching students information literacy concepts, and many are already teaching threshold concepts but may not be familiar with the ACRL Framework. Dawes suggests librarians begin conversations by finding out what faculty are already teaching related to information literacy and identify opportunities to develop collaborations.


For discipline-specific library instruction to be effective, Doney argues that librarians must first situate their teaching within the essential components of that discipline. These essential components are made up of a discipline’s epistemology (knowledge), metanarrative (ideology), and methodology (research and practice). In this article, Doney describes these components as they relate to situated instruction and her strategies for learning the epistemology, the metanarrative, and the methodology of social work. She concludes by outlining how she ultimately transformed a library instruction session for a social work practicum to be more centered within the disciplinary practice.

Of course, this article will be of interest to librarians working with social workers; however, any librarian serving in a liaison instruction role or working collaboratively with a specific discipline would find Doney’s work worthwhile as the general process she followed could be applied in many different contexts. And, even though some readers might find Doney’s individual process
overwhelming (her learning process took three-years!), she offers perspectives on how situating library instruction within a discipline could produce more effective learning and collaboration with disciplinary faculty. AJS


Here, Douglas and Gadsby follow up on their 2017 study, “Gendered Labor and Library Instruction Coordinators: The Undervaluing of Feminized Work,” by conducting a series of interviews with instruction coordinators across the United States. By capturing and analyzing the direct observations and lived experiences of these coordinators, they seek to further unpack the invisible labor of these coordinators and break down and define the broader categories of the duties they often assume.

Comparable to the Carroll & Klipfel article in this year’s Top 20, the value of this work lies in calling attention to the expectations and workload of instruction coordinators and the (at times) mismatch between these expectations and opportunities for professional development and advancement. Much of this work is relational and, as the article highlights, relational work has a tendency to be feminized and undervalued, while also being demanding of our attention and requiring skilled response. Douglas and Gadsby’s work provides us with thought-provoking commentary on the nature of relational work, while situating it well in Joyce Fletcher’s relational-cultural framework. This article provides helpful insight to instruction coordinators, their managers, and administrators. It is also beneficial for those new to the field, who seek to expand their skills into coordinating instruction services on their own campus, and it describes well the invisible expectations that accompany this work. CG


This article presents the views of Folk on reframing information literacy to address the persistent and existing racial and social-class achievement gaps. The author introduces critical social theory, a theory commonly used in educational research to extend the critical foundation provided by Elmborg to conceptualize the role of information literacy in the postsecondary academic context—cultural capital. The author describes cultural capital from the viewpoint of various
scholars. Cultural capital is a sociological concept and can be described as a set of cultural competencies that a person needs to acquire to participate in a whole range of cultural activities. Cultural capital can be associated with social inequality and social position. The author advocates that information literacy should be treated and seen as a form of academic cultural capital because the role of academic librarians in the teaching and learning curve is that of a discourse mediator. She argues that critical librarianship involves ensuring equity, diversity, and inclusion in teaching and learning through the engagement of students in a manner that their cultures, identities, and experiences can be incorporated in the information literacy instruction. The article provides some thought-provoking narratives for critical librarianship.


Inspired by Safiya Noble’s foundational work on Google and algorithmic bias, Gardner began teaching a credit-bearing information literacy course to undergraduate students focused on algorithmic awareness. In preparation to teach the course, the author discovered a dearth in appropriate curriculum, lesson plans, and activities for beginning college students, many of whom were unfamiliar with algorithms and from a variety of majors. Much of the article is a description of the activities, discussion questions, and readings that Gardner utilized to teach concepts, including beginning computer programming concepts, digital privacy concerns, how Google indexes the web, and why problematic Google image searches promote harmful narratives especially for historically marginalized communities. In addition to this practical article, Gardner has shared a variety of activities in the online repository for library instruction, *Project CORA*, and continually advocates that algorithm bias needs to be included within the curriculum of critical information literacy.


This timely article addresses the important question of how best to teach the evaluation of information. The author discusses the current “fake news” environment and the effect of this environment on students and offers a pedagogical approach to tackle this difficult issue. Much of the article describes the author’s process for creating a lesson plan that uses news stories as the catalyst for discussions on topics such as fact-based evidence, uncovering disinformation, and how to fact-check a claim. The author provides a detailed explanation of the lesson, including describing the article excerpts used and typical discussion questions employed. In addition, the author explains journalistic norms as part of the lesson to illustrate the differences between news
reporting and opinion pieces. She also provides many resources to share with students on this topic. The article ends with a discussion of various problems with social media and how to verify authentic actors. This article is an example of an innovative way to approach the teaching of critical thinking and information evaluation at the college level. DR


This article by Head, Bull, and MacMillan shares a typology created by the authors that can be used to categorize different types of information literacy assessment efforts. The categorization system offers a refreshing new way to consider and reflect on how librarians are assessing student learning. In addition to laying out the structure of their typology, the authors also describe how their four levels of assessment should work together to build a more complete picture of student learning—to move beyond “what works” to a deeper, more thoughtful consideration of what is being assessed and why.

The authors’ four levels of assessment are categorized based on the scope of the environment where the assessment is taking place—micro (class or course-level), meso (program or institution level), macro (across multiple institutions), and mega (society). The authors make a distinction between the levels of assessment that are library-centered (micro, meso, and macro) and those assessment efforts that are not library-centered (mega). The library-centered assessments are often conducted based on a strategic need of the library to capture the information literacy skills it imparts to students due to external pressures, whereas the non-library-centered assessments, such as the work of institutions like *Project Information Literacy*, consider assessment from a student perspective. To demonstrate and contextualize these different levels, the authors provide examples of the tools, data collection methods, rationale, and goals of assessment for each category as well as reflective questions that librarians should consider at each level. The reflection questions are designed to encourage librarians to think critically about their assessment efforts in order to improve teaching and student learning.

This article provides valuable insight into how information literacy assessment could be improved by embracing a more reflective approach, calling for librarians to be as thoughtful and reflective about their assessment practices as they are in their instruction and to move beyond deficit-based evaluations of students to a strengths-based approach centered around reflective assessment practices on the part of the librarian. BF

The shift from standards-based information literacy instruction to the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy* has refocused instruction from skills-based focus to an emphasis on threshold concepts. Many librarians have embraced this instructional shift but are still grappling with how to evolve learning outcomes and pedagogies to teach threshold concepts. One strategy that has worked for the authors of this article is to use the backward design instructional model introduced by Grant Wiggins and Jay McTighe in their book *Understanding by Design*. Backward design is learner-centered and asks instructors to create learning outcomes that drive the instructional activities and content. Research has shown that this instructional design model creates more engaged and authentic learning experiences for students.

Teaching students search techniques only to have them abandon them once they began their research is often a point of frustration for librarians. The authors used the ACRL frame “Searching as Strategic Exploration” as the focus of their first-year writing courses and revised a lesson plan using backward design. One of the changes to the lesson plan was to have students work in groups to problem-solve a failed search rather than start searching for articles on their individual topics, which was the activity before the redesign. The goal of the revised activity was to have students reflect on the search process, troubleshoot a failed search, and document their strategies. The revised lesson plan was taught and assessed in a variety of ways. Students showed progress in thoughtfully reflecting on their search process and strategies, which was one of the main goals for the redesign. Using a backwards design instructional model in collaboration with the faculty member for the course increased student engagement and student learning. The authors suggest this instructional model to librarians and faculty looking to teach more complex information literacy concepts and increase student learning. MG


Moran’s study of faculty attitudes and perceptions regarding information literacy (IL) at Broward College, a large two- and four-year public college, was spurred by an institution-wide reorganization, which created an opportunity to consider more intentionally scaffolded IL integration across the curriculum. With this opportunity came a recognition, familiar to many academic librarians, of a disconnect between the value faculty report placing on IL and their
apparent reluctance to seek out greater instructional collaboration with librarians. This survey investigated the perspectives of both full- and part-time faculty from across a wide range of disciplines on their current IL activities (such as research-based assignments), self-assessed confidence in teaching IL, and previous collaboration experience with librarians. In addition, the survey asked faculty to rate students’ competency in six core IL skill areas. One of this study’s strengths is its clear breakdown of findings by faculty’s subject area, giving a nuanced picture of disciplinary differences.

Broward College librarians were also asked to complete the survey questions related to perceived student competency, which revealed notable differences between faculty and librarians’ perceptions of when and to what extent students need support. The study further uncovered conflicting views among faculty regarding with whom the instructional responsibility for IL lies in higher education. Notably, even a significant number of faculty who expressed low confidence in their ability to teach IL had not invited librarians to their classes. This discrepancy led the author to a deeper consideration of the barriers faculty face in seeking IL instruction. The results of the study were used to communicate with faculty in a way that addresses specific misgivings and misconceptions revealed by the survey, anticipate future barriers to collaboration, and more clearly convey the value of integrated IL instruction. MK


In this case study, the author explores graduate teaching assistants’ (GTAs) perceptions of teaching researched writing to first-year students and identifies strategies for effectively collaborating with these new instructors. Drawing on the professional literature, Murphy begins by describing the fundamental shortcomings of researched writing in composition courses and disputes the belief among faculty that a one-shot library session will lead students to scholarly understanding and research expertise. She reminds the reader that a successfully completed research paper rarely demonstrates a student’s ability to engage deeply with sources and thoughtfully integrate them into his or her writing. Murphy argues that poorly designed assignments and a focus on mechanics rather than the research process creates a disconnect between instructors and librarians that further impedes student learning. Although she paints a familiar scene of the challenges librarians face when supporting first-year composition courses, her focus on outreach to GTAs reveals new possibilities.
After a thoughtful analysis of her qualitative data within the context of relevant professional literature, Murphy describes her approach to redesigning an orientation for new GTAs. Her new orientation challenges instructors to work closely with a librarian to create research assignments that emphasize the conceptual aspects of information literacy rather than search mechanics. Murphy includes salient talking points, as well as practical advice on aligning source criteria with learning goals, rewording instructions, and alternative research assignments. Although the article directly addresses collaborations between first-year writing instructors, the author’s ideas could also be used to design an orientation for faculty in any discipline. AMS


Through a selective and critical analysis of literature on the topic, Nowrin, Robinson, and Bawden explore multilingual and multicultural issues within the context of information literacy. They begin with a discussion of information literacy as a conceptual framework influenced predominantly by western culture. As a result, librarianship’s major models of information literacy do not fully accommodate culturally and linguistically diverse groups despite the profession’s efforts to embrace and promote diversity. The authors continue their discussion with a summary of the challenges non-English speakers face as they struggle to adapt to a new environment, language, and culture. They list measures that have been taken to overcome language barriers. However, they argue that more needs to be done to address cultural issues and concerns, especially within information literacy education.

Nowrin et al. present several examples from the literature that attempt to address multicultural concerns. However, they note that there are relatively few narratives that explicitly address the issues that arise when information literacy education is delivered without consideration for cultural differences and local norms. The authors identify six current issues related to library instruction and examine their potential impact on the delivery of information literacy education within a multicultural context. Through this analysis, the authors reveal the inadequacies of information literacy education in meeting the needs of the non-western learner and offer recommendations for addressing these needs.

This article provides valuable insight for librarians working with international students. However, all librarians would benefit from reading this piece to better understand the way in which our current instruction practices continue to disadvantage non-English speaking patrons. The extensive list of references includes international publications. AMS

Most high-level decision making is driven by data, and it makes sense that in the field of Business, employers want new hires to have strong data literacy skills. This article explores how companies are becoming more data-centric and unpacks the role of librarians in data literacy development, engaging the question: Are Business schools actively teaching data science courses to prepare students for employment opportunities? Pothier and Condon identify that many business schools are interested in educating business students in data literacy, but many of these schools have not created a plan. Newly graduated students have said that poorly developed data skills are the biggest internal roadblock for success. To help business students identify how to become more data literate, the authors discuss seven key data literacies competencies to address and be applied broadly in one’s business degree. The top three literacies are data organization and storage, understanding how data is used in business contexts, and evaluating the quality of data sources. As the authors advocate for the librarian’s role to spearhead data literacy instruction in the classroom, they also encourage collaborations with faculty to insert it within the curriculum, as well. This article is an applicable guide for libraries to develop a data literacy instruction plan, even beyond Business. AMC


Rapchak details the Duquesne University’s journey of restructuring a face-to-face introduction to information literacy course to a fully online version. The course was based on evidence from previous course assessment and structured by the ACRL Framework. Along the way, she provides useful examples of how to manage the implementation of a successful online course and examples of effective activities and techniques to use in the online classroom.

This article offers practical advice that can immediately be implemented in an information literacy course or a program. The first is that online course facilitators need to give serious consideration to making group work productive. Rapchak’s use of a group contract is an effective way to make members of the group accountable to each other. This article also highlights the need to support all instructors as they facilitate different sections of a course online. In an online course, even more so than a face-to-face course, it is important that students receive the same
information and level of support regardless of which section of the class they are in. Rapchak recommends preparing instructors before the course and regularly communicating with them while the course is happening.

Rapchak’s article has become even more relevant and helpful during the COVID-19 crisis as classes transitioned online. This practical article is useful to anyone teaching an online course or coordinating an information literacy program that will include online courses and elements. EL


As more instruction in higher education is conducted online, libraries are designing digital learning objects (DLOs) to deliver library instruction. With the increased use of DLOs, libraries must contend with a significant volume of student learning data generated from these instructional tools, including personally identifying information and scores. In an effort to develop a set of guidelines for managing student learning data at their own library, Sherriff, Benson, and Atwood surveyed academic librarians on their practices and policies pertaining to the management of student learning data garnered from DLOs. The survey consisted of 13 questions divided into four categories: a) the type of learning data collected by libraries, b) library practices for managing learning data (e.g., aggregation, storage, access, retention, reporting), c) policies or best practices that libraries follow in their management of learning data, and d) problems or uncertainties that libraries experience. Sherriff et al. received 71 complete responses from academic librarians. The respondents identified themselves as working in diverse roles, including instruction, online learning, DLO development/administration, assessment, and leadership.

Although limited in scope, the results of this study add much to the discussion of the management of student learning data and would be of interest to instruction librarians creating DLOs, heads of library instruction programs, and library administrators. Based upon the results of this study, libraries are capturing a wide variety of learning data. However, the majority do not have library-specific policies on its management, and their librarians are often unsure of their library’s current practices. The authors conclude their article by identifying a range of data management issues from the survey responses that could be rectified with a defined set of library practices and procedures. In addition, Sherriff et al. highlight a tension in the library profession between the longstanding concern of comprising user privacy and the more recent priority to contribute
to higher education student success initiatives using student data. The authors do not attempt to answer this complicated question, but the results of their study enforce the need to develop best practices for managing student learning data and further study in this area. AJS


Collaboration with faculty is key to successful library instruction at the college level. In this qualitative study, the authors ran an assignment design workshop for faculty using a charrette format developed by the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment. The charrette process provides faculty with the opportunity to give and receive peer feedback quickly in small groups. During the workshop, librarian facilitators found faculty willing to reflect on and accept peer feedback. The study analyzed in-depth interviews of faculty given at the end of the semester after the faculty implemented their redesigned assignments. In addition to improving assignments from an information literacy perspective, the workshop also helped faculty to consider the librarians’ role in contributing to the assignment design process. This article is of interest to anyone looking for an innovative process to engage with faculty on designing research assignments. DR
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