Dear LIRT members,

LIRT leadership astounds me. In what are wholly volunteer positions, the people I’ve had the pleasure to work with this year are caring, dedicated, and driven to make LIRT an organization that supports its members, looks to the future, and produces superior work.

They have sifted through award applications and made meticulous plans to celebrate the winners. They have planned programs and negotiated contracts with vendors only to see those programs dashed by circumstances beyond their control, and they have handled those changes with grace. They have coordinated and assembled these newsletters. They have come together with the spirit of working together through healthy debate and collaboration. It has been an honor to work with them this past year, particularly as they exhibited patience with me as I transitioned into this leadership role.

Other leaders have taken the helm of working groups, and members, who were not necessarily part of standard committees, came together to work diligently on the three strategic outcomes from last summer’s retreat. LIRT’s Twitter account is up and running with frequent tweeting! One group has produced a report about how we can self-examine to make sure we are an equitable and inclusive organization. Another has examined our membership so we can immediately reach more people to create a stronger organization through diversity of voices and views.

Mostly, this is my message of gratitude to everyone who has made this past year mean something for our organization, particularly in a year that has been so, so hard. We are emerging with camaraderie and a clear vision for where we are headed, and I can’t wait to see what happens next.

Jen Hunter

LIRT President
From the Editor

I want to take this opportunity to echo Jen Hunter’s gratitude for all who make LIRT run smoothly, even amidst all of the chaos that has been thrown our way over the past year.

Our quarterly newsletter would not be possible without the contributions of many LIRT committee members and others willing to take the time to share their stories, lessons learned, and tips for instructional success.

And, of course, the newsletter would be sad looking if you were left to my design non-skills, so much thanks to Rachel Mulvihill, Head of the University of Central Florida (UCF) Downtown Campus Library, who is also the LIRT News production editor. She really makes the newsletter happen – I just send her the content.

LIRT committees and members have done so much this past year— including preparing for a great LIRT presence at ALA Annual. See the section on LIRT Programming at the 2021 ALA Annual Virtual Conference, pages 4-6, for information regarding LIRT-sponsored events.

This issue also contains our annual Top 20 list of instruction articles. Special thanks to this year’s committee for the hard work of sifting through all of the great literature to find the best of the best.

And make sure to take a moment to read about this year’s LIRT award winners and their ongoing contributions to the library instruction field.

Finally, thank you for all of the time and energy you bring to your work in instruction.

Sherri
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My name is Christine Woods, and I am an Online Reference and Instruction Librarian at Saint Leo University. I changed careers in librarianship after being a school library media specialist/teacher-librarian for 25 years at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. I am a National Board Certified Teacher.

I joined the Saint Leo University team in January 2020. I was hired to visit all of the education centers in Virginia and a few others in Missouri, Texas, and California. I spent the first two months in my new job driving about 1400 miles in a month. After the lockdown in March of 2020, I eventually transitioned into working remotely full time. This is my first year being part of LIRT and serving on the Membership Committee.

**What brought you to LIRT?**

As a school librarian I often had to explain to other teachers, administrators, and even my friends that I was indeed a teacher. I have always been passionate about my role as an instructor. In my new job I am on my way to hopefully earning tenure, so my duties are divided between research, service to the school community, and teaching. I think being a member of a professional learning community is important. I want to give back to my professional learning community, and I want to learn from others, and LIRT is perfect for that.

**What do you like about LIRT and what would you like to see?**

As a school librarian I was involved with Virginia Association of School Librarians (VAASL), but when I became interested in changing careers, I started getting involved in ALA. When I joined I looked at the list of round tables and chose LIRT because it seemed like a perfect fit. When I found out more about the mission I realized I could have been a member all along. LIRT is for librarians who are interested in instruction no matter what kind of library they serve; K-12 schools, academic, public, business, law, medical, and other special libraries.

**What are you looking forward to?**

I am looking forward to sharing with other librarians from all different types of libraries. I want to help and support others as we improve our library instruction practice together.
How do we increase diversity (and what kinds of diversity) in an already robust LIRT membership?

Discussion Forum
Thursday, June 24, 2021
11:00 AM – 12:00 PM Central Time
Moderator: Mitch Fontenot, Instruction and Outreach Librarian, Louisiana State University

LIRT is one of the largest round tables at approximately 1700 members, but with a heavy emphasis on academic and school libraries. How would we increase diversity to include more types of libraries such as public, corporate, special, governmental, etc.? What other kinds of diversity in LIRT membership should we be striving for? Do LIRT members have to necessarily be formal instruction librarians or should we strive for administrators, management, technical services librarians, etc. to consider and join LIRT? These and other questions will be asked and discussed in this discussion forum.

LIRT Meetings & Events at the 2021 ALA Annual Virtual Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting/Event Title</th>
<th>Start (Central Time)</th>
<th>End (Central Time)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thursday, June 24, 2021</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Forum:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we increase diversity (and what kinds of diversity) in an already robust LIRT membership?</td>
<td>11:00 a.m.</td>
<td>12:00 p.m.</td>
<td>See Above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIRT Chair’s Program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smooth Transitions: Developing Information</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td>4:30 p.m.</td>
<td>See page 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literacy in the In-Between Places</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monday, June 28, 2021</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIRT Membership Forum</td>
<td>2:30 p.m.</td>
<td>3:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIRT 8th Annual Awards Ceremony</td>
<td>6:00 p.m.</td>
<td>7:00 p.m.</td>
<td>See page 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Smooth Transitions: Developing Information Literacy in the In-Between Places

LIRT Chair’s Program
Thursday, June 24, 2021
3:30 PM - 4:30 PM Central Time
Moderator: Julie Hornick, Instructional Services Librarian, Florida Southern College

Transitions can be full of excitement, but also anxiety. Faced with these transitions, a person may sometimes struggle to find their balance within a new environment. How are librarians collaborating across institutions (public, school, and academic libraries) to help alleviate this anxiety by teaching information literacy concepts that reach beyond the classroom and into the real world? While most conversations tend to focus on the transition between high school and academia, there are many other types of transitions that a learner can experience, like how publicly provided information can inform professional practice or how public libraries can coordinate and enhance the services students receive in school and academic libraries. This panel, rescheduled from ALA 2020, will discuss how public, academic, and school libraries work together to support the development of information literacy skills for learners of all ages, and how to connect with other librarians interested in this topic.

Our panelists will include:

- Jennifer Bromann-Bender, Librarian, Lincoln-Way West High School, New Lenox, Illinois
- Melanie Wachsmann, Assistant Director of Adult Services, Lone Star College-CyFair, a joint-use library, in conjunction with the Harris County Public Library system
- Zoe Magierek, Manager of Knowledge Services, Forefront Library, Chicago, Illinois

Find LIRT on Twitter: https://twitter.com/LIRT_ALA
8th Annual LIRT Awards Ceremony

Monday June 28, 2021
6:00 PM – 7:00 PM Central Time

In recognition of the accomplishments of librarians and libraries who promote information literacy, LIRT will host a virtual Awards Ceremony from 6:00 - 7:00 pm on Monday, June 28, 2021.

This year, we will be honoring winners of the 2021 and 2020 Librarian Recognition and Innovation in Instruction Awards (the 2020 ceremony was canceled). The honorees will briefly discuss their work in forwarding information literacy, followed by questions or congratulations from the audience.

All LIRT members are welcomed and encouraged to attend. Information regarding online attendance is forthcoming.

Honorees:

- Dr. Megan Oakleaf, Associate Professor & Director of Online Student Engagement at Syracuse University
- The Ingram Library of the University of West Georgia (Anne Barnhart)
- Melissa Bowles-Terry, Director of the Faculty Center at The University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- The Brooklyn Public Library (Amy Mikel)

The 2020-2021 LIRT Awards Committee:

- Emilia Marcyk, Co-Chair (marcyk@msu.edu)
- Rebecca Davis, Co-Chair
- Alexandra Mitchell
- Bridget Farrell
- Charlotte Nance
LIRT has chosen Dr. Megan Oakleaf, Associate Professor at the University of Syracuse iSchool, as the 2021 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.

Dr. Oakleaf began her library career as a fellow at North Carolina State University, where she also worked as the Librarian for Instruction and Undergraduate Research. Since 2006, she has been a member of the faculty at the University of Syracuse iSchool, where she is currently the Director of Online Engagement. She has numerous publications and presentations on instruction, assessment, learning analytics, and library value and impact, including the books *Academic Library Value: The Impact Starter Kit*, and *The Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report*. She has been the principal investigator on many IMLS funded projects, including Connecting Libraries and Learning Analytics for Student Success (CLLASS), and the Rubric for Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (RAILS). Her service to the profession has been significant and impactful, including her role as a founding member of the ACRL Institutional Research Interest Group, and a long-time member of the ACRL Value of Academic Libraries Committee, among many others. The Awards Committee particularly noted the depth and variety of her scholarly output, and her involvement in ground-breaking information literacy initiatives and research.

"I’m very humbled to receive this acknowledgment and join the list of those who have been honored with the LIRT Librarian Recognition Award in the past. I’m grateful to belong to a profession that values the contributions of instruction librarians. There has never been a time when this work was more essential to our learners and society, and I’m proud to have contributed in some way to the efforts of information literacy librarians nationwide."

– Dr. Megan Oakleaf, Associate Professor, University of Syracuse iSchool

2021 marks the eighth year the Librarian Recognition Award has been awarded. Dr. Oakleaf will be presented with a $1,000 cash prize and a plaque commemorating the award. Her achievement will be celebrated at a virtual awards ceremony during the 2021 ALA Annual virtual conference on Monday, June 28, 2021 at 6:00 PM Central Time (See page 6 for more information about the ceremony). Visit [LIRT’s webpage](http://www.ala.org/lirt/lirt-news-archives) to find out more about the awards.

The LIRT Librarian Recognition Awards Subcommittee included Rebecca O’Kelly Davis of Simmons University (chair), Charlotte Nance of the Western Plains Library System, and Wayne Finley of Northern Illinois University.
LIRT is pleased to announce that the 2021 Innovation in Instruction Award will be presented to the Ingram Library of the University of West Georgia. Created to recognize a library that demonstrates innovation in support of information literacy and instruction, this year’s award recognizes LibraryDen, an asynchronous information literacy course built in response to changing instructional needs during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Developed by Anne Barnhart, Melissa Farley, Lori Dixon-Leach, and Craig Schroer at the Ingram Library, with help from a larger team of library staff and student library employees, LibraryDen combines existing materials from projects (such as LibraryDIY) with new structures and self-grading quizzes to deliver scalable information literacy instruction for students across disciplines. Due to the pandemic, all initial work on the course was done remotely, incorporating student employees and library staff to develop questions and test the course through several iterations. The team paid particular attention to “finding meaningful work for all employees working from home,” particularly for student employees whose jobs are more often place-bound. The course went through several rounds of testing before it was released in fall 2020 and has since been revised to incorporate assessment feedback from the first cohort of student users. The Awards Committee particularly recognized the cross-disciplinary applicability of the course content, the use of continuing assessment to improve the course, and the exceptionally enthusiastic praise for the course from a variety of University of West Georgia faculty.

“I’m very proud of the way our team worked together during the pandemic to design and implement this online asynchronous information literacy course. The positive feedback from student testers while we were building the course and the comments from students and faculty who have used it indicated that we had developed a tool that was useful for our campus community. The external recognition of this award and the attention this draws to our project signifies that what our small team created will be beneficial beyond our campus community.”

– Anne Barnhart, Professor and Head of Outreach & Assessment, University of West Georgia, and project lead for LibraryDen

The reproducibility of the course was another factor in the selection of this program for the LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award. The LibraryDen team has committed to making their project files, question libraries, and other information about the course available to other libraries upon request. The Awards Committee found the commitment to share resources with other academic libraries that may be struggling with reduced budgets and staff was commendable and timely.

2021 marks the eighth year the Innovation in Instruction Award has been awarded. The Ingram Library will be presented with a $1,000 cash prize and a plaque commemorating the award. Their achievement will be celebrated at a virtual awards ceremony during the 2021 ALA Annual virtual conference on Monday, June 28, 2021 at 6:00 PM Central Time (See page 6 for more information about the ceremony). Visit LIRT’s webpage to find out more about the awards.

The LIRT Innovation in Instruction Awards Subcommittee included Emilia Marcyk of Michigan State University (chair), Alexandra Mitchell of Texas A&M University, and Bridget Farrell of the University of Denver.
In case you missed it...

Fostering Sustainable Collaborations

The LIRT Transitions to College Committee facilitated a Fostering Sustainable Collaborations in High School to College Transitions event on March 24, 2021. The event began with a presentation by Alice Wilson from Monroe Community College (NY) about a successful college-readiness initiative involving her library, faculty colleagues, and teachers from the Rochester City School District, followed by breakout sessions to discuss various successes in or obstacles to HS-college information literacy partnerships. 129 librarians from high school, college, public, and special libraries attended the event and contributed a wealth of ideas and experiences to the session notes document. As a result of attendee feedback, the Transitions Committee plans to offer additional sessions in the summer and fall.

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

Send your articles to Sherri Brown

(slbt4kt@virginia.edu)
2022 ALA Elections
Be a LIRT Leader!

Nominate yourself or someone else for the 2022 ALA / LIRT Elections

LIRT’s magic is in its people and their dedication. You can make a difference in the organization by nominating yourself or someone you know to an executive board position.

The following positions are open and the term will start July 1, 2022:
- Vice President / president-elect (three-year term includes serving as past president)
- Vice Treasurer / treasurer-elect (two-year term)
- Secretary / archivist (two-year term)

To hold a LIRT officer position you must:
- Be an ALA and LIRT member in good standing.
- Attend annual and midwinter conferences (in person or virtually).
- Attend meetings of the LIRT steering and executive board virtually.
- Have a commitment to continually examining and improving the organization’s diversity, equity, and inclusion practices.
- Have great communication and organization skills.

If you would like to know more about the duties of being an officer, please reach out to current LIRT president Jen Hunter at jenhunter@princeton.edu.

Nominate yourself or someone else through the form (http://www.ala.org/lirt/lirt-request-nominations) or by emailing Jen.

This article presents a detailed lesson plan, aligned with the Information Creation as Process frame of the ACRL Framework, to help increase students’ understanding of government information. Government documents can be important primary sources for student research, yet they are sometimes avoided due to various factors including growing skepticism toward government sources, and information in general, and a lack of evaluation skills. The literature review provides timely context to the lesson by discussing the decline in public trust in government information along with the role of government documents in teaching source evaluation and addressing student skepticism surrounding information more broadly. As the article notes, government document evaluation can pose particular challenges not only due to an inherent mistrust but also because of the complexity of politics and data practices surrounding these resources. To address this challenge, the lesson guides students through a careful examination of how and why the documents were produced.

Framework-aligned government document instruction is not well represented in the literature, and lesson plans and instructional guides are particularly sparse. This article addresses that gap by providing a well-crafted lesson plan including learning objectives and an appendix of sample materials. In particular, the lesson plan contains a list of critical reflection questions that could be used as a starting point for lessons adapted to different instructional scenarios that guide students through source evaluation from the Information Creation as Process mindset. The active learning strategies help students critically evaluate government sources by examining their purpose, audience, format, and creation process. These ideas and activities could serve as inspiration not only for government document librarians, but anyone interested in applying the Information Creation as Process frame to source evaluation, teaching about non-scholarly information formats, or seeking to address student mistrust of information. MK


The authors examine the perceptions of first-year writing instructors regarding their students’ development of information literacy (IL) skills. They conducted interviews with 16 faculty and performed a qualitative analysis of the results. Specifically, faculty identified both barriers to and enablers of student IL learning. As the authors found no other qualitative studies of faculty perceptions, understandings, and practices of first-year writing faculty regarding IL, this is an important contribution to the literature.
Faculty first participated in a brief survey and were asked to define IL. They included terms such as ability or capacity (but not skill) to find, evaluate, and assess information. Interviewees described IL as useful in multiple settings and as applicable beyond using library resources. However, none of them mentioned the economic, social, ethical, or legal aspects of IL. During the interviews, when prompted with language from the ACRL Framework, faculty admitted that they may have left out or missed some aspects of IL. Faculty quotations from the interviews revealed that many of them strongly identify with the framework concept of scholarship as a conversation. Several also felt that understanding the concept of authority is of particular importance.

Faculty identified as enablers of IL learning: scaffolding of skills, time spent on IL concepts, student interest in their research topics, and their understanding of evidence and argument. Among barriers to IL learning, faculty mentioned the lack of time faculty can spend on IL in their courses, insufficient high school preparation in IL, and student inability to perceive gaps in their knowledge. In addition, students fail to develop their own voices, see research as a means of finding quotations or citations rather than as a means of learning about their topics, and are overconfident in their IL skills.

Although this article does not include information about student perceptions of IL or measure actual student learning, it does give librarians some insight into how faculty perceive IL learning and may lead to better collaboration between librarians and faculty. KM


Librarians regularly teach single session or one-shot instruction sessions and as a result may feel like they need to cover a lot of content in that single session. Black suggests that librarians use Wiggins and McTighe’s backward design model as a framework to ask essential questions and frame instruction in big ideas rather than focus on database demos. Using the backward design model will result in increased student learning and engagement and provide librarians with instructional design skills they can utilize when other opportunities arise. The author describes the three stages of the Understanding by Design framework and gives an example of how they used this process to design some new instructional sessions at their library. This article provides a nice overview of the process and the library-specific examples are particularly helpful for librarians who have read about backward design but haven’t applied it to their instruction yet. MG


This article examines the cultural, sociopolitical, and linguistic assumptions that persist in information literacy practice in the United States, specifically concerning Chinese international students at public American universities. The authors argue that while the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (Framework) is a significant improvement over the previous standards-based approach to teaching and assessing information literacy, further research is needed in examining the cultural assumptions built into the framework and how students from different sociocultural backgrounds understand and engage in those concepts.

This article provides a significant step forward in this project by examining how English language learners (ELLs) understand and interpret the concept of authority as described in the Framework’s Authority is Constructed and Contextual frame. While the subject itself is laudatory, the article is further distinguished by its methodology, which provides an excellent demonstration of utilizing vignettes as a
research tool. The study utilizes qualitative vignettes combined with in-depth interviews to elicit authentic responses from participants. The four vignettes are short, hypothetical situations created from themes surrounding the Authority is Constructed and Contextual frame. The vignettes investigate how students incorporate varying perspectives, students’ understanding of bias and opinion, how students define different types of authority, and how students make evaluative decisions with information.

The findings suggest ELL students have complex and varied understandings of authority evaluation and validation. This research is valuable as a model for the effective use of vignettes as qualitative methodology in the scholarship of teaching and learning as well as further justification in resisting a “one-size fits all” approach to library instruction practices. MS


Douglas’s well-written and thought-provoking article explores a care-based assessment framework for teaching librarians. The author encourages us to shift assessment conversations away from simply demonstrating value, which only serves the administration, and towards a value of care and connection in learning for both students and librarians. In the first section of the article, Douglas successfully makes the claim that current library assessment practices emphasize value to external audiences and do not focus on our learners. She proposes that by using critical assessment, librarians can begin to “assess with rather than on students to improve their learning experiences,” and challenges us to answer the question: What is it that we value? The second section of the article unpacks and describes assessment as a practice of care by taking the reader through several models that exist in other feminized professions including: nursing, midwifery, and education. All of these models center interconnectedness, individual respect and needs, growth, and care. The third section of the article answers the question posed in the first section: What is it we value? Douglas provides guiding principles of care-based assessment in libraries through naming values, describing the values, and providing examples of how they might show up in action. The author concludes the article with the acknowledgement that this radical shift will not be easy and does not fit into our current reporting structures, however, it is a necessary shift if we want to center our learners and our relationships with students and faculty. MG


IL literature focuses heavily on librarian pedagogy and perspectives while less attention has been paid to the way disciplinary faculty conceptualize and implement information instruction in their courses independent of librarians. This study contributes a unique perspective to the existing literature through its investigation of disciplinary faculties’ own practices of information literacy. The authors undertake a data triangulation method using a faculty survey, two focus groups, and analysis of student assessment data, learning outcomes and other institutional documents to complete a fuller picture of faculties’ implicit practices and beliefs around information instruction in their own teaching practices. Findings are presented in detailed tables that clearly show the IL concepts faculty include in their teaching, the academic and professional value they assign to these skills, which they believe librarians should have responsibility for, and their use of library resources. Understanding the scope and direction of IL-related instruction that takes place beyond the library can help inform librarians’ role in shaping the impact of IL within the disciplines and across campus. Overall, the findings illuminate opening points for discussion between librarians and disciplinary faculty, both areas of common ground and differences of perspectives, with the potential to strengthen future collaboration efforts. MK

Advertising is extremely prevalent in children’s lives. This article explores a librarian’s role in helping children gain strategies to make sense of the media messages all around them. It describes a sixth grade media-literacy unit which uses a curated selection of TV commercials from the 1960s to engage students in understanding stereotypes in advertising. Using a blend of humor and age-appropriate references, students are guided in nuanced discussions about elements such as cultural expectations, bias, and the role of satire. The unit culminates in students recording their own commercials and providing feedback on each other’s work.

This unit could easily be adapted for other grade levels and instructional contexts. The article clearly articulates discussion points to encourage meaningful conversation around stereotypes in advertising and help students develop their own critical questioning skills. The portrayal of familiar brands’ marketing strategies over time couches the unit in historical context. Students’ active engagement in creating media, along with critique from their peers, provides space for them to process their thoughts in a tangible way. MK


The result of the 2016 presidential election was a shock to many, but Gohr and Nova discuss how it was the manifestation of larger issues within the United States that have played a role in the development of academia, libraries, and our students. The authors discuss neoliberalism in the larger, global context and as it relates to the 2016 election before delving into its impact on academia, as well as the dangers of meritocracy and the tendency of seeing students as customers. Gohr and Nova call on librarians to understand the effects of neoliberalism, meritocracy, corporatization, and post-racial ideology on our institutions, our profession, and our students and critically examine the position of the library within academia, ourselves, and our positions of authority within the classroom. The authors remind librarians to be selective and deliberate when choosing resources for classroom evaluation, especially with social justice-related topics whose images may harm students. This article not only serves as a call for change, but Gohr and Nova also offer suggestions for change within library instruction through being intentional and reflective, and they provide resources for teaching difficult topics, trauma-informed education practices, and practicing inclusive pedagogy both within the article and through lists of links at the end of the article. KMB


This article describes the creation of an educational escape room, focusing on concepts related to information literacy. Librarians from the University of New Mexico designed a Mystery Room workshop to address the ACRL frame Information Creation as Process. The authors note that first-year students, in particular, struggle with identifying different resource types needed for assignments (e.g., scholarly article, book chapter, etc.). Resources found online pose an even greater challenge, as all the resources are indistinguishable to a novice student's eye. The workshop described focuses on helping students identify newspapers, magazines, scholarly books and scholarly articles. In addition to helping students with
source identification, the authors place emphasis on supporting the needs of their diverse student population, which includes both Native and first-generation university students.

The article details the development of different aspects of the workshop, such as the learning objective, creation of the puzzles, as well as how the game is played. In creating the storyline for the game about competing researchers and a missing manuscript, the authors also introduce students to the function of a research university in terms of faculty research activities outside of class. The authors provide a helpful LibGuide link with information about the stations, puzzles, and a start to finish workflow. As different institutions will have access to various resources and databases, some puzzles and clues may need to be modified. However, the descriptions within the article, along with the information on the LibGuide, provide a clear guide on how this innovative workshop can be modified and implemented in other academic libraries.

The authors played the game with numerous participants of varying experience levels. They note apprehension from all players before the game begins but describe an easiness once the game is actually played. The workshop has also proved to be adaptable through changing the pre- and post-workshop activities to address the needs of a particular group. This article will be of interest to anyone who is interested in engaging with students outside of the typical library instruction session or workshop.


This study builds on the researchers’ previous work to determine if teaching Boolean logic benefits students and in what context. The researchers examined if using simple Boolean AND is sufficient for upper-level students or will they miss relevant literature that would be returned through more advanced Boolean logic.

The researchers performed simple and advanced searches across eleven databases that would be used by upper-level undergraduate students representing a range of disciplines. The researchers examined overlap percentage by database between the simple and advanced searchers and scored results for relevancy and precision. The authors found no compelling evidence that either search is superior.

Upper-level student researchers should be encouraged to do both types of searches if they want to perform a comprehensive literature search. Previous studies indicate students of all levels are unaware of Boolean searching beyond using AND, and students who are familiar with more advanced strategies do not typically use them when searching databases. The benefits to advanced Boolean searching depend on individual projects, subject areas, and relevant databases. The authors recommend providing advanced Boolean searching instruction through asynchronous instruction, a flipped classroom format, or through individual consultation.

The authors challenge librarians to address algorithmic challenges in their instruction particularly as a way to help students determine which databases to start with and how algorithms can impact search results. Additionally, the authors make the case that it is important for librarians to continually review and examine search efficacy across databases because of the direct impact to teaching, learning, and research.


This article describes the exploration of affective dimensions of information literacy at Ozarks Technical Community College in Southwest Missouri. The research described gains inspiration from observations...
that students have not developed appropriate critical evaluative skills related to information, due to stress and anxiety associated with food or housing insecurity or other significant personal responsibilities. The authors suggest the process of questioning and critically assessing information is considered a luxury. The questions driving this research are: “Why are our students so overwhelmed, not just by critical information literacy, but by the work of research? And, from what context does our particular student population operate and does that matter?”

The literature review provides a rich background exploring the work of psychologists, educational psychologists, and behavioral economists to better understand affect, learning, and cognition, as well as the effects of poverty and gender as it relates to information literacy. The discussion focuses on affect related to learning, information science, and the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education.

Through semi-structured interviews with 31 students, the authors identify positive and negative emotional themes students experience while engaging in research activities: frustration, overwhelm, anxiety, guilt/shame, passion/excitement, connection/solidarity, awe/amazement, anger/sadness, pragmatism, and empowerment. The authors suggest that the ACRL Framework does not consider students’ developing understanding of information literacy, nor does it address affective aspects or personal situations. A significant contribution of this work is suggested language for knowledge dispositions for each frame to address affect, as well as students who are developing their understanding of information literacy. Strategies are also provided to instructors for engaging students through assignment design, scaffolding of difficult concepts, reevaluation of sources required, and most importantly, compassion. While intended for audiences who engage with students in community college environments, this article’s findings provide interesting insights for any educator who works with college-aged students.


Matteson and Gersch explore how public librarians provide information literacy (IL) instruction via one-on-one encounters with patrons. While there has been significant research about IL instruction in academic and K-12 settings, there is a gap in the literature regarding its implementation in public libraries. The authors sought to address this gap by asking U.S. public librarians to record information about their instructional interactions using an online instrument, coding the entries, and sharing data about the nature of those interactions and the IL concepts taught in the transactions. As such, this article is an important contribution to the literature on IL instruction.

Their research indicates that public librarians introduce users to a variety of IL concepts as they help them plan their information tasks and then access and evaluate information. The researchers also discovered that while public librarians strongly believe in the value and importance of IL instruction, they are sometimes unable to provide it effectively. Their findings suggest that public librarians may have a broader understanding of IL instruction than that of academic and K-12 librarians. Also, many of the instruction transactions between users and public librarians are brief and focused on everyday life information literacy (ELIL). As the vast majority of these interactions are very brief, the authors recommend that micro-teaching techniques be implemented in public libraries.


This article provides an overview of the Nānā I Ke Kumu – Look to the Source project developed and enacted in Hawai‘i to increase awareness of and proficiency in exploring culturally relevant digital
resources among school library users. The project arose both as a response to a long history of cultural and linguistic inequity in Hawai‘i as well as recent observations that Native Hawaiian high school students demonstrate a lack of comfort and ability in navigating information resources. Nānā I Ke Kumu was developed through the incorporation of several frameworks including, the American Association of School Libraries National School Library Standards, the Ho‘onui I ka ‘ike (expand knowledge model), which motivates users to: prepare, listen, observe, practice, comprehend, showcase and perpetuate knowledge, and Nā Hopena A ‘o (“HĀ”) model, which aims to develop skills, behaviors and dispositions honoring the values and qualities rooted in indigenous Hawaiian culture.

Nānā I Ke Kumu provides Native Hawaiian high school students, librarians, and other educators training in accessing, retrieving, and utilizing information resources, specifically focused on digital resources featuring Native Hawaiian content. Responses from the project have been overwhelmingly positive with users indicating a greater understanding, interest, and confidence level in utilizing these resources. Nānā I Ke Kumu offers an excellent example of a project aimed at increasing information literacy grounded in culturally relevant resources.


This article describes an instruction-focused development program utilizing a community of practice model. The authors suggest that a lack of resources, along with librarians’ underdeveloped knowledge of teaching practices, can result in the use of less effective strategies such as lecture and demonstration during one-shot sessions. The goal of this program is to improve librarians’ teaching quality through unbiased peer-mentoring, reflection, observation, and encouragement to develop evidence-based practices for teaching.

A pilot project helped to identify three observation tools for use in the one-shot context. The authors provide descriptions on the evaluation, development and use of each tool:

- **Teaching Squares (TS):** TS describes four instructors who build a small community to encourage self-reflection, not peer-evaluation. Details include the composition of the square, the setting of goals, observations, reflections, and suggested meeting times.

- **Teaching Practices Inventory – Information Literacy Instruction (TPI-ILI):** TPI-ILI helps instructors to document their preparation for teaching through identification of classroom activities and effective practices. The tool contributes to understanding, self-reflection, innovation, and development of best practices.

- **Classroom Observation Protocol for Information Literacy (COPIL):** This tool records what is happening in the class every two minutes using a code inventory. COPIL captures instructional strategies and student behaviors, not quality of teaching or student work.

The article presents two case studies showing how COPIL and TPI-ILI can be used together to compare actual classroom activities with an instructor’s plan. Significant emphasis is placed on interpreting the data. The authors recommend using either TS or COPIL, along with TPI-ILI, and describe how to use the three tools simultaneously over the course of an academic year to gain insight into teaching activities and planning, suggesting that administrative support could help encourage participation. While the program described is still developing, the detailed descriptions and development of one-shot friendly tools is a notable contribution. This article will be of interest to librarians, instructional coordinators, or administrators looking to explore the development of a teaching-focused community of practice grounded in peer-mentoring and observation. RM
Quiñonez and Olivas focus on the idea of a “student scholar identity,” first introducing how students from underrepresented groups, particularly from Latinx backgrounds, can be less prepared for college due to a lack of previous information literacy instruction in under-resourced schools, but also how they are then put into a higher education system that may not reflect their culture or values, which could make them feel unwelcome. As a possible solution, the authors discuss the use of validation theory teaching methods in four academic library information literacy classes, filling a gap within the research. The article further discusses the reasoning behind using Rendón’s validation theory, which accepts first-generation college students’ experiences, backgrounds, and values can and should be used as knowledge.

The authors, who both self-identify as Latinx, taught information literacy classes to first-year college students, where they provided examples of scholarship by Latinx authors and self-disclosed personal stories while attempting to foster an atmosphere of trust. The qualitative and quantitative study had six control groups of other information literacy classes, whose instructors did not vary their usual information literacy instruction, and a majority of the 200 students involved in the study self-identified as Latinx. The qualitative portion asked the students to reflect on their student scholar identities, while the quantitative portion used a Likert scale asking students to rate their satisfaction and understanding of validation theory concepts. Quiñonez and Olivas noted the students in the validation theory sections “Agreed” or “Strongly Agreed” more often than the control sections with the statements “I am more culturally aware about the diversity of Latinx experiences than I was before participating in this class” and “I was introduced to Latinx role models in the class through guest lectures, readings, service learning, attending related events on campus, and/or the instructor sharing examples during the semester.” The authors also discuss some discrepancies in the groups regarding what content they perceived was included in the sessions, which is worthwhile to note for future studies and practices. Although the qualitative findings show no difference between the groups, the authors note observations that the students in the validation theory classes were willing to share their own stories. While this study was limited due to the lack of time spent with the students and the backgrounds of the librarians, the authors see validation theory as a way forward to support and empower Latinx students. KMB

Saunders and Budd note how authority has been brought into question in the current information environment, with the questioning of information but also traditional publishing venues and indicators of authority. Their article examines the different aspects and definitions of authority, discussing traditional approaches to define and teach authority, such as looking at the author’s credentials and the internet domains (.com, .org, etc.), then introducing the frame Authority is Constructed and Contextual and examining the literature regarding its positive and negative aspects. They then take a step back from library instruction, looking at the philosophical approach to assessing authority, then disciplinary/methodological approaches, and finally developmental approaches. The article ends with suggestions about how to teach the idea of authority in regards to source evaluation, such as focusing sessions less on search strategies, using checklists but as a starting point to be expanded upon, examining the article’s arguments and evidence, and/or using a peer-teaching model. The authors also note the strategy may be affected by the particular publication or discipline, outlining possible questions and steps for different source types. This is an extremely timely article, with the authors noting the need to critically evaluate sources, especially with many users accepting all library resources as authoritative and the issues with traditional measures of authority, such as certain publishing processes excluding certain voices.

KMB


This article provides a critique of recent movements in higher education, the concepts of grit and growth mindsets, and their impact on library instruction practices. While both are widely referenced in educational research and have well-meaning intentions in their origin, the author argues that both the emphasis on grit in learning, a privileging of perseverance coupled with a goal orientation, as well as the notion of a growth mindset, characterized as a belief that one’s essential qualities can be cultivated through effort, have origins and ties towards the deficit model of education instruction.

The author begins by defining the deficit model of education, which gained popularity in the 1960s and 1970s. The author characterizes this movement as focusing on learners' weaknesses including deficits in knowledge, motivation, and/or cultural values. This perspective is problematic in that it contributes to inequality and oppression of learners that are defined as minorities by their race, gender, sexuality, ability, or class. The deficit model ignores barriers faced by these populations and shifts the blame to the learner rather than acknowledging and addressing any inequity inherent in the system. In information literacy this manifests itself in privileging certain forms of information over others. Specifically, text-based, peer-reviewed information produced via the scientific method from the Global North, is given preference over other forms of information. This places learners with knowledge and experience outside of these areas as deficient.

The author suggests critical information literacy and culturally relevant pedagogy provide two alternative frameworks to these models. The former challenges these dominant narratives by asking librarians to position themselves and their learners within the sociopolitical definitions of information production. Similarly, the latter asks instructors to intentionally center the knowledge and experiences learners bring with them to the classroom. This article is a valuable critique of dominant teaching paradigms and provides instructors with an introduction of how critical information literacy and culturally relevant pedagogy may help challenge these models.

MS

This article begins with a discussion of playful learning theory, which is a social constructivist approach to learning. Playful structures within teaching are beneficial because they help to encourage openness and help learners feel valued, which enables an acceptance that failure is a normal part of learning. It can be particularly important in transitional periods where students may play until they achieve understanding.

Walsh argues that playful learning is a good fit for the development of information literacy instruction, because information literacy skills develop as learners interact with information in a specific context and in relation to others in that context. Playful learning is framed as a good fit for a range of ages and settings from early childhood settings through higher education and adult learners.

Barriers to using playful learning are discussed including the perception that play is a child-like activity and strategies for easing people into play are suggested. Additionally, playful pedagogies can allow instructors to incorporate playful elements into existing teaching without having to redesign instruction. The author challenges instruction librarians of all types and across all learners to improve their instruction by becoming familiar with playful learning theory and practice. MG


Applying information to complex problems requires not only a broad subject knowledge but also skills in analysis and interpretation, and the ability to work collaboratively. The project presented in this article uses a “wicked problem” approach to help students apply the data they gather to the complex yet familiar issue of food insecurity. Using a case study approach based on local context, the scaffolded instruction introduces subject knowledge paired with analysis of different information sources at each phase including census data, company information, media, scholarly articles, and government documents. Students also engaged in primary data collection through field trips to the areas being studied, furthering their understanding of data gathering practices. Situated within a literature review of pedagogy surrounding wicked problems and critical thinking, the article provides detailed assignment guidelines including objectives, resources used, and student deliverables.

The assessment piece of this project analyzes students’ responses to end of semester reflection questions. The authors developed a unique rubric to identify instances of student growth in critical thinking skills from dualistic to multiplicitic and finally systemic thinking. This evaluation tool along with coded responses for three semesters of data are included in the article. One valuable aspect of this paper is the inclusion of quotes from students to illustrate the different levels of critical thinking arising from the project, which helps to illustrate how student thought processes and perspectives develop through different levels of critical thinking around information as they apply new knowledge to their understanding of larger structures. MK
Dear Tech Talk— I understand there is a new version of the Recommended Practice for the Open Discovery Initiative available from the National Information Standards Organization (NISO). Given I was unaware of the previous Recommended Practice, and it seems to be associated with discovery services, I think perhaps I need to know more about this initiative.

– Openly Desiring Information on the Open Discovery Initiative

Dear ODIODI— Before delving into the Open Discovery Initiative (ODI), let’s take a look at how the research environment has changed over the past 50 years. Fifty years ago, and perhaps centuries prior, research was print based—card catalogs stuffed with 3x5 cards, year after year of indices and abstracts sitting on tables and shelves, all of which led researchers to print books, journal articles, conference proceedings, and reports. However, with the development of the MARC record in the 1960s, libraries started migrating to online catalogs as a replacement of the card catalog. Services like Dialog enabled online searches (mediated between the librarian and the researcher) for research material. Eventually, end-user searches replaced mediated searches as libraries migrated to CD-ROM technology for databases; and with the advent of the internet, CD-ROM technology became obsolete, being replaced by internet-based databases that could be accessed and searched from the library and beyond.

However, research activity took place in silos—a silo for content held within the local online catalog, silos for institutional repositories and/or digital collections, and multiple silos for content located in discipline-specific databases to which libraries subscribed. A new technology—federated search—emerged, which enabled a single search across multiple resources. However, federated searching failed to meet expectations. The delay in the return of search results was disappointing, and there was a limit to how many databases could be or should be included in the configuration of the federated search engine.

In 2004, Google Scholar emerged as a real game changer. “Released in beta in November 2004, the Google Scholar index [now] includes most peer-reviewed online academic journals and books, conference papers, theses and dissertations, preprints, abstracts, technical reports, and other scholarly literature, including court opinions and patents” (Wikipedia, 2021). Since its inception, anyone can use Google Scholar, searching across a large corpus of research content with relevant results returned within seconds. Although through the years it has been unclear which content providers work with Google, researchers immediately gravitated to the ease and speed of using Google Scholar. Even librarians appreciated the efficiency and effectiveness of Google Scholar, although they also bemoaned the lack of transparency.

In 2009 ProQuest (via Serials Solutions) introduced Summon—the first highly touted web-scale discovery service (shortened to discovery services)—with the intent of providing a cloud-based central index for all of a library’s content: online catalog data, institutional repositories, digital collections, online databases (both
abstraction and indexing (A&I), as well as aggregators), publisher content, open access content, etc. This new approach promised the speed and effectiveness of Google Scholar but honed to each library’s collection. Other discovery services quickly followed, most notably: EBSCO Discovery Service (2010) and Ex Libris Primo (2010, with Ex Libris and ProQuest joining together in 2015, although Summon and Primo continue to be developed separately).

And this is the world in which many libraries find themselves today as is evidenced by data from Marshall Breeding (2021) showing about 19,435 installed index-based discovery services in 2020 (excluding EBSCO Discovery Service). However, even as an increasing number of libraries move to discovery services, these services are not the great panacea librarians hoped they would be. The “domain of index-based discovery services involves a complex ecosystem of interrelating issues and interests among content providers, libraries, and discovery service creators” (Open Discovery Initiative Standing Committee, 2020, p. 1).

It is from this complex ecosystem that challenges, and concerns have arisen:

- What level of metadata is ingested into the central index?
  - Basic citation information
  - Citation + abstract
  - Citation + abstract + subjects/keywords
  - Citation + abstract + subjects/keywords + full text
  - Some other combination

- What metadata is excluded from the central index because of:
  - Exclusive agreements between discovery service providers and content providers?
  - Abstracting and Indexing (A&I) services hesitant to participate because of potential impact on their business models?
  - Challenges associated with non-text-based formats (streaming video/audio, images, etc.)?
  - Third-party agreements content providers have that prevent the sharing of some content?

- In addition to the metadata that is or is not ingested in the central index, how frequently is new data added and how often is it re-indexed?

- How are records merged and/or deduplicated?

- How well does the central index reflect the library’s subscribed content?

- What technology and technological standards are used by the content providers to deliver content to the discovery services?

- Do discovery service providers that are also content providers remove bias when displaying search results or linking to full text (fair linking)? Do libraries have any local control over link display?

- How transparent is the relevance ranking; do librarians have any control over the relevance ranking algorithms?

- What usage data is provided – both to the libraries and to the content providers; can content providers see a return on investment (ROI) from them sharing their content with discovery services?

These questions and others inspired “[Marshall] Breeding and Jenny Walker, then a vice president for product management at Ex Libris... [to convene] a conversation at the ALA Annual Conference in 2011, with invited guests representing discovery services, content providers, and libraries along with NISO... [Out of this
meeting] a new NISO Working Group, the ODI, was officially formed in October 2011, with the committee created and beginning work in January 2012” (Varnum, 2017, p. 45).

The first draft of the recommended practice was released for public comment in October 2013, with the first ODI Recommended Practice released in June 2014. The ODI Standing Committee was formed, and in 2017 they began work on a revision of the Recommended Practice, which was formally released in June 2020 (National Information Standards Organization, 2020d).

Since the Open Discovery Initiative is a recommended practice—and not a standard—a bit more background might be helpful. Most librarians recognize NISO as the entity that develops and implements standards (https://www.niso.org/publications/standards), such as the NISO Z39.50 standard that enables the option to perform a single search against disparate databases with different search interfaces (federated search).

However, librarians may be less aware of the NISO recommended practices (https://www.niso.org/explore/type?type=11) – “a recommended ‘best practice’ or ‘guideline’ for methods, materials, or practices in order to give guidance to the user” (Open Discovery Initiative Standing Committee, 2020, p. ii). According to Nettie Lagace (2016), NISO Associate Executive Director, NISO recommended practices are similar to standards but lighter weight:

- They can be created and updated more quickly because they don’t have to go through all the (ANSI) processes that apply to NISO standards.
- They are developed when an information area is fast moving, and it is difficult to determine when things will become more stable; whereas standards are created for a more stable environment where the stakeholders can reach agreement more easily.
- The ANSI requirements are still applicable in creating recommended practices:
  - **Balance** – all stakeholders are equally represented.
  - **Consensus** – respond to all comments and make efforts to resolve all issues associated with negative “votes.”
  - **Open process** – enables confidence in the process for members and the community.

Consequently, “All elements of Recommended Practices are **discretionary** [emphasis mine] and may be used as stated or modified by the user to meet specific needs . . . [and Recommended Practices] may be revised or withdrawn at any time” (Open Discovery Initiative Standing Committee, 2020, p. ii). So, the ODI Recommended Practice was developed and approved relatively quickly between 2012 and 2014, with the forethought among the working group that it would be revised to address identified but out-of-scope concerns.

The initial ODI Working Group formed by NISO in 2011 was composed of equal representation from all the interested constituents: content providers, discovery service providers, and librarians (Lagace et al., 2013, p. 162), and focused on the following goals:

- Define ways for libraries to assess the level of content providers’ participation in discovery services
- Help streamline the process by which content providers work with discovery service providers
- Define modes for ‘fair linking’ from discovery services to publishers’ content
- Determine what usage statistics should be collected for libraries and for content providers – how do you account for the discoverability of the record and give ‘credit’ to the vendor that contributed the metadata (Varnum, 2016)

Early in the process, those on the working group recognized the need for a common vocabulary in order to facilitate accurate communication among them and the larger community. Consequently, both Recommended Practices provide a glossary. Below are a few concepts important to the Recommended Practices:

- **Central Index** – The result of storing and indexing content in a central location. Disparate content sources are aggregated with consistent formatting, indexing, and ranking algorithms.
• **Content Providers (CPs)** – These organizations offer content products or services primarily intended for access by library patrons or the general public. The content provided by these organizations is used to generate the central indexes associated with the discovery services.

• **Discovery Service Providers (DSPs)** – These organizations create index-based discovery services intended to enable end users to search the broad universe of content made available through their library.

• **Libraries** – These organizations—which may be affiliated with universities, research institutes, or commercial firms—acquire content from a variety of content providers and may also implement an index-based discovery service. Libraries represent particular user communities including staff, students, researchers, etc. (Open Discovery Initiative Standing Committee, 2020, pp.4-7)

First and foremost, the effectiveness of the central index for any discovery service is absolutely dependent on the effectiveness of all three stakeholders, as is illustrated in the image below.

A breakdown in the data received, ingested, and/or configured by any one of these groups will result in outcomes that do not benefit any of those involved, including—and especially—the end users, as is illustrated by the chart provided by Zhu (2017) which succinctly summarizes major causes for discovery-to-delivery problems (p. 73).

With this set of relationships in mind, below is a summary of points addressed in the first ODI Recommended Practice:

- **Content Providers**
  - Metadata
    - A suggested minimum level of metadata provided by content providers
    - Optional enriched metadata such as keywords/subject, abstracts, full text
    - Disclosure to libraries of their level of metadata participation
  - Data transfer from content providers to discovery service providers using existing standards as much as possible
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- Discovery Services Providers
  - Make available sufficient information about the content of their repositories so they can be evaluated against customer needs
  - Metadata
    - Provide publication titles; dates of coverage or publication; standard identifier(s); content format and type; depth of coverage
    - Provide downloadable files, tab-delimited, using file naming conventions
    - Frequency of updates
  - Use protocols to ensure fair linking, including allowing libraries to configure their preferences for linking when more than one provider is available
  - Defined practices related to the transfer of data from one party to another
  - Usage statistics
    - Usage metrics that are of value to the content provider, including the use of a referrer URL so the content provider knows the origin of the request for content
    - Usage metrics for libraries that demonstrate how the discovery service is used (Open Discovery Initiative Working Group, 2014, pp. 15-29)

One last important consideration from the ODI Recommended Practice resides in Appendix B (Content Provider Conformance Checklist) and Appendix C (Discovery Provider Conformance Checklist). With these two appendices, both content providers and discovery providers can assess their conformance against each of the specific recommendations—Yes, No, Partial—providing comments when desired. By making their conformance statements publicly accessible, libraries obtain a clearer understanding of each provider’s participation. However, “there is no auditing of this, it is not formal and is not enforced by any group, except peers to kind of keep you on the straight and narrow” (National Information Standards Organization, 2020d).

The major discovery service providers have made available completed conformance statements:

- EBSCO Discovery Service (https://www.ebsco.com/odi-conformance-checklists)
- Ex Libris (https://exlibrisgroup.com/open-discovery-initiative/)

However, conformance statements from content providers are scarcer: https://www.niso.org/standards-committees/odi/configuring-content-providers.

Ken Varnum (2016) emphasizes the value of conformance statements:

I think the information and standardization we can gain from our vendor partners through even the very simple conformance statements is very high. It is really important that we understand where the licensed content we pay for is going and how it is used and in fact it really is being used the way we expect it to be in the discovery platform.

Regarding the lack of conformance statements, Varnum (2017) quotes Rachel Kessler (Ex Libris):

I think there’s a misconception that you need to be perfect in order to declare conformance. While I understand the apprehension behind declaring imperfections in writing, the goal of ODI, at least as I see it, is transparency, to show that your organization is honest and forthcoming. Organizations should therefore publish their conformance statements and make plans to improve upon the areas where they are not yet perfect. (p. 47)

Librarians can help increase the provision of conformance statements from providers by bringing the ODI Recommended Practice to their attention and recommending that they complete the statements and make them public. To assist, NISO provides talking points for this purpose (National Information Standards Organization, 2020b) as well as the conformance statements as Word documents (National Information Standards Organization, 2020a).

Segueing to the present—with the 2014 release of the ODI Recommended Practice, the Open Discovery Initiative Standing Committee replaced the ODI Working Group. This standing committee has worked to facilitate the adoption of the Recommended Practice and to promote the adoption of conformance statements, as well as conducted additional surveys to assess the discovery environment and identify...
potential enhancements to the recommended practice – ultimately using this survey to inform the revised Recommended Practice (Open Discovery Initiative Standing Committee, 2020, p. vi).

The revision of the ODI Recommended Practice includes a significant number of updates and changes:

- **Metadata Elements** (3.2.1): Now just one set of metadata (consolidation of ‘core’ and ‘enriched’ from v.1)
- **Fair Linking** (3.2.3, 3.3.2): Recommended metadata for OpenURLs and provision of non-proprietary direct links
- **Open Access** (3.3.5): Parties should use ‘free to read’ metadata
- **Authentication** (3.3.6): Guidelines to ensure that only mutual subscribers can access metadata & full text where appropriate [Note: this feature is particularly important to Abstracting & Indexing services that fear damaging their business model if they participate]
- **Coverage Lists** (3.3.7): When DSPs offer alternative coverage of CP content, that should be clearly noted
- **Statistical Reporting** (3.3.4): Report usage in line with current COUNTER standards, which includes discovery usage reports
- **Record Display** (3.3.8): CPs can request not to merge their records & display credit for their metadata in DSP record
- **Ranking Algorithm Disclosure** (3.3.9): DSPs should explain the general fundamentals of how metadata is used (National Information Standards Organization, 2020d)

However, the most important change in the revised Recommended Practice is the addition of an obvious missing piece of the 3-pronged relationship discussed earlier – **Best Practices for Libraries** (3.4) – which outlines practices related to system maintenance, library advocacy, and training and communication. The goal for this section is to:

- Ensure that they [libraries] have followed discovery provider’s configuration guidelines
- Ensure that all desired content is activated
- Follow up with vendor partners on their conformance
- Establish training for library staff and end users
- Complete and publish a library conformance statement – an exercise would be very valuable in that it will identify areas where a library needs to focus on improvements (National Information Standards Organization, 2020d)

As with content providers and discovery providers, libraries also have a conformance checklist they can use to assess their adherence to these recommended practices and also to guide them in identifying areas on which they need to focus. Thus far, it appears that only Harvard University has completed a library conformance statement (https://wiki.harvard.edu/confluence/display/LibraryStaffDoc/Open+Discovery+Initiative), but hopefully as librarians learn about this new section in the ODI Recommended Practice, they will complete and add their conformance statements to the NISO site (https://www.niso.org/standards-committees/odi/statements-libraries).

In the end—**What’s in it for me?** Why should the three entities—content providers, discovery providers, and libraries – care about the ODI Recommended Practice?

- For providers/aggregators, “if content is not ‘findable’ via library ‘front door’, access and use will go down.”
- For discovery service providers, the technology/data delivery side should be easier if standards are in place (delivery technology and metadata elements), which encourages more participation from content providers and improves the central index.
- For libraries, the “discovery system can only be effective if the depth and breadth of indexed content matches the libraries collections.” (Varnum, 2016)

More specifically, both technical service and public service librarians should care about the ODI Recommended Practice because the more all the players conform to these practices:
• the more transparent and understandable the data held in the central index becomes
• the easier it becomes for technical services personnel to manage the data in the system
• the more reliable the discovery service central index becomes and
• the more confident librarians become with encouraging their constituents to use it for their research.

Additional Resources


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.

**Communications**
This committee is responsible for soliciting and distributing content, in both written and visual formats, for all avenues of communication with LIRT membership. This includes, but is not limited to, preparing and distributing the round table’s newsletter, curating all social media accounts, and providing oversight of LIRT’s online presence. The committee may create and update content, as well as solicit content and advise other committees regarding the creation and maintenance of content.

**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.

**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. Special attention will be given to technologies that enhance learning and can be easily adapted to a variety of different learning environments. Activities will include assisting with programs, writing reviews and articles for the newsletter, and promoting research that relates to our charge.

**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. Annually, this committee shall prepare and publish in the LIRT News a list of the Top 20 articles on library instruction.

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

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