

2019 LIRT Top 20 Articles

2019 Committee Members

April Schweikhard (Co-Chair)

Ann Marie Smeraldi (Co-Chair)

Adefunke Alabi

Yi Han

Bridget Farrell

Melissa Gomis

Chris Granatino

Meghann Kuhlmann

Elizabeth Lang

Ann Matsushima Chiu

Dorothy Ryan

Branch, N. (2019). Illuminating social justice in the Framework: Transformative methodology, concept mapping and learning outcomes development for critical information literacy. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 13(1).

<https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2019.13.1.2>

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) usabilityTEST 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, J. M. (2019). Interpreting the conventions of scholarship: Rhetorical implications of the ACRL Framework. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 19(2), 295–314.

<https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0017>

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 disciplinary 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 dialog 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

Burns, E., Gross, M., & Latham, D. (2019). The information literacy continuum: Mapping the ACRL Framework to the AASL School Library Standards. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 25(1), 1–20.

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, A. J., & Klipfel, K. M. (2019). Talent, schmalent: An instructional design/action research framework for the professionalization of teaching in academic libraries. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 45(2), 110–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.01.009>

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

Cromartie, K. (2019). It all starts with a question. *Teacher Librarian*, 46(3), 21–25

In this article, Cromartie details how inquiry—including question creation and writing—was taught in a 5th 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 5th 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

Dawes, L. (2019). Through faculty's eyes: Teaching threshold concepts and the framework. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 19(1), 127–153.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0007>

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. MG

Doeny, J. (2019). Situating library instruction: A case study of upper-division social work seminar/practicum courses. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 25(1), 8–27.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2018.1460726>

For discipline-specific library instruction to be effective, Doeny 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, Doeny 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 Doeny's work worthwhile as the general process she followed could be applied in many different contexts. And, even though some readers might find Doeny'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

Douglas, V. A., & Gadsby, J. (2019). All carrots, no sticks: Relational practice and library instruction coordination. *In the Library with the Lead Pipe*. Retrieved from
<http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2019/all-carrots-no-sticks-relational-practice-and-library-instruction-coordination/>

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

Folk, A. L. (2019). Reframing information literacy as academic cultural capital: A critical and equity-based foundation for practice, assessment, and scholarship. *College & Research Libraries, 80*(5), 658–673. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.80.5.658>

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 which 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. AA

Gardner, C. C. (2019). Teaching algorithmic bias in a credit-bearing course. *International Information & Library Review*, 51(4), 321–327.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2019.1669937>

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. AMC

Glisson, L. (2019). Breaking the spin cycle: Teaching complexity in the age of fake news. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 19(3), 461–484. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0027>

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, which 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

Head, A. J., Bull, A. C., & MacMillan, M. (2019). Asking the right questions: Bridging gaps between information literacy assessment approaches. *Against the Grain*, 31(4).
<https://against-the-grain.com/2019/10/v314-asking-the-right-questions-bridging-gaps-between-information-literacy-assessment-approaches/>

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

Mills, J., Wiley, C., & Williams, J. (2019). "This is what learning looks like!": Backward design and the framework in first year writing. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 19(1), 155–175. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0008>

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, which 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, C. (2019). Disconnect: Contradictions and disagreements in faculty perspectives of information literacy. *The Reference Librarian*, 60(3), 149–168. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2019.1572573>

Moran's study of faculty attitudes and perceptions regarding information literacy (IL) at Broward College, a large 2- and 4-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

Murphy, M. (2019). On the same page: Collaborative research assignment design with graduate teaching assistants. *Reference Services Review*, 47(3), 343–358.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-04-2019-0027>

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

Nowrin, S., Robinson, L., & Bawden, D. (2019). Multi-lingual and multi-cultural information literacy: Perspectives, models and good practice. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, 68(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-05-2018-0050>

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

Pothier, W. G., & Condon, P. B. (2019). Towards data literacy competencies: Business students, workforce needs, and the role of the librarian. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08963568.2019.1680189>

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 is 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, M. (2019). When online instruction doesn't measure up: How can you yell, and what should you do? *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, 13(1-2), 150–158. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1533290X.2018.1499248>

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 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

Sherriff, G. Benson, D., & Atwood, G.S. (2019). Practices, policies, and problems in the management of learning data: A survey of libraries' use of digital learning objects and the data they create. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 45(2), 102–109.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2018.12.005>

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 adds 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

Wishkoski, R., Lundstrom, K., & Davis, E. (2019). Faculty teaching and librarian-facilitated assignment design. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 19(1), 95–126.
<https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2019.0006>

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