

# ILA/ACRL Newsletter

vol. 25, no. 2, March/April 2015

The Newsletter Committee is pleased to report on many of the concurrent sessions from the March 20, 2015 ILA/ACRL Spring Conference held at Drake University in Des Moines, Iowa. In addition, the scholarship recipient is announced along with her reflection piece about the spring conference. If you did not get to all the sessions you wanted to, here is your chance to catch up. You can also find information on how to volunteer for ILA/ACRL.

## Volunteer for ILA/ACRL



## Volunteer for ILA/ACRL

ILA/ACRL needs your help to make our association the best it can be! The Nominating Committee is currently seeking nominations and volunteers for Executive Board Officers and committee members. Responsibilities and time commitments vary, so I encourage you to learn more about the appointments to find the right opportunity for you. You can nominate a colleague or volunteer by filling out this quick and easy [online form](#). If you have any questions please contact [Sara Scheib](#), chair of the Nominating Committee.

## **Executive Board Officers:**

[Vice President/President Elect](#): Nominees must be national ACRL members. This position is a 3-year commitment. In the first year, the Vice President/President Elect will serve as [chair of the nominating committee](#), selecting committee chairs and members (with the approval of the Executive board) and conducting the Executive Board officer elections. In the second year, the [President](#) serves as the chief executive officer of the organization and in this capacity presides at all Chapter meetings, oversees the business of the Chapter, and serves as an official liaison to ILA and ACRL. In the third year, immediate Past President chairs the [Awards Committee](#), administering the associations scholarships and other awards. (Contact Vice President/President Elect [Sara Scheib](#) for more information.)

[Secretary/Treasurer](#): Nominees must be national ACRL members. This position is a 1-year commitment. The Secretary/Treasurer is responsible for recording minutes of all business and Executive Board meetings, reporting the financial status of the Chapter to the Executive Board and the general membership, and working with the ILA-ACRL President to collect official documents from all officers and chairs for the Chapter's archives at ILA. (Contact Secretary/Treasurer [Kristy Raine](#) for more information.)

[Member At-Large](#): This position is a 2-year commitment. At-large members of the Executive Board serve on behalf of the entire ILA/ACRL membership. Their role includes fostering a broad view of the organization and bringing together various viewpoints for the overall benefit of the Chapter. (Contact At-Large Members [Carrie Dunham-Lagree](#) or [Jill Jack](#) for more information.)

## **Committees:**

[Awards Committee](#): This committee works to publicize, evaluate, and select winners for Iowa ACRL awards. (Contact Awards Committee Chair [Dan Chibnall](#) for more information.)

[Electronic Communications Committee](#): The committee is responsible for running the mailing list and maintaining the ILA/ACRL Web site and social media, including [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#), [LinkedIn](#) and [Diigo](#). (Contact Electronic Communications Chair [Andrew Welch](#) for more information.)

[Fall Conference Program Committee](#): The Fall Conference Program Committee generates ideas for IA/ACRL chapter sessions for the Iowa Library Association Fall Conference. (Contact Fall Conference Program Committee Chair [Amy Paulus](#) for more information.)

[Membership Committee](#): Committee activities include encouraging membership, maintaining ILA/ACRL membership lists, and providing a channel for news and information to and from individual institutions through a network of ILA/ACRL Ambassadors. (Contact Membership Committee Chair [Jenny Parker](#) for more information.)

[Newsletter Committee](#): Newsletter Committee members will serve as liaison to assigned libraries at colleges and universities and to organizations. Committee members will solicit the news that these colleges, universities, and organizations would like to share with the rest of ILA/ACRL. (Contact Newsletter Committee Chair [Leila Rod-Welch](#) for more information.)

[Nominating Committee](#): The committee's main function is to find members of the chapter who are interested in serving as officers of the Executive Board, chairs of the standing committees, and members of those committees. (Contact Nominating Committee Chair [Sara Scheib](#) for more information.)

Professional Development Ad-Hoc Committee: New for 2016! Details forthcoming. (Contact Nominating Committee Chair [Sara Scheib](#) for more information.)

[Spring Conference Program Committee](#): The activities of the Spring Conference Program Committee are to plan and publicize the Spring Conference and spring business meeting. (Contact Spring Conference Program Committee Chair [Elizabeth Kiscaden](#) for more information.)

### **Campus Ambassador Program:**

In this new program, one volunteer per campus is charged with spreading the word and gathering feedback about the association, sharing information about membership benefits, and encouraging colleagues to become involved members.

## **Reflections of Spring Conference Scholarship Winner, Debra Lynn Ford**

### **Bold Moves, New Connections! ILA/ACRL Conference Reflections**

*By Debra Lynn Ford*

I planned to attend the conference to add to the knowledge I am gaining in my classes, to make connections between library theory and library practice, and to make connections with librarians in the field. I feel like I did that and more as I connected with professional academic librarians and they shared their perspectives on different aspects of academic librarianship.

Many of my classes have had discussions on collaboration. At the conference I heard further discussion of it in the sessions and saw librarians from different institutions come together to present conference sessions. For a class presentation in April I plan to use some of the concepts from the instructional idea swap session. There were interesting ideas and models to bring into a discussion on library instruction.

The dine-around was enjoyable, and because of it I went from knowing nobody on Thursday to feeling like I was meeting friends on Friday, which gave the conference a welcoming feel. I

enjoyed being greeted as a friend and colleague at the conference. It was also good to see some of last year's graduates from my program attending the conference as employed librarians. I intend to return to this conference or others like it, knowing there is so much to learn from others in the field and many more new connections to make in the future.

## **ILA/ACRL Spring Conference 2015**

### **Bold Moves: New Connections**

ILA/ACRL Spring Conference 2015

Friday, March 20, 2015

Cowles Library

Drake University, Des Moines, IA

## **Concurrent Sessions – 1**

### **From Standards to the Framework: Using Threshold Concepts to Rethink Instruction**

*Ericka Raber, University of Iowa & Leslie Ross, St. Ambrose University*

The new Framework for Information Literacy has given all librarians who provide instruction much to think about. Ericka Raber shared how the Framework has informed her work with the University of Iowa College of Education. Ericka's desired changes for library instruction include moving to a model of curriculum-integrated instruction rather than offering one-shot sessions. Another change is moving from procedural instruction to conceptual. Reaching graduate students, not just undergraduates, is also on the agenda. To do this she is identifying the College of Education's needs and goals. She wants to start the conversations by evoking the Frame Research as Inquiry. This can direct instructors towards instruction that emphasizes asking questions and thinking critically. Ericka also discussed the challenges of working with faculty to make these important shifts in thinking. Some questions she is using to guide those conversations include: What do you see as gaps in your students' abilities and skills? Where in your course do students have opportunities to practice those skills?

Next, Leslie Ross from St. Ambrose University discussed how she is using the Framework to guide her in modifying assignments. She has used a popular evaluation tool, the CRAAP Test, in class and observed that students diligently use the tool, but they still fail to find a quality source. Leslie identified the problem as the criteria of authority that is part of the CRAAP test. She felt that authority needed more weight when evaluating a source. And indeed, Frame 1 states: Authority Is Constructed and Contextual. With Frame 1 as her guide she developed an evaluation tool that examines suitability, packaging, origins, and context. Leslie also redefined the term information literacy for her syllabus and included the term "information ecosystem" which was a

great conversation starter with students in her classroom. Ericka and Leslie's enthusiasm for the new Framework is very evident!

*Reported by Jennifer Sterling, William Penn University*

## **How We Finally Got Rid of 14,590 Books in One Summer**

*Joyce Meldrem and Kristen Smith, Loras College*

Weeding is an essential aspect of librarianship. Unfortunately, it can also be misunderstood or cause complications, especially when a library undergoes a large-scale weeding project. Librarians at Loras College decided in 2009 to look into weeding the library's collection of over 300,000 volumes.

The collection had not been weeded for a long time and large number of volumes were outdated or had not been checked out by patrons since at least 1994.

The presentation showed a number of variations the weeding process went through. Initially the librarians ran a list of books with low circulation rates and created a spreadsheet, asking faculty for input on which books should be weeded and which ones were to be kept. This brought up some issues on the communication between library staff and university faculty, as well as scrutiny amongst faculty and some librarians about the weeding process. As a result, the project was left unfinished. In the fall of 2013, after news that additional library space was needed due to upcoming changes to the library, the librarians knew they had to quickly take action and implement a successful weeding plan. After some tweaking and addressing past issues, the librarians were able to arrive at "Weeding 2.0". This improved process involved using general criteria for books to weed instead of only lists of books that hadn't been checked out since 1994. Faculty now had more direct input, in hopes that they would become more seriously involved with the weeding.

A comprehensive communication plan between the library and faculty was also used, including a presentation on the weeding project at a faculty meeting. As a result, the librarians and faculty were able to meet towards the middle in removing unnecessary volumes while still keeping books with low circulation rates which faculty found important to the areas of study.

The results of this "Weeding 2.0" yielded 14,590 titles being ultimately weeded from the collection, including 10% of the total volumes on the 1st floor and 15% of 2nd floor volumes. These books were sent to a company named Better World Books, a bookseller that donates some of the books to literacy programs around the world.

This presentation concluded that it is better to work together in the stacks and utilize the expertise and knowhow of everyone involved with the weeding project. There are weaknesses to this approach, in particular the labor-intensive nature of the project. However, having faculty input for weeding criteria and a healthy amount of pre-communication from the librarians on

important actions have been essential for positive outcomes on large-scale weeding projects such as the one.

*Reported by Justin Baumgartner, University of Iowa*

## **Who's Trending at the Learning Commons? New Partnerships in the Libraries**

*Brittney Thomas, University of Iowa*



As Learning Commons Coordinator for the University of Iowa, Brittney Thomas's position is defined as "51% IT and 49% library." She coordinates both the space of the Learning Commons and the people using [it] and promotes the library as a "focused learning environment." As the Learning Commons works to intentionally support both traditional "serious study" and active, collaborative learning at the same time in the same place, some deeply rooted ideas about "what the library is" are challenged by the goals of this new space. Thomas told participants she is "always thinking about the intersections" between the social and educational experiences of students.

In this session, Thomas shared examples of partnerships, both successful and unsuccessful, that the Learning Commons has explored.

Express Workshops, such as drop-in workshops on EndNote, avoiding online filter bubbles, wireless printing, and making healthy study snacks, were some of the earliest initiatives. Although Thomas reported undergraduate students, the target audience for these workshops, did not respond, the workshops nonetheless provided an opportunity to connect with other campus partners and gather information about how students were using the Learning Commons space. Because Thomas's objective was to create a culture where solo study and collaboration and

social activity can happen seamlessly, she continued seeking partnerships and opportunities even though the Express Workshop model was discontinued after three semesters when it became clear even focused outreach and promotion was not increasing undergraduate participation. Similarly, Open Houses and a hosted 24-hour event “Late Night in the Learning Commons” were so under-attended even the organizers left early, prompting Thomas to ask the question whether she should undertake any programming at all. In contrast, a Social Media Bootcamp idea turned out to be so successful that it expanded to a full week of events, but taxed the resources of the staff and the space in the process.

Together with campus partners, Thomas began to think differently about format and about time commitments that could be realistic and sustainable. While some Learning Commons dedicate permanent space to organizations such as tutoring or the writing center, Thomas sought to preserve the flexibility of this space. Therefore, the Learning Commons brought in some campus partners on a “hotel model,” allowing groups such as statistics tutoring and “SWAT” tutoring to reserve space during midterms and finals, with good success and an increase in usage of these services. Reflecting on this successful example, Thomas emphasized the importance of developing effective partnerships and developing a model that is right for the local user community.

In some cases, the objectives of a potential partner just weren’t right for the Learning Commons. Some academic or student involvement fairs were turned down because they had the potential to overwhelm the entire space or would involve extensive tabling or solicitation. A technology-training initiative lead by the bookstore raised questions about working with retail or commercial partners, and in this case the events are offered in the Learning Commons with the understanding that the focus is not on promoting any commercial products or sales.

Among some surprising partnerships, Thomas included the bookstore’s technology training program and the Digital Studio for Public Arts and Humanities, which offers Studio Talks focused on faculty research in media, video production, and more. In order to develop more connections to classes, the Learning Commons hosts presentations by students in Rhetoric courses, a Shark Tank event, a juried video art exhibit, a digital photo exhibit from the First Year Experience “Capture Iowa” project, and a Pop Up Museum developed in conjunction with a visiting artist and an arts management class. Although Thomas acknowledged that this event was “actually quite disruptive,” she continues to demonstrate the point that the Learning Commons is a collaborative, student-determined space. While she reports that there are always more potential partners to reach out to across campus and within the library, at this point in time enough people and groups are reaching out to her to ensure many more creative and successful partnerships.

*Reported by Beth McMahon, Central College*

## **Concurrent Sessions – 2**

### **Everything that is Old is New Again: Using the Past to Ensure Our Future**

*Johnathan Helmke, University of Dubuque*

Sometimes library archives are considered a place where we keep things stored, and not to be touched. Johnathan Helmke of University of Dubuque has a completely different vision of archives and how they can connect us with our institution's constituents. Johnathan outlined his model of that vision for the audience.

Advocating- Archives can be used for advocating for the library, students, faculty, alumni and the institution.

Reaching Out- Johnathan has used the archives to reach out faculty, students, staff, administrators, and community members. For example, he prepared a display for Veteran's Day that included items from the archives and photographs of student veterans who were very appreciate. Another successful event centered on the African American Student History Project that drew community members and family of alumni.

Connecting to the Institution's Mission- Programming is part of this segment. It includes exhibits outside the library, classroom session and the institutional repository.

Helping Others Succeed- Johnathan has developed partnerships with departments, faculty and other libraries. One example is the upcoming Small Archival Projects Conference.

Inviting People to Share Stories- Every institution has people with wonderful stories to share. UD's archives encourages this through their oral history project, Sol Butler Exhibit, and McCormick Memories.

Visioning the Archives- Because of the success of the archives projects and programming heritage was added to the library mission statement.

Educating and Learning- Johnathan has used the archives in courses such World Civilization and has taught a standalone oral history course.

Strengthening the Library's Future- By reaching out to constituents the library is positioned as involved and vital to the institution.

Johnathan's model is cleverly an acronym, ARCHIVES, in case you did not notice. It is an excellent example of how libraries can take existing materials and gain the interest of those who make decisions about the library's future.

*Reported by Jennifer Sterling, William Penn University*

## **The Georgia State Cases and Fair Use in Academic Libraries: What Should You Know?**

*Marcia Keyser, Drake University*

Marcia Keyser has extensive background working with copyright issues in the e-reserves context. She teaches a class on copyright issues in the United States and consults with faculty and administrators on copyright issues as part of her work at Drake University. Still, she was forthright in saying that, given the complex and shifting nature of copyright and fair use, participants in this session should not expect to walk away with simple or clear-cut guidelines for applying fair use at our home institutions. Instead, Keyser encouraged participants to consider not just the legal elements but also the social and cultural implications of the recent Georgia State copyright cases, known formally as *Cambridge University Press et al v. Patton et al*, US District Court for the Northern District of Georgia.

The proliferation of electronic and digitized materials has stretched and challenged copyright laws and policies that were developed to apply to print materials only. Keyser and other librarians who were early adopters of e-reserves could only rely in existing copyright law and wait in anticipation that legislation would be coming. While Keyser emphasized the point that librarians and educators must be responsible for "making good, responsible, good-faith decisions" about the use of copyrighted materials, she gave participants in this session a clear and thorough description of the recent cases against Georgia State University, which have the potential to define fair use for the future.

In 2005, many university libraries began reporting that they had been contacted by the Association of University Publishers regarding their e-reserves practices. Cornell University was one such institution, working with this organization to update their institutional copyright and fair use policies. The result was a much more restrictive policy that led to a significant decline in e-reserve usage at Cornell, and the university later revealed that this strict new policy was adopted under threat of a copyright infringement case. In contrast, Georgia State University resisted the push to adopt the stricter copyright policies in spite of the absence of clear legal precedent and in the face of increasing publisher pressure, and therefore found itself at the center of this conflict.

Plaintiffs for the case included well-known publishing companies Cambridge University Press, Sage, and Oxford University Press, which were funded by the Copyright Clearance Center and Association of University Publishers. Their objectives were to establish a clear line for when licensing is needed, to establish the "Classroom Guidelines" as an accepted baseline for working with copyrighted works, and to establish legal decisions made in the 1990s concerning copyright clearance for print coursepacks produced by commercial copy companies such as Kinko's as applicable legal precedent for e-reserves.

This case brought forward 99 separate claims of alleged copyright infringement by Georgia State University. 16 claims failed because ownership of the materials could not be proven, 10 were

disregarded because the amount used was so small, and 10 more dismissed because the materials that were put on the e-reserve system were never downloaded (an ironic example of students neglecting their reading resulting in a small victory for libraries). 43 of the claims were established as fair use. Finally, 5 claims out of 99 were found to be infringements for which the GSU policy was found to be at fault for not limiting use or providing sufficient guidance to faculty. No financial harm was found to any publisher.

In this decision, the presiding judge Orinda D. Evans introduced a method of interpreting the four factors of fair use that was ultimately rejected upon appeal and the “10% Rule” for considering the amount of a copyrighted work that can be copied under fair use, a “rule” that Keyser explained “has been confusing librarians ever since.”

Not surprisingly, Keyser explained, this decision was appealed. In October 2014, the Eleventh Circuit court “reversed and remanded” Judge Evans’s decision, sending the case back to the district court with two directives. First, it advised the lower court to use the four factors of fair use more analytically, not as a formula or mathematical “average.” Secondly, it rejected the “10% Rule.” This in turn means that the Classroom Copying Guidelines are not enforceable, a point Keyser illustrated by dropping a printed copy directly into the trash can (or, in this example, the recycling bin).

The case currently resides in District Court, and libraries must wait for the next round of decisions to emerge from this complex situation. In the meantime, Keyser advised librarians interested in copyright and fair use to “just start reading” about these issues. She referred to the website [nolo.com](http://nolo.com) as a source for legal definitions and explanation of legal terms for non-specialists. She suggested copyright-related sessions at library conferences, copyright-specific conferences, and online courses as other useful learning experiences. At Drake, she had the opportunity to audit a copyright course in the law school, giving her more formal education in this area than some attorneys. This underscores her point that librarians must educate ourselves and be prepared to engage and lead our institutions in understanding and applying fair use.

*Reported by Beth McMahon, Central College*

## **Lights, Camera, Interaction! Visual Literacy and First-Year Students**

*Stella Herzig and Karly Lyle, St. Ambrose University*

St Ambrose University has a basement media lab full of goodies for students to use in their academic endeavors, but very few students are making use of them. Partly due to its location in the library and partly due to lack of awareness, no students - beyond some whose teachers told them to go there - frequented the lab. Karly Lyle, Media Librarian and Stella Herzig, Information Literacy/ Reference Librarian came up with an innovative way to not only expose students to the treasures in the media lab, but to make that knowledge stick.

Their multimedia presentation at the conference attracted 14 curious librarians who were patient through some initial technical difficulties; no multimedia session is complete without some technical difficulties! They were soon wowed, though, by the collaborative effort of these two intrepid presenters who went on to detail a two class lesson that originated in a first-year IL101 class. Stella started the students in the regular classroom with Visual Literacy concepts, such as encoding and decoding, the spectrum from being able to correctly ‘read’ visuals to creating persuasive multimedia. The student’s got a glimpse of visual “grammar” concepts and had to evaluate a short video for bias and for facts to verify.

In the next class period Karly put video cameras, still cameras and voiceover mics in their hands and asked them to create footage to ‘market’ the library to their peers. The students could make-up their own dialogue (with some general prompts given by Karly) – the student roamed the library for 20 minutes with such tools – Karly then edited their footage into a short video that showcases a product of the very tools and software the media lab has within it. The students love seeing themselves on film (on the last day of classes) and they then would remember both the concepts and the lab the rest of their campus days.

Karly and Stella showed the student video to the gathered librarians and also showcased a Vlog-like “Ten Lessons Learned” video of their mistakes (made with free software online). They ended with a handing out a list of ‘freebies’ software for those who did not own the software for making videos. A lively discussion ensued.

*Reported by Karly Lyle, St. Ambrose University*

### **Concurrent Sessions – 3**

#### **Altmetrics Are for Everyone!,**

*Emma Molls, Megan O’Donnell, and Kelly Thompson, Iowa State University*

Emma Molls, Megan O’Donnell, and Kelly J. Thompson, librarians at Iowa State University presented on the meaning and usefulness of AltMetrics. According to the presenters, AltMetrics “expands our view of what impact looks like, and also what’s making the impact.” These matters, the presenters contend, because expressions of scholarship are becoming ever more diverse: more publishing is being done digitally than in the traditional journal/monograph articles. AltMetrics, or alternative metrics, takes into account publications such as videos, course materials, podcasts, and blogs, to name a few publication media. AltMetrics is a new way to think about how people are viewing and using your material. AltMetrics can tell a scholar how many times their paper was downloaded, what countries or regions of the world are viewing or using their material.

AltMetrics covers areas like Facebook, Twitter, and similar social media platforms- it shows, for instance, how many times a scholar’s article has been re-tweeted or mentioned on Facebook. Digital repositories are another place where AltMetrics is able to mine information. This is a

guide put together by the presenters that does a thorough job of explaining all aspects of AltMetrics. <http://instr.iastate.libguides.com/altmetrics>.

*Reported by: Dan Coffey, Iowa State University Library*

### **Building Your Instruction Toolkit**

*Becky Canovan, University of Dubuque & Cara Stone, Grand View University*

Billed as a swap of library instruction methods, this interactive session requested that attendees bring an instructional item or lesson plan to share. Becky and Cara kicked off the discussion by outlining the structure and goals of the session. This session was designed as a participatory workshop and featured two main activities, the “Instruction Swap” and an instructional design roundtable.

The first round of share-and-compare was the “Instruction Swap.” Participants paired off into small groups and discussed learning objects or specific strategies they employed in a classroom setting. This activity gave participants the opportunity to collect ideas for their instruction toolkits and network with peers. After several minutes, participants would rotate to a new group and have the opportunity to share their ideas.

For the second portion of the workshop, discussion revolved around the topic of instructional design concepts. Attendees shared their strategies for planning instructional sessions with the whole group. Much of the discussion focused on successful methods for building meaningful relationships with faculty. Another hot topic for this portion of the session was faculty expectations for library instruction. Many participants shared how they guide faculty requests for instruction to better meet the needs of the class, and by extension the students.

*Reported by Karly Lyle, St. Ambrose University*

### **Capturing Student Voices: Assessing Civic Engagement through Student Digital Media Literacies**

*Kate Adams, Paula Kinney, and Paula Wiley, Iowa Wesleyan College*

Civic engagement is often an important learning outcome at institutions, but colleges often encounter problems in how to accurately show and evaluate it. In the past, low-tech service presentations were not fully effective for college student learning and were difficult for instructors to assess. Additionally, librarians in the past did not often actively play an active role in assessing these outcomes.

The “digital stories” project was brought up by a faculty member to address these issues and make students’ presentations more up-to-date with current technologies. Librarians at Iowa Wesleyan College played an active role in these student digital media projects in which the

students reflected on a recent service-learning project in a video slideshow setting. The librarians worked on the logistics of such a project and helped it to come to fruition for the class, researching applicable software for the students to use to complete the project. This software included a free and easy-to-use program called Stupeflix for the students to make short videos of photo slideshows with music and narration. The students also became introduced to and involved with other programs such as Dropbox, Symbaloo, and Google Drive to coordinate the project with their assigned project partner. The librarians involved gave instruction to the students on digital media literacies and other related areas.

At the end of this project, the librarians reflected on the good and the bad of this initial endeavor. The students were able to achieve a more professional final product, which was also easier for instructors to assess. The digital media literacy project also increased the engagement of students with faculty as well as increasing the possibilities for future class projects. There were some drawbacks to this process, particularly in having only one librarian working individually on certain technical matters with over 70 students, as well as the lack of faculty training for tech support. However, these pros and cons have only enabled the possibility for improvements in a future digital media literacy project (i.e. Better, Faster, Stronger). And in conclusion, digital media literacy projects such as this allow librarians to play a more active role in institutional assessment and accreditation.

*Reported by Justin Baumgartner, University of Iowa*