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This month's cover features a photograph of a couple watching the homecoming parade during Bridgewater College's homecoming celebration in October 1973. The theme of the 1973 homecoming celebration was Country Comfort. The image is part of the Bridgewater College Special Collections, part of the John Kenny Forrer Learning Commons.

The Robert R. Newlen 75 and John C. Bradford Special Collections at Bridgewater College are committed to collecting, preserving, and making accessible the archival and material culture of Bridgewater College, the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, and the regional Church of the Brethren. Learn more at https://libguides.bridgewater.edu/specialcollections.
ACRL speaker honoraria policy updates
At the 2023 ALA Annual Conference, the ACRL Board of Directors received the final report and recommendations from the ACRL Member Accommodation/Compensation Task Force. Due to changing landscapes, member feedback, and requests in recent years, the Board asked the task force to review existing policies and norms pertaining to member participation and compensation to better engage, acknowledge, and support a diverse library workforce and to help make ACRL a more welcoming, equitable, and accessible association.

On the task force’s recommendation, the Board approved a series of policy updates that allow ACRL units such as committees (including the President’s Program committee) and sections to offer honoraria to all speakers, regardless of their membership in ALA/ACRL, job position, or degree status. Examples of work for which honoraria can now be offered include speaking at virtual or in-person events, leading workshops, or presenting at ALA conferences. The Board also reaffirmed that the association will continue providing discounted registration for all speakers at future biennial ACRL Conferences. Learn more in the full update from ACRL President Beth McNeil on ACRL Insider at https://acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/acrl-speaker-honoraria-policy-updates/.

Applications open for IMLS grant opportunities
Museums and related organizations across the United States have six opportunities in the coming months to apply for grants from the nation’s primary source of federal funding for museum services. The Institute of Museum and Library Services is now accepting applications for six grant programs including Museums for America, Inspire! Grants for Small Museums, Museums Empowered, National Leadership Grants for Museums, Museum Grants for African American History and Culture, and Native American/Native Hawaiian Museum Services.

Applications for all six programs are due on November 15, 2023. Applicants should review the notices of funding opportunity carefully to understand each program’s specific goals and objectives, which reflect the agency’s focus on championing lifelong learning, strengthening community engagement, and advancing collections stewardship and access. Learn more at https://www.imls.gov/grants/grant-programs.

D2O opens access to new books
Thanks to the support of libraries participating in Direct to Open (D2O), the MIT Press will publish its full list of 2023 scholarly monographs and edited collections open access on the MIT Press Direct platform. Launched in 2021, D2O is a sustainable framework that harnesses the collective power of libraries to support open and equitable access to vital, leading scholarship. D2O moves scholarly books from a solely market-based, purchase model, where individuals and libraries buy single ebooks, to a collaborative, library-supported open access model. Instead of purchasing a title once for a single collection, libraries now have the opportunity to fund them one time for the world through participant fees.
In its second year, 322 libraries from around the globe committed to support D2O, an increase of 33% from the first year. Expanding D2O’s international footprint, the MIT Press also entered into all-in agreements with Big Ten Academic Alliance and the Konsortium der sächsischen Hochschulbibliotheken, as well as central licensing and invoicing agreements with Council of Australian University Librarians, Center for Research Libraries, Greater Western Library Alliance, MOBIUS, Northeast Research Libraries, Jisc, Partnership for Academic Library Collaboration and Innovation, SCELC, and Lyrasis. In the coming year, the MIT Press will seek to expand library participation in the model. Supporting libraries not only contribute to opening frontlist titles, but also receive exclusive participation benefits including term access to a backlist collection of more than 2,400 titles. To learn more about Direct to Open, visit https://direct.mit.edu/books/pages/direct-to-open.

**Big Ten Open Books project launches**
The Big Ten Academic Alliance recently announced the launch of the Big Ten Open Books project, a collaboration between the university presses and libraries of the alliance. The first 100-title collection centered on gender and sexuality studies is now published. The works included in the collection have all been previously published in print by the partnering university presses and are now being made openly available in digital form to read and reuse at no cost. The project creates open content that is immediately and universally available, on open infrastructure, Fulcrum, hosted by the University of Michigan, using open distribution models (including Project MUSE, JSTOR, and OAPEN) to envision a robust programmatic future for open monograph publishing. This work is aligned with the Big Ten Academic Alliance’s development of the BIG Collection’s ambition of uniting the collections of the libraries of the Big Ten Academic Alliance and is supported by the Mellon Foundation’s Public Knowledge program. To learn more about the project, visit https://bigtenopenbooks.org/.

**New from ACRL—Practicing Privacy Literacy in Academic Libraries**
ACRL announces the publication of *Practicing Privacy Literacy in Academic Libraries: Theories, Methods, and Cases* edited by Sarah Hartman-Caverly and Alexandria Chisholm, which collects practical ways to incorporate privacy literacy into your instruction and practice.

Privacy is not dead: Students care deeply about their privacy and the rights it safeguards. They need a way to articulate their concerns and guidance on how to act within the complexity of our current information ecosystem and culture of surveillance capitalism. *Practicing Privacy Literacy in Academic Libraries* can help you teach privacy literacy, evolve the privacy practices at your institution, and re-center the individuals behind the data and the ethics behind library work. It is divided into four sections:

1. What is Privacy Literacy?
2. Protecting Privacy
3. Educating about Privacy
4. Advocating for Privacy
Chapters cover topics including privacy literacy frameworks; digital wellness; embedding a privacy review into digital library workflows; using privacy literacy to challenge price discrimination; privacy pedagogy; and promoting privacy literacy and positive digital citizenship through credit-bearing courses, co-curricular partnerships, and faculty development and continuing education initiatives. *Practicing Privacy Literacy in Academic Libraries* provides theory-informed, practical ways to incorporate privacy literacy into library instruction and other areas of academic library practice.

*Practicing Privacy Literacy in Academic Libraries: Theories, Methods, and Cases* is available for purchase in print and as an ebook through the ALA Online Store; in print through Amazon.com; and by telephone order at (866) 746-7252 in the United States or (770) 442-8633 for international customers.

**ITHAKA announces new services for digital collections**

ITHAKA has announced a new set of services to help academic, research, and cultural institutions easily and affordably share, preserve, and manage their local digital collections. Using the same infrastructure that powers ITHAKA's nonprofit services JSTOR and Portico, institutions can now increase the reach and usefulness of their local digital collections, secure access for generations to come, and further the mission they share with one another and ITHAKA to improve access to knowledge worldwide. Following a successful series of pilots during which over 300 institutions shared more than 1,800 collections on JSTOR, and a cohort of 40 partners helped to define preservation and collection-loading needs, ITHAKA developed three services to support institutions of all sizes looking for high-impact, sustainable solutions. Institutions can now share collections on JSTOR, making it possible for millions of users to discover and use content alongside a rich trove of journals, books, images, and other primary source collections while bringing greater visibility to institutions; preserve collections with Portico to safeguard the accessibility and usability of digital files in the long term, addressing the needs of tomorrow's scholars; and manage collections using JSTOR Forum, a web-based tool that makes it easy to catalog, edit metadata, and publish to JSTOR and other sites—all in one place. Learn more at https://www.ithaka.org/news/new-services/.

**Project Muse adds new titles, prepares for Subscribe to Open**

Project MUSE has announced five titles confirmed to join its curated Journal Collections beginning in 2024: *Journal of Global Postcolonial Studies*, *The Journal of Race & Policy*, *Quebec Studies*, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, and *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*. All titles will be included in the Premium Collection. Selected titles have also been added to other Project MUSE journal collections for 2024. For full details, visit the Collection Updates page at https://about.muse.jhu.edu/librarians/journal-title-upgrades.

MUSE is additionally continuing with preparations to launch a coordinated multi-publisher Subscribe to Open program, built around current curated collections, for the 2025 subscription term. With more than 800 current journals in the humanities and social sciences on its platform from close to 200 nonprofit publishers, MUSE is positioned to develop and deploy an S2O program at scale for a significant number of its journals. Through the support of MUSE’s vast community of publishers and libraries worldwide, the S2O program will
open a wealth of vital scholarship in disciplines not well served by other open access models. Learn more at https://about.muse.jhu.edu/muse/s2o/.

Springshare debuts LibCal tablet displays
Springshare has launched a set of customized UI screens in the LibCal calendaring and space reservations solution designed to seamlessly integrate with Crestron room scheduling panels. The new interface allows patrons to view availability and check in to rooms/spaces via Crestron room scheduling panels mounted in front of the bookable rooms. With this integration, library users can view details about a space, pulled from LibCal and displayed directly on the institution’s Crestron room scheduling panels; instantly see whether the space is available, in use, or has a booking starting soon; scan a QR code to book the space via LibCal; and check in and check out of their LibCal Space booking on the tablet screen. More details are available at https://buzz.springshare.com/producthighlights/libcal-libraries.

Enhanced Gale Presents: Peterson’s Test and Career Prep Suite user experience
Gale, part of a Cengage Group, has made updates to the Gale Presents: Peterson’s Test and Career Prep Suite, a comprehensive online tool for standardized test preparation, researching undergraduate and graduate programs, finding tuition assistance, and exploring and preparing for careers. With a newly redesigned interface with simplified navigation and improved accessibility, these enhancements provide learners with a better user experience to easily access and find the resources they need to achieve their academic and career goals more effectively. Key enhancements include a redesigned user interface, goal setting functionality, easier navigation, a Spanish language interface, and expanded content. Learn more at https://www.gale.com/elearning/petersons-test-and-career-suite.

Tech Bits . . .
Brought to you by the ACRL ULS Technology in University Libraries Committee
Looking for a powerful data visualization and analytics program either for yourself or for your patrons and research partners? Take a look at Microsoft Power BI, which offers users an array of data visualization tools, reports, and other options to interpret and analyze data. Offering similar features to many of the leading statistical software platforms, Power BI has a familiar look and feel to other Microsoft products coupled with a large amount of support and community resources to help users quickly learn how to best use the software. Microsoft Power BI’s desktop app is available for free at powerbi.microsoft.com; paid Pro and Premium subscriptions allow users access to enhanced tools including live data dashboards as well as access across multiple platforms including mobile devices.

—Samuel Dyal
Roseman University of Health Sciences Library
... Power BI
https://powerbi.microsoft.com
When it comes to information access, academic librarians are advocates for openness. They demonstrate a strong commitment to creating cultures of openness at their institutions, leading the way for others to grasp the power and benefits of open access publishing, open education practices, open data sharing, and more. Breaking down information barriers while establishing pathways to unfettered and free access is a core professional value. It’s probably safe to say that academic librarians have yet to encounter an open concept they refuse to embrace. Well, there might be one exception.

If the conversation at the 2022 Designing Libraries IX Conference, held November 6–8, 2022, at Temple University serves as an indicator, academic librarians are still quite wary of, and at times downright oppositional to, the open office concept. No other topic raised at the program generated as much conversation. In the one program session that addressed open offices, there was debate on the potential benefits and pitfalls of open offices. Administrators asked for suggestions on how to get library staff to be more open to the possibility of open office space. Librarians questioned how they could effectively perform their duties in open workspaces. Architects and designers offered their advice on how to make it work—or when they thought it wouldn’t. When an attendee asked me, during a conference library tour, about my office in the relatively new Charles Library at Temple University, I invited them to visit it with me. Assuming that as a senior library administrator I had my own office, this colleague was taken by surprise when I led them to my workstation/cubicle and asked, “How do you like it?”

Based on my experience at this Designing Libraries conference (given the reaction of attendees at this session) and despite all the talk about open offices in academic librarianship, both pro and con, one thing is clear: few practitioners, at any level, appear to have actually visited and learned more about open office environments from those who work in them. This article, written from the perspective of an open office dweller who no longer has their own private office, seeks to provide an objective look at the open office environment. As our libraries emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic and we draw from that experience the potential of remote and hybrid work practices, academic librarians who are engaging in redesign, renovation, and building projects must face the question of whether private, dedicated offices still make sense. When these decisions are made, no doubt with the constraint of limited space, will our allocation decisions be determined by a user-centric or worker-centric mindset? Can a balanced approach be found?
Open office debate
Whatever an individual’s personal perspective is on open offices, whatever their library role, they will find literature to support their position. Hate open offices?¹ There is an abundance of articles that elaborate on the ways in which they lead to low productivity and lower worker morale. Want to make the case for open offices? There’s no dearth of information singing the praises² of how the open office concept contributes to worker idea pollination and staff engagement. Opponents will point to the lack of privacy, disruptive noise, and other disturbances that contribute to a decrease in productivity. Supporters see increases in serendipitous worker interaction, the creation of a more equitable workplace void of office status, and cost savings that maximize resources. My perspective is that open offices are neither as bad as opponents, nor as good as supporters, make them out to be. The outcome ultimately depends on factors such as design, planning, communication, and setting agreed-upon workplace norms—for starters.

Rather than debate whether open offices are the worst or best thing that ever happened to workers, we should focus on how to make open office environments productive and satisfying for all library workers. With flexible work arrangements becoming more acceptable in academic libraries for workers to whom it is an option, the prospect of private, dedicated offices being a part of future renovation or new building projects is questionable. In addition to costs saved by eliminating private offices, where staff work offsite two or more days a week, the need for a private office diminishes. Library buildings designed for the future, as was Temple’s Charles Library, must offer the next generation of inhabitants maximum flexibility to adapt spaces to the needs of the current users. Building private offices is expensive for new projects, as well as far more expensive to remove for future projects. Whatever you might think about open offices today, if your vision is future-oriented, then the flexibility and desirability of open office space is worth consideration.

The open office decision
Temple University Libraries had the good fortune to engage in a new building project because of the inadequacies of its then 50-year-old building. The availability of a building space at the center of campus, along with the extreme high cost of renovation, convinced the administration to opt for new construction. That led to a series of numerous building and service design decisions. For example, would the building use traditional and compact shelving or an automated storage and retrieval system? Would it feature traditional desktop-oriented computer labs or a mobile-first laptop approach³ that would eliminate hundreds of thousands of dollars in electrical and wiring infrastructure costs? To what extent would building design address contemporary student needs as opposed to aiming for maximum flexibility for future building inhabitants? Decisions about a centralized service point,
instruction spaces, and co-located student services were among the many major choices needing to be made. But of all the decisions facing the building planning team, none created quite as much tension between the planners and staff as the decision to eliminate all private offices in favor of open staff areas.

In the existing Paley Library, nearly all administrators and librarians had private office space. Offices conveyed administrative or professional status. For librarians, they could communicate a personal style. Other workers, typically in administrative, access, and technical service areas, always had assigned desks in open spaces. As part of the new building planning process, there was a detailed analysis of existing staff space, both offices and open work areas. In conceptualizing and planning new staff areas, the design team recommended an open office arrangement for all staff. Given the need to maximize student seating and study spaces, it was apparent that space constraints made it impossible to give all those with existing offices a similar private footprint in the new building.

Despite their awareness of the potential pitfalls of open offices and how existing office owners would react, the building design team made the difficult choice. In support, the designers touted the potential benefits of open office environments, such as increased collaboration, serendipitous idea generation, or simply more opportunities for staff engagement. What tilted the scale in favor of open offices, ultimately, was student-centered design. Given the choice between more amenities and study space for students or giving select staff a private office, the choice was clear. While most staff were disappointed by this decision, they understood and accepted it. To their credit, the building planners and space designers were already developing a strategy to provide a workspace environment that would address staff concerns related to the openness of it all.

Making an open office work

Where open office environments are less successful, it often results from a conversion of existing private offices to one where staff shift to an open arrangement. That approach is akin to fitting round pegs into square holes. The final product will lack some or all of the necessary design elements and amenities a born-open space provides. On the surface, the “private-to-open” conversion can achieve the goal of creating more user-centered spaces in the library, but an underlying culture of resentment is likely to persist if the negative qualities of open offices go unaddressed. Anecdotal evidence from libraries that experience this type of transition suggests staff will be bitter about losing their offices. They gain little in return to accommodate their needs, such as additional private meeting rooms, natural lighting, or necessary acoustical treatments or eye-friendly light technology.

Here are features, based on the Temple University Charles Library experience, that can contribute to a more successful conversion to or design of an open office workspace:
• Quality workstations that facilitate staff productivity while offering a degree of privacy. Situating workstations in an arrangement that promotes staff visibility facilitates a more collaborative workspace.
• A single workspace design for all workers helps to instill a greater sense of workplace equity than private offices of different sizes and locations. That said, even open offices will have some locations that are more desirable than others.
• Established workplace norms achieved through research, staff focus groups, and recommendations from colleagues can lead to a consensus on appropriate behaviors related to noise levels, impromptu meetings, socialization, phone calls, food consumption, and more. Staff working together to address the causes of low productivity and morale often associated with open office environments can reduce or eliminate the most undesirable actions and distractions.
• Abundant, large windows that offer natural light throughout the day, supplemented by indoor lighting that automatically adjusts as needed to complement natural light.
• Identify practices that establish signals for how staff interact in the open office environment. Headphone use, for example, can indicate a no-interruption mode.
• Construct adequate rooms convenient to the open office space that offer privacy for phone calls, supervisor-supervisee meetings, group meetings, chat service support, and any other activities that would create noise and distraction in the workstation area; create rooms that hold two, four, six, or more workers to provide multiple room occupancy options. Then make it easy to reserve rooms with a calendar system.
• Design the workstation layout to minimize walking patterns to discourage constant interruptions or distractions caused by passersby traffic.

These are just a few of the types of recommendations one can locate in the open office literature that are based on successful workplace practices designed to minimize the most challenging elements of open office environments while maximizing what helps them to succeed. Though overlooked at Charles Library, incorporating biophilic design elements into the open office area can positively contribute to staff well-being.

**Bringing equity to academic library staff space**

In a January 2023 issue of his blog newsletter, well-known higher education analyst Jeff Selingo predicted that faculty offices are likely to be on the chopping block for a number of reasons, from the cost of maintaining personal offices and eventual renovations to an expectation that faculty will be more visible and accessible when they are on campus. Traditional office hours are likely to be a thing of the past. Selingo writes:
Private offices have been a fact of life for faculty for centuries. Having a private office connotes stature in the campus hierarchy. As a result, expect lots of debates and handwringing as campuses rethink faculty spaces to become more student-centered. I visited the two of the college’s six campuses last week as faculty toured mock-ups of the new spaces. The new buildings will do away with the traditional private office in favor of a “palette of spaces” that include open work areas, huddle rooms, and enclosed focus areas that are private.

Selingo’s observation for faculty workspace is likely applicable to the library administrative and professional class as well. Claiming that professional librarian status and the nature of that work requires a personal private office is likely to ring hollow as campus space is reconfigured for a more hybrid work future. Past perspectives that determine who among library workers is assigned a private office establishes a hierarchy based on status. Staff lacking master’s degrees in library science rarely have private offices or they share an office with multiple co-workers. The existence of private offices in academic libraries, along with their size and location, establish these spaces as status symbols within library facilities.

Those libraries that eliminate private offices in favor of open office environments will move the organization in the direction of eradicating the private office as status symbol. If our profession is truly committed to eliminating systemic structures that divide rather than unite staff based on worker status, let’s consider breaking down the barriers that hierarchical workspace systems have built in library facilities. A profession that seeks to create equitable
and inclusive spaces for the people who use the library but allows its worker spaces to perpetuate a system of inequality should recognize the value in this change. For those who have yet to experience open office space, but instead base their perceptions on the literature that characterizes them as a worker purgatory, it’s time to develop a more welcoming and open mind to working in an open office.

Conclusion
To be sure, open offices are far from perfect. Everyone will at some point do something that annoys their fellow open office dwellers. Food odors. Ringing cell phones. Colleagues chattering away. And there is no personal, private office to escape to. With fewer staff showing up at the office on any given day—as remote work is an increasingly available option—these annoyances diminish over time. With the right design and worker norms in place, any undesirable behaviors are further diminished. Granted, losing a personal, private office is hard. Thinking of the transition in this way may allow for a more positive mindset. When moving from a private office to an open office, move beyond focusing on what you lost. Focus instead on the space improvements gained by those who use the library. In that respect, the decision to transform from private and closed to open and shared supports our essential core values. If it’s less than objective to state that this proposition is a “no-brainer,” this author pleads guilty.
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Notes


St. John Fisher University is the home of Lavery Library, the only library on the campus of a small doctoral-granting institution in Rochester, New York. Over the past couple of years, the three authors have formed a coalition for updating LibGuides in a participatory way. During the summer of 2022, we led a project to reorganize our library’s LibGuides homepage, the index of our guides.

**How it started**

Back in 2019, all we had started talking about improving usability for our LibGuides homepage. We wanted to make it easier for users to find guides. We knew we would have to change the way the guides were categorized on the page. But, without clear goals and direction, we soon lost momentum. In September 2021, Christina Hillman came to Ben Hockenberry and Mia Breitkopf, proposing we revisit the conversation. We decided to name Christina as project manager and restart this stalled effort. The three of us designed a two-phased project to define new LibGuides subject categories.

In the first phase, we threw out all our old LibGuides subjects, which had included broad categories like health sciences (for our nursing and pharmacy guides) and humanities (arts, English, and other guides). On LibGuides homepages, users view guides organized by subject. To make our homepage easier to browse, we made a list of the majors, minors, and graduate programs and created a subject for each. Users would now be able to skim the page for their academic program of study to find the corresponding LibGuides. For example, they could now see our English guide without first having to select humanities (see figure 1).

In the second phase, we facilitated a participatory card sort activity to categorize all the leftover guides. This leftover group covered varied topics, from information literacy tutorials to information for alumni, and a guide to interlibrary loan. We opened this card sort to all library staff, inviting them to sort these guides into new metaphorical “buckets.” We also asked them to label each bucket with a name that would make sense to our users.

This participatory card sort phase was a success. About half of our total staff chose to participate, and it was a good mix of librarians and non-librarians. They were able to complete the card sort on their own time during a period of about three weeks. Then, our three-person coalition examined their suggested bucket groupings and labels. We were able to create a proposal for the new set of subjects and the guides that would fall within each. We held a
meeting with the small group to share our proposal, and we used collaborative decision-making to finalize subject labels.

What follows is a conversation between the three of us who led the project. We came up with a few questions that would elicit reflection on how we used project management techniques to move a stalled project forward.

**What were some of the challenges we encountered with this project?**

**Ben Hockenberry (BH):** The major challenge for any project that impacts a whole staff population is making sure every stakeholder feels their positions are respected. Ideally, everyone’s voices would be heard in person. However, scheduling meetings that allow for all LibGuides-creating staff to attend is problematic, particularly when so many library projects have to occur during time between semesters! So we had to look at alternate means to secure buy-in from the whole staff.

**Christina Hillman (CH):** A big challenge was the timeline we gave ourselves to complete the update. As Ben mentioned, projects like this are ideally completed between academic semesters, and we wanted to “go live” before classes started in September 2022. We started the first phase of this project in March 2022, and began phase two in June 2022. This was a compressed timeline when we considered summer break, vacations, liaison work for librarians. Getting the staff together was going to be problematic. Ben, Mia, and I worked with tight deadlines, and actively shared those deadlines with staff who participated in the card sort activity, in order to complete the project on time.

**BH:** Yes, changes needed to be made well before the start of a semester to allow time to update videos, screenshots, and other learning objects.

**CH:** Ben also mentioned staff buy-in was a challenge, and I agree. There were competing feelings, priorities, and values around homepage organization. Over the years, as LibGuides had grown organically, there had not been a lot of oversight and shared understanding about how to apply subject labels for organization. The lack of shared understanding led to internal issues, which we handled as one-off cases, and this didn’t lead to any long-term or systemic changes.

For me, personally and professionally, I was concerned about building trust—trust that Ben, Mia, and I would make good decisions and trust that the three of us could speak freely and feel like our opinions and values were respected during the process.

**Mia Breitkopf (MB):** I am the newest librarian on our staff, and I immediately noticed that Christina and Ben didn’t think the three of us should make big LibGuides homepage changes without including the other library staff in decision-making. I really appreciated that...
inclusiveness. I could see that approach was an important part of the organizational culture. We recognized that it would be challenging to include everyone, so the three of us talked a lot about how to invite the rest of the staff into the discussion, knowing not everyone would have the time or the interest.

What techniques did we use to address those challenges?

CH: Creating our three-person coalition over the last two or three years has helped to build a sense of trust around changes we have proposed, beyond this homepage reorganization project. As Ben mentioned in a meeting, when the three of us work together we can lend not only our shared expertise to LibGuides, but also a sense of authority and good decision making because one person isn’t dictating best practices or deciding which changes are necessary. This little coalition we’ve built also helped us to encourage each other to make executive decisions during the card sort. Basically, it allowed us to move through the process more quickly as a full team.

MB: Yes. We realized that if we brought everyone’s card sort ideas to the small group meeting, decision-making would stretch our timeline way past summer. Like Christina said, we made those decisions for some subject labels and groupings and brought those recommendations to the small group. They were happy with that. It let us use our meeting time to discuss a few subjects for which people had proposed very different labels.

BH: The three of us met to plan the meeting with the card sort meeting for the small group. In our pre-meeting, we established norms for communication.

CH: During the final meeting with the card sort group, we also all agreed to a set of norms, as you put it, Ben. These were guiding principles for the meeting—this helped us to collaborate and make decisions more quickly, while making sure to respect individual contributors. I was the facilitator for this final meeting and I think that having a single person lead the meeting, but with the shared voice of all three of us, helped to keep our timelines.

MB: The guiding principles included things like “Participate fully and honestly,” “Raise your hand if you want to speak and the facilitator will call on you,” and “Strive for consensus.” It helped build trust and helped us keep a quick pace. It set an important tone that helped us accomplish a lot in one meeting.

CH: The coolest thing we were able to do was bring in non-librarian staff, who have little skin in the game for LibGuide subject organization, because it allowed fresh eyes!

MB: I agree! In order to make it easy for these staff to participate, we spent a lot of time talking about how to phrase things, how to time meetings and communications so they felt relevant and useful. We also used multiple communication channels. And Christina created formal project documentation that we disseminated to staff.

How did it go? Are there other projects this process could be useful for?

BH: I’ve been happy to have a core team working on LibGuides projects. This enables us to consider options and other perspectives, avoiding the tunnel vision of one individual, but avoiding the paralysis that comes with a large committee making decisions. Using a group buy-in-building method to set expectations for guide authors will pay dividends for content standardization and ease of navigability. The tactics we used to amplify important stakeholders’ voices while encouraging multiple perspectives will be useful in the future for
approaching how to deliver library services in new modalities—particularly as the library is approaching a building closure for renovation. We’ll have to try a lot of new things in order to meet user needs.

**CH:** Things went way better than I expected! Decision-making with lots of stakeholders is hard, and especially hard when there are competing priorities and values. Something I keep telling myself is that we made these updates without input from our end-users (the students), so as we begin to see how they understand and access LibGuides, we will likely make updates to the subject category names. I think this probably helped a lot of folks as we moved through the final meeting and compromised on word choice or location of guides.

**MB:** LibGuides upkeep is hard. Really hard, especially in a library like ours, with a dozen people creating content. I think our approach was effective. It took a fair amount of planning to make it participatory, but I agree with Ben that it pays off in the long run. We wanted to establish trust so we can make other big updates to LibGuides.

**CH:** I can see a similar process working for other projects. In fact, the librarians used a similar process while rewriting our library’s information literacy learning outcomes during the summer of 2018.

**BH:** I could see a stylistic overhaul of LibGuides in the near future, perhaps with focus on author profile boxes and pages!

**MB:** I’m imagining the three of us as a LibGuides project management team. We could rotate leadership for future projects. I can see this becoming an annual thing, where we choose a discrete LibGuides update project each summer. One of us three would step forward as project manager and guide the staff through.

**BH:** I’d say that this sort of process will help build that trust, but there does need to be some meeting of minds between the core group or nothing will come together. A small project with a clear end point is a great opportunity to work on that culture.

**CH:** This is so accurate, Ben. I like how you mention the core group, and how they are important for getting the work to come together—this core group can start to create the culture for the larger projects by building trust and respect in small ways, especially when there are clear and goals set.

**MB:** Right, we had already spent a lot of time in meetings with norms and clear goals. We had already built up that muscle.

**CH:** We understand that what we did won’t work at all institutions. But hopefully some of the techniques we used will be helpful, and inspire others.
In 2019, three faculty—a psychology professor and two faculty librarians—at Cal Poly Pomona (CPP), collaborated on an open pedagogical project to provide a hands-on experience for undergraduates taking a psychology course, Program Evaluation (PSY 4430/A). Taught by Michael Giang from CPP’s Psychology department, the Program Evaluation course was designed not only to teach students about research designs, methods, analysis, assessment, and communication strategies to improve social and organizational issues, but also to help build the students’ résumés with real-life experiences of collaborating with professionals across campus to improve current programs. The two of us mentored and worked with Giang’s student teams that were tasked to evaluate the library’s APA citation workshop.

Background
Giang’s Program Evaluation course is designated as a “Signature Polytechnic Experience” (i.e., PolyX) course which engages students to partner together to address global challenges in a diverse and interdisciplinary world while receiving intense mentoring. PolyX is a discovery and learning initiative at Cal Poly Pomona aimed at enhancing students’ creativity and innovation in support of the university’s “learn by doing” ethos. Students in teams of 4–6 members would meet with campus program leaders to determine the programs’ goals and evaluate the execution of these programs in meeting those goals.

Giang and Briana Pam Anan, metadata management librarian, were acquainted with each other as they were part of the same tenure-track faculty cohort at CPP. Because of the real-life interaction and assessment requirements for the Program Evaluation course, Giang approached Anan and inquired whether the librarians would be willing to mentor a team of 4–6 of his students and allow them to evaluate one of the library’s programs. At the time, the library was offering workshops on a variety of topics, including APA Citation Style. Anan agreed and partnered with Research and Instruction Librarian Jennifer Bidwell, who taught the APA Citation Style workshops, to have the workshops reviewed by the student team. As a result, the student team was responsible for making the initial contact with the librarians, arranging meetings, creating an assessment tool or survey for the workshops, distributing this survey at the end of the workshop sessions, and analyzing the data from the survey. All these activities culminated in the students’ final written report and oral presentation.
Throughout this evaluation and assessment process, we as library faculty, in partnership with Giang, mentored the student teams by offering guidance on interview techniques, professional communication, assessment tool creation and dissemination, and data analysis. We worked with one student team each semester in Fall 2019, Spring 2021, Fall 2021, and Spring 2022.

**The project: Faculty-student mentorship**

The faculty-student mentorship began in Fall 2019 when the first group of students contacted us to schedule a series of meetings and to develop an assessment for the APA Citation workshop. Our initial meeting was a blend of a “meet and greet” as well as a “reference interview” for the team to discern the workshop’s needs (e.g., best days and times to host the workshop, better marketing strategies, and whether the workshop was effective). We, as their clients, wanted input on improvements to the content of the workshop and strategies for increasing attendance. We were concerned that the workshop’s content was too dense and comprehensive for one workshop. In collaboration with the team, we designed the assessment according to these needs.

Although the assessment varied from semester to semester, it was designed to capture student status (e.g., class year, major, etc.); feedback on day, time, and format preferences; usefulness of the content; and effectiveness of the librarian’s teaching style. Each semester we met with the team periodically to review the draft of the assessment, provide feedback to the team, and discuss the logistics for distributing the survey during the workshop. The student teams created unique assessments for the APA workshops conducted in Fall 2019, Spring 2021, Fall 2021, and Spring 2022. Our project concluded at the end of Spring 2022 because of Bidwell’s departure to the University of San Diego.

**Table 1. Summary of APA Citation Workshops from Fall 2019–Spring 2022**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Library Workshop Title</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2019</td>
<td>APA Citation (2 workshops)</td>
<td>7 attendees (In-person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citing Your Sources: APA Style (7th Ed.) (1 workshop)</td>
<td>20 attendees (+186% increase) (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2021</td>
<td>APA Style (7th Ed.): In-Text Citations</td>
<td>38 attendees (+90% increase) (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APA Style (7th Ed.): References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2022</td>
<td>APA Style (7th Ed.): In-Text Citations</td>
<td>34 attendees (+70% increase) (Virtual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>APA Style (7th Ed.): References</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The student teams wrote a final report on the results of the workshop evaluation to satisfy one of the requirements for their final project. They also provided us with a copy of the report. At the end of the semester, the team gave an oral presentation of their evaluation of the APA workshops at Giang’s Program Evaluation Symposium. All campus partners, including the library, were invited to attend. The students presented both quantitative and qualitative data that reinforced the strengths of the workshops as well as areas that needed improvement. This partnership was especially advantageous for planning future workshops.

**Findings and discussion**

The final reports from the student teams consisted of the overall learning outcomes of the workshops, the purpose of the evaluation, project management, data management,
findings, data analysis, and suggestions and recommendations. Based on the suggestions from the student teams as well as data from the oral presentation and written report, Bidwell redesigned the workshop to align more closely with the student learning outcomes. Because of this faculty-student partnership, the following improvements were made:

1. The APA workshop was converted to an online format beginning in Spring 2021, due to the pandemic and work/learn-from-home mandate and remained virtual for the other workshops.
2. The APA workshop was split into two separate workshops: In-Text Citations and References.
3. The workshop slides were reworked and improved to target in-text or references skills in more depth.
4. Pre-test questions were added to the LibCal registration form, in which students told us their citation questions prior to the workshops to have their specific needs addressed live. For example, the registration form for the APA workshops included questions such as “What questions do you have about in-text citations?” and “What questions do you have about creating references?”

These changes increased attendance because of the required delivery method of going virtual and by allowing more time for questions and a focused discussion on a specific skill (e.g., in-text citations, references) of APA citation. We saw a 186 percent increase from Fall 2019 to Spring 2021 from 7 to 20 attendees. We also saw a 90 percent increase in attendees (38 attendees) from one workshop in Spring 2021 to two workshops in Fall 2021. In the Spring 2022, the registration for the workshop dropped slightly, but we continued to see an increase in attendees of 70 percent (34 attendees) from Spring 2021. This data suggests that the workshops were gaining traction with students. This upward trend can be explained by the redesign of the workshops from one to two as well as the student-centered approach, where student attendees dictated the topics for discussion and had more time for questions.

To increase attendance, the student teams also pointed out a major area for improvement—marketing of workshops. The teams recommended four areas to increase attendance:

1. Collaborate with teaching faculty to offer extra credit for attending the workshop.
2. Incentivize attendance by hosting a gift card raffle or free food and drinks.
3. Host the workshops more frequently throughout the semester.
4. Publicize the workshops more extensively through the various library social media platforms.

**Conclusion**
The results of this mentorship and collaboration with the student teams were an exciting development from this project. These instructional design improvements, based on actual student feedback, made the workshops more beneficial for future students, attendance for the workshops increased over time, and the student reports became more professional, organized, structured, and detailed.

Our most important takeaway from this partnership, in addition to improved library workshops, is that through the mentorship that we provided to the students, in addition to the guidance they received from their professor, we played a role in their professional
development and future academic or career goals. They collected raw data through their survey instrument, provided assessments and recommendations based on their analysis of that data, and presented that data not only to us but to their peers, their professor, and other academics and professionals across campus. These students now had a report to show to potential employers or graduate schools. They could apply those same skills to other data-related projects. They could speak of their experience of conducting program evaluation with professionals in their future job or admissions interviews. They improved their professional communication skills through interactions with us during in-person meetings, virtual meetings, and over email. The student teams helped enhance the effectiveness of our library workshops and simultaneously had this opportunity to expand their skills needed beyond the classroom.

We reaffirmed that as librarians and library faculty, we also provide added value while partnering with and mentoring students on projects, events, and other curricular and co-curricular activities. This mentorship and teaching this type of transferable professional readiness complements our goal of teaching information literacy and critical thinking. Our role in mentoring students is integral to student success and career readiness as we support teaching faculty for projects like this one to empower our students to become lifelong learners and information creators.

Notes

Our article in last month’s issue covered the purpose of CVs, how they are distinct from résumés, and how they might change for specific purposes or over the course of a career. This installment of our two-part series goes hands-on “into the kitchen” with our recipe for bringing a CV to the table, discussing specific components, and a few notes on style.

The essential ingredients: Must-have content on your CV

Several key categories are essential to include on an academic CV: education, professional experience (such as current or former positions), scholarly work (e.g., publications, presentations), and service.

Education: Beginning with your undergraduate degree(s), include the type and name of your degree(s) as well as the institution, location of the institution, and the year received. If you are still working on a degree, share your expected completion date. Please add degrees or certifications in progress; these are an indication of professional growth. Note that “Education” should be the first category on your CV in academia (other industries may deprioritize this category).

Professional experience: In this section, list your current and previous positions, whether in libraries (academic or otherwise), or in other industries. Each position should correspond with specific dates when you held that role and the location of the position. Be sure to clearly identify the position you held and indicate interim roles. Consider that this may mean providing a working, rather than official, title. For example, “library specialist” is generic, but “cataloging specialist” provides much more information about the work you likely performed. Identify rank and when you were promoted or tenured.

Scholarly work: Consisting primarily of publications and presentations, this section outlines your scholarly output. We encourage you to have subheadings for different formats (e.g., books, articles, presentations, posters, reviews, editorial responsibilities, grants, etc.). As a mid-career professional, be sure to categorize items, especially presentations, based on how they came to be, and note the type of publication venue (peer-reviewed, editor-reviewed). If you were invited to give a presentation, we want you to shout that from the rooftop and include it under a header for “invited presentations.” You can also categorize by “competitively selected” (and include the acceptance rate if you have it!). Include your...
works in progress (further evidence of growth), and consider which older, less impactful works you may decide to remove.

Service: Service work happens at all levels from within the library and at the campus, to state, regional, national, and international stages. Organize this section by prominence, prioritizing higher-impact service work, and then by date, with most recent activity first. Identify the venue, duration, and your role, and clearly communicate any leadership positions you have held and whether they were appointed or elected.

Season to taste: Add as appropriate
We recommend adding the following, complementary sections to more holistically communicate your professional experiences and the trajectory of your career thus far.

Librarianship: Add items to your CV that relate to the big bucket category we call “Librarianship.” These are items not easily represented in the sections we have already recommended, and the purpose of this section is to communicate the value of your work over time, especially to stakeholders external to the library such as campus administrators. This category highlights unique roles and responsibilities, specific projects and assignments, mentoring, supervision, and teaching (from individual library instruction sessions to credit courses, and everything in between). This section should only provide succinct highlights and possibly key numbers (e.g., total number of students taught in an academic year). Be careful not to duplicate content and draft extensive narratives that should go into a cover letter or tenure statements.

Professional development or certifications: There’s no need to list every webinar you have attended over your 15-year career. Use this section to outline key professional development experiences such as attendance in a competitively selected and/or immersive program, programs or training that represent significant, new areas of skills or knowledge, formal certifications (e.g., Academy of Certified Archivists), or regular participation in an annual meeting most related to your area of librarianship.

Awards and honors: Remember, your CV is a celebration of you! Include professionally relevant awards and honors, especially if these were competitively awarded and highly visible.

Media coverage: If you or your work are frequently covered by the media, include references.

Languages: If you speak, read, or understand other languages, include these in a “Languages” section on your CV. Definitely include this section if a position you are applying for requires or prefers language proficiency, and consider this as a “bonus” skill worth highlighting on your CV in general. Be sure to indicate your level of proficiency when listing your experience with other languages (fluent, proficient, reading level).

Serve it on the side: Context-specific categories
Some content makes sense to include in a CV only in particular circumstances. While the purpose of a CV is to provide a record of one’s overall professional accomplishments, it is possible (maybe even easy?) to overwhelm the reader with so much information that they miss what’s important. Adding tangentially relevant content to your CV might inadvertently call into question the rest of its content.

Other context-specific categories are listed below.

Church membership: There is only one context in which this should be included, and that is when the document is being used (for example in a job application) by a private
religious institution that is legally permitted to ask about, and discriminate based on, this information.

**Citation counts/download counts/Altmetrics:** In some contexts, like promotion documentation, short parenthetical references to Altmetrics scores, numbers of citations, and the like may be useful to include. In other situations, such as a job application, you might opt to leave it out.

**Hobbies and interests:** This is not necessarily harmful, but it’s almost always entirely irrelevant to the reader. So if you include a section like this, it should always be the very last thing in the document, and very short.

**Technology:** Some technologies make sense to include if they are rare or specialized. For example, a digital humanities librarian who knows how to program in R should certainly say so. Familiarity with common technologies or applications like Microsoft Office or EBSCO should be assumed and not listed.

**Volunteering / community service:** If industry-adjacent, it definitely makes sense to include volunteer work. Sometimes you may wish to include other community service. If you include this section, keep the list short and sweet and eliminate any explanatory details.

### Unpalatable: Things to exclude
Many résumé advice publications, and some CV advice, suggest inclusion of some of the elements below. We disagree and suggest not including any of these.

**Images:** Photographs, charts, decorative borders, and other images are very uncommon in a CV. Some, like a personal photograph, do not belong in any of your documentation. Some charts and infographics could be appropriate in a statement; other images (i.e., screen captures) might appear as part of a portfolio.

**Long lists or descriptions:** If a lengthy description, in paragraph or bullet form, is necessary for an accomplishment to be understood, then it belongs in a cover letter or a narrative statement, not a CV. Consider whether there is a short, bulleted-list approach to convey the accomplishment you are considering.

**Skills-based organization:** The intention of a CV is to organize accomplishments first by category, and then chronologically. Skills or function-based structures (e.g., “Project management/Collaboration/Instructional Design”) do not fit this model and should not be used.

**Summary statements, goals, or objectives:** While résumés commonly include a “summary” statement at the top of a document that highlights your career accomplishments in a couple of sentences, this element does not belong on a CV. Likewise exclude an “objective” statement, or “goal” job titles.

**Value statements:** Statements of what matters to you and why are important, but do not belong in a CV. Those belong in cover letters, in separate companion documents like Teaching Philosophies, or in written statements discussing the impact of your work (typically required as part of promotion documentation).

### Setting the table: Write with style
The CV is a document, and therefore is subject to the usual expectations and requirements for good document structure: appropriately formatted and clear headings, a well-organized outline, and useful cues for the reader such as page numbers and consistent application of
font and formatting. With that in mind, here are a few things to keep in mind to make your CV as readable as possible.

**A few words on fonts**

An academic CV or résumé is a formal, professional document. Your workplace dress code may be traditional business wear, business casual, or “just wear clothes to work.” When your CV wakes up in the morning, it should always don the same outfit—button down and formal business attire. Your reader is interested in you and your accomplishments, so keep the focus on that by skipping decorative fonts and bullets.

Opinion is divided on whether serif or sans serif fonts are more readable, so feel free to go with your own preference (just please no Comic Sans). More importantly, opt for a commonly used font of standard width, avoiding extremely wide or narrow fonts. Keep font sizes, including internal headings, between 10 - 14 points for better readability. The only exception to this is your name, which is the title of your CV—go for it . . . up to 18 points.

**Thoughts on formatting**

- Standard margins (half-inch all around) allow sufficient white space and avoid overwhelming the eye or crowding the page.
- Similarly, allow sufficient and consistent spacing between lines and sections. For ourselves, we like setting “space after.”
- It’s helpful to include your last name in the footer, along with a page number (e.g., Page 2 of 6), in case the printer hiccups and delivers your CV in disconnected pieces.
- Don’t rely on color. Black text with default blue and underlining for hyperlinks on white paper is most accessible.
- Stick with single columns and only use tables for tabular information, never for layout.
- For lists of publications, etc., save the reader time by formatting as a numbered list.
- Include entries in reverse chronological order, so that the reader begins in the present and moves backward into the past.

**Finish strong**

Keep your eyes on the prize—proofread carefully for typos, grammar, and consistency. Choose a citation style that clearly indicates authorship and stick with it. No, honestly, it doesn’t matter which citation style, as long as a reader can clearly see authors and their order. Proofreading is easiest on a printed copy. Don’t be shy about asking trusted colleagues, friends, or family to read your CV for consistency and clarity.

While we aren’t discussing cover letters or other narrative pieces in this article, you will be writing those documents anyway, so we will take a moment here to suggest Helen Sword’s excellent book *Stylish Academic Writing*.²

**If it’s expired, toss it**

Just as we weed our collections (and our spice racks), it’s okay to periodically weed our CVs and our “Scholarly work” section is a great place to cull, especially as we want to highlight more important work.
We recommend a strategy of asking yourself whether a particular entry meaningfully adds to how your readers will understand your career. If it does not, consider omitting it or collapsing it (e.g., “30 search committees” or “12 book reviews”). We’ll give some examples through scenarios.

• If your sole published work is a book review, you should absolutely include that in a publication section. That said, a seasoned scholar with many pages of publications and presentations to record would be ill-advised to separately list every single review.

• A new professional whose entire record of professional development post-MLS consists of attendance at two conferences should certainly include those in the professional development section. But a professional with 10 years of experience who might have attended 20 conferences, and presumably has had an opportunity to engage in other professional development like workshops, certificates, etc., should not.

• One of the authors of this article has served on more than 30 search committees. It would be wearisome to inflict that list on any reader! If you have served on two, it probably makes sense to include both, listed with details. Our long-serving colleague might still wish to highlight if they have been invited to serve on a search committee of particular impact.

The choices you make in selecting, formatting, and organizing the content of your CV or résumé will either enhance or obscure the reader’s ability to parse, absorb, and understand your accomplishments.

**Bon appétit!**

Remember, your CV is a celebration of you; take our advice with a grain of salt. If you would like to sample our recipe for an outstanding CV or download and use a template, please see our example available with this article on the *C&RL News* website.

**Notes**


The ACRL Board of Directors met virtually on June 16, 2023, and in-person on June 24, 2023. An informal face-to-face Board Update meeting was held on June 24, 2023. The Board also held a face-to-face strategic planning meeting on June 23, 2023. The Board met with the leaders of its five goal-area committees: Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion; New Roles and Changing Landscapes; Research and Scholarly Environment; Student Learning and Information Literacy; and Value of Academic Libraries to assess progress on ACRL’s strategic plan, the Plan for Excellence.

The Board received updates from the ALA Treasurer and ACRL’s liaison to the ALA Executive Board, as well as representatives from the ALA Operating Agreement Work Group, ACRL Member Accommodation/Compensation Task Force, and ACRL Awards Process Implementation Task Force. The Board supported reviews and revisions for the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education, Standards for Libraries in Higher Education; Guidelines for Media Resources in Academic Libraries, and six Status of Academic Librarians documents. A Bylaws Board Working Group was formed and will seek to align the ACRL Bylaws with the newly approved ALA Bylaws, clarify section appointments, and update the policy for vacancies. The Working Group will also review and consider recommendations from the ACRL Nominations and Policies Audit Task Force’s final report. The Board reviewed the FY24 budgets for ACRL and Choice and will take action prior to the ALA Executive Board on the final budgets in late summer 2023.

Board members, whose service ended on June 30, 2023—Julie Ann Garrison, Kim Copenhaver, and Cinthya Ippoliti—were recognized and thanked for their service.

The ACRL Board of Directors took the following actions during the ALA Annual Conference.

**Student Learning**

- Approved the Companion Document to the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education: Instruction for Educators.
- Rescinded the 2011 Information Literacy Standards for Teacher Education.

**Value of Academic Libraries**

- Approved the Proficiencies for Assessment in Academic Libraries.

**Enabling Programs and Services**

Strategic goal areas will be supported by financial and operational planning and will guide the development and implementation of programs and services that target education, advocacy, and member engagement.
Advocacy

- Approved the 2023 ACRL Legislative Agenda.

Publications

- Approved the ACRL/RBMS Guidelines Regarding the Security of Special Collections Materials.
- Approved the ACRL Budget and Finance Committee’s recommendation of the shutdown of Choice's Reviews on Cards with the February 2024 issue. Refunds or credits will be issued to subscribers for remaining issues (about $911).

Member Engagement

- Approved the creation of the Threshold Achievement Test for Information Literacy (TATIL) Editorial Board.
- Renewed for another three years the Digital Badges Interest Group and History Librarians Interest Group.
- Dissolved the Student Retention Discussion Group.
- Transitioned from an interest group to a discussion group the Library Marketing and Outreach Interest Group Transition and Asian, African, Middle Eastern Studies Interests Group.
- Approved for all Chapter Speaker Bureau visits be virtual, effective immediately.
- Approved the Board’s proceedings from meetings held during the 2023 ALA LibLearnX.
- Removed policy dictating that open microphone time be held during the final fifteen minutes of the first Board meeting. The timing will be up to the current Board moving forward.
Enabling Programs and Services: Operations
Updated policy to allow ACRL units (committees, sections, President’s Program committee, etc.) to offer honoraria to speakers regardless of the speakers’ ALA/ACRL membership status or job. For more information, see “ACRL Speaker Honoraria Policy Updates” by ACRL President Beth McNeil on ACRL Insider at https://acrl.ala.org/acrlinsider/acrl-speaker-honoraria-policy-updates/.
Where does ChatGPT fit into the Framework for Information Literacy?
The possibilities and problems of AI in library instruction

The above screenshot (figure 1) was what was generated when we asked ChatGPT, the generative AI system that has been the subject of a thousand hot takes about how it’s disrupting academia-as-we-know-it, to describe itself for an academic librarian audience. Perhaps it’s learning a bit too much from the public relations documents that were a part of the vast amounts of data it was trained on, when it describes itself as “highly relevant,” “invaluable,” and “accurate.” It did not, however, bring up the caveat that greets you when you open up ChatGPT itself: that it “may occasionally generate incorrect information,” that it “may occasionally produce harmful instructions or biased content,” or that it has “limited knowledge of the world and events after 2021.” In addition, it doesn’t bring up the reddest of academic red flags—that ChatGPT provides an easy way for students to cheat and plagiarize. *The Atlantic* has claimed that because of ChatGPT and other AI, “the undergraduate essay [which] has been at the center of humanistic pedagogy for generations..."
... is about to be disrupted from the ground up.” A writer at *Times Higher Education* has suggested that allowing AI to replace a student’s creative voice means “abandoning our responsibilities as educators.”

For as many handwringing accounts of how generative AI will destroy academia, there seem to be twice as many researchers, teachers, technologists, and pundits embracing what AI (and specifically ChatGPT) can do for teaching and learning. They suggest using it for overcoming writer’s block, generating outlines, creating summaries, generating prompts for discussion, asking for definitions, or generating flawed examples for critique. One compelling argument by Christopher Grobe in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* suggests that what generative AI can help us with is to “provide new starting points for some of the processes we routinely use to think.” We agree with Grobe’s argument that ChatGPT can give us a good starting point from which to work. The text generated by ChatGPT in the screenshot at the start of this article is an overly optimistic and idealized view of itself. We hope that in this article we can add the nuance that it lacks.

Academic librarians serve their students and faculty to help them navigate the research process. Therefore, when a new technological tool blazes through higher education, as ChatGPT has over the last few months, it becomes increasingly important that librarians are aware of the tool and its uses so that they can serve their students and faculty. After decades of the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education was established with a much more flexible route for integration into curricula. The Framework provides librarians and disciplinary faculty with a customizable way to provide information literacy instruction that meets the needs of students and enables them to become participants in the information that they are producing (not just consuming). Because of the Framework’s flexible nature, librarians can incorporate new technology, like ChatGPT, more easily into their instruction.

We have found that the idea of ChatGPT (and generative AI more broadly) can be connected to many of the knowledge practices and dispositions from the six frames of the ACRL Framework. In some places, the Framework enables us to embrace ChatGPT as an exciting new tool that adds value to information literacy instruction. In other places, the Framework’s discussions of evaluating authority and examining bias shines light on the inherent flaws of ChatGPT. In the next section, we will review each of the frames and discuss how ChatGPT fits into each of those Frames.

**Authority is Constructed and Contextual**

The Authority is Constructed and Contextual frame states that learners who are growing their information literate abilities “develop awareness of the importance of assessing content with a skeptical stance and with a self-awareness of their own biases and worldview.” On the opening screen, ChatGPT provides a disclaimer to let users know that the information that it provides may contain biases and that it has a limited knowledge of current events. As the usage of ChatGPT increases it will become even more important that students know how to evaluate whether information that they come across is authoritative within the context of their research. Students need to recognize that bias is everywhere and ChatGPT is getting information that exists out on the open web. Much of the information that it produces derives from text from political organizations, nonprofits, companies, and individuals, and this context shapes the model’s output. ChatGPT is built on predictive
language modeling, which means it generates natural sounding language, not necessarily factual language. Students should always approach information, from ChatGPT or elsewhere, with skepticism.

**Information Creation as a Process**

As with any new technology, there will be people who are hesitant adopters. In the early 2000s many librarians were skeptical of students using Wikipedia. Now we realize that we need to be instructing students about the proper use of Wikipedia, rather than banning it. One of the dispositions for the Information Creation as a Process frame states that “learners who are developing their information literate abilities accept the ambiguity surrounding the potential value of information creation expressed in emerging formats or modes.” To us, this is direct confirmation that ChatGPT has a place in the library instruction classroom, both for its use in instruction and for discussion with students. Librarians should absolutely be talking about it with students, trying it out, and discovering together what those problems and promises are. In particular, students should be made aware of the machine learning process: tools like ChatGPT are trained on large amounts of textual data in an iterative process, whereby it “learns” from this data over time. This process is very similar to how information literate scholars learn, research, create, write, and refine their ideas over time, as presented in this frame.

The frame challenges us that “the dynamic nature of information creation and dissemination requires ongoing attention to understand evolving creation processes.” A technology columnist for *The New York Times* advised his readers along the same lines: “today’s students will graduate into a world full of generative A.I. programs. They’ll need to know their way around these tools—their strengths and weaknesses, their hallmarks and blind spots—in order to work alongside them. To be good citizens, they’ll need hands-on experience to understand how this type of A.I. works, what types of bias it contains, and how it can be misused and weaponized.” It is imperative librarians bring students to that attention about the process of creating information through ChatGPT and similar AI models.

**Information has Value**

The Information has Value frame indicates that learners who are developing their information literacy skills need to “learn the importance of giving credit to the original ideas of others through proper attribution and citation.” As more learners use ChatGPT for citation assistance, they will need to be extremely careful to verify accuracy of all citations. As explained above, ChatGPT does not always provide factual information. For example, if you ask ChatGPT to give you a list of scholarly articles on a particular topic, it will list articles with full citations, including DOIs. The articles appear to be related titles from reputable-sounding journals. However, if you Google each of the articles, you will discover that some of them do not exist. ChatGPT will automatically generate nonexistent articles through predictive language modeling, making article titles appear genuine, even if they are not. If you ask it to give you citations for scholarly articles on the topic of higher education and information literacy, it will give you several citations that look very convincing. Here is an example:
If a student were to take this AI response and incorporate those citations into a paper or assignment, they would include some nonexistent articles. Students citing articles they have not read of course is a problem, but students citing fake articles that cannot be read compounds the problem. As students become creators of information themselves, they will need to accurately cite all information that they use, not only for the ethical and moral good, but also for the sake of their own reputation in their field(s). ChatGPT is a minefield when it comes to citation, and we would not recommend students use it for that purpose. However, asking ChatGPT to generate citations like this in an in-class exercise and discussing the results with students can help them to see the minefield for what it is and navigate around it.

**Research as Inquiry**

One of the knowledge practices for the Research as Inquiry frame states that “learners who are developing their information literate abilities deal with complex research by breaking complex questions into simple ones, limiting the scope of investigations.” We have found that students will often come to research consultations or library instruction sessions with broad or vague research questions that they often do not know how to simplify or narrow down to research writing sufficiently scoped to a level that they can tackle in five to eight pages. While they might be interested in, let’s say, “the problem of poverty” or “the abortion debate,” they cannot digest the enormous amount of research in multiple academic
disciplines that have attempted to address these types of questions. This is where we believe ChatGPT can help students (and even seasoned researchers) in generating ways to break complex problems down. ChatGPT can help refine research questions, determine search terms, come up with synonyms and related terms or phrases for searching, help decide which databases to search, generate textual concept maps, and even help generate citations. For example, here was the response it gave when we asked it “What search terms should we use for our hypothetical research question, ‘why aren’t college athletes paid?’”

![Figure 3. Screenshot from https://chat.openai.com/chat: Providing search terms.](image)

ChatGPT can also create textual concept maps to help think through various aspects of a research topic. This can be useful for students who need to narrow or refine their topic. Simply asking the AI to help narrow a research topic can be useful as it will give you a variety of ways to explore a topic. For example, we asked it to help us narrow our search on why college athletes aren’t paid, and it gave us detailed options in an easy-to-read format:
You can see clearly how ChatGPT can help students push past that inquiry threshold. Often, they don’t even know where to start in their search for information, or how to probe the nuances or facets of a large complex question for a scope they can grasp. Instead of typing their entire research question into Google or a database (as we have all seen students do) and having to sift through a mountain of results, they can type it into ChatGPT and ask “How do I start searching? Where could I go from here? What’s manageable?” As students are growing in their information literacy abilities, ChatGPT can help scaffold their skills enabling them to accomplish this task more confidently in the future.

One caveat that always bears repeating: ChatGPT has biases. It is trained on a large dataset of material from the internet. It may not produce underrepresented or less well-researched aspects of a topic. Because of this, it is important for students to explore topics holistically, with ChatGPT as one tool in their toolbelt.
Scholarship as Conversation
“Learners who are developing their information literate abilities see themselves as contributors to scholarship rather than only consumers of it.”12 This disposition from the Scholarship as Conversation frame, which shows up similarly in Information has Value, means that students are able to see themselves as a part of the scholarly conversation through the ways they critically examine, interact, and synthesize course and research materials, along with how they can contribute their own ideas and research through writing, presenting, and publishing. Whether students are intending to pursue further academic study or not, their voices are valuable in the conversation. This is where we urge caution in the use of ChatGPT, which may undermine the development of their academic voice.

On the extreme end, there will be students who use ChatGPT to generate an essay to turn in, and on the other end, there will be students who use it with great skill to enhance or refine their writing, to find a starting place for scattered thoughts, or to break out of creative blocks. As we teach about how students can join the scholarly conversation with their own voice, we need to emphasize the use of ChatGPT as a supportive resource, along with librarians, and other academic mentors.

Searching as Strategic Exploration
The Searching as Strategic Exploration frame describes searching as “nonlinear and iterative, requiring the evaluation of a range of information sources and the mental flexibility to pursue alternate avenues as new understanding develops.”13 This section is a succinct summary of why we as librarians provide information literacy instruction. We work with students to increase their information literacy skills and subsequently an awareness of the scholarly conversation that is taking place around them, something that ChatGPT will not do. ChatGPT will not teach students how to evaluate itself. Librarians are still necessary to encourage learners to evaluate the information sources and tools that may not be familiar to them.

For example, many students enter college having never searched for peer-reviewed, scholarly articles, so that skill may be entirely new to them. Their range of information sources grows when, through our instruction, we help them see the value in using academic databases for finding the information that they need in an effective, efficient manner. In addition, they will most likely have to take another look at their use of Wikipedia. Through information literacy instruction, they will gain a new understanding of how to use it effectively in a higher education context. ChatGPT is a brand-new source for information and our understanding of it is still developing. Our job, as teaching librarians, is not to shun the tool, but to embrace it and guide students toward using the tool responsibly and ethically. As with any new tool, librarians, as well as students, will need to show their flexibility and adapt to these new tools and resources as they become available.

Conclusion
The ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education is open-ended enough for us to try new things in our teaching, explore new tools and new ways of helping students to understand the information in the world around them. These are just a few ways that we see how the Framework addresses ChatGPT and other generative AI tools. When we first were looking at this issue, we took a highlighter to the Framework document
and made several dozen connections, and we’re sure that’s not all. In looking at these tools through the lens of the Framework, we can see both the promise and the pitfalls. Ultimately, there must be instruction about these tools: how they were developed, the ethics surrounding their use, and the specificity of the ways they can both help and hurt students. While we are aware that it can seem burdensome to add “one more thing” onto the plate of librarians who provide information literacy instruction, we urge librarians to have discussions with their faculty partners to share the burden of instruction. We are also confident that instruction librarians will create lesson plans that teach about or use ChatGPT in library instruction and will share them with their peers at places like Project CORA, the Framework for Information Literacy Sandbox, and other lesson plan repositories.

Notes
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Generative artificial intelligence (AI) describes algorithms (such as ChatGPT) that can be used to create new content, including audio, code, images, text, simulations, and videos. Large Language Models are specialized AI models trained on enormous volumes of text data and created to comprehend and produce text-based content.

I am hardly the first to ask the question of whether these tools can facilitate the research process. A proposed Scholarly AI taxonomy “outlines seven key roles that AI could potentially play in a scholarly publishing workflow.” UNESCO has suggested possible uses of ChatGPT in the research process including for research design, data collection, data analysis, and writing up. Indeed, an industry has already sprung up with enterprising researchers selling their knowledge in this area with tutorials such as “Become an efficient academic writer with AI apps.”

So, for what it is worth, here’s my take on where generative AI can assist (or not) the research process. The only prediction I am making is this will be out of date by publication.

**Literature searching**

One of the major issues for literature searching using ChatGPT is the “hallucination” problem where the results make up answers that seem plausible rather than pulling directly from factual sources. ChatGPT can provide responses that reflect the format of references and use language that relates to the query so, while the references look real, they are entirely fabricated. There are examples of library staff being approached by students looking for specific references that turn out to have been a fictitious creation of ChatGPT.

There are some plugins being developed that search actual literature such as the ScholarAI plugin for ChatGPT. This only searches open access articles published by SpringerNature, which clearly limits the search. The Iris.ai Researcher Workspace program “searches open access articles from around the world.” One of its main sources is the free service CORE-GPT from the CORE repository, “the world’s largest collection of open access papers.”

It is worth noting these search systems are all accessing open material, not those behind a paywall. In March, I publicly asked whether ChatGPT was accessing information in research papers that are behind a paywall. Among the responses there was agreement that it could access abstracts, but disagreement on whether large publishers provide access to subscription material to OpenAI and Google. There was general frustration about the lack of transparency on this issue. The full summary of the responses is online.
Regardless, if Large Language Models are accessing paywalled articles it opens questions about copyright. Recently, publishers of big journals have increased calls for transparency about the sources of learning for these models. This is addressing one of many challenges—ChatGPT is fundamentally opaque. It is essentially impossible to track down what copyrighted material is being drawn from in the prose it produces, suggesting every result may comprise multiple violations. There are cases already in the courts for the use of work without permission for training the system, with two authors, Paul Tremblay and Mona Awad, filing a lawsuit in a San Francisco federal court against OpenAI alleging ChatGPT generates accurate summaries of their works and therefore that their copyrighted books were used to train ChatGPT without their consent.

**Potential benefits of generative AI**

One area that generative AI might prove helpful is in coding survey responses. One study found ChatGPT was able to code responses with a 92 percent accuracy rate compared with a trained human coder. One of the authors noted: “It makes those parts of research which don’t need creativity or judgement so much easier.” A hackathon to explore where ChatGPT might be able to help the research process found “the primary use case seems to be helping people accomplish tasks they *already know how to do*, but to do them more effectively and faster.” Another study demonstrated that ChatGPT “outperforms crowd-workers for several annotation tasks, including relevance, stance, topics, and frames detection.”

There appears to be at least one useful way that ChatGPT could help with literature searches. Rather than asking it the question directly, ChatGPT can assist by formulating and refining a good Boolean query for systematic review literature search. Research testing this capability found that guided prompts lead to higher effectiveness than single prompt strategies. An example single prompt is: “For a systematic review titled ‘{review_title},’ can you generate a systematic review Boolean query to find all included studies on PubMed for the review topic?” However, the caveats in relation to replicability is that ChatGPT generates different queries even if the same prompt is used, which vary in effectiveness.

Given that the American Psychological Association (APA) style now has instructions for how to cite ChatGPT, it seems not only that there is a growing acceptance of the use of ChatGPT in the writing process, but that it is here to stay. APA has also provided advice on how to use ChatGPT as a learning tool. Advice from the Thesis Whisperer on how to use ChatGPT to write better is to “imagine it as a talented, but easily misled, intern/research assistant who has a sad tendency to be sexist, racist and other kinds of ‘isms,’”

There are some areas where generative AI can really come into its own. ChatGPT knows various citation styles such as APA, MLA, Chicago, and Harvard, which means it can take a raw list of references and regenerate it with a specific format, although it is a good idea to ask it not to generate details if it doesn’t know them (the “hallucination” problem mentioned earlier). This could be extremely useful for reducing the estimated 14 hours per paper it takes to manage the formatting.

Given that vast majority of research publications are written in English, which is not the first language of most researchers in the world, there could be great benefit from using generative AI to assist authors write in more concise and clearer English. There have been arguments against the hard position some journals and publishers are taking excluding the
use of ChatGPT because this misses the opportunity “to level the playing field for EAL [English as an Additional Language] authors.”

Given the challenges that journals and editors are experiencing to find peer reviewers for scholarly articles, there could also be a possible place for generative AI to assist with peer review. There have been some experiments using generative AI tools to help draft reviews, but when an author shared their experience, the JAMA editor-in-chief interrupted to note using AI for peer review was a violation of their policy. One of the issues here is “there are currently no guidelines on how these systems should be used in review tasks.”

**Generative AI and open access**

Given the use generative AI is making of open access research, it could become a very strong argument for universal open access. Peter Suber has noted that summaries created by generative AI programs could help open access to research findings because even if the paper itself is behind a paywall, the summaries are themselves not copyrighted.

**Conclusion**

There are clearly some areas that ChatGPT can help research—coding survey responses, improving the writing for people who have English as an additional language, and formatting of bibliographies stand out. But there is a need to exercise caution in relation to some of the material it generates, including the tendency for ChatGPT to “hallucinate.” Consideration of copyright appears to be a developing area. The opaque nature of the material it is using to generate results has major implications for replicability and as a result both for research integrity and the open movement.

**Notes**


Using art to talk and think about metadata
An experiment

Metadata is not often seen as creative work. I think many metadata librarians, myself included, struggle to describe our work in a way that is meaningful and understandable to our colleagues. We can quantify it, and numbers are meaningful to administrators and budget-crunchers. But it’s difficult to imbue numbers with passion, significance, or true understanding of what metadata work supports in a library. If my colleagues don’t understand metadata work because it is not visible or obvious, I wanted to find a way to communicate about what I do visually, and I wanted to think differently about my approach to my work as well.

I’m an artist with an undergraduate degree in screenwriting and video production. I also paint, embroider, draw, and take photographs. I’m not a linear thinker at all. I do not follow instructions. When I got my library science degree, it was to be a museum librarian. I did that for a little while, but eventually transitioned my career to doing academic metadata. Even now I wonder how I ended up spending my days production cataloging, batch fixing bytes of metadata and applying (or writing) rules and standards. I’ve been trying to see my work from a different angle, and I remembered scientists who were also artists. Maria Sibylla Merian was a naturalist who observed the life cycles of insects. She published books of her beautiful detailed plates and engravings from live insects. Santiago Ramón y Cajal won a Nobel Prize for his work studying the brain, but he was also an aspiring artist who made incredible drawings depicting what he saw when studying brain sections under the microscope. Art evokes an emotional response or bond to a topic that a chart or rule or standard can’t replicate.

I believe you can use art to help someone more fully engage with science and data topics. Using this idea as my theory, I set out to engage other metadata librarians in an artistic endeavor to explain our work. I posted a call out on three metadata and cataloging listservs in the summer of 2021. I was specifically seeking metadata creators who embroider, and I was surprised to receive a great response. I asked contributors to examine their stories and
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experiences of unseen labor in our work, and to stitch it on a piece of fabric no larger than 15 x 15 inches. The stitched pieces submitted to the project would then be put on display in the Science and Engineering Library at University of Massachusetts-Amherst during the Spring 2022 semester.

Ultimately, my goal was that this project would serve as an educational tool for metadata outreach, and I accomplished this goal pretty quickly! After the exhibit went up, I began to receive emails from students who told me they learned something about metadata and its function in a library. I even did two informational interviews with students who wanted to know more about my work and if it could be a career option for them. I was encouraged to find out that students were paying attention to the exhibit and learned about work being done for them behind the scenes in their library.

I also had surprising conversations with non-metadata colleagues who saw the exhibit and told me it was meaningful to them. Many have been surprised by how emotional some of the pieces are. I’ve been told that they didn’t expect us to have so much creativity in our work, which I’m trying not to be offended by, but it might mean that as metadata librarians and catalogers, we haven’t been talking about our work in ways that other people can understand. In my mind, a cataloger’s judgment is a bit like art because it’s the thing that gives us true personal connection to the piece we’re cataloging. But as cataloger’s judgment is invisible, it’s not something that can be shown to someone who doesn’t work with metadata. The
art that metadata professionals created for the project succeeded in creating an emotional connection to metadata work.

Aside from teaching others about the unseen labor of cataloging and metadata, this project also allowed me to explore the idea that art is an innovation tool that helps people imagine, problem-solve, and experiment. I think this is something that metadata librarians don’t often focus on in their work. Personally, my creativity is what helps me analyze a workflow and see all the moving parts and pieces. I break things apart in my mind and sprawl them about like a yard sale. When I make art, I can think differently about the things I’m making my art about. Likewise, contributors have told me that this project influenced how they think about their own work. It has been an empowering experience for many of them, and they have used their art to reexamine their work or to talk about metadata and cataloging at their own libraries.

The exhibit was on display at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst from January to May 2022, and a companion online exhibition catalogue is available³ The response to the project has been something I never could have imagined. Other libraries wanted to host the exhibit. It was displayed at the Memorial University of Newfoundland in December 2022, went to Minnesota State University-Mankato, during spring 2023, and is current at California State University-Fresno, through June 2024. The project includes 37 pieces of embroidery and cross stitch made by cataloging and metadata professionals from 19 states, 1 from Canada, and 1 from the United Kingdom. Each piece tells a story about metadata or the workers who create it. The exhibit has truly taken on a life of its own. It continues to show others about the creativity in metadata work and supports the growth and innovation of our contributors in their own libraries.

Notes

The Animal Welfare Institute (AWI) is a nonprofit organization addressing animal suffering caused by humans. The AWI works with policymakers, scientists, industry, and the public to improve conditions for animals in the laboratory, farm, in commerce, at home, and in the wild.

The AWI’s website provides information to encourage action on their initiatives. The website is searchable from the homepage, and search results include content from all sections of the website. The website is clearly organized for browsing by sections including “Animal Programs,” “Government Affairs,” “Legal,” and “Library & Store.”

“Animal Programs” is an extensive section of the website, providing articles on issues faced by animals in laboratories, companion animals, farmed animals, marine life, terrestrial animals, and animals used in education. Each section comprises articles addressing the issues experienced by animals in these environments and the AWI’s work in each area. For example, in the marine life section, an article on whaling addresses where and why whaling takes place, the suffering a struck whale experiences before death, and work the AWI is doing to protect whales. Linked articles provide more information from the AWI about issues of commercial whaling, whaling in specific locations, Aboriginal Subsistence Whaling, and more. Most of the articles in this section do not reference sources outside of the AWI.

The “Government Affairs” section of the website outlines federal and state legislation related to AWI’s aims, other laws and measures, tips for communicating with legislators, an action center, and a link to register to vote. Articles on legislation present clearly AWI’s stance on the issue and occasionally reference sources from outside of the AWI. The “Legal” section lists current and past lawsuits initiated by the AWI.

“Library and Store” contains the AWI’s publications. Free downloadable publications are illustrated with beautiful photographs and include brochures, books, the newsletter AWI Quarterly, and more. Books on animal rights topics for children, teens, and adults are available for purchase.

The AWI’s website will be most useful to your campus’s animal rights groups, who can use the website to learn key talking points and download brochures for distribution. Consider also using the website to open discussions with students in political science, communications, education, biology, environmental sciences, agriculture, and health sciences, about how advocacy organizations present information to encourage action.—Emily Hamstra, Network of the National Library of Medicine, Region 5, ehamstra@uw.edu

COVID-19 accelerated the move toward remote work and social spaces. This legacy is seen in museums and archival collections around the world that responded to the closure of their physical spaces by creating robust, interactive virtual spaces that live on. The New York Historical Society’s Center for Women’s History offers a rich online collection
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highlighting archival finds, fellowships, courses, and more virtual content that scholars and educators from elementary to graduate level will find useful.

Browsing the site in August 2023, the center’s front page featured a curriculum titled “Women and the American Story.” Beginning at the dawn of the Colonial Era, the curriculum is divided into ten units organized chronologically through 2001. The key takeaways from each unit are highlighted at the top, and users are provided with questions to help frame their learning. This curriculum would work as stand-alone lessons or could be integrated into a general lesson plan on American History. The lessons are supported by primary documents, biographies, period literature and art, as well as tools and artifacts of communities and families. Users will also find a four-course program in collaboration with Columbia University titled “Women have Always Worked,” but should note after a seven-day trial period the course requires a monthly fee.

The archives section links primarily to finding aids; however, researchers would still have to visit the collection in person to access materials not included in online exhibits or courses. This may be an opportunity to grow the website in the future when more digital surrogates of the physical materials become available. Even without digitization of the actual materials, researchers will find the chronological arrangement and rich descriptions in finding aids useful in preparation for an in-person research visit.

Current physical exhibitions are featured on the site, but users should also consider clicking on the explore tab, which opens to the museum in aggregate, revealing several robust online exhibits, some of which are related to women’s history, including “Women March,” a history of women-led protests from 1820 to 2020. There is much to explore on this page for scholars, educators, and even those with a casual interest in the history of women in the United States.—Bart H. Everts, Camden County College and Rowan University in Camden, bart.everts@rutgers.edu

The Peterson Institute for International Economics (PIIE) is an esteemed independent nonprofit think tank based in Washington, DC. Since its founding in 1981, PIEE has focused on a broad variety of international policy concerns around the world, with emphasis on major economic powers. This freely accessible website currently indexes just over 10,000 documents, of which 45% are in the form of blog entries, 22% are commentaries, 9% are multimedia, and 8% are event announcements that include background information about guest speakers. The remaining 16% of all documents include a mixture of working papers, policy briefs, op-eds, and public testimony before governmental bodies.

“PIIE Charts” is a collection of graphics accompanied by a textual summary and either a citation or a link to the underlying in-depth document. PIIE’s strength resides in their efforts to explore, analyze, dissect, and discuss policies and potential concerns. Although many of their documents obviously contain statistics, PIIE does not index data sources as discrete search results. PIIE offers transparency and access to their 50 senior researchers and 6 staff analysts, whose works have been authored in 17 languages.

Inside the major section called “Research” is a button that will yield 56 “Educational Resources” since 2016. As for recent hot topics, the site yields seven items mentioning the March 2023 collapse of Silicon Valley Bank. The website’s search engine conducts full-text searches, so users looking for “FDIC” will find articles about the US banking system, as
well as PIIE staff who previously worked for that regulatory agency. Whether the researcher
uses the website’s keyword search box (which accepts quotation marks) or options for major
types of inquiry, the results are displayed in date-descending sequence and offer the ability
to modify results by a specific date range, major topic, or major geographic area.

Less than 2% of all documents found on this website have publications dates prior to
2000 and the oldest document was from 1989. PIIE’s website includes summaries of books
that PIIE sells directly to the public, as well as some titles that were published through an
arrangement with Columbia University Press. PIIE invites people to sign up for their general
email announcements, as well as a separate subscription list for updates on their educational
resources. Students interested in public policy, politics, and economics will find PIEE a
helpful resource.—Gary M. Klein, Willamette University, gklein@willamette.edu
The Institute of Museum and Library Services recently announced 64 awards totaling $20,363,297 to support libraries and archives across the country. The FY 2023 awards were made through National Leadership Grants for Libraries and the Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian Program. Complete information on IMLS grants, including an awarded grants search with project details, is available at https://www.imls.gov/grants.

The Private Academic Library Network of Indiana (PALNI) has awarded $20,000 in grant funds to three of its supported institutions in recognition of their innovative ideas for enhancing student learning and success. Butler University, the University of Indianapolis, and Wabash College are the 2023 recipients of the PALNI Library Innovation Grant, an award that funds programs, projects, and initiatives that align with PALNI strategic priorities and support deep collaboration throughout the consortium. These grants will fund the libraries’ proposed initiatives in areas that meet students’ evolving needs, including artificial intelligence (AI) literacy and digital literacy. Learn more at https://palni.org/innovation-grant.

The San Diego State University (SDSU) Center for Comics Studies has been awarded a $175,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to develop a two-week institute for secondary school educators using comics and graphic novels in their teaching. Using Comics to Teach Social Justice is the latest in a series of grants awarded to the new center, founded jointly by the SDSU College of Arts and Letters and the University Library, promoting collection-centered learning, scholarship, and engagement around comics and graphic novels. Information on other SDSU Center for Comics Studies grants is available at https://comics.sdsu.edu/.

**Acquisitions**

The San Diego State University Library has acquired the IDW Founders Collection, a collection of more than 20,000 items, including comics, graphic novels, promotional items, archival materials, and games, donated by IDW founders Ted Adams and Robbie Robbins. Currently the fifth-largest comic book publisher in the US, IDW’s Top Shelf Productions imprint is renowned for publishing works of literary significance including the trilogy *March* by the late US Rep. John Lewis, Andrew Aydin, and Nate Powell, as well as George Takei’s graphic memoir *They Called Us Enemy*. The IDW Founders Collection enhances the SDSU Comic Arts Collection, which has grown over the past decade to encompass almost 150,000 titles in its circulating and special collections and is an essential resource in the growth of the interdisciplinary Center for Comics Studies. Learn more at https://newscenter.sdsu.edu/sdsu_newscenter/news_story.aspx?sid=79243.

The Library of Congress has acquired the music manuscripts and papers of contemporary American composer, conductor, and writer John Adams. Adams is known for works including the opera “Nixon in China” and concert pieces such as “Shaker Loops,” “Harmonielehre,” “Road Movies,” “Chamber Symphony,” and “Short Ride in a Fast Machine.” Adams was born in Worcester, Massachusetts, in 1947. His career has taken place at the forefront
of contemporary music, with Adams’ works among the most played of new classical music pieces beginning in the 1970s. The archive acquired includes a variety of materials that tell the story of Adams’ creative life: handwritten music manuscripts and annotated music scores, business and personal correspondence, photographs, date books and diaries, journals, publishing and performing contracts, artwork, and files of news clippings and concert programs.

The personal archive of the late renowned composer James Horner has been donated to UCLA Library by his wife, Sara Nelson Horner. The collection, valued at more than $2.2 million, features thousands of personal notes, scores, and orchestrations. It spans from 1979, the year of Horner’s first credit as a composer for feature films, to 2015, when he died at the age of 61. The archive includes Horner’s early scores for films by American Film Institute students and for noted B-movie director Roger Corman, as well as full orchestrations from his compositions for blockbusters such as *Star Trek II: The Wrath of Khan* (1982), *Aliens* (1986), *Apollo 13* (1995), *Jumanji* (1995), *Braveheart* (1995), *Titanic* (1997), *A Beautiful Mind* (2001), and *Avatar* (2009).
Elizabeth Dill has been appointed dean of the library at California State University-Long Beach. Formerly the director of University Libraries at University of Hartford in West Hartford, Connecticut, Dill was responsible for the operation and development of Mortensen Library, Allen Library, and the University Archives. Prior to joining the University of Hartford, Dill held several other library leadership positions. She has been actively involved in various library related organizations and initiatives and coedited the ACRL book *Intersections of Open Educational Resources and Information Literacy*.

Tania Munz has been named president and chief executive officer of The Forest History Society (FHS), a nonprofit institution recognized as the world’s foremost library and archive of forest and conservation history. Munz comes to FHS from the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in Cambridge, Massachusetts. As chief program officer, she led the independent research center’s programmatic work in areas spanning science, humanities, international affairs, and education. She succeeds Steven Anderson, who is retiring after leading FHS for the past 27 years.

Neil Romanosky has been appointed dean of Michigan State University (MSU) Libraries. Before joining MSU, Romanosky served as dean of university libraries at Ohio University, a position he has held since 2019. His accomplishments in this role include developing a strategic plan for the libraries with a focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion; overseeing the alignment of the Ohio University Press and five regional campus libraries into the university libraries portfolio; and spearheading Ohio University’s joining the HathiTrust. Romanosky succeeds Interim Dean Terri Miller, who had been at the helm of the MSU Libraries since July 2022.

Amy Dye-Reeves is now head of the Library of Architecture, Design, and Construction (LADC) at the Auburn University Libraries.

Trey Shelton has been named the first chair of academic resources and consulting services at the University of Florida George A. Smathers Libraries.

Courtney Taulbee has been appointed visiting program officer at Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL).

Nicole Vollum has joined the University of Western States in Portland, Oregon, as reference, instruction, and outreach librarian.

Retirements

Alice Schreyer has retired after eight years as Roger and Julie Baskes Vice President for Collections and Library Services at the Newberry Library. She began her career of 47 years as a special collections curator, administrator, and educator at Columbia University Libraries and held curatorial and administrative positions during 24 years at the University of Chicago Library. She also worked at the University of Delaware Library, Rutgers University, and the Center for the Book in the Library of Congress. Schreyer served as chair of the ACRL Rare Books & Manuscripts Section and as editor of *Rare Books & Manuscripts Librarianship* (now *RBM*). Between 1986 and 2011, Schreyer taught courses on the history of books and special collections librarianship at the Rare Book School. She also served as a member and chair of the Rare Book School Board and is a director of the Chicago Collections Consortium and an officer of the Bibliographical Society of America.
Deaths

Sandy Schiefer, journalism librarian at the University of Missouri (UM), has died. Schiefer served as a librarian at UM since 2009. She was a strong contributor to government information as well as to the Journalism Library, including her work on a born-digital news preservation project. She was an active member of ACRL, serving on several committees, and was also active in the Missouri chapter of ACRL.