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Summary:
Jennifer Parker introduced the session by saying that when attending the ARLIS/NA conference she herself looks for sessions for teaching librarians. She believes there is a great deal of interest in what others are doing with instruction. Initially, the plan was to form a workshop on this topic. Instead, plenty of time will be left for discussion within the session format.

1. Jennifer Parker, “Working with Faculty to Create Credit Courses and Other Instruction for Art and Art History Students”

Jennifer received her M.A. in art history from the University of Virginia (where she was recruited into librarianship by Lucie Stylianopoulos), which has a long established instruction program within the Art and Architecture Library. There are both credit and one-shot classes. The librarians have established the practice of creating web pages, which she found useful as a student. When she became a librarian, she wanted to use the practice of these web pages for her own classes at Boulder.
Although nearly all incoming freshmen in the Schools of Arts & Sciences and Business are introduced to the library and its resources through required online tutorials and in person sessions, they have traditionally rarely been seen after that point. She wanted to get into the department of art and art history to create discipline specific classes for upper level students. In creating these classes, it is very important to get the department involved and to obtain “buy-in”.

At Boulder, the art and art history department had never had discipline specific instruction. She started knocking on doors. She also was able to use a friend in the Visual Resource Center who already had an established relationship with the faculty. She met with the chair and convinced him to invite her to faculty meetings. There she gave 5 minute updates on the collections and instruction. She also began the practice of walking through the department every morning and afternoon. After all of this effort, she was asked to teach six art history classes the first semester. Now, it was time to turn to Studio Arts.

This was a large group who, while very friendly, didn’t see a need for instruction. Many do not think they have research needs. She started by trying to get them into the library. She offered to let the faculty display their works. This was not successful. She found that the art historians embraced her right away, but the studio faculty members believe the library has little to do with their work.

In 2006, a new writing component was added to the studio Foundations Program, which is required of all incoming studio art students. Jennifer was able to help the instructor craft the research assignment for this program. It consisted of a 3-4 page paper on a studio artist. The paper had to include a bibliography and an image. The resources had to include one book, one article, and one Internet source. In the one hour library session centered around this assignment, which was scheduled after students had chosen an artist, the librarian went over steps for researching a contemporary artist by:

1. Searching the library catalog for a book
2. Searching ArtBibliographies Modern for an article
3. Searching Lexis/Nexis Academic for a review
4. Searching the Internet for a website

Time was also given over to how to evaluate web pages and how to cite all of the materials. She tends to teach all of this from a webpage. A third round of these classes was taught this past spring.

A third initiative was the desire to establish a one credit course on research for art history graduate students. Jennifer proposed this course in a faculty meeting, stating that everything graduate students need cannot be covered in one hour. This one credit course would be taught in conjunction with the Art Theory course. There are eight, one-hour sessions, held during the first eight weeks of the semester. The course is to be required for all incoming graduate students and advanced undergraduates. The curriculum is based
Some of the outcomes of these initiatives:

- 700 students in the Foundations Program have been introduced to the library
- A credit course has been listed in the course schedule for the fall
- There is increased presence of art and art history faculty and students in the library
- They see her everyday as she walks through the departments
- Faculty have an increased interest in collaboration
- Other librarians have been inspired to look for collaborative opportunities in their own departments


Jeanne presented a series of ideas termed the ‘Elements of Collaboration’. These might apply in multiple situations.

Persistence and Repetition – She wanted to institute a program of core competencies throughout the curriculum from first year students through graduate students. Initially, a faculty member was very positive about this idea, but he subsequently left, so she had to start over with the new architecture coordinator. This was possible because she started with a document with wider acceptance – the Information Competencies for Students in Design Disciplines – which gave her something to take to the faculty as a whole. From there she could go to the curriculum committee.

Flexibility/Take What You Can Get – She advises going for soft targets. Go to the ones who are receptive. They become your spokespeople. For example, architectural historians will see the need for library competencies before the studio faculty. Also, find your niches. There was one faculty member for Design Fundamentals who thought it was important for students to get into the library. Unfortunately, he left and his replacement thought drawing was more important. A compromise was developed to have students look at and summarize the online tutorials.

Know Your Faculty – Try to understand the specific concerns of faculty. Many are concerned with plagiarism and they are often receptive to the idea that students need instruction in this area.

Show Results – The learning outcomes from the core competencies are a great way to focus. Use multiple forms of assessment. Offer to grade class assignments. Give a survey and share the results with faculty and graduate assistants.
Seize the Day – You never know when an opportunity will present itself. An opportunity to work on a faculty member’s mini grant proposal came about when a library component was discovered. It resulted in an image copyright tutorial. An article for a faculty newsletter about using Wikipedia was taken to a faculty meeting to generate a discussion about evaluating resources.

Quid Pro Quo – There should be something for both parties when collaborating. You may be able to help give them something they want (like merit) in order to accomplish what you want. And don’t complain if they use you as a substitute.

Capitalize on the Personal – Have coffee, go to lunch, or do anything to share research interests with faculty members. It’s all about forming a basis.

Nurture Your Creds – What do you want to accomplish? Develop expertise and the perception that you have expertise.

Be Grounded in the Discipline – This adds weight to your lobbying efforts.

Enlist the Students – If we can show that students are interested, this also lends weight to our arguments. She started a coffee initiative, asking them about ideas for promoting the library and was told in turn about faculty interests. A survey was developed based on the ten Core Competencies. They were asked how important each competency was on a scale of 1-5. The majority felt they are important. In terms of skill levels, almost all thought they knew about plagiarism. She was then able to show that a class on plagiarism is essential since faculty already believe that students don’t know about this.

3. Claudia Covert, “Work in Progress: Foundation Building with Art and Design Students”

It is important to take an opportunity when you see it. Claudia saw that the Art History survey classes were being restructured so she designed a 90 minute library session using the ACRL guidelines in spring 2004. A total of 15 sessions were conducted. She created a PowerPoint with a virtual tour of the library, research strategies, resources, demos of databases, a critical use of the Internet, and an introduction to Special Collections.

A survey was sent out later in the semester. The faculty response was positive though the student response was mixed. Students were more interested in a walking tour while faculty wanted more communication. She attended every meeting about these classes and met with every faculty member who taught the classes. The sessions were scheduled at any time during the semester. She assigned two librarians to multiple sessions. Documents were shared between librarians.
In the second year, she incorporated a walking tour, presentations by students, and exercises. She also conducted a live survey and rewarded questions answered with candy. Many things were included in the PowerPoint used for these classes (templates can be requested from the speaker at covert@risd.edu) including: objectives, how to define a topic, using and evaluating Internet resources, using Google Scholar.

Sample exercises include:

- How would you begin your research (asked as a pretest and a posttest)?
- The differences between keywords and subject headings (Google is keyword/database is subject heading)
- Works Cited Exercise – A dummy works cited page is made, students are divided into groups, and asked why or why not you would use a particular resource
- Scavenger Hunt/Group Exercise – Covering all areas of the library

Surveys are now given to both faculty (later in semester) and to students (right after class). As a result of these endeavors, librarians and faculty want to work together more. There is an end of semester review of the instruction sessions. There is a new proposal for two sessions (spring and fall). In the fall, there will be a scavenger hunt and an introduction to resources. In the spring, there will be a bibliographic exercise, students will present their assignment, and spend time in Special Collections.

4. Lucie Stylianopoulos, “Developing Organic Instruction for Incoming Architecture Students”

The librarians at the University of Virginia are experimenting. This talk shows how two librarians were embedded into the School of Architecture. The embedded librarian is a concept of how to better serve studio-based courses. The mantra becomes: immerse yourself in the life of the school so that a trust develops.

**Organic Instruction** is grassroots instruction. It grows from the ground. It’s embedded in the community. There is no interference from library administration. It is the fruit of continual interaction. It grows from the need for good research and good topics between colleagues. It must remain unique to the community and the school curriculum.

**Homegrown** – At UVA, the librarians have the benefit of close proximity to the school. The push for better/more instruction came from a noted lack of research skills in students, which corresponded to a lack of interaction. The Dean was interested in enhancing student research skills but the faculty had to be sold on the idea. The Chairs became willing partners. A basic course for graduate students was devised. This coincided with reaccreditation and talk of student outcomes.
Embedded in the Community – The librarians moved into the faculty space. Being out is more effective. The library course would be the first course taken by any incoming graduate student.

Without Preservatives – Patrons need to have trust in the library. We need to work with them and find out what they need. Those in the studio environment traditionally make less use of the physical library than those in historical studies (where the library corresponds to the studio). This aversion to the physical space is reflected in a lack of research skills in graduate students. The UVA librarians mapped out a new strategy that would incorporate bibliographic citation teaching and practical skills. Google would be used as a major research tool.

Unique – Library sessions were in the students’ classroom, not in the library. The librarians were given the Friday class for 10 sessions of the semester. The syllabus was analyzed to see what content was needed in the sessions (the syllabus ruled). The first class was a session on RefWorks. There was also a class on image resources (ARTstor, the web, plagiarism, and citations). The class begins with the importance of turning first to Google, then to the catalog, then the databases, and how to have them all work together. All of this will evolve into a website. Currently, everything is on the course management system. All of the content is designed and redesigned.

Architecture at UVA – The interests of the architecture faculty at the University of Virginia include urban ecology, historic architecture, the global vernacular, and community-oriented design. Students need to do credible text and image research in these subjects (credible, not advanced).

SARC (the School of Architecture) must fulfill the library’s needs as well. Instruction must be mandatory or it is a waste of time. It needs to be required of all incoming graduate students. It should be a blend of theory and practice. It features a close interaction of faculty and teams.

Embedding the Librarian – The library is often not allowed to design organic instruction. Much is dependent on the librarian’s ability to be agile. There is an equal need for GIS and Avery. One must embrace both Google and traditional resources. The evaluations show that they are basically on target (80% are positive). There have been meetings with the Dean and the department chairs to streamline the course. Students seem to want more advanced research. They also need help picking topics.

Outcomes – Is the interaction with more architecture students scaleable? They have more positive reactions than before. There are more purchase requests (they want more videos). They’ve produced more savvy researchers. Future plans include taking it to the streets. They won’t teach in the library classroom, only in the architecture classroom. Students must bring their laptops. The goal is a library without walls.