

7/1/16 Conference Call Notes

The call-in info:

Dial (855) 925-3266.

- When prompted enter meeting ID (21069), then #
- When prompted speak your name, then enter #

Notetaker: Robin Katz

Agenda:

- Recap ALA and discussion
ALA Annual Draft Minutes:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/15gFlwANr2_V1hhEtjDKKq-6mXTy8ZrfDIHQ8MXTd0S8/edit

Brain Dump:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1_SiZ1nbmWia09oRHM-7fwXxh1rmiUeM5HxhY-6dFBdA/edit
- Next steps – getting the word out

Present:

Heather, Lisa, Robin, Gordon, Julie, Morgan

Discussion Notes:

Idea of an “In Practice” Section

Lots of push for things (“In Practice”) beyond scope and timeline of the committee

How well could we pull off?

Is this in scope?

Other professionals expecting more applicable, concrete things.

Is “guideline” the right word? Should this be a conceptual document, or more practical, concrete steps or examples?

So far, only talked to fellow (and a lot of public services) librarians

So as we get feedback from other groups, we may see different reactions/expectations

Early on in the feedback phase

Overwhelming feeling that there was a desire for something more practical

Maybe we can go further, address to some extent, but no way to do everything people were
Someone wanted a toolkit, how to teach - that is well beyond our scope.
Annotated bibliography might address some

User community may be able to step up and create tools, resources once document published

We can at least address somehow (without giving specifics, can say “practitioners would need
to think about...”)

Manage expectations from beginning, explain in intro more what does/does not do
-lays groundwork for.... This work

“Guidelines” - is that the right word?

Like the framework, moving away from standards. But we don’t necessarily want to use the
word framework.

It is our charge, can we change the word?

Look at the charge again, it says:

- Competency standards
- Guidelines

Can’t stray too far from that.

Definition

Lots of groups will look to this document for the definition

Don’t want to weigh down the document with lots of explanations/discussions, but useful to
make some implicit things more explicitly

Structural ideas:

- Glossary

Balance between complicated nature and need to be quotable

Big point of discussion: whether “time under study” clause is necessary
Also “human activity” was questioned

Better define things like “source,” then “primary source,” then “literacy”

What was the overall reception at ALA?

Lots of thanks, impressed

Consensus that we’ve accomplished a lot

Qs more about organizational structure, clarifying some issues

Overall a positive reception

Feedback on two extremes:

- big picture, what is it supposed to be? How used?
- But also nitty-gritty, wordsmithing, pulling apart concepts in the language

Some circular discussions that we have had as a task force about language/ideas

Other Notes

Also, a suggestion about reordering the Key Concepts section

Is the Learning Outcomes section really “outcomes?” Is it “competencies”? How relates to learning goals and objectives?

Some people had a desire to see “levels” - beginner, intermediate, advanced
(was discussed by the task force too)

Request for rubric - that prompted the idea of an “in practice” section

A recommendation could be to create a rubric out of the guidelines

We have concerns about presenting a single structure, order,

We can suggest that instructors think about levels, rubrics, without doing it
How much of samples, etc. is out of scope?

Actually - in some ways, forcing practitioners to grapple with how to apply this document to their practice is a useful, important thing to do

Overly curating someone’s experience with the document

Framework has an “Implementing the Framework” section

- Read and reflect, convene group of librarians, reach out to partners

Can take a cue from that

Other ideas about making the document more practical without going too far out of scope

- Crosswalk to the Framework
- Address the practical origin of document, intended purpose
- Could include “implementing” or some section to address instruction of (not just what primary source literate people look like)
- How are these guidelines, guidelines for who to do what?

In definitions/glossary, push on “primariness” too

Q of creating specific learning objects: bibliography/other resources could address how to

Levels, differentiation, - deal w in the “In Practice?”

Think the Framework has language about how info lit is not a linear process

Table of contents would help make this easier to navigate

Idea of “quick reference” - understandable, but was unclear from the commenter

Biggest push for practical section from the Public Services Discussion Group, a group of people who teach a lot, were asking for practical, practical

Role of an annotated bibliography to point people towards the literature we are all so familiar with (*Using Primary Sources, Past or Portal?*, *TeachArhives.org*, forthcoming “resource bank” or “info exchange” site from SAA)

Make more explicit:

Role that libraries play, what we do, why we collect

“Collecting” - more space for that in the document

For definition, etc. we had in mind the idea that primary sources don’t always live in special collections or archives, but other sections are written as if that is the only place.

Definitely need to revise with the idea in mind that primary sources live in:

- Published anthologies
- Subscription databases
- Open web
 - Social media especially
- Community-based (non-traditional institution) archives
- Private hands (families, individuals, orgs)

Feedback that was useful for talking to faculty - lots of people said would be a good use of this

Expanding the Ethical part of key concepts

Also break out / add to learning outcomes that correlate

Discussion on “authenticity” of sources, ideas of “collecting”

Next Steps for Feedback

Kind of a small number of people in the Task Force meeting itself, so interested to see wider feedback. Hope other people engage, was disappointing only 6 - 7 at TF mtg

TO DO / NEXT STEPS:

[x] Divy up listservs among membership

- Bill will send to RAO?
- Heather will start a document with a list of individual contacts

[x] Share with institutional and personal networks

- Q: Stick to targeted, or go wide on social media, etc?
- Decided: Let's go open

[x] Some key stakeholders who have reached out to us already

[-] Unconference

Focus on Ethical key concepts section?

Discuss the definition

Open feedback session?

More in depth conversation on a focused topic?

How long are the sessions?

45 min and 1 hr - Will we get a set time yet as a workshop? Or will it be proposed/voted as a session?