Framing and Painting the Library:

Mapping Existing Instruction, Services, and Practices to Established Standards

Elizabeth Young Miller, Moravian Theological Seminary

ABSTRACT Moravian's seminary liaison librarian utilizes existing frames and standards to map to the seminary's curriculum and existing services in order to paint a complete picture of all the library offers. Using lessons learned from mapping the curriculum of the MATS program to the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, the current curriculum mapping iteration has expanded to focus on courses required across degree programs. The curriculum mapping across degree programs not only provides ideas on how to scaffold library instruction, but it also serves as a stepping stone for mapping instruction and library services to the ATS and Middle States standards. Aligning the library's projects, resources, and services to standards that matter to seminary administration and faculty can generate awareness of the important role the library serves.

Currently, I serve as the information literacy and seminary liaison librarian at Moravian Theological Seminary, which is an embedded seminary within Moravian University. The institution is located in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, and one library serves all degree programs and students. Moravian Seminary offers several dual-degree programs and four separate Master's degree programs:

1) A Master of Arts in Chaplaincy (MACh)
2) A Master of Divinity (MDiv)
3) A Master of Arts in Formation & Ministry (MAFM)
4) A Master of Arts in Theological Studies (MATS)

I will start by sharing some background on curriculum mapping at Moravian. Next, I will discuss both curriculum mapping across degree programs, as well as aligning accreditation standards to ACRL's *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, which I will refer to as the *Framework* or frames. Moravian is accredited by both the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) and Middle

States. I will wrap up with some comments on the benefits and short-comings of this approach before sharing some next steps.

I would like to start by providing the history of curriculum mapping at Moravian and can trace the beginnings of this work to a poster presentation by Desirae Zingarelli-Sweet at the ATLA 2016 conference entitled "Prepare a Way through the Wilderness: Transforming Library Instruction by Mapping the Curriculum." After connecting with Desirae, I met with the dean of the seminary to pitch curriculum mapping and gain his input and support. He recommended that I begin by mapping the MATS program to the *Framework*, which I did. To learn more about this project, I invite you to read my book chapter "Charting Information Literacy: Curriculum Mapping at an Embedded Seminary," which appears in the Atla open-access e-book, *Information Literacy and Theological Librarianship: Theory & Praxis* (https://books.atla.com/atlapress/catalog/book/33). After I had mapped assignments in required MATS courses and worked closely with the director of the MATS degree program to develop assessments and exercises, he took a position at another institution. His departure, as well as changes to the curriculum gave me an opportunity to consider how I wanted to frame the value the library offers to the seminary. I was concerned that by focusing on the MATS program, I was missing opportunities to work with students in other degree programs. Therefore, I decided to look at courses that are required across degree programs and how information literacy is or could be incorporated into these courses—in other words, repainting the picture to be more inclusive.

When I started examining the courses required across degree programs, the seminary offered five degree programs; however, the Master of Arts in Clinical Counseling (MACC) is being phased out. I found there were nine required courses, two of which at the time were required across four of the five degree programs and are now required across all degree programs. Once I had this list of courses, I noted whether there was any existing library instruction in place. Of the nine classes, I was meeting with over half of them—five to be exact. These five courses included Introduction to Hebrew Bible, Introduction to New Testament, Learning in Community, Religion in the American Context, and World Religions.

For these five courses, I mapped library instruction to the *Framework*; see table 1 for a sampling of this mapping.

TABLE 1. Frames Mapped to Instruction Across Core Courses

Authority is Constructed and Contextual	Information Creation as a Process	Information has Value	Research as Inquiry	Scholarship as Conversation	Searching as Strategic Exploration
Religion in the American Context – evaluating sources (CRAAP) Intro to Hebrew Bible - evaluating sources (CRAAP); considering and incorporating various worldviews and perspectives into assignments - Text in Context (TIC) paper	Intro to Hebrew Bible - scholarly vs. popular literature Intro to New Testament - scholarly vs. popular literature	Learning in Community – plagiarism tutorial Intro to Hebrew Bible - plagiarism tutorial	Religion in the American Context – database searching (America: History and Life, CQ Researcher, JSTOR) (required research paper) Intro to New Testament - STEP Bible (exegesis paper)	Intro to Hebrew Bible - variety of catalog searches, e.g. commentaries, criticism, and special search features of Atla Religion Database (required annotated bibliography)	Religion in the American Context – concept mapping Religion in the American Context – database searching (America: History and Life, CQ Researcher, JSTOR) Intro to Hebrew Bible - variety of catalog searches, e.g. commentaries, criticism, and special search features of Atla Religion Database

During this process of mapping instruction in required courses to the frames, I found some overlap in instruction; for example, I discussed scholarly versus popular literature in both Introduction to Hebrew Bible and Introduction to New Testament. Some overlap can be beneficial. However, moving forward, I wanted to ensure that there was some unique information literacy instruction occurring in each course, for not only did I wish to keep students engaged, but I also wanted students' skills to build upon prior knowledge.

Library instruction was not integrated into each required course, so for the courses that did not have an information literacy component, I reviewed syllabi, looking at course objectives and assignments to see if there was a way I could demonstrate the benefit of adding library instruction. For example, based on course objectives, I was not sure that information literacy instruction was warranted in Introduction to Spiritual Formation. However, I discovered that information literacy instruction might be beneficial for students enrolled in an introductory theology course. In addition, I saw from the syllabus that students in Christian Ethics must complete a research paper, which may map to Authority is Constructed and

Contextual, as well as Scholarship as Conversation. I then shared this mapping with the seminary administration, as well as with the professor teaching Introduction to Theology and Christian Ethics, inviting him to have a conversation with me. I am grateful that this professor responded, and we had a very engaging conversation in spring of 2020.

Returning to my earlier comment that I wanted information literacy sessions to be unique, I worked hard at listening to what this professor was requiring and how I could assist his students. I was then able to map library instruction for his introductory theology class to three frames: Authority is Constructed and Contextual, Information Creation as a Process, and Searching as Strategic Exploration. I tied denominational resources to Authority is Constructed and Contextual, primary sources to Information Creation as a Process, and subject versus keyword searching to Searching as Strategic Exploration. While other classes map to these frames, the content for each of these frames is unique to the introductory theology course.

Additionally, I tried to determine, based on course offerings and prerequisites, when students would typically enroll in a particular course. If possible, I wanted to scaffold library instruction, which has been a challenge since many students are part-time and are not part of a cohort. I came up with a tentative plan, grouping courses into three tiers. All classes in tier 1 have an information literacy component and include Learning in Community, Introduction to Hebrew Bible, and Introduction to New Testament. Concepts covered in these courses range from plagiarism, to web evaluation, to the peer-review process, to finding books and articles on religion and theology.

Instruction is currently in place in both of the tier 3 classes: Religion in the American Context and World Religions. This instruction focuses on advanced searching skills and using both specialized and interdisciplinary databases. Since instruction is only included in one of the tier 2 classes (Introduction to Theology), my focus will be on the other two courses in this tier (Systems Theory and Christian Ethics), especially outreach to the professor teaching Systems Theory.

Supporting the curriculum is one way the library can demonstrate its value to the institution, and integrating information literacy into required courses reaches more students and faculty. Additionally, I wanted to paint a picture that would attract the attention of the administration. I knew that accreditation mattered, and I wanted to show the value of the library to this population. Therefore, keeping

the seminary's recent 2018 accreditation in mind, I decided to map ATS and Middle State standards to the *Framework*. First, I focused on mapping the ATS standards to the *Framework* and created a Google sheet, with a tab dedicated to each frame (please see snapshot 1). This approach seemed to work from a librarian's perspective. However, I noticed quite a bit of overlap with regard to some of the examples and I was concerned that this might bog administrators down. Again, I wanted to showcase the value the library brings to the seminary, especially in support of the curriculum.

SNAPSHOT 1. ATS and Framework Mapping

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
1		Authority is Constructed and Contextual	Information Creation as a Process	Information Has Value	Research as Inquiry	Scholarship as Conversation	Searching as Strategic Exploration
2							
3	Standard 1: Mission and Goals					"support of scholarly inquiry"	
4							
5	Standard 2: Ethics and Integrity	x		"respect for intellectual property rights"			
6							
7	Standard 3: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience	x		x	x	x	x
8							
9	Standard 4: Support of						

| + ≡ | Frames & Standards ▼ | Authority is Constructed & Contextual ▼ | Information Creatio ◄ ► | 🔳 |

Therefore, I decided to create a Word document organized by ATS standard, hoping that this might be more appealing and that administrators could easily navigate to the standard and/or section of interest to them. I also combined examples, thereby reducing repetition. For example, reference assistance often maps to three frames: Research as Inquiry, Scholarship as Conversation, and Searching as Strategic Exploration. This is certainly the case in snapshot 2, which features ATS standard 6.6: Library Services and Resources.

SNAPSHOT 2. Library Services and Resources – 6.6

"The library offers services that enhance student learning and formation and partners with faculty in teaching, learning, and research. Librarians provide reference services, help users navigate research resources, teach information literacy skills, support the scholarly and educational work of the school and foster lifelong learning" (6.6).

Examples

> The librarians keep reference statistics, which they align with the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. Since January 1, 2016, the seminary liaison librarian has answered over 125 reference questions from the seminary community, 25 of which have been from the seminary faculty. Some of these reference questions have included research appointments with both faculty and students. Nearly a third of these questions have aligned with the frame Searching as Strategic Exploration (**Research as Inquiry; Scholarship as Conversation; Searching as Strategic Exploration)**.

> The librarians created a searchable knowledgebase (FAQs) based on actual questions received from library patrons (**Searching as Strategic Exploration).**

> The seminary liaison librarian also developed a research rx (prescription) form for students to complete during one-on-one research consultations. The research rx can then be referred to by students after the meeting (**Searching as Strategic Exploration**).

Aligning the ATS standards to the *Framework* served as a springboard for mapping the Middle States standards to the *Framework*. I found it more challenging to map to the Middle States standards, however, because there is no mention of the library, and information literacy is just mentioned once in the standards. Therefore, I tried to think creatively and more broadly. With this mapping, I focused on how the library supports the university as a whole (see snapshot 3). I also shared this mapping with the assistant library director. Our hope is that sometime in the near future, we can have a conversation with the other two instruction librarians and brainstorm additional content to add. This mapping will also serve as a living document.

SNAPSHOT 3. Middle States and Framework Mapping

	Authority is Constructed and Contextual	Information Creation as a Process	Information Has Value	Research as Inquiry	Scholarship as Conversation	Searching as Strategic Exploration
Library and Information Services (6)	x	x	x			
Library Purpose and Role (6.1 - 6.2)	6.1 & 6.2	6.1		6.1 & 6.2	6.1 & 6.2	6.1
Library Staffing and Evaluation (6.3 - 6.5)			6.5		6.5	
Library Services and Resources (6.6 - 6.10)	6.7 & 6.8			6.6; 6.10	6.6; 6.7 & 6.10	6.6 & 6.10

Frames & Standards   Authority is Constructed & Contextual   Information Creatic

After my conversation with the assistant library director, I wanted to integrate the ATS and Middle States mapping to demonstrate specific examples of how the library supports the seminary curriculum and community as a whole. Again, my desire is to create something relevant for seminary administrators. I found it easiest to begin again with a Google sheet. This process helped me organize my thoughts and find connections.

Overlap clearly exists among the ACRL frames and connects to both ATS and Middle States standards, as is evident with the frames Authority is Constructed and Contextual and Scholarship as Conversation. For example, ATS standard 6.7, which addresses the library's collection to support research and a diversity of voices, and ATS standard 6.8, which mentions the library's collection development policy, echo Middle States 3.5a-b, as well as 3.6.

Middle States 3.5a-b emphasize an education that expands "cultural and global awareness and cultural sensitivity" (3.5a) and "includes the study of [...] diverse perspectives" (3.5b)." Middle States 3.6: reads "[I]nstitutions that offer graduate and professional education [provide] opportunities for the development of research [and] scholarship." With access to over 75 subscription databases, spanning the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences, students at Moravian have access to resources that offer multidisciplinary perspectives. These varying points of view are particularly important for students writing a thesis, as it is important for them to engage with a wide range of voices. As the seminary liaison librarian, I peruse vendor catalogs and read book reviews in approximately 25 journals, in search of titles to add to the diversity of the collection. Collection development is done in collaboration with teaching faculty, keeping the curriculum in mind, as well as the research and information needs of both students and faculty.

Several ATS and Middle States standards also map to the frames Scholarship as Conversation and Research as Inquiry. For example, ATS standard 6.6 highlights that librarians partner with faculty to teach research and information literacy skills. Middle States standard 3.6 emphasizes that graduate schools offer opportunities for research and scholarship. To demonstrate the library's contributions in these areas, I share with faculty yearly instruction statistics and corresponding research guides. Instruction sessions are mapped to the frames too, and about a dozen seminary information literacy sessions align specifically with the frame Research as Inquiry, whereas two map to Scholarship as Conversation. Middle

States standard 3.6 also corresponds to ATS standard 6.10: "The library provides environments conducive to learning and scholarly research, with appropriate agreements for its contracted or consortial resources." Moravian's library supplements advanced research through interlibrary loan and reciprocal borrowing agreements with the national Atla Reciprocal Borrowing Program, the regional Southeastern Pennsylvania Theological Library Association (SEPTLA), and the local Lehigh Valley Association of Independent Colleges (LVAIC). These reciprocal agreements allow students access to materials so that they can fully engage in the scholarly conversation, thereby aligning with the frame Scholarship as Conversation.

ATS and Middle States standards also correspond with the frame Information Has Value. ATS standard 6 states: "Libraries and librarians partner with faculty [...] to equip students to be effective and ethical users of information resources." This language mirrors that of Middle States 2.1a: "respect for intellectual property rights." Examples in support of these standards include the interactive plagiarism discussion I have with students in two required courses, as well as the library's citation, Zotero, and copyright research guides. Copyright information is also included in the research guide for local clergy and alums.

After hearing about this project, the wheels may be turning, and you may be identifying benefits of this kind of mapping. I would like to emphasize or reiterate several advantages to this approach.

1) This mapping may showcase many activities you are currently doing that stakeholders may not be aware of, further demonstrating the value the library brings to an institution.

2) By mapping to standards that matter to the seminary administration and faculty, you may be able to attract their attention more easily.

3) If this is a joint project at a library, connecting current and future endeavors to the recognized ACRL frames may increase buy-in from other librarians and staff members.

Of course, no approach is perfect and there are some shortcomings related to this kind of mapping. Namely, I can think of the following drawbacks:

1) Not everything the library does easily maps to a standard.

2) The mapping focuses heavily on public services; this may be partly because of my role at the library.

3) Mapping to the Middle States standards does not paint a complete picture of the library and its services and resources, especially since, as mentioned previously, there is no mention of the library in the standards and merely a single mention of information literacy in standard 3.

Despite the shortcomings of this mapping project, I do think it has value in painting a picture of the library, and I would like to briefly share with you some of my next steps. The seminary will be welcoming a new dean, and I am eager to share with her some highlights and documentation from the project. I am hopeful that these examples and discussion will be a nice introduction to what the library offers. I would also like to expand this conversation to include the entire seminary faculty and continue to look for ways to integrate information literacy into the core classes required across degree programs. I look forward to collaborating with librarian colleagues to brainstorm and map Middle States standards to library initiatives geared toward undergraduates and those in other graduate degree programs. My hope is that this mapping process can serve as a springboard for university-wide accreditation efforts, framing the library in the best possible light.

REFERENCES

Association of Theological Schools (ATS) Commission on Accrediting. 2020. "Standards of Accreditation." https://www.ats.edu/uploads/accrediting/documents/standards-of-accreditation.pdf

Middle States Commission on Higher Education. 2015. "Standards for Accreditation and Requirements of Affiliation," 13th ed. https://msche.box.com/shared/static/6upfla8coxha663p0j10u3ga tow38jel.pdf

Miller, Elizabeth Young. 2019. "Charting Information Literacy: Curriculum Mapping at an Embedded Seminary." In *Information Literacy and Theological Librarianship: Theory and Praxis*, edited by Bobby Smiley, chapter 5. Chicago: Atla Open Press. https://doi.org/10.31046/atlaopenpress.33

Zingarelli-Sweet, Desirae. June 17, 2016. "Prepare a Way through the Wilderness: Transforming Library Instruction by Mapping the Curriculum." Poster presented at the American Theological Library Association Conference (ATLA), Long Beach, CA.