

2017

# Shifting Expectations: Revisiting Core Concepts of Academic Librarianship in Undergraduate Classes with a Digital Humanities Focus

Melanie Griffin

*University of South Florida*, [griffinm@usf.edu](mailto:griffinm@usf.edu)

Tomaro I. Taylor

*University of South Florida*, [tomaro@usf.edu](mailto:tomaro@usf.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/tlscd>

 Part of the [Digital Humanities Commons](#)

---

## Scholar Commons Citation

Griffin, Melanie and Taylor, Tomaro I., "Shifting Expectations: Revisiting Core Concepts of Academic Librarianship in Undergraduate Classes with a Digital Humanities Focus" (2017). *Special Collections Faculty and Staff Publications*. 41.  
<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/tlscd/41>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Tampa Library at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Special Collections Faculty and Staff Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [scholarcommons@usf.edu](mailto:scholarcommons@usf.edu).

Running head: SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

**Title:** Shifting Expectations: Revisiting Core Concepts of Academic Librarianship in Undergraduate Classes with a Digital Humanities Focus

**Authors:** Melanie Griffin

University of South Florida Libraries

[griffinm@usf.edu](mailto:griffinm@usf.edu)

Tomaro I. Taylor<sup>1</sup>

University of South Florida Libraries

[tomaro@usf.edu](mailto:tomaro@usf.edu)

**Accepted manuscript for article published in *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 23.2/4 (2017)  
available online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2017.1325346>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Both authors contributed equally to this article.

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

### **Abstract:**

This article explores best practices for supporting digital humanities (DH) activity and pedagogy in the undergraduate classroom on campuses without a DH center in the library. By examining specific aspects of librarians' curricular engagements, with a particular focus on reference and instructional activity, we discuss how re-envisioning these services aids in the development of effective support for both faculty and students engaged in DH. An included case study illustrates how redefining "traditional" librarian liaison roles and shifting expectations of faculty from one-shot instruction sessions to embedded librarianship models can be put into practice in undergraduate classrooms with a DH focus. The article concludes with a discussion of the librarian as digital humanist and how this role can positively impact undergraduate curricula.

**Keywords:** pedagogy, reference, instructional support, embedded librarianship, digital humanities resources

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

### Introduction

The 2014 OCLC report “Does Every Research Library Need a Digital Humanities Center?” (Schaffner and Erway 2014) examines digital humanities (DH) activity in college and university libraries by considering the ways in which “library culture may need to evolve in order for librarians to be seen as effective DH partners” (5). Primarily focused on how libraries can actively engage digital humanists, the report concludes that campus-wide DH activity should not influence the designation of libraries as centralized locations for digital humanities unless the following supports are also present: demonstrated need and appropriate human and technological resources (15). By acknowledging that “Every research library is already supporting DH at some level” (14), OCLC also suggests that college and university libraries should neither be expected nor required to provide formal DH hubs as part of their core functionality. In sum, there are few, if any, compelling reasons why college and university libraries should serve their parent institutions as dedicated service points for campus DH activity. In particular, the report suggests that one of the most compelling reasons for the decentralization of DH centers is the benefit that libraries and DH scholars derive from cross-campus collaborations (7).

In light of the conclusion that every research library does not need a DH center, this article explores best practices for how subject and liaison librarians in college and university libraries can support digital humanities activity in libraries without dedicated DH service points. We discuss ways to mitigate the challenges arising from the dispersion of DH activities across campuses and within libraries by redefining “traditional” subject and liaison librarian roles and by considering how reframing the associated responsibilities of these professional positions helps to develop effective collaborative partnerships in the digital humanities. In redefining subject and liaison librarians’ roles in college and university libraries, we also examine different aspects of librarians’ curricular engagements in undergraduate coursework centered on DH projects. With an emphasis on reference and instructional services, we discuss revamping course content and projects, identifying appropriate tools and resources,

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

shifting expectations of faculty from one-shot instruction sessions to embedded librarianship models, and developing methods to assess non-traditional assignments. These aspects of librarians' participatory involvement in DH projects are presented through a case study inspired by a recent collaboration between librarians and a senior-level English seminar at the University of South Florida Tampa campus. The study demonstrates how subject and liaison librarians might serve as embedded project librarians for an undergraduate-level, semester-long DH pedagogy project by offering students and faculty a single point of service. We conclude with implications for library practice and discuss the role of librarians in supporting DH-focused pedagogy in the undergraduate classroom.

### **Theoretical Paradigms for Library Support of DH Curricular Activity**

The inaugural issue of *College and Research Libraries* describes the academic library as a brick-and-mortar building that conserves, transfers, and extends knowledge through collection development and instructional and research activities (Wilson 1939). Over the past seventy years, not much has changed; college and university libraries are commonly regarded as supports for the programmatic and curricular interests of parent institutions. Where significant changes have occurred are in the ways libraries provide academic research services to their campus communities and how academic research librarians negotiate these changing responsibilities. Increasing technology, revamped curricula, and new expectations for student success significantly impact the ways librarians approach "traditional" library services and provide mechanisms for enhancing both student and faculty research activity in higher education (Lankes 2011; Shank and Bell 2011; Jaguszewski and Williams 2013; Delaney and Bates 2015; Cox 2016). Thus, even though yesterday's bibliographer may be today's subject or liaison librarian, many of the roles undertaken by librarians continue to evolve in accordance with changes to libraries' scholarly and curricular engagements and under the presumption that the appropriate technological and human resources are available to further initiatives in these ever-expanding areas.

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

A review of the literature suggests that the bevy of skills and competencies required to serve as a “traditional” reference, research, or subject librarian have been well-documented (Kong 1996; Nofsinger 1999; Hazen 2000; Feldman 2006; Moran 2005; Jaguszewski and Williams 2013). Instead, this review demonstrates how particular aspects of research librarianship have withstood myriad changes in academia and have been re-envisioned to better serve contemporary researchers, particularly those in the digital humanities. Of utmost consideration are the ways librarians actively support the digital humanities by building on commonly recognized skills sets in order to foster collaborative relationships with teaching faculty. This review also suggests that subject and liaison librarians actively engaged in DH activity often employ well-established practices in reference and instruction services to squarely position themselves as research and curricular partners within the academy’s growing digital humanities sector. By applying the library profession’s most commonly recognized skills, librarians can bridge both traditional and non-traditional services to facilitate DH in the undergraduate classroom.

Library research often uses job trends as a way to demonstrate both field trajectory and the competencies needed in new and emerging areas of professional librarianship (Detlefsen 1992; Beile and Adams 2000; Goetsch 2008; Saunders 2015). Recent additions to the literature also consider the aptitudes expected of new hires in “established” areas of librarianship, such as reference and research. Scholarship in the latter area considers not only the measureable skills discussed in earlier literature, such as bibliographic knowledge, but also characteristics and traits that facilitate knowledge transfer to library users (Gerolimos, Malliari, and Iakovidis 2015; Bakkalbasi, Jaggars, and Rockenbach 2015; Kenney 2015). Accordingly, proficiencies in the more commonly referenced “hard” areas of librarianship often correspond with the “softer” skills now being identified by researchers.

Matteson, Anderson, and Boyden (2016) describe soft skills as “a collection of people management skills...yet the concept...lacks definition, scope, instrumentation and systematic education and training” (71). They go on to outline a number of soft skills discussed in library literature suggesting

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

that there is still a lot of work to be done to solidify how this rather nebulous terminology is used by the profession. However, two tables presented in the article highlight communication as both a “base competency” (79) and “skill set” (81) identified by researchers. A few years prior, the Association for Research Libraries (ARL) identified communication as one of the most sought after traits for research librarians (Jaguszewski and Williams 2013, 15). The following year, an independent study analyzing roughly 130 academic librarian job announcements correlated with the ARL’s and Matteson et al.’s findings. The authors of the independent study discovered that while hard and soft skills were highly valued in libraries, communication had “evolved into a *de facto* requirement” for academic librarians (Gerolimos, Malliari, and Iakovidis 2014, 31).

Given the many ways librarians share information, it is not surprising that communication ranks highly among both required and desired skills. Librarians’ varied approaches to research, and their ability to identify the tools and resources necessary for the successful negotiation of information, requires more than relaying basic instructions to library users; it requires the ability to consider and express different research methods that will both aid and expedite a scholar’s inquiry. In sum, an important part of academic reference and research librarianship is being able to convey subject expertise to all levels of researchers (Delaney and Bates 2015) while guiding them to the tools and resources most appropriate for their research. These skills are particularly beneficial when working in the digital humanities as less experienced researchers—such as undergraduate students—explore the many new and innovative methodologies they can use to critically evaluate research topics. Because digital humanities curricula tend to veer away from the tried and true research papers often anticipated by undergraduates, the librarian’s ability to engage in the classroom’s DH activities helps facilitate the learning process by allowing students to apply many of the library research skills they already have, but in different ways. And, when engaging undergraduate-level digital humanists, the librarian’s ability to communicate effectively is especially important as DH research is best supported by more user-centered

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

techniques to research and scholarship (Delaney and Bates 2015; Matthews 2012; Meulemans and Carr 2013) than traditionally provided in college and university libraries. As discussed in the included case study, for these researchers more direct access to research and instructional support services can contribute to the overall successfulness of their DH projects.

A librarian's ability to move fluidly between hard and soft skills stems, in part, from their shifting professional responsibilities. As ARL indicates, "rapidly changing technologies, an abundance of digital information in myriad formats, an increased understanding of how students learn, evolving research methods, and changing practices in how scholars communicate and disseminate their research and creative work" (Jaguszewski and Williams 2013, 4) are important considerations for both libraries and librarians. Instead of just knowing the tools and demonstrating their use, librarians must take a more holistic approach to research. Being capable of applying traditional skills to different projects, regardless of how or in what format the final product manifests, brings together the librarian's hard and soft skills and responsibilities and creates possibilities for different approaches to research. However, as librarians' roles transition from that of information gatekeeper to "navigator" (Delaney and Bates 2015; Choy 2011; Shank and Bell 2011), they are required to tap into less tangible skill sets in order to better facilitate their work with researchers. As such, the "librarian as educator" has become increasingly more prominent (Shank and Bell 2011; Vassilakaki and Moniarou-Papaconstantinou 2015). While this role has developed in part from strategic shifts in higher education settings (Jaguszewski and Williams 2013; Vassilakaki and Moniarou-Papaconstantinou 2015), it also has been noted to result from librarians' changing interactions with constituent research communities. Librarians' "pedagogical knowledge," as cited by Vassilakaki and Moniarou-Papaconstantinou (2015), not only impacts their effectiveness as teachers but also how well they are viewed by other educators in academia.

Librarians are able to capitalize on the educator role through "embeddedness," which allows greater opportunities for direct interaction with both students and faculty in a particular course.

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

Embedded librarianship is best described as the formal, participatory relationship in which librarians are “experiencing and observing, as nearly as possible, the daily life of the primary group” (Dewey 2004, 6). It is argued that the development of embedded librarianship is two-fold (Vassilakaki and Moniarou-Papaconstantinou 2015). On the one hand, it is suggested that embeddedness grew out of the desire to better establish closer relationships with teaching faculty, particularly as newer technologies were introduced to both the front and back ends of academic curricula (45). On the other hand, the rise of embedded librarianship has been considered an offshoot of both reference and subject librarianship as a way to promote and “go beyond” (45) traditional library services. Either way, embeddedness affords opportunities for librarians to engage in collaborative partnerships with both faculty and students in ways that directly support research-based curricula (Jacobs 2010; Kvenild and Clakins 2011; Rosenblum, Devlin, Albin, and Garrison 2015, 160; Varner 2016, 215). By integrating subject and research expertise and information and digital literacies with the humanistic values of the DH scholar community, liaison librarians are well-positioned to provide the human capital needed for classroom initiatives that involve the tools and methodologies of an applied DH pedagogy. In institutions where a central DH center does not exist, subject librarians are tasked with providing a kind of support that goes beyond basic public, research, or collection development services by being more hands-on in their reference and research activities.

Embedded project librarians can bridge the gap between DH and college and university libraries without centralized DH units (Gibson, Ladd and Presnell 2015, 3), such as the University of South Florida Tampa campus, because they offer a way to provide DH services without the commitment and stress of financial, technological, or human resources (Bell 2016, 112). Our case study demonstrates the embedded librarian’s significance in advancing library support of campus DH initiatives. By working collaboratively with teaching faculty, and by providing classroom research support at all levels of a phased project, librarians embedded in undergraduate courses with a DH focus firmly establish their

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

roles as campus educators. Further, the embedded librarianship model presents a sustainable way for libraries to foster DH activity across disciplines by merging the expertise of subject and liaison librarians with other in-house specialists and professionals in order to provide well-rounded classroom support. As such, the embedded librarians' DH role not only benefits the students and faculty with whom they work but also the library, as library staff recognize that greater working relationships can develop across different departments. Additionally, college and university libraries benefit from the subject or liaison librarians' role as the practicality of providing the level and type of services often desired for full and steady engagement in DH is untenable for many institutions.

### **Putting Theory into Practice: Library Support for DH Pedagogy in the Undergraduate Classroom**

In order to ground the theoretical approaches discussed in the literature in the actual practice of supporting DH pedagogy in libraries without a DH center, we offer a case study to illustrate how subject and liaison librarians can partner with teaching faculty to better incorporate DH into the undergraduate curriculum. We have intentionally redacted course-specific information in order to provide this case study as a more exploratory model. Although we specifically discuss an undergraduate-level English class, our example demonstrates how librarians can engage in supporting DH pedagogy in general rather than an individual or subject-specific courses.

#### *The Environment: The Course, the University, and the People Involved*

One of our authors has served as the University of South Florida (USF) Libraries liaison to English for a number of years and is familiar with the type of coursework offered by the department as well as the library's level of involvement with the faculty and students. In spring 2016, an English faculty member approached the author to discuss plans to offer an undergraduate-level senior seminar in place-based literature. In addition to traditional close reading and research papers, which formed the backbone of the professor's course requirements in previous semesters, the professor wanted to

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

revamp the course to make use of digital humanities resources and pedagogy that would encourage digital literacy via exploration of digital collections and resources and writing for digital audiences. The new requirements of the class included the creation of digital story maps and a final multimodal research project, as well as a presentation derived from research in both physical and digital archives.

While USF is a large, urban, public university campus with a Carnegie classification of research intensive, there is no formal DH center on campus. There is, however, consistent campus activity in the digital humanities in the form of DH interest groups, informal lunch-and-learn series, and department-specific DH centers and initiatives. Through these activities, individual faculty members have expressed interest in incorporating DH pedagogy into classroom activities in addition to carrying out their own research-intensive DH projects. At the time that the course described in this case study was offered, the USF Libraries offered very little formal support for DH pedagogy, particularly in undergraduate humanities classrooms. As the Tampa Library is the main library serving the vast majority of campus disciplines, with the exception of Health Sciences and the College of Behavioral and Community Sciences, librarians are responsible for supporting the campus at large. Currently, the USF Tampa Library employs a lean liaison model, with 13 subject librarians supporting the research and teaching needs of approximately 1800 faculty members and over 40,000 students. Given these constraints, an embedded project librarian approach to support the needs of students in the professor's course was utilized.

### *Faculty Support*

The first step in supporting this course and its DH-inspired pedagogy projects was to meet with the faculty member to discuss the non-traditional components of the course. While the faculty member was familiar with the traditional services offered by the library, such as bibliographic instruction and collection development support, she was less certain if the library could assist with the teaching and learning needs required for this type of course. She ultimately met with three different librarians during

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

the planning stages for her course: one focused exclusively on methods for selecting and evaluating platforms to support multimodal student research projects; the second focused on offering formal instruction to students on how to use these tools; and the third focused on scaffolding the library, web, and digital archive research skills needed for students to succeed at the assignments.

This decentralized approach to library support proved crucial. As there is not a DH center on campus, there is no single librarian charged with keeping current on DH pedagogy, research, or tools. Therefore, when we were first approached by the faculty member, we evaluated the needs of the class in terms of skills, not subjects, and involved liaison librarians who were best equipped to meet those needs. While seemingly simple, this was actually a rather challenging step to take organizationally, as a single librarian typically serves as the point of contact for a given discipline. Providing support for a DH pedagogy project required on-the-ground re-visioning of our current liaison model to a team-based, functional specialist approach, which mirrors the shifts noted in other academic libraries (Jaguszewski and Williams 2013).

### *Support for Assignment Development*

Two of the three librarians involved in providing instructional support engaged in conversations and planning activities with the faculty member to re-envision course assignments and incorporate digital learning components. When we began working with the faculty member, general assignment details were already in place; the faculty member knew the course content that each assignment would cover and had excellent ideas for digital learning activities that would encourage student learning. Library support came in the form of providing specific, concrete ideas and examples for scaffolding these assignments. One assignment, for example, was designed to help students visualize place in literature. Librarians consulted with the faculty member to suggest specific platforms and tools, such as Google's My Maps, that students could use to create maps based on their literary analyses. We also provided

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

ongoing support in the form of recommended resources, including print and archival materials and both open access and subscription-based digital archives.

### *Instruction Sessions*

In consultation with the faculty member teaching the class, the librarians involved decided to offer two different types of instruction sessions: one would focus on technology and tools, the other would focus on materials and research skills. In the technology-oriented sessions, the librarian offered training on how to make successful use of the digital platforms required in the course. These sessions were somewhat akin to the more traditional workshops often offered by libraries on making effective use of citation management software. The point was not to create expert users in seventy-five minutes, but rather to offer an introduction, demonstrate why the software would be useful, and get students started in their use of the tool.

In the second librarian-led instruction session, students received research support in both physical and digital archives, with an emphasis on tools for navigating both, and they learned about the relationship between physical archives and digital objects. Part of the allure of digital humanities pedagogy is that it enables students to interact with materials not available at the students' institution (Mitchell, Seiden, and Taraba 2012; Enoch and VanHaitsma 2015; VanHaitsma 2015); at the same time, however, interaction with physical archives often entices and excites students, particularly those who have not had the opportunity to interact with rare or historic materials previously (Robyns 2001; Johnson 2006; Mitchell, Seiden, and Taraba 2012). Further, a basic knowledge of physical archives (particularly their limitations) are important in understanding the lacuna found in digital collections (Shillingsburg 2014). Therefore, this instruction session introduced students to physical exemplars of place-based literature and provided time for hands-on time exploration of how physical objects compare with digital surrogates. Finally, after students had a chance to experience print materials, we

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

discussed and practiced methods for searching digital collections and databases. This is, of course, quite a lot of material to cover in one seventy-five-minute session, and the librarian concluded with an invitation to open office hours.

### *Library Space as Third Space*

Zorich (2008) suggests that libraries can play a crucial role in supporting DH pedagogy in the classroom by offering access to a third place, such as seminar rooms or meeting spaces, to support collaborative work. This case study affirms the need for collaborative third spaces in DH pedagogy projects, particularly those geared towards undergraduate students. While this particular class formally met in the library only twice, it made use of a variety of library spaces over the course of the semester. One class session, which focused on providing instruction on digital tools, occurred in the library's Digital Media Commons (DMC), where students can work in classroom, pod, and other configurable spaces. The space is designed to offer students access to joint digital workspaces and equipment, and staff are on-hand to assist users with supported technology and software. Another class session took place in the library's Special Collections department. For this session, one-half of the class session occurred in a computer lab and the other half in a seminar room. In both sessions, the library's third spaces connected students to resources— whether rare books, digital tools, or library personnel—and each other by supporting their needs for places to meet and work collaboratively.

### *Research Consultations*

Given the newness of the course, the lack of familiarity that students expressed with the topics covered, and the amount of information covered in both types of library instruction sessions, the librarians expected students to request individual or group research consultations during the course of their projects. We also expected students to schedule research assistance with the librarian who offered the session covering the material with which students needed the most help. As all librarians

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

involved with the course provided explicit offers of help during instruction sessions and included their contact information for scheduling consultations, we anticipated an equal distribution of research consultation requests across all three librarians.

Our first expectation was certainly met: over one-half of the students in the class scheduled individual research consultations, and a number of them scheduled more than one consultation. Our second expectation, however, was not. The tools-based instruction sessions were offered early in the semester, with the materials and research skills session occurring several weeks later, right as the students began working on their large multimodal research project. All students elected to schedule consultations with the librarian who offered the materials and research skills session, regardless of the type of help that needed; we suspect it is because students encountered this librarian closer to the point of need. Therefore, one librarian ultimately provided students with help on a diverse range of course-related topics, including database search strategies, building a story map, selecting a platform on which to build the project, and methods for finding primary source material not included in the physical and digital archives already searched by the student. By the end of the semester, the librarian had become embedded in the course and was providing the faculty member, graduate teaching assistant, and students with a single point of contact for all library-related questions and concerns. As an embedded project librarian, the subject liaison became “the face” of the library’s curricular and research support for faculty and students involved in the class. Behind-the-scenes, conversations among the three librarians continued, and the two librarians who provided tools-based instruction to the students assisted the librarian who ultimately provided more direct student support.

### *Lessons Learned*

Collaboration was an essential component of supporting this course, and it is possible that the subject liaison librarian might have struggled to manage the continually expanding responsibilities if

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

other librarians had not been on deck to provide instruction, help with resources, or other forms of assistance. In hindsight, our collaboration could have been even more successful if the three librarians supporting the class had maintained closer communication with one another and the class. While we were keenly aware of who was best suited to supporting which parts of the project, the faculty member and students were not. More often, they were simply aware that they needed help and thus asked the librarian who was most conveniently located at their point of need—whether in the Digital Media Commons or Special Collections. There is also the possibility that enhanced communications between the librarians and students in the class could have alleviated some of the burden placed on the subject librarian. If we had re-introduced students to the librarians mid-way through their project, whether by offering refresher workshops or drop-in help sessions, the students would have been better able to identify which librarian to contact for the issues they encountered. Increased communication would have resulted in each player knowing precisely what the other had recommended and allowed any librarian to offer the assistance needed. Additionally, better communication across all participant groups would have worked to increase each librarian’s DH-support knowledge base, thereby allowing for more seamless integration of library services into classes with a DH pedagogical focus in the future.

### **Implications for Library Practice**

As demonstrated by our case study, the varied facets of public service, instruction, communication, and collaboration combine to form opportunities for librarian embeddedness in DH-focused classrooms. As a whole, these components create the basis for many of the professional research styles that also are endemic to a community that thrives on open sharing of information and resources. Thus, collaborative relationships among librarians and with teaching faculty in the digital humanities allow library liaisons to “build on their role as instructors and reflect the emerging identity of the library as an active and productive space on campus and not only a warehouse of primary and

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

secondary sources” (Varner 2016, 220; see also Vandergrift and Varner 2013, 72-73) for the implementation and production of DH scholarship.

We offer this case study not as a road map but rather as a snapshot, suggesting methods for how libraries and librarians might modify existing workflows to support DH pedagogy. First, we are aware that the solutions we reached were very dependent upon the environment in which this course was offered and the skill sets as well as material resources available to us at the time. While these resources will vary from library to library, the general principals we have presented could nevertheless assist other libraries in supporting DH pedagogy on campuses without a centralized DH center. Second, we also understand that our current liaison model affords more flexible assignments than other librarians may be able to negotiate. Flexibility is key, as is a willingness for librarians to take on different roles. Administrative support for flexibility is also crucial. The timeline for supporting pedagogy projects is typically brief and confined to a single semester, precluding the ability of libraries to formally change librarian assignments or liaison models. Therefore, the philosophical alignment of administration with librarians practicing on the ground is important. We could not have successfully supported the pedagogy project featured in the above case study if we had felt administratively tied to the library’s existing liaison model.

Our experience also suggests the necessity of collaboration between librarians. No single librarian at our institution was equipped to support the teaching and research needs of the class independently. Collaboratively, however, we discovered that we had more than enough expertise to support both the faculty member and the students throughout the semester. Despite this collaborative approach to library support, students nevertheless contacted the librarian who had interacted with them closest to their point of need. Existing research suggests that this is common information seeking behavior (Komissarova and Murray 2016), and future collaborative support for DH pedagogy projects should account for this behavior. In hindsight, greater behind the scenes communication would have

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

facilitated more streamlined support for students, including having other librarians drop in on research consultations to advise on other aspects of the project. This approach, while more time consuming for the library, has the added benefit of not shuffling students between service points.

Technology skills are often considered a barrier to implementing DH pedagogy projects in the classroom (Hartley, Head et al. 2005, 7), and this case study reaffirms this finding. While almost all of the students enrolled in the course were digital natives, very few were digitally literate. Topics covered in research consultations included digital basics, like the difference between a PDF and a JPG file and the appropriate time to use both in the final project. Scaffolding digital literacy skills, including basic technology skills, is crucial for many undergraduates to engage successfully in digital pedagogy projects.

### **Discussion: Implications for Library Support of DH Pedagogy in Undergraduate Classrooms**

When considering embedded librarianship, Dewey suggests a formal, participatory relationship in which the librarian “is experiencing and observing, as nearly as possible, the daily life of the primary group” (Dewey 2004, 6). Embedded librarianship allows librarians to not only understand what students learn over the course of a semester but how they learn it. As opposed to one-shot instructions sessions during which librarians often focus on a specific classroom project or assignment, embeddedness allows librarians to, instead, engage with a class throughout the research cycle. Being in the center of curricular activity affords librarians the chance to anticipate potential challenges students might face during the research process while also giving students direct support during their negotiation of resources, tools, and analytical approaches. Gibson, Ladd, and Presnell (2015) similarly suggest that embeddedness at the level of being involved in the DH research process, yet slightly removed from the minutiae of the project, allows library liaisons “to make decisions based on collection strength or institution and preservation needs or ability to answer the original research question, rather than solely on the personal interest brought by a faculty scholar” (11). In essence, the librarian’s involvement is tempered by a more

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

holistic view of available resources as opposed to the much narrower perspective of the student or scholar engaged in the research. This case study suggests the challenges and opportunities involved with embedding multiple librarians in a single class.

As participant-observers, liaison librarians have the opportunity to not only engage in the classroom's curricular activities but also to *gauge* the students' research capacity. In doing so, librarians can adjust the level and type of services provided to students over the duration of the course. They also can use this information to facilitate the development of other, related courses by professors interested in moving into the digital humanities realm.

Because we learned that most students seek help at their point of need, anticipating where and how they might require assistance during their project would allow the librarians involved in the course to better manage their own duties. Although we work in a fairly flexible environment, other duties beckon; juggling the technology, resource, and research needs of an entire classroom is difficult when considered alongside other responsibilities and when managed between multiple parties. However, determining at which points students might need the most help would have allowed us to better prepare for the busier periods. In doing so, we could have enlisted additional library personnel to work with us in fielding basic questions or in collaborating on joint research consultations. By engaging additional subject liaisons and functional specialists, we enhance the library's digital humanities support and increase the number of personnel capable of working with teaching faculty and students in this capacity.

The students' information-seeking pattern also suggests the need to develop course-embedded library modules. Library modules centered on the DMC, print and archival holdings, and DH tools and resources would both expand the students' digital literacy and help the librarians determine if additional instruction sessions would be necessary in future course sections to solve common classroom concerns.

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

Additionally, modules can help students and faculty by intermittently assessing where students are in both the learning process and the project development phase (Swan, Shen, and Hiltz 2006), thereby providing benchmarks of successful accomplishment.

The importance of subject and liaison librarians to “take the lead” as embedded project librarians should be noted. Their skills can transform conventional liaison roles into collaborative partnerships both within and across libraries as a result of their ability to serve as conduits for connecting resources and researchers. Yet, the entrée of subject and liaison librarians into digital humanities scholarship is often hindered by research libraries’ strategic foci on “traditional service areas” (Saunders 2015, 290). Thus, it is imperative that librarians in these areas use their roles to demonstrate the changing nature of research and curricula and how their efforts to support those areas must change to.

In keeping with our assertion that decentralized digital humanities activity can be supported by college and university libraries—but that centralized DH units do not have to be—we conclude with the following thoughts. In “Evolving in Common,” Vandergrift and Varner (2013) state: “Digital Humanities does not have a place in the library. Digital Humanists do” (76). In their article, as well as in other library and related literature, the librarian as digital humanist comes to the fore far more frequently than discussions of the “digital humanities librarian.” Perhaps this is a result of a still burgeoning field, a continuing struggle for budgetary allocations, and the need to find personnel with the right combination of skills to support entire campus departments, if not the entire campus. But we contend that it goes much deeper than the rapidly emerging DH centers and initiatives popping up across academia and the newly reimagined library job titles that support these new efforts. We suggest that the library provides effective support for digital humanists because the core competencies of librarianship are designed to support people—not projects and not technology, but the people actively engaged in the type of research that both utilizes and produces these approaches to scholarship.

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

In the undergraduate classroom, where students are faced with navigating a plethora of resources available at their fingertips, the librarian as digital humanist respects the juxtaposition of digital natives who are not digitally literate and embraces the opportunity to help these students negotiate their own exploration of digital humanities tools and resources. This level of assistance is often positioned as an education and a support for the students, but it is an inherent responsibility of the library profession. For classrooms with a DH focus, this responsibility is best supported when librarians are able to shift their own expectations of “traditional” subject and liaison roles and re-envision their responsibilities in ways that best support the curriculum.

The case study we have offered highlights the collaborative, flexible role of the embedded subject liaison librarian and the part this librarian can play in supporting DH pedagogy projects on campuses without a centralized DH center. In this study, we use the liaison librarian to demonstrate effective support of DH pedagogy projects by suggesting that collaborative work within and across the library setting can allow the liaison to provide DH support without the backing of a dedicated service unit in the library. By working directly with the teaching faculty who are actively incorporating DH pedagogy projects into undergraduate classrooms and by collaborating with additional library personnel to bolster the type of support capable of being provided, the subject liaison’s “traditional” duties shift in accordance with the expectations of both faculty and library administrators seeking to better establish the Digital Humanities on their campuses. In short, our experiences have led us to agree with the OCLC Research report with which we opened this article: not every library needs a DH center (Schaffner and Erway 2014). With adaptability, both on the part of liaison librarians and library administrators, academic libraries can support DH pedagogy without creating dedicated DH service centers.

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

- Bakkalbasi, Nisa, Damon Jaggars, and Barbara Rockenbach. 2015. "Re-skilling for the Digital Humanities: Measuring Skills, Engagement, and Learning." *Library Management* 36(3): 208-214.
- Beile, Penny M., and Megan M. Adams. 2000. "Other Duties as Assigned: Emerging Trends in the Academic Library Job Market." *College & Research Libraries* 61(4): 336-347.
- Bell, Christina. 2015. "In Practice and Pedagogy: Digital Humanities in a Small College Environment." In *Digital Humanities in the Library: Challenges and Opportunities for Subject Specialists*, Edited by Arianne Hartsell-Gundy, Laura Braunstein, and Liorah Golomb, John W. White and Heather Gilbert, 103-126. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.
- Choy, Fatt Cheong. 2011. "From Library Stacks to Library-in-a-Pocket: Will Users Be Around?" *Library Management* 32(1/2): 62-72.
- Cox, John. 2016. "Communicating New Library Roles to Enable Digital Scholarship: A Review Article." *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 22(2/3): 132-147.
- Delaney, Geraldine, and Jessica Bates. 2015. "Envisioning the Academic Library: A Reflection on Roles, Relevancy and Relationships." *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 21(1): 30-51.
- Detlefsen, Ellen G. 1992. "Specialists as Professionals in Research Libraries: An Overview of Trends and an Analysis of Job Announcements." *Library Trends* 41(2): 187-97.
- Dewey, Barbara. 2004. "The Embedded Librarian." *Resource Sharing & Information Networks* 174(1/2), 5-17.
- Enoch, Jessica, and Pamela VanHaitsma. 2015. "Archival Literacy: Reading the Rhetoric of Digital Archives in the Undergraduate Classroom." *College Composition and Communication* 67(2): 216-242.

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

Feldman, Louise. "Subject Librarians in the Changing Academic Library." *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship* 7.3 (Winter 2006).

Gerolimos, Michalis, Afrodite Malliari, and Pavlos Iakovidis. 2015. "Skills in the Market: An Analysis of Skills and Qualifications for American Librarians." *Library Review* 64(1/2): 21-35.

Gibson, Katie, Marcus Ladd, and Jenny Presnell. 2015. "Traversing the Gap: Subject Specialists Connecting Humanities Researchers and Digital Scholarship Centers." In *Digital Humanities in the Library: Challenges and Opportunities for Subject Specialists*, Edited by Arianne Hartsell-Gundy, Laura Braunstein, Liorah Golomb, John W. White and Heather Gilbert, 3-17. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Goetsch, Lori A. 2008. "Reinventing Our Work: New and Emerging Roles for Academic Librarians." *Journal of Library Administration* 48(2): 157-172.

Hartley, Diane, Alison J. Head, David Nasatir, Susannah Paletz, Jonathan Henke, Ian Miller, Xi Sheng, and Jing Guo. 2005. "Understanding the Use of Digital Collections in Undergraduate Humanities and Social Science Education: Status Report, Preliminary Analyses, and Next Steps. Retrieved from [http://www.cshe.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/shared/research/digitalresourcestudy/documents/faculty\\_discussion\\_group\\_june05.pdf](http://www.cshe.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/shared/research/digitalresourcestudy/documents/faculty_discussion_group_june05.pdf)

Hazen, Dan. 2000. "Twilight of the Gods? Bibliographers in the Electronic Age." *Library Trends* 48(4): 821-841.

Jacobs, Warren N. 2010. "Embedded Librarianship is a Winning Proposition." *Education Libraries* 33(2): 3-10.

Jaguszewski, Janice M., and Karen Williams. 2013. *New Roles for New Times: Transforming Liaison Roles in*

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

*Research Libraries*. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries.

Johnson, Greg. 2006. "Introducing Undergraduate Students to Archives and Special Collections." *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 13(2): 91-100.

Kenney, Anne R. 2015. "From Engaging Liaison Librarians to Engaging Communities." *College & Research Libraries* 76(3): 386-391.

Komissarova, Sloan, and James Murray. 2016. "Factors that Influence Undergraduate Information-seeking Behavior and Opportunities for Student Success." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 42(4): 423-429.

Kong, Leslie M. 1996. "Academic Reference Librarians." *Reference Librarian* 25(54): 21-27.

Kvenild, Cassandra, and Kaijsa Calkins. 2011. *Embedded Librarians: Moving beyond One-Shot Instruction*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Lankes, R. David. 2011. *The Atlas of New Librarianship*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Matteson, Miriam L., Lorien Anderson, and Cynthia Borden. 2016. "'Soft Skills': A Phrase in Search of Meaning." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 16(1): 71-88.

Matthews, Nancy, Jason Yun, and Sarah Pickle. 2012. "Assessing Library Contributions to University Outcomes: The Need for Individual Student Level Data." *Library Management* 33(6/7): 389-402.

Meulemans, Yvonne Nalani, and Allison Carr. 2013. "Not at Your Service: Building Genuine Faculty-Librarian Partnerships." *Reference Services Review* 41(1): 80-90.

Mitchell, Eleanor, Peggy Seiden, and Suzy Taraba. 2012. *Past or Portal? Enhancing Undergraduate Learning through Special Collections and Archives*. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

Moran, Robert F. Jr. 2005. "Core Competencies." *Library Administration and Management* 19(3): 146-148.

Nofsinger, Mary M. 1999. "Training and Retraining Reference Professionals: Core Competencies for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century." *Reference Librarian* 30(64): 9-19.

Robyns, Marcus. 2001. "The Archivist as Educator: Integrating Critical Thinking Skills into Historical Research Methods Instruction." *The American Archivist* 64: 363-384.

Rosenblum, Brian, Frances Devlin, Tami Albin, and Wade Garrison. 2015. "Collaboration and CoTeaching: Librarians Teaching Digital Humanities in the Classroom." In *Digital Humanities in the Library: Challenges and Opportunities for Subject Specialists*, Edited by Arianne Hartsell-Gundy, Laura Braunstein, and Liorah Golomb. Washington, D.C.: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Saunders, Laura. 2015. "Academic Libraries' Strategic Plans: Top Trends and Under-Recognized Areas." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 41(3): 258-291.

Shank, John D., and Steven Bell. 2011. "Blended Librarianship: [Re]Envisioning the Role of Librarian as Educator in the Digital Information Age." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 51(2): 105-110.

Shillingsburg, Peter. 2014. "From Physical to Digital Textuality: Loss and Gain in Literary Projects." *CEA Critic* 76(2): 158-168.

Schaffner, Jennifer, and Rick Erway. 2014. "Does Every Research Library Need a Digital Humanities Center?" Dublin, Ohio: OCLC Research. Retrieved from <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2014/oclcresearch-digital-humanities-center-2014-overview.html>

Swan, Karen, Jia Shen, and Starr Rozanne Hiltz. 2006. "Assessment and Collaboration in Online Learning." *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks* 10(1): 45-62.

## SHIFTING EXPECTATIONS

- Vandegrift, Micah, and Stewart Varner. 2013. "Evolving in Common: Creating Mutually Supportive Relationships between Libraries and the Digital Humanities." *Journal of Library Administration* 53(1): 67-78.
- VanHaitsma, Pamela. 2015. "New Pedagogical Engagements with Archives: Student Inquiry and Composing in Digital Spaces." *College English* 78(1): 34-55.
- Varner, Stewart. 2016. "Library Instruction for Digital Humanities Pedagogy in Undergraduate Classes." In *Laying the Foundation: Digital Humanities in Academic Libraries*, Edited by John W. White and Heather Gilbert, 205-222. West Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Vassilakaki, Evgenia, and Valentini Moniarou-Papaconstantinou. 2015. "A Systematic Literature Review Informing Library and Information Professionals' Emerging Roles." *New Library World* 116(1/2): 37-66.
- Wilson, Louis R. (1939). "Essentials in the Training of University Librarians—I." *College & Research Libraries* 1(1): 13-21.
- Zorich, Diane M. 2008. *A Survey of Digital Humanities Centers in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Library and Information Resources. Retrieved from <https://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/pub143/pub143.pdf>