

# Libraries as Learning Labs in a Digital Age: A Youth Services Conference in an LIS Classroom

**J. Elizabeth Mills**

*University of Washington Information School. Email: jemills1@uw.edu*

**Kathleen Campana**

*University of Washington Information School. Email: kcampana@uw.edu*

**Annette Y. Goldsmith**

*University of Washington Information School. Email: agoldsmith.fsu@gmail.com*

In the face of a changing landscape of youth services, LIS education can push the field of librarianship forward by adopting research-based frameworks that are directly applicable to the profession. We combined the Connected Learning framework with Radical Change theory and Outcome-Based Planning and Evaluation (OBPE) to establish the structure and content for a brand-new culminating course in the children's and youth services track at the University of Washington Information School. We taught the course in Spring 2015 using a conference-like model based on the late Dr. Eliza T. Dresang's teaching plan. Innovative delivery methods engaged both online and residential students, deliberately seeking to change boundaries, change perspectives, and change formats in how programs for digital-age children and youth are planned, delivered, and evaluated. This paper highlights how applying a radical approach to teaching that focuses on hands-on learning connects practice with pedagogy, and provides takeaways that offer a new model for LIS educational approaches.

**Keywords:** connected learning, children's and youth library services, LIS education, radical change theory, outcome-based planning and evaluation, hybrid course delivery

## Introduction

Changes and advances are constantly occurring in the dynamic field of children's and youth librarianship. Recent research (Koh & Abbas, 2015) investigated the competencies and skills needed by information professionals when guiding youth in learning labs and put forth recommendations for LIS educators to develop relevant curriculum for future youth librarians. A new shift in policy by the American Academy of Pediatrics (Brown, Shifrin, & Hill, 2015) looks more favorably on screen time for very young children, which in turn has families and librarians alike rethinking what it means to bring technology into children's programming. Additionally, a white paper adopted and

published by the Association for Library Service to Children (Campbell, Haines, Koester, & Stoltz, 2015) is redefining the role of the youth librarian as a media mentor, focusing on serving families and providing guidance and recommendations when choosing media for young children.

So how do MLIS (Masters in Library and Information Science) students acquire the skills and theoretical frameworks they need to be prepared for this new and ever-changing landscape in children's and youth librarianship? And how do LIS educators develop a relevant, profession-focused curriculum in order to prepare students to meet this need? This paper will highlight three theoretical frameworks and then discuss how a conference approach to course structure was used to meaning-

fully partner these theoretical frameworks with effective practices for librarianship in an LIS course on youth services. It is our hope that this paper will provide a guiding approach that can transform the process of learning how to implement library services for youth.

## Literature Review

One of the most important trends in recent time in children's and youth librarianship has been the recognition of the library as an informal learning environment. The term "informal learning environment" is typically used to describe learning environments outside of school (Anderson, Lucas, & Ginns, 2003) such as libraries, museums, zoos, and aquariums, but can be expanded to include digital spaces, the home environment, and other environments outside of school that support learning. Informal learning environments can be incredibly powerful because some young people will spend a greater portion of their childhood and adolescence in these environments than in formal learning environments. However, informal learning environments are inherently different from formal learning environments in many ways. For example, the majority of learning that occurs in these environments is different from the majority of learning that occurs in formal educational environments in that learners have the power to construct and motivate their own experience (Diamond, Luke, & Uttal, 2009). Because of this, learning in informal learning environments is personalized. In addition, the learning in informal learning environments is nonlinear, open ended, ubiquitous, ongoing, and self-paced. Whereas learning in formal educational environments can tend to be an individual experience, learning in informal learning environments tends to be a social experience with friends and family, giving children and youth the opportunity to learn by observing the behavior of these individuals (Diamond Luke, & Uttal, 2009). The importance of learning

in informal learning environments is that it "prepares people for lifelong learning. It teaches people that learning is a part of everyday life . . . [It] reinforces learning for its own sake, and reminds us that learning can be both fun and exciting" (Diamond, Luke, & Uttal, 2009, p. 13).

Libraries in particular continue to gain recognition as an informal learning environment as they evolve beyond their traditional role of providing materials and information. Libraries want to make an impact with children's and youth learning through all their developmental stages and many are working to do so through their programming and services (Institute of Museum and Library Services, 2013, 2014). As a result, these programs are undergoing a tremendous shift in terms of how they are developed and delivered. Where, at one time, children's programming was performance based and solely considered a form of entertainment, more recently it is often an interactive event filled with multiple types of learning experiences (Campana *et al.*, 2016). As an informal learning environment, libraries have an opportunity to make an impact with children and youth through programming that supports lifelong learning.

## Connected Learning

Much of the discussion about learning in informal environments for youth has centered on learning labs. Learning labs in libraries are spaces where youth can engage with new media, interact with their peers and adult mentors, and produce a variety of projects (IMLS, 2014). Moving beyond the well-known model of learning labs (exemplified by YOUmedia in Chicago), all libraries can become learning labs by offering interactive, participatory, production-centered programming that incorporates the tenets of Connected Learning. The Connected Learning framework features equitable, social, and participatory learning (Ito *et al.*, 2013). By incorporating these tenets into library-based learning

labs and participatory programs, librarians can provide a supportive environment in which youth use their own interests to drive their learning in informal environments. This learning can then be applied to the formal environment of school where connected learning skills are becoming increasingly important.

The Institute of Museum and Library Services (2014) identified the following as the common features of a learning lab:

- access to new media
- interest-driven and production-centered learning
- connections between youth and adult mentors
- partnerships and collaborations.

One of the signature characteristics of a learning lab is the involvement of youth in the planning and design process of the learning experience. This helps ensure buy-in and can lend authenticity to the experience. Librarians can help youth develop self-confidence and trust in adults who listen to them and who also want their opinion. A high degree of input and engagement has transformed individual youth advisors into youth designers who work as part of collaborative teams. Participation in planning and design provides youth with a sense of ownership and responsibility. When adults and youth are partners in a productive learning environment, and youth are put in the forefront of decision-making, the learning is deeper, more contextual and more meaningful for teens. The development of trust and partnerships between youth and community can also lead to institutional transformation—a large-scale rethinking of a library’s vision and new partnership opportunities for the future. By transforming into learning labs and proactively supporting and encouraging learning in their community libraries can advocate, ever more deeply, not only for their more traditional programs and services, but also directly for their communities. Such activity can further affirm their position as an anchor

in the communities in which they are located.

### ***Outcome-Based Planning and Evaluation***

In order to design effective, community-focused programming that is steeped in the framework of Connected Learning, it is important for librarians to consider potential learning outcomes in their planning process. However, it is also important for librarians to understand that outcomes for their programs may look different than those in formal learning environments. Diamond, Luke, and Uttal (2009) proposed a set of learning outcomes for informal learning environments. These outcomes include: awareness or knowledge of a specific topic; engagement or interest in the information or activity; attitudes towards information, activities, and learning; and behavior and skills. Schauble, Leinhardt, and Martin (1997) argue that, because of the longer lifespan of this type of learning, informal learning environments should examine the processes of learning, not just the outcomes, as well as studying learning over time.

Identifying outcomes for children’s and youth programming is important for librarians because being able to measure those outcomes can provide data that can help to demonstrate the impact and value of the program. The Outcome-Based Planning and Evaluation (OBPE) model (Dresang, Gross, & Holt, 2006) offers a simple framework that helps librarians to incorporate learning outcomes when designing, delivering, and evaluating programs that factor in community need and relevance. In addition to providing stand-alone evaluation data, the framework includes an iterative process where the information from the outcome evaluation feeds back into the next instance of design and delivery, allowing for constant alteration of program content based on community needs (Dresang, Gross, & Holt, 2006). Understanding the OBPE process—which identifies

how to incorporate outcomes in program design and evaluation—is becoming a crucial skill for librarians serving children and youth as libraries work to become learning labs through their interactive, participatory, production-centered programs.

### **Radical Change**

In 2013, Dr. Eliza T. Dresang, the Beverly Cleary Professor in Children and Youth Services at the University of Washington Information School, redesigned the youth services curriculum of the MLIS program. Dresang wanted the courses that made up the curriculum to build on one another to best prepare students for their role in this new world of children's and youth librarianship. In order to do this, she felt the courses needed to incorporate theory, research, and literature related to child development and youth services. Dresang envisioned the final course in the youth services track as the place to tie all of these big pieces together. In Dresang's own words, taken from her course teaching plan:

Both public and school libraries have become learning labs where youth, birth to 18, actively participate in programs and create rather than simply locate information. Covering both the *why* and the *how* of programming, *Libraries as Learning Labs in a Digital Age* links programs to the research and resources studied in previous courses, including child development and information behavior, use and evaluation of children's and youth materials, and multicultural literature for youth, all set in a digital age (2013b, p. 1).

As Dresang was not able to teach the course she designed, we wanted to offer the course in a manner that upheld her original vision. Thus, we looked to her theory, Radical Change (Dresang, 1999), as a guide. Dresang developed this theory to explain and understand the ever-changing behavior of digital-age youth who she saw as capable and seeking connection.

Digital-age youth were interacting with media, and the media they used represented a new world. Her theory was based on the digital-age principles of interactivity, connectivity, and access, and revolutionized the use of media—both print and digital—by young people through three classifications:

- Type 1: changing forms and formats;
- Type 2: changing perspectives; and
- Type 3: changing boundaries.

These classifications served as the scaffold for this unique course as we decided to take a radical approach to LIS instruction. Diversity, access, collaboration, and innovation—these themes are at the heart of Radical Change and informed every aspect of the course design and delivery. This course emphasized an additional aspect of Radical Change by inserting research-based theories and findings into practice and pedagogy. Dresang's research into OBPE (Dresang, Gross, & Holt, 2006) and Project VIEWS2 (Valuable Initiatives in Early Learning That Work Successfully; Dresang, 2013a; Campana *et al.*, 2016) are examples of this research-to-practice trajectory that helped to deepen students' understanding of trends in children's and youth librarianship today.

### **Course Design**

The course was designed with the following objectives in mind:

1. Employ the tenets of Radical Change to inform and transform LIS pedagogy through conference-style materials and presentations.
2. Introduce students to the Connected Learning framework and community-focused OBPE in a hands-on way in a course on digital-age youth programming.
3. Facilitate collaborative learning for both local and remote students through a hybrid synchronous classroom experience.

4. Create a community of practice among the students to emphasize the importance of peer feedback in their future professions.

The purpose of these objectives was to facilitate the students' learning through the use of research-based frameworks coupled with practitioner guidance and feedback in a radical conference-in-a-classroom approach.

### **Course Structure**

In Spring 2015, we co-taught the inaugural iteration of *Libraries as Learning Labs in a Digital Age*. Designed to cover all ages of youth from birth to young adult, the course addressed the purpose, design, and evaluation of children's and youth programming, along with related topics such as diversity and inclusion, marginalized populations, early learning, and technology. In order to cover such an extensive amount of material in one quarter, we employed Dresang's Radical Change Theory (1999) to provide a radical conference-in-a-classroom approach for the course, pushing the form and format of LIS instruction. Radical aspects included: individual guest speakers as well as a panel, posters, facilitated workshops, lightning talks, and breakout sessions to encourage interactive hands-on learning and to illustrate how research can translate into and inform practice. We emphasized the Connected Learning framework (Ito *et al.*, 2013) in the content of the course to encourage the students to develop programs that are interest-driven, purposeful, and seek to support lifelong learning and embrace diversity, in line with the needs and requirements of children's and youth services librarian positions currently available (Bransford *et al.*, 2000; Dresang, 2013c). This served as one part of the conference-style approach, complemented by the model of OBPE (Dresang, Gross, & Holt, 2006). This model informed how we designed assignments and presented

material around programming for youth. In addition, it served to gird the program development process used by the students to complete their assignments throughout the course.

The course was offered in a hybrid, synchronous, online-residential format. This choice was made because Dr. Eliza Dresang had taught other courses in this format and found it to be effective and engaging as well as accessible for a wider selection of students (Evans, Dresang, & Campana, 2013). In this format, all students would be able to learn from one another and to benefit from the differing perspectives that each learning mode offers. Furthermore, since we were spread apart geographically, we knew that interested students were similarly dispersed, this kind of instructional mode would enable all these groups to come together. This course also gave online students the opportunity to engage in a different way than they would in other online, asynchronous courses, which make up most of the online MLIS program at the University of Washington. The hybrid mode gave online students a chance to interact and discuss in real time, rather than just on offline discussion boards—which can be quite valuable but offer a very different learning experience entirely. Lastly, this hybrid mode enabled us to bring in guest speakers from across the country to share their expertise in a real-time experience that enabled discussion and Q&A; this would likely have been a very different experience in an online-only, or residential-only learning environment.

The hybrid synchronous mode of the course enabled us to interact with remote students and residential students in the physical classroom. This multimodal experience further facilitated lively discussions between the students and both local and remote guest speakers. Our weekly course lectures, final student presentations, and in-class workshops were also delivered in this hybrid mode. The shared classroom environment fostered engagement and

hands-on work, encouraging students to come prepared to share, discuss, and take ownership of the material for their future careers. With the exception of the opening and closing weeks, each module featured lectures by guest speakers—academics and practitioners alike—who expanded on the readings and theory presented in class by bringing in their own experiences and findings. Knowledgeable about different aspects of working with youth in libraries and other informal learning environments, these experts brought diverse experiences to their lectures, exposing the students to a multitude of approaches and considerations with respect to issues related to children's and youth programming.

### ***Course Content***

The syllabus covered many of the major aspects of modern children's and youth librarianship. Beginning with the purpose of youth programming, students learned, among other things, about outcome-based program design, the importance of literacy storytimes for early learners (McKenzie & Stooke, 2012) and the basics of teen programming (looking at tech- and non-tech programs alike). Throughout, the course provided a continual focus on programming and materials for marginalized and underrepresented populations, including LGBTQ+ (Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning, +) youth, youth experiencing homelessness, and other diverse groups in a variety of informal learning settings. We wanted to impress upon students the importance of community both in terms of those they serve through their programming but also their own community of practice. Thus, students' ideas, outcomes, and program design were all based around and derived from the needs and desires of a particular community. This approach encouraged students to select a community (real or imagined), reflect on that community's needs, design a program that would meet those needs, and develop outcomes and metrics to measure those

outcomes that would help the students advocate for and articulate the successes of their programs. As libraries continue to face limited funding, knowledge of the outcome-based planning and evaluation framework will be crucial for the students in their future roles with regards to measurement and advocacy. Furthermore, in their future roles, library students may be serving both young children and teenagers while being asked to provide a wide variety of programming for both age groups. Consequently, students looked at different communities in turn, and addressed issues that cut across communities.

The readings for the course were selected to inform fundamental aspects of children's and youth programming as well as current trends in related fields, with an intentional focus on diversity. These included an application of research studies and theoretical frameworks introduced in an earlier course, practical guidance, research agendas from industry, and research-based tools. The varied materials, including web articles, blog posts, and videos, in addition to more traditional scholarly articles, enabled students to build their own information toolkit for future professional use. The assignments consisted of hands-on, collaborative projects designed to give students the opportunity to explore programming ideas for both younger and older children and youth, to compose mini-program proposals, and to design one large youth program proposal that was refined and workshopped right up through the last class. The Connected Learning tenets of interest-driven and learner-centered projects were at the heart of the assignment design as well as outcome-based planning and evaluation. Collaborative learning and constructive feedback proved helpful and affirming for the students in the course. In conjunction with an ongoing research study on assessment in libraries (Mills *et al.*, 2015), the preliminary findings were applied to the course through having the students explore what it means to have a peer-mentoring process, and by having

them “mentor” each other on their program proposals.

A particularly important aspect of the course was the introduction of research findings into practice, as this is a strong part of the Radical Change framework. We introduced the background and findings of Project VIEWS2 (Valuable Initiatives in Early Learning that Work Successfully)—Dresang’s last major research study—during the early learning module. Project VIEWS2 was a four-year Institute of Museum and Library Services-funded study that demonstrated both a correlation between early literacy storytimes and observable early literacy behaviors in the children who attend those storytimes, and the statistically significant effect that an intentional focus on early literacy can have on the children who attend storytime (Campana *et al.*, 2016). A librarian participant from the study introduced the research-based planning tool to students through a hands-on demonstration. She led the students in lively storytime activities including fingerplays, rhymes, and stories, all the while explaining how to use early literacy behaviors in the planning and delivery of storytime. This direct connection between research-based findings and tools and their implementation in and impact on practice is emblematic of Dresang’s core vision for the course.

## Discussion

This course set out to address several objectives outlined below. These objectives were achieved through the following: the variety of outcome-based youth program designs that were submitted by students for their final assignment; results from a mid-quarter check-in survey; quotes from the course evaluations; and final reflection papers that demonstrated deep engagement and understanding of the material. This section will present results for each objective and discuss implications of these results for the field of librarianship and for LIS pedagogy.

### *Employ the Tenets of Radical Change to Inform and Transform LIS Pedagogy*

We used the three types of Radical Change as identified by Dresang’s theory—changing forms and formats, changing perspectives, and changing boundaries—to inform the design and delivery of *Libraries as Learning Labs in a Digital Age*. The first type of Radical Change—changing forms and formats—was introduced into the course design through the conference-in-a-classroom model. This model helped to change formats by using many unconventional forms of information delivery for LIS education, such as videos, weekly guest speakers, posters, panels, breakout sessions and workshops. We worked to change the perspectives of the students by incorporating information on a variety of diverse groups that they might serve in the future including LGBTQ+ youth and youth experiencing homelessness. In addition, the variety of practitioners and researchers who spoke in the class helped to expose the students to alternative points of view. Including research, practice, and the relationship between the two helped to minimize any inherent boundaries for the students, hopefully encouraging them to continue incorporating research into their practice. Finally, constantly working on changing boundaries between the face-to-face and online students through hybrid breakout sessions, discussions, and workshops helped create a more seamless classroom environment and a deeper learning experience for all.

### *Introduce Students to the Connected Learning Framework and Community-focused OBPE in a Hands-on Way in a Course on Digital-age Youth Programming*

We embedded the Connected Learning and Outcome-Based Planning and Evaluation frameworks into each aspect of the course. Timely and relevant readings highlighted both the theoretical frame-

works and the practical applications of the theories. Assignments focused on creating interest-driven, collaborative, and purposeful programs with an emphasis on considering outcomes during the program development. Students' program ideas included a book-based film festival, pop-up makerspaces, LEGO balloon car races, an art-and-summer-reading program, college and workplace prep for teens, a video-game tournament, and coding workshops for elementary school children, among others. Each program proposal presented the tenets of Connected Learning and OBPE as part of the appeal and assessment of the program. One student commented, "*When applied, the Connected Learning framework can help transform seemingly simple and fun library activities into amazing learning occasions that youth will carry with them.*" An additional activity involved an in-class discussion of various real program proposals submitted to the YALSA President's Program Shark Bowl at the 2015 ALA Annual Conference. Students reviewed the programs for their interest-driven, collaborative, purposeful nature and use of assessment methods, and then rated the programs accordingly. This activity enabled the students to review real-life program proposals, to further develop their ability to seek out and identify programs that will appeal to teens, and to prepare for creating their own future conference submissions.

One of the biggest successes of the course was having the students make connections between elements of children's and youth programming that had been introduced in other courses. Because core elements of children's and youth programming were explored in depth each week, students were provided with opportunities to ask questions and push each other to think about things in a new way, enabling them to make those connections. According to one student: "*This class led me to look at programming in libraries differently. It introduced me to new concepts*

*such as connected learning and outcomes based evaluation.*"

Several students shared the impact the course had on their impressions of the practice of youth librarianship as well as their future career: "*This class helped me see clearly the process of planning a program and the detail required to execute it effectively.*" And "*One of the important takeaways for me was refining my skills in outcomes-based programming. Libraries seem to be moving away from output-based assessments toward outcomes, so the fact that this class trained us in developing and measuring meaningful outcomes places us on the forefront of library services for youth.*" Another student pointed out: "*As an aspiring children's librarian, this class is single-handedly the most important class I took in graduate school. The discussions were topical, on point, and deep; and the assignments were so practical I feel like I can implement them directly in a future job position.*"

Students learned about the programming process from beginning to end and the importance of planning outcomes from the beginning: "*Evaluation should be embedded in the planning process of the program, rather than being an afterthought,*" offered one student. And another commented:

*"Being familiar with the [OBPE] strategy and knowing what to do to assess programs is a piece of invaluable knowledge that I will come into the profession with. . . . Looking at the [Connected Learning] framework has gotten me to think about how children's programs, teen programs, and even family events can tie the different qualities together."*

We emphasized a continual focus on the importance of identifying and considering community needs throughout the programming design and assessment process. One student said, "*I think the main thing I will take away from the class is the importance of going out into the community and learning about every culture*

*that is involved in it. Once you've discovered every culture don't just expect they'll come to you but go out, learn about them, and make connections."* Thus, we believe this course has succeeded in familiarizing students with both the Connected Learning framework and community-focused OBPE and prepared them for intentional program design in their future work.

*Facilitate Collaborative Learning for both Local and Remote Students through a Hybrid Synchronous Classroom Experience*

The course focused on providing several opportunities for collaborative learning through workshops between the students and speakers. These workshops used hybrid online and residential groups, both within and across modes, to provide the students with the opportunity to interact and collaborate with each other and the speakers. Demonstrations and question-and-answer sessions allowed the students to interact with and learn from the variety of guest speakers, who made a point of engaging with the students as part of their lectures. According to one student: *"The guest speakers covered a variety of topics and shared diverse experiences and knowledge."*

Additionally, we were able to support collaboration for all participants across modes by having an instructor presence in the classroom as well as online. Online discussion boards also allowed the students to continue their interactions and collaborations outside of the classroom. We conducted a mid-quarter evaluation with the students via a short survey, to find out how things were going and whether the students had any feedback that might necessitate a mid-course correction. The response rate was 50%. The students who responded indicated that they generally felt the hybrid mode was working for them and that they were engaged in the course and liked the material and speakers. However, responses overwhelmingly indicated

a desire for more time for interactive activities and discussion in class. The survey resulted in significant changes in class structure to enable more time for discussion and the inclusion of question prompts to scaffold that discussion. Furthermore, we took time at the end of each class for students to reflect on takeaways from the day's material, again providing questions to spark discussion. We believe that these collaborative learning techniques were successful because student discussion and participation increased over the course of the quarter as the students shared their ideas, their work, and their feedback in each class meeting.

A significant challenge of facilitating collaborative learning in a hybrid environment was, perhaps not surprisingly, the technology. This kind of course relies heavily on connectivity, visibility, and sound quality—all of which presented varying types of challenges throughout the course. With help from the iSchool's tech department, these tech-related challenges were addressed. The presence of a tech assistant at every class helped to deal with any unexpected issues that arose. In addition, the students were patient, flexible, and eager to embrace all that the course had to offer, thereby creating a safe space for innovation and exploration.

*Create a Community of Practice among the Students to Introduce them to the Importance of Peer Feedback in their Future Professions*

One of our goals with this course was to build a small community of practice among the students, all of whom were in their final year. This classroom community of practice could then serve to demonstrate the importance of establishing such a community once they graduated into the professional world, both for the purposes of idea-sharing and professional development, but also for peer mentoring and advancing the field. In order to facilitate the development of this commu-

nity of practice, we purposefully included multiple opportunities for the online and face-to-face students to workshop their class projects together in hybrid groups. The students were asked to prepare for the workshops by reading their group members' class projects. During the workshops they were provided with unstructured time to provide feedback on each other's projects, enabling the students to gather the most meaningful feedback. One student shared, *"I think what really stuck with me from this course was the importance of maintaining professional connections after I graduate. . . . I was really struck by how useful it is to have other librarians to have as a sounding board for your ideas."* We believe that this emphasis on shared learning and giving and receiving peer feedback demonstrated the value of a community of practice in students' future work. Another student said, *"I am not alone. There is a great support network out there from all the other librarians and organizations trying to offer great programs to their patrons."* It is our hope that the students will use peer communities like these to facilitate a lifetime of learning for themselves and the communities they serve. As one student pointed out,

*"In serving young populations and their families or caregivers, we need to create informal learning spaces that also allow for peer-to-peer engagement and discovery. This can be done through programming, but the class taught me to think beyond programming, to consider innovative methods of applying the connected learning framework in outreach, booktalks, or even reader's advisory."*

## Future Planning

Preparing for the next iteration of a course is always a careful balancing act of including new information and revisiting and reviewing what has come before. Certainly, the curriculum can be improved for the next iteration of the course, and

we will take into consideration the needs articulated by the students in their course evaluations with respect to the number of guest speakers, amount of readings, and time allotted for discussion. While we endeavored to assess students' comfort-level with the course and their degree of engagement through the mid-quarter survey, we did not overtly create a measure that would have told us at the end whether the online and residential students did in fact have a similar learning experience in this hybrid, multimodal conference-in-a-classroom format. Future iterations of this course can incorporate such a measure in order to better meet students' needs. Additionally, while we designed the course around the three frameworks of Radical Change, Connected Learning, and Outcome-Based Planning and Evaluation, we did not tease apart these three frameworks in terms of impact and effectiveness in the curriculum, nor did we evaluate the course beyond the specific objectives outlined above and the questions included in the standard student evaluations, from which we drew our quotes. We plan to find methods that will help us understand how each framework informs and impacts the curriculum of the course and the outcomes for the students.

## Recommendations

Looking forward, we offer several recommendations for LIS educators to incorporate research-based frameworks into curriculum.

1. Incorporate the themes of Connected Learning and community-focused Outcome-Based Planning and Evaluation into course design and delivery. They can inform the ways in which instructors share information by focusing on being interest-driven, participatory, and production centered in their learning activities.
2. Incorporate the tenets of Dresang's Radical Change theory into a con-

ference-in-a-classroom approach to teaching in order to move LIS instruction in a radical direction. By focusing on changing forms and formats, changing perspectives, and changing boundaries in all aspects of course delivery and design, these frameworks can bring student learning to life in an interactive way, grounded in real-world scenarios.

3. Design a classroom environment that enables students, both residential and online, to feel immersed and invested in the learning process—a learner-centered environment. For instance, we intend to experiment with Kubi robots—iPad-based programs that enable users to control their view and interaction with the class—to further facilitate class interactions with both remote instructors and remote students, wherever possible. We know from the Connected Learning framework that when the student is at the center of the academic process, the learning is that much more meaningful and relevant.
4. Have regular check-ins with students during the course, to assess engagement, motivation, and academic success. Making mid-course adjustments and revisions that are grounded in these assessments further enables the learning to be agile and responsive to students' needs.

We want to emphasize that each classroom is unique and therefore presents unique challenges and opportunities with respect to students and instructors alike, all of which should be taken into account when considering the possibility of implementing a new approach to pedagogy.

## Conclusion

Librarians are constantly seeking ways to provide informal learning opportunities for youth, amidst changing technologies and new innovations. Through learning labs that embody interest-driven, learner-

centered, equitable programs, librarians can meet youth where they are, connect their academic and home lives, give youth opportunities for collaboration around a shared purpose, and enable them to innovate and connect with the world around them. Our radical conference-in-a-classroom approach has opened up new possibilities for teaching in the LIS field by bridging research and practice through the incorporation of research-based frameworks into course design and delivery. Perhaps classrooms, too, are learning labs where students and instructors can experience Radical Change and go forth to serve youth in a brand-new way.

## References

- Anderson, D., Lucas, K. B., & Ginns, I. S. (2003). Theoretical perspectives on learning in an informal setting. *TEA Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(2), 177–199. doi: 10.1002/tea.10071
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.). (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience and school (Expanded Edition)*. Washington, DC, USA: National Academies Press.
- Brown, A., Shifrin, D. L., & Hill, D. L. (2015). Beyond “turn it off”: How to advise families on media use. *AAP News*, 36(10), 54–54. Retrieved from <http://www.aappublications.org/content/36/10/54>
- Campana, K., Mills, J. E., Capps, J., Dresang, E. T., Carlyle, A., Metoyer, C., ... Kotrla, B. (2016). Early literacy in library storytimes: A study of measures of effectiveness. *Library Quarterly*, 84(4), 369–388. doi: 10.1086/688028
- Campbell, C., Haines, C., Koester, A., & Stoltz, D. (2015). *Media mentorship in libraries serving youth* (White Paper). Chicago, IL: Association for Library Services to Children. Retrieved from [http://www.ala.org/alsc/sites/ala.org.alsc/files/content/2015%20ALSC%20White%20Paper\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.ala.org/alsc/sites/ala.org.alsc/files/content/2015%20ALSC%20White%20Paper_FINAL.pdf)
- Diamond, J., Luke, J. J., & Uttal, D. H. (2009). *Practical evaluation guide: Tools for museums and other informal educational settings*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Dresang, E. T. (1999). *Radical change: Books for youth in a digital age*. New York, NY: Wilson.
- Dresang, E. T. (2013a). *2800 kids observed, 24,000 miles traveled, 240 storytimes visited, 35 student*

- researchers trained, a risky research design: So what? iSchool research conversation. Lecture conducted at the University of Washington Information School, Seattle.
- Dresang, E. T. (2013b). LIS 567: Libraries as learning labs in a digital age—teaching plan document, University of Washington Information School.
- Dresang, E. T. (2013c). Opening doors to understanding: Developing cultural competence through youth literature. In J. C. Naidoo & S. P. Dahlen (Eds.), *Diversity in youth literature: Opening doors through reading* (pp. 17–29). Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Dresang, E. T., Gross, M., & Holt, L. E. (2006). *Dynamic youth services through outcome-based planning and evaluation*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Evans, A., Dresang, E., & Campana, K. (2013). Research in action: Taking classroom learning to the field. *Journal of Education of Library and Information Science*, 54(3), 244–252.
- Institute of Museum and Library Services. (2013). *Growing young minds: How museums and libraries create lifelong learners*. Prepared by IMLS Office of Strategic Partnerships. Washington D.C. Retrieved from <https://www.imls.gov/assets/1/AssetManager/GrowingYoungMinds.pdf>
- Institute of Museum and Library Services. (2014). *Learning labs in libraries and museums: Transformative spaces for teens*. Prepared by Association of Science-Technology Center and Urban Libraries Council. Washington D.C. Retrieved from <https://www.imls.gov/publications/learning-labs-libraries-and-museumstransformative-spaces-teens>
- Ito, M., Gutiérrez, K., Livingstone, S., Penuel, B., Rhodes, J., Salen, K., ... Watkins, S. C. (2013). *Connected learning: An agenda for research and design*. Irvine, CA: Digital Media and Learning Research Hub (executive summary). Retrieved from <http://dmlhub.net/publications/connected-learning-agenda-for-research-and-design/>
- Koh, K., & Abbas, J. (2015). Competencies for information professionals in learning labs and makerspaces. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 56(2), 114–129. doi: 10.12783/issn.2328-2967/56/2/3
- McKenzie, P. J., & Stooke, R. (2012). Making a difference: The importance of purposes to early learning programs. *Children & Libraries*, 10(2), 47–52. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5860/cal.10n2>
- Mills, J. E., Campana, K., Fullerton, S., Brouwer, M., Carlyle, A., Metoyer, C., Dresang, E. T. (2015). *Impact, advocacy, and professional development: An exploration of storytime assessment in Washington state. White Paper*. Seattle, WA: The Information School, University of Washington. Retrieved from <http://views2.ischool.uw.edu>
- Schauble, L., Leinhardt, G., & Martin, L. (1997). A framework for organizing a cumulative research agenda in informal learning contexts. *Journal of Museum Education*, 22(2/3), 3–7. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10598650.1997.11510350>