

Aiala Levy  
Assistant Professor, Department of History  
January 11, 2022

## **Information Literacy Stipend – Report**

Course: HIST 190 Digital History (Fall 2021)  
Collaborating Librarian: Donna Witek

My aim in revising HIST 190 Digital History with the support of an Information Literacy Stipend was to create more intentional and better scaffolded opportunities for students to develop information literacy (IL) abilities, as well as to more explicitly communicate to students the IL abilities that they were developing. As planned in my proposal, I focused on improving three *Framework* information literacy outcomes:

1. “design[ing] and refin[ing] needs and search strategies as necessary, based on search results” ([Searching as Strategic Exploration](#), ACRL);
2. “persist[ing] in the face of search challenges, and know[ing] when they have enough information to complete the information task” ([Searching as Strategic Exploration](#), ACRL); and
3. “assess[ing] the fit between an information product’s creation process and a particular information need” in creating their own information product ([Information Creation as a Process](#), ACRL).

### *Changes Implemented*

To improve student learning of the first two outcomes as well as our assessment of students’ learning, Prof. Witek and I spent part of Summer 2021 revising four assignments: Tasks 1-3 and what had been called the Primary Source Paper, which I renamed and reframed as a Mock Project Proposal (MPP). Specifically, we made the following changes to existing assignments:

- We trimmed Task 1, in which students use the internet to define digital history, to focus on the search process and explicitly introduced the concept of a workflow for searching.
- For Task 2, which requires students to compare searching through two digital archives, we clearly defined IL terms and added IL language that better framed the assignment as an exercise in designing and adapting search strategies. We also added an initial step that required students to state their topic of inquiry so that its connection to search terms would be more explicit.
- We revised Task 3, which guides students through crafting a research question and finding secondary sources, by (a) normalizing search challenges in the assignment description, (b) adding an initial step that clarified the link between the primary source students found in Task 2 and their search process for secondary sources, (c) adding language that encouraged students’ persistence in the face of search challenges during Step 4 of the assignment, and (d) including links to the Library catalog and journal databases so that students resist the temptation to search for secondary sources using Google.
- In reconceptualizing the Primary Source Paper as a Mock Project Proposal, we (a) clarified that the paper’s primary aim was to explain methodology, a term that we

explicitly defined and connected to the search workflows of Tasks 2 and 3; (b) added IL language (data and metadata) to the guidelines for describing sources; (c) asked students to reflect on their strategies for searching secondary, in addition to primary, sources; and (d) framed source choice within the context of the search process, i.e. asked students to explain why they considered their chosen sources to be successful outcomes of a search process. Additionally, we created a rubric of IL abilities, based on the VALUE rubrics designed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities and my own rubrics from other courses, so that students could better understand what these learning outcomes entailed, as well as how they would be evaluated.

- Finally, to stress the significance of altering search strategies and persisting in the face of challenges, we designed a worksheet that led students through the process of critiquing a peer's search process and workflow for Tasks 2 and 3. The worksheet also asked the workflow author to state what changes they would make to their search process based on the feedback they received. The revised MPP required students to explain how they incorporated peer feedback and whether it was useful.

To enhance students' mastery of search strategies, as well as complement the course's new research theme (the University's Black history), I also made changes to Unit I's assigned reading, as planned in the proposal. Students read and discussed the first chapter of Safiya Noble's *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism* (New York: New York University Press, 2018).

We tackled the third *Framework* learning outcome ("assess[ing] the fit between an information product's creation process and a particular information need") by revising Task 6 (formerly Task 7) and the Final Project. Specifically, we created a table for both assignments that guided students through the process of evaluating websites—for Task 6, other universities' websites, for the Final Project, students' own site—as information products. To better communicate IL concepts, I reframed the Final Project's content assessment in terms of information selection.

In addition to the above assignment revisions, we updated the [Abilities Entrance Survey](https://forms.gle/MTEYUf3axbcj5zmx5) <https://forms.gle/MTEYUf3axbcj5zmx5> students take at the start of the semester to include questions related to the three *Framework* outcomes. We administered a nearly identical survey at semester's end, the [Abilities Exit Survey](https://forms.gle/QKnw3jRqDa1fSGUd7) <https://forms.gle/QKnw3jRqDa1fSGUd7>, to gauge the extent to which students' self-perception of their mastery of IL abilities changed over the course of the semester.

### *Outcomes*

Using the assignments and surveys above, I was able to assess student learning of the three *Framework* outcomes. Eleven students (92%) completed the initial Abilities Entrance Survey, while eight students (75%) completed the Abilities Exit Survey.

1. Designing and refining search strategies
  - a. *Successes*. The majority of students did demonstrate increasingly sophisticated search strategies as they progressed through Tasks 1-3 and the MPP. Most

understood the usefulness of facets and successfully utilized them. All understood the need to alter search terms and, when relevant for the search engine, use the wildcard symbol (\*). In their Final Project reflection, almost all students demonstrated an understanding that search engines were man-made infrastructures that demanded careful search design and adaptation. One student described their learning as follows:

All together, this research project taught me a lot more than just the research question we were aiming to answer. The whole process of the project taught me how to research with more intent, find better articles with more ease, and more assets to provide information.

Among the 7 students who completed both entrance and exit surveys, all indicated at semester's end that they "comfortably" used library databases, whereas only 1 had responded affirmatively at semester's start (3/11 of all entrance survey respondents claimed to comfortably use library databases). The median experience level with "searching the internet" rose from 4.14 to 4.86 (1 = "little experience," 5 = "significant experience") between entrance and exit surveys. Likewise, the median comfort level with "designing and refining search strategies" increased from 3.43 to 4.14 (1 = "Not Comfortable at All," 5 = "Extremely Comfortable and Confident"). Finally, student course evaluations demonstrate that an overwhelming majority of students (10 of 11 respondents) agreed or strongly agreed that the course improved their "ability to use digital tools to search for historical sources."

- b. *Shortcomings.* Approximately half continued to struggle through the Final Project with differentiating between search terms appropriate for primary versus secondary sources. A handful consistently misused the wildcard and a similar number neglected to utilize library databases for finding secondary sources, relying instead on Google. In general, peer feedback on Task 2 and 3 workflows was weak; students paid more attention to the clarity of the writing than to the search process itself, with few offering concrete suggestions for refining search strategies.
2. Persisting in the face of search challenges and knowing when there is enough information
    - a. *Successes.* Compared to previous semesters when I taught HIST 190, students far less frequently expressed frustration with their search experience in assignment reflections. In the Final Project reflection, eight of eleven students were enthusiastic about the benefits of search engines for historical research. The three less zealous students thoughtfully explained the challenges that search engines presented. Most noted that librarians were essential in helping them overcome search challenges. Their exit surveys corroborated this point: 4/7 students, as opposed to 1/7 in the entrance survey, included librarians in responding to the question "Where do you get help with technology when you need it?" The exit survey also indicated that students were, at semester's end, more comfortable with "persisting in the face of search challenges": the median response increased from

3.14 to 4 (1 = “Not Comfortable at All,” 5 = “Extremely Comfortable and Confident”). The quality of the primary sources that constituted the Final Projects demonstrate students’ persistence.

- b. *Shortcomings*. More difficult for students was the second half of this learning outcome: knowing when to stop searching. One Final Project group cast too wide of a net while another could have extended their reach. However, knowing when and how to limit one’s search is a challenge for even veteran researchers.
3. Assessing the fit between an information product’s creation process and information need
    - a. *Successes*. Most students demonstrated progress between Task 6 and the Final Project in their ability to critically evaluate historical websites as information products responding to particular needs. The organization and content of students’ Final Project websites illustrated an understanding of their audience and its needs.

Survey responses suggest that students considered themselves to have developed their ability to create a digital information product and to design it according to information need. Among the 7 students who responded to both entrance and exit surveys, the median experience level with “creating/editing webpages” grew from 1.86 to 3.29 (1 = “little experience,” 5 = “significant experience”) between semester’s start and end. Respondents’ median comfort level with “matching information creation processes to an information need” increased from 3.43 to 4 (1 = “Not Comfortable at All,” 5 = “Extremely Comfortable and Confident”). Correspondingly, in their course evaluations, a majority of students (8 of 11 respondents) agreed or strongly agreed that the course improved their “ability to use digital tools to narrate the past.”

- b. *Shortcomings*. The fact that Final Project reflections primarily addressed search processes suggests that students did not recognize the impact of digital technology on the creation of their information product and/or its audience’s information needs (on the plus side, students clearly indicated that mastering search design mattered). This may in part be due to the fact that our use of Omeka limited students’ influence on the information creation process.

### *Next Steps*

Students’ written work, feedback, and in-class performance this semester suggest that our assignment revisions enhanced student learning of the three *Framework* outcomes. I therefore plan on maintaining these revisions for future iterations of the course. Given that Noble’s chapter was the reading most often cited by students in in-class discussions and reflections, I will continue to assign the text to help students think critically about search design.

There are a few changes that I would like to make to further improve student learning of the two outcomes related to searching. First, I need to provide more time between Task 3 and the MPP so that, in preparation for the MPP, students are able to receive my comments and learn from their

Task 3 search experience and the workshop. Second, given the weak peer feedback, I would like to restructure at least the first Workflow Workshop. One possibility would be to split the class into two large groups, one headed by the collaborating librarian and the other by me, so that students are initially guided through the process of critiquing a search process. Relatedly, it would be helpful to offer criteria for search strategy evaluation in the worksheet's fourth question, as well as reword the final question so that students are required to improve their search strategy. Finally, in addition to reviewing in class, it would enhance students' search process if the Final Project Proposal required them to spell out in greater detail their strategy for finding both secondary and primary sources.

## **Task 1: Defining Digital History**

---

**Due:** in the Task 1 Google Drive folder by the start of class on Wednesday, September 8

**Objective:** individually apply and reflect on concepts addressed in class

**Assessment:** 3% of course grade, based on fulfillment of assignment below

**Assignment:** Today in class we began to define “history” through group research and discussion. Now it’s time to understand what we mean by “digital history.” Your first task, then, is to search the internet for explanations of digital history and come up with a definition of your own. Along the way, you’ll begin to get a sense of existing resources for understanding and learning how to do digital history. This online digital history community will often be our guide this semester.

### *Part I: Workflow*

Get in the habit of keeping track of *how* you research by creating a workflow for your online search for definitions of digital history.

- workflow: a list of (1) actions you take, (2) the decisions that led to those actions, and (3) the outcomes of those actions. (In computer science, “workflow” refers to the sequence of instructions that a machine follows.)

Writing workflows is an ability that can be developed with practice. This assignment is the first of many that will ask you to document your search process in the form of a workflow.

Keep your workflow brief but clear. Make sure that someone else could follow your workflow if they needed to replicate your search process. (A classmate will eventually try to follow your search process; we’ll be pairing up to discuss each other’s workflows on the days that Tasks 2 and 3 are due.)

Your workflow might look something like this:

1. Searched Google for “digital history.” Top results were Wikipedia, historians.org, uh.edu, gmue.edu.
2. Chose to begin with historians.org since that’s the main professional association of historians in the US. Read their page on “What is Digital History?” by Seefeldt and Thomas (May 2009).
3. For comparison, next examined gmue.edu’s “Digital History: A Guide to Gathering, Preserving, and Presenting the Past on the Web” by Daniel Cohen and Roy Rosenzweig. Extensive site (digital version of a book) so I just read the opening page.
4. Synthesized the two explanations above to create a single definition of “digital history.”

### *Part II: Outcomes*

Your workflow in Part I should have revealed how you arrived at two types of outcomes:

- (a) sources (in this case, websites) for understanding digital history, and
- (b) a definition of digital history.

Write those outcomes here. For (a), don’t worry about citation formatting quite yet, but do make sure to include a site’s name, URL, and author if one (or more) is specified.

## **Task 2: Digital Collections**

---

**Due:** in Task 2 Google Drive folder by the start of class on Monday, September 20

**Objective:** individually apply and reflect on concepts addressed in class

**Assessment:** 3% of course grade, based on fulfillment of assignment below

**Assignment:** What are the offerings and limitations of digital archives? One way to answer this question is by exploring a digital archive.

- archive: an institution that collects, organizes, and preserves material from the past

For this Task, you will search two different archives. Along the way, you will record your search process in the form of a workflow. In class, we will workshop in pairs each other's workflows in order to improve our ability to document and design a search process.

### *Step 1: State Your Topic*

In no more than one sentence, indicate the topic for which you would like to find a relevant primary source. This topic should be related to the theme of this semester's final project, the Black history of The University of Scranton.

### *Step 2: Search a Single Archive*

1. Explore the website of [The University of Scranton Digital Collections](https://digitalservices.scranton.edu/) <https://digitalservices.scranton.edu/> until you understand the scope and mission of the archive. In your own words, what is the purpose of this archive?
2. Search the archive for a primary source relevant to your topic. Create a workflow of your search process that demonstrates your search strategy. Don't forget to list your search terms and write clearly enough so that a classmate can replicate your search process!
  - primary source (a friendly reminder): a source of information that was created during the studied time period
3. In 2-3 sentences, describe one primary source that you found. Include a link to the source's page.

### *Step 3: Search an Archive Aggregator*

1. Head to the [Digital Public Library of America](https://dp.la/) <https://dp.la/> (DPLA). The DPLA is an archive aggregator, that is, a search engine that allows you to search multiple archives at once. This is helpful if you are interested in finding primary sources outside of the University's collections but don't know where to start. (Another good resource for finding primary sources is your friendly librarian!)

2. Search the DPLA for a primary source relevant to your topic. Follow an interesting primary source to its original archive by clicking on the “View Full Item” box. If you end up in The University of Scranton’s collections, go back to the search results or revise your search. The goal is to reach the website of an archive other than the University. Once you are in a new archive’s website, continue to search within that specific archive. Write a workflow of your entire search process, beginning with DPLA and ending in the specific archive.
3. In 2-3 sentences, describe one primary source that you found. Include a link to the source’s page within the original archive to which it belongs (this should NOT be a <https://dp.la> link).
4. Explore the website of the archive you found (not DPLA) until you understand the scope and mission of that archive. In your own words, what is the archive’s purpose?

*Step 4: Reflect*

Reflect in 5-8 sentences on your search experience by answering the following questions:

1. How does searching an archive compare to searching an archive aggregator (DPLA)?
2. In what ways are the two archives you searched (The University of Scranton Digital Collections and whatever archive you found through DPLA) similar and different, and why? Think about the mission of and resources available to each archive. You may want to address the following:
  - How do the archives’ collections differ? Why are their offerings different?
  - Was one archive easier to search than the other? In what ways? Why might that be the case? For example, is there a difference in how their search engines operate?
  - What are the limitations of each archive? Why do you think these limitations exist?
  - What does each archive do well? Why do you think the archive succeeds in this way?

### **Task 3: Research Troubleshooting**

---

**Due:** in Task 3 Google Drive folder by the start of class on Wednesday, September 22

**Objective:** individually apply and reflect on concepts addressed in class

**Assessment:** 3% of course grade, based on fulfillment of assignment below

**Assignment:** How did your research for Task 2 go? Did you have a hard time finding relevant primary sources? Or were you overwhelmed by the results? Do not fear; sleuthing is rarely straightforward. So, to use digital lingo, let's troubleshoot.

This Task's series of steps will help you overcome obstacles in your search process. Along the way, you'll also produce a feasible, historical research question for your Mock Project Proposal.

*Step 0: Respond to your partner's workflow worksheet for Task 2*

How will you change your search process based on feedback received during the Workflow Workshop?

*Step 1: Select a primary source*

Review the primary sources you found for Task 2 or since then. Choose one that you are particularly excited about and list its significant metadata (title, creator, date, archive, source type, etc.).

*Step 2: Revise your topic*

Use your primary source from Step 1 to refine the topic you chose for Task 2. Perhaps you now have a better sense of what time period or group of people interests you. Or perhaps you now would like to hone in on a particular event. Whatever it may be, your topic should reflect the primary source you chose in Step 1 and be related to—but different from—"the Black history of The University of Scranton."

State your revised topic and explain why the topic matters to you.

*Step 3: Craft a research question*

Historical research begins with a historical question. As part of your Mock Project Proposal (the final assignment for Unit I), you will need to propose a question that your chosen primary source can help answer. The question has to encompass in some way the Black history of The University of Scranton.

To figure out what question to propose, you'll need to think about the story that you want to tell. A single topic can have multiple stories. For example, take the topic of "Black activism at the University of Scranton." You might search the archives for sources that explain:

- a. Black students' participation in protesting the War on Terror,
- b. The University of Scranton's response to the civil rights movement, or

- c. efforts by faculty since the 1980s to include the study of Black social movements.

You may have noticed that all these examples have the following elements:

1. a subject of study (“Black students,” “University,” “faculty”)
2. a time period (“War on Terror,” “civil rights movement,” “since the 1980s”)
3. a process or situation (“protesting,” “response,” “include the study”)

By including these three components, your question might become something along the lines of: “How did The University of Scranton’s administration respond to the civil rights movement during the 1950s and 1960s?”

State your research question here.

*Step 4: Write a workflow for finding TWO secondary sources*

Now that you have a research question, it’s time to figure out how to answer it. More precisely, we need to see if our research question is even answerable. This is where secondary sources are especially helpful—and why the Mock Project Proposal requires you to explain the relevance of at least two secondary sources.

So let’s start looking for secondary sources! Head to the [library catalog](#) or directly to the [library’s list of historical databases](#) (Prof. Witek focused on JSTOR, Project MUSE, and America: History & Life). Apply the methods that you learned in class with Prof. Witek to find TWO secondary sources that may help you answer your research question. For the purpose of this assignment, each source should be a different type of secondary source. Please choose two from the following: an academic journal article, a book chapter in an edited volume, or a book.

As you search, write a workflow to track your search process. List your search terms (in quotation marks!) and results, including those that are unhelpful. As usual, make sure that your workflow is clear enough for a peer reviewer to follow it.

If you’re unable to find two relevant secondary sources after a few searches, consider what changes you need to make. Explain and track these changes in your workflow. Do you need to alter your search so that it better answers your research question? Or do you need to change your research question? Don’t forget that to fully answer your research question you will need to understand what was happening beyond The University of Scranton. In other words, your secondary source will likely cover more than the University’s history.

*Step 5: Get back to the archive (no need to write anything for this step)*

Eventually, you may need to return to the archive. Perhaps, as you refine your research question, you will need to find a different primary source. Historical research requires regular back and forth between analysis and archival/library work. That’s what it means to troubleshoot as a historian. Embrace the process, and happy sleuthing!

**Task 6: Audiences**

---

**Due:** in the Task 6 Google Drive folder by the start of class on Wednesday, November 10

**Objective:** individually apply and reflect on concepts addressed in class

**Assessment:** 3% of course grade, based on fulfilment of assignment below

**Assignment:** Our final unit is all about using digital tools to narrate the past. For this Task, you will need to compare two different websites that explain universities’ historical connections to slavery and the legacies of slavery. Please choose TWO sites from the following list:

1. <http://slaveryarchive.georgetown.edu/>
2. <https://slavery.princeton.edu/>
3. <https://columbiaandslavery.columbia.edu/>

Respond to the prompts below as they take you through the process of comparing the two narratives.

*Part I: Evaluation*

For EACH of the two websites you chose, complete the following steps:

1. Explore the website. What are 1-2 things that you learned about the university’s historical relationship with slavery?
2. Keep on exploring until you are able to comprehend the organization of each website. Following the format introduced by Prof. Farry in her Omeka tutorial and [guide](#), map the website (i.e. write an outline of the website’s organization).
3. Based on what you have read and seen, who do you think is the project’s intended audience? Why do you think so?
4. A good historian chooses their narrative techniques based on the audience they would like to reach. Do you think the website is appropriately designed for its intended audience? Evaluate the website’s design by completing the table below.

| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Notes</b><br>Record here what you observe about each criterion. | <b>Rating</b><br>Give the website a score of 1-4 (1 = needs significant improvement, 4 = accomplished) for each criterion. |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Interface:</b> organization of information (tabs, tags, filtering, etc.), clarity and aesthetics of the layout and text, ease of navigation |  |  |
| <b>Information selection:</b> what is and isn’t included, what previous knowledge on the audience’s part is                                    |  |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| assumed  |  |  |
| <b>Metadata:</b> the selection of metadata of primary sources, the format in which metadata presented  |  |  |
| <b>Visual analysis:</b> relevance and clarity in communication of visual information, comprehensibility of the visual material                               |  |  |
| <b>Written analysis:</b> clarity, relevance, appropriateness of length of written material   |  |  |
| <b>Transparency:</b> the quality of the explanations of the project's aims, methods, funding, and authors/directors  |  |  |
| <b>Accessibility:</b> whether available to a variety of audiences (e.g. hearing/visually impaired), whether dataset or sources are available for others' use |  |  |

*Part II: Comparison*

While these websites tell a similar story, they do so in different ways. Of the two websites you chose, which more effectively conveys the history of that university's relationship with slavery? Why do you think so? In answering this question, be sure to refer to the criteria from your tables in Part I.

*Part III: Application*

Now that you have evaluated the narration of someone else's digital project, what have you learned about your own? In other words, who is the intended audience of your group's project? What, concretely, will your group need to do so that your final project is appropriate for your intended audience? Consider referencing here the criteria you applied in Part I of this Task and think about how you might intentionally address those same criteria in your own project.

**Workflow Workshop: Peer Review Worksheet**

Workflow author's name:

Workflow peer reviewer's name:

*Workflow reviewer, fill out this section:*

How many steps did the workflow author document in their workflow?

If you needed to find the same source(s) the workflow author found, do you think you would be able to do so by following their workflow? Why or why not?

Now test it out! Use their workflow to try to find the same source(s) they did. Were you successful? If you were, share what made their workflow so easy to follow. If you were not successful, list 1-3 things the author might change in their writing so that another person could successfully recreate their search.

Reflecting on the above exercise, what are 1-3 actions the author can take to improve or advance their search process (not the writing of the workflow)?

*Workflow author, fill out this section after receiving your peer's review:*

How will you change your search process based on feedback received during the Workflow Workshop?

## **Mock Project Proposal**

---

**Objective:** Demonstrate a critical understanding of how to utilize digital technology to find primary and secondary sources. You will do this in two ways:

- I. Explain, in writing, a primary source that you found and use it to propose a research project related to the Black history of The University of Scranton. You are NOT expected to complete this research project.
- II. Engage peers in your work by orally articulating research and results, as well as responding to questions and comments.

### I. Essay

**Due:** in the Mock Project Proposal folder on Google Drive by 9pm Monday, October 4

**Assessment:** 10% of course grade, based on:

1. The sophistication of your search design (2%);
2. The sophistication of your reflection on the research process (2%);
3. The relevance of your sources to the research question (2%);
4. The technical quality of your writing (2%); and
5. Fulfilment of the guidelines below, i.e. your ability to follow instructions (2%).

See attached rubric for detailed criteria.

**Format:** 1" margins, size 12 font, double spaced, 3-4 pages. Please include:

1. page numbers on each page
2. your name at the top of the first page
3. your last name in the filename (e.g. Levy\_MPP)

**Assignment:** Pretend you are embarking on a historical research project (which, in a few weeks, you will be) based on your work in Tasks 2 and 3. Now that you've conducted preliminary research, it's time to explain your project to advisors and funders. You'll need to describe, justify, and reflect on your accomplished and proposed methodology.

- methodology: the set of methods (procedures) followed in a particular area of study (in our case, for answering a historical question)

If this definition sounds like a workflow, that's because a workflow is simply a way to record your methods! Your task here is essentially to transform your workflows into a readable and persuasive document. To do so, you'll need to answer:

(a) What is your project about?

1. Articulate a historical research question (an ability you practiced in Task 3!). Your protagonist(s), periodization, and historical process or event should be clear.
2. Explain why this question is important to you, the University community, and/or others.

- (b) What have you already learned, and how did you learn it?
1. Describe ONE primary source relevant for understanding the Black history of The University of Scranton. Explain both the source's data (what the source tells us about the past) and metadata (what we know about the source's creation, distribution, and preservation). If possible, include an image of or link to the source.
  2. Justify your choice of this primary source for your proposed project. Why do you consider this source to be a successful outcome of your search process?
  3. Explain how and where you found your primary source. In other words, summarize your workflow for finding this primary source (an ability you practiced in Task 2!). What worked well in your search process? What could you have done differently? How did you change your search process based on feedback received during the Task 2 Workflow Workshop?
- (c) What do you still need to understand, and how will you go about figuring it out?
1. Explain where and how you will find additional primary sources to help you answer your research question.
  2. List at least two secondary sources that you will need to read to help you answer your research question. In 2-3 sentences per secondary source, summarize the source and explain why it is relevant to your project.
  3. Explain how and where you found your secondary sources. What worked well in your search process? What could you have done differently? How did you change your search process based on feedback received during the Task 3 Workflow Workshop?
  4. Describe what steps you will take to continue your secondary source search process once you have examined these two sources.

In addition, your paper should:

- (a) Have a title that reflects the essay's research question and indicates its periodization.  
*Example: The University of Scranton and the Civil Rights Movement, 1954-1964*
- (b) Accurately cite in footnotes primary and secondary sources whenever appropriate. You should use Chicago Manual of Style full-note citations that include page numbers when applicable. For a quick citation guide, see [https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools\\_citationguide/citation-guide-1.html](https://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide/citation-guide-1.html). Don't forget that Zotero can format your citations for you!
- (c) Include a bibliography at the end of the essay. Your bibliography should be organized into two sections:
1. Archives: list here in alphabetical order the archives and libraries in which you found and hope to find your primary sources. For digital collections, include the URL.
  2. Sources: list here the primary and secondary sources that you referenced in your paper.

## II. Presentation

**Due:** in class on Monday, October 4 (upload any file you'd like to project to the MPP Presentation folder on Google Drive)

**Assessment:** 2% of course grade, based on fulfillment of guidelines below. 60% of your grade will be based on Dr. Levy's assessment of your presentation. The other 40% will be based on your classmates' evaluation of your presentation.

**Format:** 2-minute, individual presentation of your Mock Project Proposal

**Assignment:** In preparing your presentation, focus on the following:

1. Content
  - a. Do you cover all of the key points of the Mock Project Proposal?
  - b. Do you do so in a way that is comprehensible to your audience?
  - c. Does your content engage your audience (hint: show an image of your primary source)?
  - d. Are you relevant and concise in your response to audience questions and comments?
  
2. Delivery
  - a. Is your voice audible and appropriately animated?
  - b. Do you enunciate clearly?
  - c. Do your posture and gestures inspire confidence and not distract?
  - d. Do you make eye contact with your audience?

## Mock Project Proposal Essay Rubric

|   | 4 - Accomplished  | 3 - Good   | 2 - Satisfactory   | 1 - Needs Substantial Improvement  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| The sophistication of your search design (2%)                                   | Uses search techniques with facility to explore and persist through the search process and defines those techniques in their workflows. Revises search process and workflows in response to peer and instructor feedback, and articulates those revisions with detail and reflection on their own learning. | Uses search techniques with facility to explore and persist through the search process. Revises search process and workflows in response to peer and instructor feedback, and articulates those revisions. | Uses search techniques to explore during the search process. Revises search process and/or workflows in response to peer and instructor feedback.                                  | Little to no evidence of use of search techniques during the search process. Unclear if their search process and/or workflows have been revised in response to peer and instructor feedback. |
| The sophistication of your reflection on the research process (2%) <sup>1</sup> | Reviews prior learning (past research experiences) in depth. Reveals clarified meanings or broader perspectives about the research process, showing how the experience has provided a foundation for expanded knowledge and growth over time.   | Reviews prior learning (past research experiences) in depth, revealing fully clarified meanings or indicating broader perspectives about the research process.   | Reviews prior learning (past research experiences) with some depth, revealing slightly clarified meanings or indicating a somewhat broader perspective about the research process. | Reviews prior learning (past research experiences) at a surface level, without revealing clarified meaning or indicating a broader perspective about the research process.                   |

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from American Association of Colleges & Universities Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning VALUE Rubric

|   |  |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| <p>The relevance of your sources to the research question (2%)<sup>2</sup></p>                        | <p>Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering their importance to the research question, their credibility, and their viewpoint. Justifies with clarity the choice of sources.</p>   | <p>Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering their importance to the research question, their credibility, and/or their viewpoint.</p> | <p>Chooses a variety of information sources somewhat appropriate to the scope of the research question. Selects sources using basic criteria, such as relevance to the research question or credibility.</p>   | <p>Chooses a few information sources. Selects sources using limited criteria, such as relevance to the research question.</p>   |
| <p>The technical quality of your writing (2%): Grammar/Spelling, Flow, Organization, Diction/Tone</p> | <p>Everything is spelled correctly, grammar is accurate, punctuation is correct. Words, clauses, sentences, and paragraphs flow logically and smoothly from one to the next. Structure of essay is explained at the beginning and clarified throughout. Words are precise and appropriate for audience (in this case, formal).</p> | <p>Has few grammatical and/or spelling errors. Words, clauses, sentences, and paragraphs flow logically from one to the next. Structure of essay is clear and coherent. Most words are precise and formal in tone.</p>                    | <p>Has fair amount of grammatical and/or spelling errors. Awkward transitions make some passages difficult to follow. Essay's structure is unclear or doesn't support the essay's aim. Tone is occasionally informal (uses contractions, colloquialisms, etc.), or use of undefined pronouns or vague or inaccurate words makes comprehension difficult.</p> | <p>Has so many grammatical and/or spelling errors that reading the essay is difficult. Flow is stilted due to many confusing transitions between words, clauses, sentences, and/or paragraphs. Organization of ideas is murky and counterproductive to the essay's purpose. Tone is often informal and/or wording is confusing and vague.</p> |

---

<sup>2</sup> Adapted from AACU Information Literacy VALUE Rubric

## **Final Project**

---

### **Objectives:**

1. Demonstrate an understanding of course concepts and methods through (a) the creation of a digital information product about the Black history of The University of Scranton, and (b) an evaluation of your experience creating a digital project.
2. Orally articulate methods and findings to an expert audience.

### **I. Presentation**

**Due:** in class on Wednesday, December 8, in LSC 133

**Format:** 10-minute group presentation of your Final Project, followed by questions and comments from the audience. The aim is to explain the contents of the project rather than the website itself.

**Assessment:** 8% of course grade. 40% of your grade will be based on your classmates' assessment of your individual performance. The other 60% will be based on Dr. Levy's evaluation of your group's presentation skills.

Your individual grade will be based on your oral and visual delivery:

1. Do you enunciate clearly and audibly?
2. Is your intonation varied (not monotonous) and positive?
3. Is your speaking pace comfortable to follow (neither too fast nor too slow)?
4. Are your facial expressions appropriately animated?
5. Is your appearance professional (business casual dress, mask properly fitted)?

Your group grade will be based on:

1. Organization
  - a. Do you explain early on the structure of the presentation?
  - b. Does the presentation cover all the components of the Final Project?
  - c. Does the presentation progress in a way that is comprehensible to the audience?
2. Visuals
  - a. Are your visuals relevant to what is being said?
  - b. Does their design reflect the presentation's organization (e.g. an early slide outlines the presentation, headings communicate their slide's content)?
  - c. Do your visuals engage the audience without distracting (e.g. not too much text on one slide)?
  - d. Is your visual material legible (font color, style, and size allows for easy reading; image is of high enough resolution to be seen on full-sized computer screen)?

## II. Website

**Due:** by start of class on Wednesday, December 8

**Assessment:** 18% of course grade, based on fulfillment of guidelines below. The grade will be distributed as follows:

- 6% - the effectiveness of your methodology for answering your research question
- 6% - the clarity, relevance, and rigor of your site's content (part A below)
- 6% - the legibility and aesthetics of the site's design (part B below)

**Format:** An Omeka website that, across multiple pages or sections, explains and illustrates your project's aims and findings. Your group's site will form a part of the course's Omeka site.

**Guidelines:** Your website should communicate your research project. The guidelines below will help ensure that you do so effectively.

### A. Content

You'll need to think carefully about **information selection**, that is, what information to include and what information to omit given (a) the format you're using (a website) and (b) your expected audience. The site should include, but not be restricted to, the following pages:

1. Introduction: an explanation of the project's research question and argument and the bigger story that the project helps to tell.
2. Context: information to help readers understand the larger story to which your project contributes (e.g. the civil rights movement, college and/or professional athletics, college student life). Fully cite secondary and tertiary sources.
3. Conclusion: explain what your analysis reveals, i.e. the answer to your research question (or as close to an answer as you are able to get).
4. Methodology: an overview of your primary sources, how you found them, and the steps you took to analyze them. Also explain here your digital tool and why it was appropriate for answering your research question.
5. About: describe who you are and why your group chose to pursue this research.

In addition to the above pages, you'll need to dedicate a part of your site to analyzing your primary sources. Your Progress Report sitemap will get you started thinking about what this portion of the site will look like.

### B. Design

Feel free to get creative, as long as your writing and design are legible to a general audience. In other words, your site's interface will be evaluated according to the following criteria (this should look familiar from Task 6):

|  |
|--|
| <b>Interface:</b> organization of information (tabs, tags, filtering, etc.), clarity and aesthetics of the layout and text, ease of navigation |
|--|

|   |
|---|
| <b>Metadata:</b> the selection of metadata of primary sources, the format in which metadata presented |
|---|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Visual analysis:</b> relevance and clarity in communication of visual information, comprehensibility of the visual material                               |
| <b>Written analysis:</b> appropriateness of length and legibility of written material  |
| <b>Accessibility:</b> whether available to a variety of audiences (e.g. hearing/visually impaired), whether dataset or sources are available for others' use |

III. Reflection

**Due:** 9:00pm Wednesday, December 15, in Final Project Reflection [dropbox on Brightspace](#)

**Assessment:** 5% of course grade, based on fulfilment of the guidelines below.

**Format:** 1" margins, size 12 font, double spaced, 3-4 pages. Please include:

1. page numbers on each page
2. your name in the filename (e.g. Levy\_FinalReflection)

**Guidelines:** Your final assignment is to reflect on your work and learning in this course. You will do this by writing an essay that combines two evaluations.

A. Website

Complete the table from Task 6 (copied below) for your group's website. Then, in 1-2 paragraphs, evaluate your own role in producing your group's site. In what ways did you contribute to each criterion? How did your group's dynamics and individual contributions contribute to the success or shortcoming of each criterion? In sum, to what extent and why does your group's site effectively narrate the Black history of The University of Scranton for a general audience?

| <b>Criteria</b>  | <b>Notes</b><br>Record here what you observe about each criterion. | <b>Rating</b><br>Give the website a score of 1-4 (1 = needs significant improvement, 4 = accomplished) for each criterion. |
|--|--|--|
| <b>Interface:</b> organization of information (tabs, tags, filtering, etc.), clarity and aesthetics of the layout and text, ease of navigation |  |  |
| <b>Information selection:</b>  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| what is and isn't included, what previous knowledge on the audience's part is assumed  |  |  |
| <b>Metadata:</b> the selection of metadata of primary sources, the format in which metadata presented  |  |  |
| <b>Visual analysis:</b> relevance and clarity in communication of visual information, comprehensibility of the visual material                               |  |  |
| <b>Written analysis:</b> clarity, relevance, appropriateness of length of written material   |  |  |
| <b>Transparency:</b> the quality of the explanations of the project's aims, methods, funding, and authors/directors  |  |  |
| <b>Accessibility:</b> whether available to a variety of audiences (e.g. hearing/visually impaired), whether dataset or sources are available for others' use |  |  |

B. Course

In at least 3 paragraphs, make an argument about the impact of digital technology on our interpretation of the past. In what ways is digital technology helpful? In what ways is it problematic, perhaps even dangerous?

To fully answer these questions, think carefully about the ways in which your group was able to explain the University's Black history. Explain how digital technology positively and/or negatively affected your group's ability to:

1. Find sources (through search engines, digital archives, scholarly journal databases, etc.),
2. Analyze primary sources (making timelines, maps, etc.), and
3. Narrate your findings (through Omeka—use the table above for ideas).

Be sure to address the resources necessary for your methodology (don't forget all the labor and money that went into creating your tool!), the type of historical evidence that your digital tool privileges, the kinds of questions that your tool was able to answer, and the audiences your project may reach. You should refer to some of the texts we read throughout the semester to support your points.