

Using a Standards Crosswalk to Adapt Resources for Teaching with Primary Sources Across K–12 and Higher Education

By Jen Hoyer

ABSTRACT: This article explores the work of archivists and special collections librarians in teaching with primary sources (TPS) for K–12 and higher education audiences and argues that the resources created for this work have largely targeted either audience, but not both. Building on a trend in the TPS literature toward skills-based instruction efforts, this article introduces a crosswalk between skills-based standards typically used in higher education (the SAA/RBMS *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*) and K–12 education (Common Core State Standards). This crosswalk demonstrates how resources created with one audience in mind can be adapted for use with other audiences. Examples of this crosswalk’s application are provided, as well as a discussion of the pitfalls of standards-based learning and the potential of a standards-based crosswalk to open up communication and collaboration around the benefits of teaching with primary sources.

Introduction

In his 1986 article “Archives in the Classroom,” Ken Osborne called on archivists and special collections librarians to more intentionally explore the potential of education work within archives and special collections. Osborne pointed to earlier sources on archives and education, highlighting suggestions that archives produce two types of educational resources: those intended for K–12 classrooms and others for higher education.¹ Osborne’s grief over the “neglect of the educational potential of archives” has thankfully been remedied across major swathes of our profession as a vibrant community dedicated to the work of teaching with primary sources (TPS) has developed in the decades since.² At the same time, the different materials and efforts for K–12 and higher education that he identified foreshadowed current trends in efforts by archivists and special collections librarians to do instruction work. In a profession where resources are scarce and austerity is rampant,³ the assumption that K–12 and higher education audiences need entirely separate materials and teaching efforts means that most institutions will be compelled to focus their instructional efforts on one audience or the other. We see this reflected in the archives and special collections literature, which provides evidence of deeply successful education programs for K–12 and higher education that rarely utilize the same resources for both groups.

This article argues that TPS resources generated by archivists and special collections librarians for use in a K–12 education context are adaptable to higher education, and vice versa. This argument is rooted in an understanding that the skills-based needs of these two audiences are different but not wholly separate. As evidence for this, this article

establishes connections between K–12 and higher education contexts by presenting a crosswalk between the skills-based education standards most commonly used in each context—namely, the SAA/RBMS *Guidelines for Teaching with Primary Sources* and the Common Core State Standards. The goal of this crosswalk is to make more transparent the similarities and needs within K–12 and higher education contexts, to reveal the transferability and adaptability of educational materials and teaching efforts across these contexts, and to expand our collective imagination concerning the ways the archives profession could use primary sources to support a broader audience of students.⁴

Considering the Literature: Approaches to Teaching with Primary Sources

The benefits of learning with primary sources for students of all ages are well established in the education literature.⁵ However, the growing community of librarians and archivists who do instruction work with primary source materials is not a community that requires a graduate degree in education or similar advanced training for entry. For this reason, this literature review focuses specifically on publications within the disciplines of archives and special collections to explore how archivists and special collections librarians who are doing instruction describe the work that they do. A review of the literature reveals that this work is largely divided by audience—K–12 and higher education—and also suggests some causes for this division. It also demonstrates an overall pedagogical shift toward skills-based learning.

Writing about Teaching with Primary Sources

The peer-reviewed literature on education outreach initiatives within archives and special collections demonstrates the extent to which these efforts have traditionally focused on either K–12 or higher education audiences, but only occasionally on both—and in such instances, rarely with adaptations of the same resources. Institutions in the cultural heritage sector such as libraries, museums, and historical societies tend to create educational resources for K–12 students and teachers, while the focus for TPS in higher education contexts tends to come from professional organizations more typically affiliated with higher education institutions (including the Society of American Archivists and the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section of ACRL).⁶ Robin Katz links the difficulty of producing resources for both K–12 and higher education instructors to a lack of common language and reference points between the two learning and instruction environments.⁷ Many college and university archives are used in the service of education with a focus on higher education students—and, often, mostly or entirely on their own campus.⁸ These efforts include the creation of guides for cultivating primary source literacy or offering research seminars.⁹ The success and failure of these efforts are then measured by the ability to use primary sources to support the learning of each institution's student population.¹⁰ As one example of how this plays out in other contexts, a project by Marcus Robyns at Northern Michigan University, while rooted in broader strategies to implement new education standards across the spectrum of K–12 and higher education, only details initiatives that meet these standards within

the higher education context in which they were created and implemented. Minimal guidance is given as to how such an initiative could be implemented outside higher education in the form of “community educational outreach.”¹¹

Higher education teaching faculty have also detailed their efforts to include primary source materials in their teaching of everything from composition to history and mathematics, either on their own or through collaboration with archivists and special collections librarians.¹² This scholarship necessarily focuses on the group of students each instructor works with, and it inevitably (if unintentionally) reinforces a separation in the literature between uses of primary sources in K–12 and higher education. Yet, while faculty and library staff at the University of Colorado–Boulder describe how their collaboration could be replicated in other departments across campus, they do not discuss whether their work is applicable to audiences beyond undergraduate students despite recognizing that only 25 percent of visitors to their collections are university students.¹³ Similarly, in describing a faculty–archivist teaching collaboration with primary sources at Framingham State College, the instruction session for education undergraduates was deemed successful because students asked critical questions, made connections between local and national events, and developed historical perspective. However, there is no recognition that this could become a “teach the teacher” instruction session for using the same pedagogy with the K–12 population these teachers-in-training will ultimately serve.¹⁴ Much of our professional literature on TPS in an undergraduate context mentions initiatives that could be appropriately adapted for a K–12 context, and yet literature about these initiatives often fails to explicitly make this connection.¹⁵

This is not to say that college and university archivists and special collections librarians are not working with K–12 audiences directly. In some contexts, they are creating resources to support K–12 programs such as National History Day¹⁶ or to align with state K–12 learning standards, such as the Opper Project at The Ohio State University.¹⁷ However, the case studies referencing these projects do not discuss how those resources could also be useful for the institution’s undergraduate students and their instructors. In Visser’s summary of a 2006 survey on the state of education outreach to K–12 institutions by higher education special collections, she notes polarized attitudes toward this work as well as a lack of scholarly literature detailing K–12 outreach.¹⁸ Visser writes of efforts at the University of Colorado–Boulder to support both undergraduate and K–12 students but does not note any similarities between these initiatives or potential transferability of the methodologies and resources developed, beyond the comment that “Special Collections at CU–Boulder does emphasize touch, with both child and adult patrons.”¹⁹

Efforts developed specifically for K–12 audiences also include initiatives to support teacher training in the use of primary source materials in the classroom as well as the development of materials for students. Lee Ann Potter describes programs across the presidential libraries that provide excellent support of this kind to both K–12 students and their educators.²⁰ The Library of Congress has been at the forefront of developing

resources and mechanisms for reaching K–12 audiences with primary source materials and teaching resources.²¹ Anne Gilliland-Swetland’s research on using digitized primary sources within K–12 classrooms tested various tools and resources by training K–12 teachers in their implementation.²² These publications do not describe whether or how these programs and resources might be transferrable to educators outside the K–12 realm.

There are, thankfully, a few exceptions to the trends identified here. Malkmus understands a connection between K–12 and higher education and theorizes that programs designed to support primary source literacy in undergraduates should build on skills and competencies honed at the K–12 level.²³ Carini dips a toe in K–12 when he suggests both secondary and higher education students as the target audience for the archives literacy competencies he proposes.²⁴ Additionally, resources created for educators and students have, in rare instances, been positioned to span the gap, or at least bridge high school and undergraduate audiences. Examples of such resources can be found in projects carried out at Utah State University, the University of Florida, the National Archives and Records Administration, and the Cleveland Museum of Natural History.²⁵

It is possible that, in the literature noted, the tendency to focus on either K–12 or higher education is a result of how TPS scholarship is generated in the archives and special collections field.²⁶ Garcia notes the emphasis of professional archives literature on TPS in an undergraduate setting, not K–12.²⁷ This is borne out in Yaco, Ramaprasad, and Syn’s 2020 research linking archives and special collections with curriculum needs. While their article is titled “Themes in Recent Research on Integrating Primary Source Collections and Instruction,” it becomes evident, in the description of “relevant” literature selected for their study, that their entire focus is on literature about TPS in a higher education context.²⁸ The excellent volume *Past or Portal? Enhancing Undergraduate Learning through Special Collections and Archives* focuses, as the title suggests, entirely on undergraduate audiences.²⁹ Many of the chapters relate strongly to K–12 instruction needs, yet only one of the forty-eight case studies mentions that it could be adapted for use with middle or high school students. A second case study in the volume mentions—in a footnote—that TPS resources developed for K–12 audiences could be used in undergraduate settings.³⁰ Transferability in our writing about practical strategies for higher education and K–12 is the exception rather than the norm.

Austerity is also partially to blame for the siloing of TPS work in the archives profession. Funding constraints may force us to think only about the audience at one’s own institution. Greg Johnson acknowledges that even when direct efforts are made to reach local K–12 populations, staffing and time constraints ultimately mean that classes from the university receive priority.³¹ An argument could be made for institutional mission as a factor that orients archival instruction work to only higher education audiences. While it may be true that most higher education institutions have institutional missions to serve their own students and faculty, archives and special collections within colleges and universities often have mandates to serve both the institution’s community as well as off-campus researchers and K–12 students

specifically.³² Grant funding may also dictate the way that resources for TPS are developed and shared. Projects funded by grants targeted at higher education will necessarily, in their documentation, focus on use with higher education audiences.³³ Conversely, in a project with the grant-funded goal “to enhance K–12 teaching and learning by working with Louisiana teachers to integrate the use of the digital collection into their classroom activities,” transferability of products and findings to a higher education situation is not discussed.³⁴

It is likely that many of the authors referenced here recognize that the resources and instruction strategies they are writing about could be adapted for use with both K–12 and higher education audiences. However, the literature indicates an overwhelming tendency to write, and possibly to think, about the work of TPS in either K–12 or higher education contexts. These trends in the literature undoubtedly establish and reinforce professional norms that assume that instruction work with these audiences is wholly unique and that an entirely different set of teaching tools and curricular resources are needed. Ultimately, this leads to division across a community of educators who are otherwise like-minded and who could share valuable experience and ideas.

Skills-Based Pedagogy in TPS

In recent years, recognition of the skills-based value of TPS has begun to emerge, not only with regard to archival literacy competencies but also within a broader framework of transferable research skills that benefit students across K–12 and higher education.³⁵ TPS provides an opportunity to learn and practice research skills that can be utilized in other disciplines to foster discussion, support project work, and improve student engagement.³⁶ Nygren argues that high school students deserve to be taught the scholarly habits that will enable them to do research in the same way historians do; namely, analyzing multiple sources to develop historical thinking and historical empathy.³⁷ A rising demand for document analysis skills at the K–12 level as outlined in the Common Core Standards and similar curricula provides a need that archivists can fill.³⁸ A general trend toward skills-based outcomes within the field of TPS has in fact been a motivating factor for the creation of the SAA/RBMS *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*, the pedagogical framework most used right now by archivists and librarians working in higher education.³⁹ As noted at the outset, Robin Katz suggests that a common language is needed for discussing TPS across K–12 and higher education contexts. This article suggests that skills-based learning could provide this much-needed connection between the two contexts.

Seeking a Bridge: Examining Learning Standards

The consistent divide in how archivists and special collections librarians write about resources created for TPS highlights a need for new professional norms that could help us more broadly apply our instructional resources and practices to expand the impact of our collections and education initiatives. This article suggests that skills-based learning can provide a common language for understanding the TPS work we do across

K–12 and higher education. This is not to suggest that *no* differences exist between the needs of K–12 and higher education audiences; quite the opposite, there are important nuances. However, just as instructors would adapt an instruction plan for working with a group of English Language Learners and Advanced Placement students at the same grade level, so too should we adapt our instruction to work with both elementary school and undergraduate students. Resources for TPS can address core skills and competencies that apply to every student.

As noted, a shift to focus on skills and competencies was a key instigator for creation of the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* published by the Society of American Archivists and the ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy in 2018.⁴⁰ The guidelines “articulate the range of knowledge, skills, and abilities required to effectively use primary sources.”⁴¹ They include twenty-two objectives categorized within five broader concept areas: Conceptualize; Find and Access; Read, Understand, and Summarize; Interpret, Analyze, and Evaluate; and Use and Incorporate. Their intended audience is primarily archivists and librarians, and they speak directly to concepts that archivists know well, outlining a clear set of archival research skills that can be imparted to students.⁴² Use of these standards has, to date, been documented mostly in a higher education context. For example, the Society of American Archivists’ *Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources* includes 18 published case studies at the time of this writing; of these, 17 describe use of the *Guidelines* in higher education, and only one (Case 4) describes application of the *Guidelines* primarily in a K–12 context.⁴³ Another case, “Co-curricular Innovation: Teaching about Patents as Primary Sources,” describes an attempt to replicate a lesson initially designed for undergraduate students with middle school students.⁴⁴ Adaptation of TPS resources across audiences is, again, the exception rather than the rule.

While the *Guidelines* has been a key tool to help archivists and special collections librarians to think about their instruction work in a skills-based context, much of the work to integrate primary sources into K–12 classrooms has been motivated by trends toward standardization, including, but not limited to, the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). The CCSS are a set of guidelines that articulate which concepts and skills students should be equipped with by the time they reach college.⁴⁵ They have been adopted by 41 states, the District of Columbia, four territories, and the Department of Defense Education Activity.⁴⁶ The CCSS include a set of English Language Arts/Literacy (ELA) Standards and a separate set of Mathematics Standards.

Use of primary sources is key for meeting the CCSS, and an increased reliance on these and similar standards within the K–12 realm has been an impetus for increased archives outreach to K–12 audiences for more than two decades.⁴⁷ Many archivists and special collections librarians who create resources for K–12 audiences have done so in conjunction with state standards—either standards that preceded implementation of the CCSS or standards that have been adopted as the official statewide implementation of the CCSS.⁴⁸

Standards are not perfect, and suggesting the use of standards to hone our instruction work in archives and special collections cannot be the only answer. Concerns have been voiced regarding whether standards can be implemented in useful ways for English Language Learners and students with disabilities.⁴⁹ Standards move away from recognizing differences among students and away from culturally responsive teaching.⁵⁰ However, the widespread prevalence of standards, and their existence as a tool for working with primary sources across K–12 and higher education audiences, provides a starting point for understanding commonalities across these learning audiences.

Building a Bridge: The Potential of Crosswalks

A crosswalk document is a reference tool for educators, in this case allowing for quick comparison and translation between educational standards. One example of a crosswalk, the *Crosswalk of the Common Core Standards and the Standards for the 21st-Century Learner*, was published in 2011 by the American Library Association to show commonalities between the CCSS and standards created by the American Association of School Librarians.⁵¹ Crosswalks are not new to TPS. For example, Anne Gilliland created a crosswalk between K–12 learning and cognitive objectives, and activities for TPS that might address these.⁵² A crosswalk between the *Guidelines* and the CCSS could help archivists and special collections librarians identify the ways that their existing instruction work for either higher education or K–12 audiences might speak to needs across audiences. A crosswalk will not explain all the details of adapting an instruction activity for another audience, but it will serve as a starting point for understanding the applicability of our collections and our instructional resources across K–16+. Moreover, an understanding of standards and alignment with a crosswalk can be a starting point for conversations with instructors. If an activity is created in alignment with *Guidelines* objectives that then show crosswalk alignment with objectives from the CCSS, merely articulating this to a K–12 educator shows that we are trying to speak to their needs and opens the door for new collaboration. Because schools that have adopted the CCSS are under tremendous pressure to demonstrate that they are achieving these standards (teachers can face barriers to retention and promotion if their students repeatedly underperform on standards-aligned assessments, and schools that repeatedly underperform on standards-aligned tests can face additional oversight and/or closure), it is imperative for archivists and librarians who wish to work with students in these settings to be able to communicate to teachers and school administrators how their contributions are supporting the achievement of goals established by the CCSS.

Building a crosswalk between the *Guidelines* and the CCSS is not a small task. The *Guidelines* includes twenty-two objectives, while the CCSS contains standards for both ELA and mathematics. This crosswalk focuses on the ELA standards, which contain grade-level standards in each of four areas: reading, writing, speaking and listening, and language. The number of grade-level standards makes a crosswalk between the *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* and every existing grade-level standard of the CCSS unwieldy. However, at the heart of the CCSS are thirty-two College and Career Readiness standards (CCRs) across areas of reading, writing, speaking and listening,

and language; often referred to as the anchor standards. Creating a crosswalk between twenty objectives from the *Guidelines* and thirty-two anchor standards from the CCSS is much more feasible.

This crosswalk was developed, after deep study of both sets of standards, by matching each Common Core standard to objectives from the *Guidelines* through a card-sorting activity. Each of the objectives from the *Guidelines* was written on a pink index card, and each Common Core anchor standard was written on a white index card. Pink index cards were selected one at a time and matched with all white cards that described a similar skill-based objective. Results were recorded, and then the activity was repeated several weeks later to determine whether sorting decisions were consistent. To further check for discrepancies (none were noted), a draft crosswalk was then shared for review with colleagues who focus more on K–12 and higher education instruction.⁵³

In the crosswalk offered in Table 1, the relationship between the *Guidelines* and the CCSS should not be thought of as equal. Rather, this crosswalk indicates how a particular TPS lesson or activity that meets a specific *Guidelines* objective could also meet the corresponding Common Core standard (or, how the activity could be easily altered so that it does directly align with the CCSS). However, because the CCSS does not have the same overall focus on primary sources that the *Guidelines* does, a lesson designed to teach those same CCSS should not be assumed to teach the objective from the *Guidelines* shown in this crosswalk. This crosswalk shows that some of the guidelines have very high relevance to a K–12 audience, through alignment with multiple anchor standards. Instructors who are more familiar with the *Guidelines* may wish to start their K–12 instruction using resources and activities designed to teach a *Guidelines* objective that also aligns with multiple anchor standards. This could make applicability to a K–12 context even easier to conceptualize, paving the way for fruitful new collaborations with K–12 classrooms.

Table 1. The Standards-Based TPS Crosswalk

Objective from the <i>Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy</i>	Related Anchor Standards from the CCSS
<p>1.A. Distinguish primary from secondary sources for a given research question. Demonstrate an understanding of the interrelatedness of primary and secondary sources for research.</p>	<p>Reading 9: Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take.</p> <p>Speaking & Listening 2: Integrate and evaluate information presented in diverse media and formats, including visually, quantitatively, and orally.</p>
<p>1.B. Articulate what might serve as primary sources for a specific research project within the framework of an academic discipline or area of study.</p>	<p>Reading 7: Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.</p>
<p>1.C. Draw on primary sources to generate and refine research questions.</p>	<p>Writing 7: Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.</p>
<p>1.D. Understand that research is an iterative process and that as primary sources are found and analyzed the research question(s) may change.</p>	<p>Writing 5: Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.</p>
<p>2.A. Identify the possible locations of primary sources.</p> <p>2.B. Use appropriate, efficient, and effective search strategies in order to locate primary sources. Be familiar with the most common ways primary sources are described, such as catalog records and archival finding aids.</p> <p>2.C. Distinguish between catalogs, databases, and other online resources that contain information <i>about</i> sources, versus those that contain digital versions, originals, or copies of the sources themselves.</p>	<p>Writing 8: Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.</p>
<p>2.D. Understand that historical records may never have existed, may not have survived, or may not be collected and/or publicly accessible. Existing records may have been shaped by the selectivity and mediation of individuals such as collectors, archivists, librarians, donors, and/or publishers, potentially limiting the sources available for research.</p>	<p>Reading 6: Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.</p>
<p>2.E. Recognize and understand the policies and procedures that affect access to primary sources, and that these differ across repositories, databases, and collections.</p>	<p>Writing 8: Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.</p>

<p>3.A. Examine a primary source, which may require the ability to read a particular script, font, or language, to understand or operate a particular technology, or to comprehend vocabulary, syntax, and communication norms of the time period and location where the source was created.</p>	<p>Reading 4: Interpret words and phrases as they are used in a text, including determining technical, connotative, and figurative meanings, and analyze how specific word choices shape meaning or tone.</p> <p>Reading 5: Analyze the structure of texts, including how specific sentences, paragraphs, and larger portions of the text relate to each other and the whole.</p> <p>Speaking & Listening 3: Evaluate a speaker's point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric.</p> <p>Language 4: Determine or clarify the meaning of unknown and multiple-meaning words and phrases by using context clues, analyzing meaningful word parts, and consulting general and specialized reference materials, as appropriate.</p> <p>Language 5: Demonstrate understanding of figurative language, word relationships, and nuances in word meanings.</p> <p>Language 6: Acquire and use accurately a range of general academic and domain-specific words and phrases sufficient for reading, writing, speaking, and listening at the college and career readiness level; demonstrate independence in gathering vocabulary knowledge when encountering an unknown term important to comprehension or expression.</p>
<p>3.B. Identify and communicate information found in primary sources, including summarizing the content of the source and identifying and reporting key components such as how it was created, by whom, when, and what it is.</p>	<p>Reading 1: Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.</p> <p>Reading 2: Determine central ideas or themes of a text and analyze their development; summarize the key supporting details and ideas.</p> <p>Writing 2: Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.</p> <p>Writing 8: Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.</p>
<p>3.C. Understand that a primary source may exist in a variety of iterations, including excerpts, transcriptions, and translations, due to publication, copying, and other transformations.</p>	<p>Reading 7: Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.</p>
<p>4.A. Assess the appropriateness of a primary source for meeting the goals of a specific research or creative project.</p>	<p>Reading 1: Read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and to make logical inferences from it; cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.</p>

<p>4.B. Critically evaluate the perspective of the creator(s) of a primary source, including tone, subjectivity, and biases, and consider how these relate to the original purpose(s) and audience(s) of the source.</p>	<p>Reading 6: Assess how point of view or purpose shapes the content and style of a text.</p> <p>Reading 8: Delineate and evaluate the argument and specific claims in a text, including the validity of the reasoning as well as the relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.</p> <p>Speaking & Listening 3: Evaluate a speaker’s point of view, reasoning, and use of evidence and rhetoric.</p> <p>Language 3: Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening.</p>
<p>4.C. Situate a primary source in context by applying knowledge about the time and culture in which it was created; the author or creator; its format, genre, publication history; or related materials in a collection.</p>	<p>Reading 9: Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take.</p> <p>Language 3: Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening.</p>
<p>4.D. As part of the analysis of available resources, identify, interrogate, and consider the reasons for silences, gaps, contradictions, or evidence of power relationships in the documentary record and how they impact the research process.</p>	<p>Reading 3 (Literacy in History/Social Studies, Grades 11 and 12 only): Evaluate various explanations for actions or events and determine which explanation best accords with textual evidence, acknowledging where the text leaves matters uncertain.</p>
<p>4.E. Factor physical and material elements into the interpretation of primary sources including the relationship between container (binding, media, or overall physical attributes) and informational content, and the relationship of original sources to physical or digital copies of those sources.</p>	<p>Reading 7: Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.</p>
<p>4.F. Demonstrate historical empathy, curiosity about the past, and appreciation for historical sources and historical actors.</p>	<p>Reading 3: Analyze how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop and interact over the course of a text.</p>

<p>5.A. Examine and synthesize a variety of sources in order to construct, support, or dispute a research argument.</p>	<p>Reading 7: Integrate and evaluate content presented in diverse media and formats, including visually and quantitatively, as well as in words.</p> <p>Reading 9: Analyze how two or more texts address similar themes or topics in order to build knowledge or to compare the approaches the authors take.</p> <p>Writing 1: Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence.</p> <p>Writing 2: Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content.</p> <p>Writing 9: Draw evidence from literary or informational texts to support analysis, reflection, and research.</p> <p>Speaking & Listening 4: Present information, findings, and supporting evidence such that listeners can follow the line of reasoning and the organization, development, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.</p>
<p>5.B. Use primary sources in a manner that respects privacy rights and cultural contexts.</p>	<p>Writing 4: Produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization, and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience.</p> <p>Speaking & Listening 6: Adapt speech to a variety of contexts and communicative tasks, demonstrating command of formal English when indicated or appropriate.</p>
<p>5.C. Cite sources in accordance with appropriate citation style guidelines or according to repository practice and preferences (when possible).</p> <p>5.D. Adhere to copyright and privacy laws when incorporating primary source information in a research or creative project.</p>	<p>Writing 8: Gather relevant information from multiple print and digital sources, assess the credibility and accuracy of each source, and integrate the information while avoiding plagiarism.</p>

Putting the Crosswalk to Use

Drafting new lesson plans to illustrate application of the crosswalk for adapting resources is beyond the scope of this article. Instead, it will illustrate how the crosswalk might serve existing TPS resources. As already noted, the Society of American Archivists has published *Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources*. Each of these is aligned with one or more of the *Guidelines*, but only one also includes alignment with the Common Core State Standards. As a preliminary test of the crosswalk, we can examine whether it applies to any of these case studies with accurate results.

Two of these case studies are mentioned in the literature review as already targeting K–12 audiences wholly or in part. The first case study (“Case 4: Crafting a Research

Question: Differentiated Teaching for Instruction with Primary Sources Across Diverse Learning Levels”) describes scaffolded instruction techniques for teaching K–12 students to generate and refine research questions (*Guidelines* Objective 1.C) and for helping students understand that research questions evolve and change (*Guidelines* Objective 1.D).⁵⁴ Turning to the crosswalk, we are presented with the following Common Core State Standards alignment for these objectives:

Writing 7: Conduct short as well as more sustained research projects based on focused questions, demonstrating understanding of the subject under investigation.

Writing 5: Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach.

The procedure outlined in Case 4 would meet these objectives, and in fact, Case 4 is the only SAA case study to date that aligns with both Common Core State Standards (for grades four through twelve) and the *Guidelines*.⁵⁵ This CCSS alignment does include grade-level standards for Writing 7 in grades six through twelve, as well as other standards, but not Writing 5. As the author of Case 4, the author of this article can attest that Writing 5 was omitted because other Common Core standards were identified as more crucial in the learning environments for which the lesson plan was written. Case 4 also reinforces the earlier statement that the crosswalk does not assume an equal relationship between the *Guidelines* and the CCSS. The lesson plan in Case 4 was initially written with Common Core alignment in mind, and then objectives from the *Guidelines* were aligned secondarily. We can see that selected *Guidelines* objectives are met by aligned Common Core standards from the crosswalk, but if our starting point is the CCSS, we may see a different set of standards on that side of the equation.

The second case study (“Case 14: Co-curricular Innovation: Teaching About Patents as Primary Sources”) also includes K–12 audiences as a secondary focus. Bridget Garnai and Heidi Gauder developed workshops to introduce students to using patents, including an overview of the history of patents in the United States, the role of patents in research and development, and instruction on how to search patents. These workshops aimed to ensure that students could search the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) database and identify and communicate about the components of a patent.⁵⁶ The activities in this two-part workshop were designed to meet four *Guidelines* objectives: 1.B, 2.A, 3.A, and 3.B. Turning to our crosswalk, these objectives are aligned with several of the Common Core anchor standards: Reading 1, 2, 4, 5, and 7; Writing 2 and 8; Speaking & Listening 3, and Language 4, 5, and 6. The breadth of Common Core anchor standards aligned with the four selected *Guidelines* objectives makes discussion of the appropriateness of this alignment lengthy, and it may be wise when speaking with K–12 classroom teachers to select and communicate the most relevant Common Core standards taught by this activity. With a quick glance, however, we can see the applicability of the crosswalk to this scenario. By learning about patents and the patent application process, conducting patent searches in the USPTO database, and describing information about the patents found, students are using content provided in a variety of formats (Reading 7), using context to understand

technical information that is presented to them (Reading 4; Language 4, 5, and 6), and, finally, gathering and integrating information from a variety of sources (Writing 8) to clearly present information that communicates main concepts from the patents (Reading 1 and 2; Writing 2).

It has been noted earlier that the CCSS has been criticized for not including culturally responsive pedagogical frameworks. A third case study (“Case 3: Fostering Historical Empathy in Unusual Times: A Case Study of the Course ‘OSU, Women and Oral History: An Exploration of 150 Years’”) is aligned with Objective 4.F from the *Guidelines* (“Demonstrate historical empathy, curiosity about the past, and appreciation for historical sources and historical actors”), which calls for a degree of cultural sensitivity training.⁵⁷ This case study gives us an opportunity to explore whether the crosswalk can help translate Objective 4.F, and culturally responsive teaching, into the language of the Common Core. Case 3 situates oral history skills within the context of a semester-long class on women’s history. Central to the focus on teaching historical empathy was a series of activities in which students listened to an oral history and wrote a reflection detailing the content of the oral history, what they believe to have been the purpose of the interview, and an explanation of how the oral history added to existing historic narratives on the same topic.⁵⁸ As a final project, the students conducted their own oral history interview with a notable woman at the university and wrote a reflection on their project. The overall nature of the students’ feedback confirmed that the course instructors had successfully developed historical empathy in their students.⁵⁹

Returning to our crosswalk, Objective 4.F is aligned with the Reading 3 Common Core anchor standard (“Analyze how and why individuals, events, and ideas develop and interact over the course of a text.”). At a glance, it does not appear that this Common Core anchor standard is terribly interested in the development of historical empathy. A concern for how to integrate social and emotional learning competencies such as empathy into the Common Core is an ongoing discussion and requires some creativity.⁶⁰ Social-emotional skills such as development of historical empathy are not explicit in the Common Core standards, but Reading 3 appears to be the anchor standard that best corresponds to the development of empathy. Examination of grade-level standards can help us see this more clearly. The connection is most obvious at lower learning levels. For example, the third grade Reading 3 standard (CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.3.3) requires students to be able to “describe characters in a story (e.g., their traits, motivations, or feelings) and explain how their actions contribute to the sequence of events.” A middle school-level version of the standard (CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.6.3) uses similar language; however, the need to identify and describe feelings and motivations is no longer explicit: “Describe how a particular story’s or drama’s plot unfolds in a series of episodes as well as how the characters respond or change as the plot moves toward a resolution.” By high school, all of these skills from third and sixth grade are assumed to have been acquired, as reflected in the ninth and tenth grade version of the standard (CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RL.9–10.3): “Analyze how complex characters (e.g., those with multiple or conflicting motivations) develop over the course of a text, interact with other characters, and advance the plot or develop the

theme.” These grade-level standards ask students to identify emotions, to interpret the motivation for actions, and to reflect on how individuals in a narrative react, change, and interact. All of these skills tie in with what Petersen and Edmunson-Morton describe having their university students write about in reflection activities for oral history listening—activities that successfully helped develop historical empathy.

In adapting the activities of Case 3 to a K–12 learning environment, it is clear that changes would need to be made. Oral histories could be swapped out or excerpted to be most appropriate to the learning level, reflection activities could be modified to include age-appropriate prompts for response, and these activities could be conducted as class discussions at a lower learning level or written activities at a higher learning level. However, it is not unimaginable that an archives educator could rely on the structure of the activities from Case 3 for teaching K–12 classes to develop similar activities aligned to the Common Core anchor standards.

As demonstrated in the example of Case 3, the Common Core anchor standards in the crosswalk do not provide as much specificity as grade-level standards. They do, however, provide a clear way to navigate to grade-level standards, which can shed further light on appropriate adaptation for the skill level demanded at each grade. Further instructions on reading grade-level standards are beyond the scope of this article but are readily available on the Common Core State Standards website.⁶¹ Furthermore, an archivist who is nervous about navigating the myriad grade-level standards for the first time could have an honest conversation with a classroom teacher about this. Simply starting a conversation with, “I think that one of my favorite oral history activities could be adapted to meet the Reading 3 standard for your students, but I’d love your help on making sure I understand the grade-level requirements” could be the start of a great collaboration.

Reflections and Future Work

What does this crosswalk between the *Guidelines for Teaching with Primary Sources* and the Common Core State Standards teach us? And, what implications can it have for our work? This crosswalk illustrates that higher education and K–12 audiences share a common language in skills-based pedagogy. Reflecting on the skills that are taught within our instruction practices, we can use the crosswalk to translate our instruction techniques to different audiences and communicate their benefits to different age levels. While some objectives from the *Guidelines* are aligned with fewer anchor standards from the CCSS, only one objective has no direct alignment (2.C), and a second does not align with every grade level (4.F). And, while only three examples have been used to put this crosswalk to the test, they demonstrate how we can use a skills-based standards crosswalk to adapt our teaching to various learning levels across K–16 education. As we consider future directions for scholarship and publications on TPS, this crosswalk sets the stage for changing norms regarding how we write and speak about our work. The archival literature abounds in case studies on teaching with primary sources, but even authors of case studies that illustrate work with a very specific audience could use this

crosswalk to articulate applicability of that work to other age groups or to read those resources and translate them to other instruction contexts. Additionally, creators of other TPS educational materials, such as lesson plans and classroom resources, could reference this crosswalk for articulating standards and objectives met by those materials in a way that resonates with both higher education and K–12 instructors.

This crosswalk is not, however, the entire solution. As noted previously, standards can be problematic; often neglecting to account for student diversity and not including culturally responsive pedagogy. As a reference tool that relies entirely on standards, this crosswalk could unintentionally amplify the role of standards in designing our resources and pedagogy. The hope, however, is that this standards-based crosswalk might make some of our work—particularly communicating relevance in different learning environments and to different audiences—easier and inspire archivists and special collections librarians to grow and learn other instructional skills by turning to the education literature for guidance on culturally responsive teaching in a standards-based environment and to the archival literature for strategies to cultivate historical empathy and cultural sensitivity in archival spaces.⁶² Ultimately, this crosswalk is intended to be a tool that can make space for creativity, collaboration, and continued learning in the adaptation of TPS pedagogy and resources to meet the needs of every student.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Jen Hoyer is the electronic resources and technical services librarian at CUNY City College of Technology. She previously worked as the educating librarian at Brooklyn Public Library's Center for Brooklyn History from 2016 through 2021 and has been a core organizer at Interference Archive (Brooklyn, New York) since 2013. She has spent significant time researching and exploring both community archives and teaching with primary sources and considers the impact of creating access to diverse source types to be a critical area of discourse in the profession. She is passionate about dialogue around how access to information impacts individuals and their identity within larger communities. She has previously published articles on archives, education, and access in *Reference Services Review*, the *Journal of Contemporary Archival Studies*, *Archival Science*, *Radical Teacher*, *Radical History Review*, and the *Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies*. She is also the innovation in practice section editor for *Partnership: The Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, is a member of the Wikimedia Foundation Regional Grants Committee for the United States and Canada, and was series editor of the Society of American Archivists' Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources from 2019 to 2021. Her coauthored volume, *The Social Movement Archive*, was published by Litwin Books in 2021.

NOTES

1. Ken Osborne, "Archives in the Classroom," *Archivaria* 23 (Winter 1986–87): 16.
2. *Ibid.*, 17. See the work of groups including the TPS Collective (<http://tpscollective.org>), the RBMS Instruction and Outreach Committee (<https://rbms.info/committees/instruction-outreach>), and the Society of American Archivists Reference, Access, and Outreach Section (<https://www2.archivists.org/groups/reference-access-and-outreach-section>).
3. Nora Almeida, "The Labour of Austerity: Absurdity, Performative Resistance, and Cultural Transformation," *Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship* 6 (December 18, 2020): 6, <https://doi.org/10.33137/cjal-rcbu.v6.34008>; Maura Smale, "Doing Less with Less," *ACRL Log* (blog), November 9, 2019, <https://acrl.org/2019/11/09/doing-less-with-less>; Kevin Seeber, "Austerity Forever," *Kevinseeber.Com* (blog), December 3, 2019, <https://kevinseeber.com/blog/austerity-forever>.
4. The author's personal experience in this field, and passion for bridging gaps between higher education and K–12 resources for TPS, includes eight years of doing education outreach at Interference Archive, an all-volunteer-run archive of social movement ephemera in New York City which frequently hosts (mostly higher ed) class visits; five years working in the education department of Brooklyn Public Library's Center for Brooklyn History (formerly the Brooklyn Collection) to conduct approximately seventy instruction sessions for K–12 students each year; four years collaborating to organize the Teaching with Primary Sources Unconference, with a specific personal focus on creating space at this event for conversations across K–12 and higher education divides; and one-and-a-half years as series editor for the Society of American Archivists' Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources.
5. David Kobrin, *Beyond the Textbook: Teaching History Using Documents and Primary Sources* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1996); Keith C. Barton and Linda S. Levstick, "Why Don't More History Teachers Engage Students in Interpretation?," *Social Education* 67, no. 6 (2015): 358–61, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315726885-10>.
6. Franky Abbott and Dan Cohen, "Using Large Digital Collections in Education: Meeting the Needs of Teachers and Students" (Digital Public Library of America, April 9, 2015), 9, https://www.amaga.org.au/sites/default/files/uploaded-content/website-content/ACT_Branch/Events/2017/using-large-collections-in-education-dpla-paper-4-9-15-2.pdf.
7. Robin Katz, "Documenting and Sharing Instruction Practices: The Story of TeachArchives.Org," in *Educational Programs*, ed. Kate Theimer (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 185.
8. Jeanine Mazak and Frank Manista, "Collaborative Learning: University Archives and Freshman Composition," *The Reference Librarian* 32, nos. 67–68 (2000): 225–42, https://doi.org/10.1300/J120v32n67_16; Pablo Alvarez, "Introducing Rare Books into the Undergraduate Curriculum," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts and Cultural Heritage* 7, no. 2 (2006): 94–103, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5860/rbm.7.2.263>; Kirsten Mulrennan, "Lessons in Making the Unique Ubiquitous: Diversifying the Role of the Special Collections and Archives Department to Enhance Teaching and Learning at the University of Limerick," *Archives and Records* 41, no. 2 (2020): 126–47, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23257962.2020.1713070>; Megan L. Toups, "When the Curioso Meets the Curator," *The Reading Room* 1, no. 2 (2016): 35–48; Jason Tomberlin and Matthew Turi, "Supporting Student Work: Some Thoughts About Special Collections Instruction," *Journal of Library Administration* 52, nos. 3–4 (2012): 304–12, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2012.684512>; Matthew C. Reynolds, "Lay of the Land: The State of Bibliographic Instruction Efforts in ARL Special Collections Libraries," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, & Cultural Heritage* 13, no. 1 (2012): 19, <https://doi.org/10.5860/RBM.13.1.366>; Shan Sutton and Lorrie Knight, "Beyond the Reading Room: Integrating Primary and Secondary Sources in the Library Classroom," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, no. 3 (2006): 320–25, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2006.03.001>; Susan M. Allen, "Rare Books and the College Library: Current Practices in Marrying Undergraduates to Special Collections," *Rare Books and Manuscript Librarianship* 13, no. 2 (1999): 110–19, <https://doi.org/10.5860/13.2.157>; Jeanne Abrams, "Primary Sources in the College Classroom: The Beck Archives at the University of Denver Libraries," *Judaica Librarianship* 21 (July 2, 2020): 49–57, <https://doi.org/10.14263/jl.v21i.535>.

9. Christopher Harter and Elisabeth McMahon, "Maximizing Partnerships: Faculty Buy-in, Service Learning, and Hidden Collections," in *Innovation, Collaboration and Models: Proceedings of the CLIR Cataloging Hidden Special Collections and Archives Symposium* 169 (CLIR, 2015), 40–47, <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED561290.pdf>; Joanne Archer, Ann M. Hanlon, and Jennie A. Levine, "Investigating Primary Source Literacy," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 35, no. 5 (2009): 410–20, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2009.06.017>; Dainan Skeem and Catherine Fulford, "An Introduction to the University Archive: A Web-Based Instruction Module," <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/40180>.
10. Mark Greene, "Using College and University Archives as Instructional Materials: A Case Study and an Exhortation," *Midwestern Archivist* 14, no. 1 (1989): 30–38, <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1793/45542>; Laurie L. McFadden, "Making History Live: How to Get Students Interested in University Archives," *College & Research Libraries News* 59, no. 6 (1998): 423–25, <https://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/20100/24106>; Peter Wosh, Janet Bunde, and Chelsea Blacker, "University Archives and Educational Partnerships: Three Perspectives," *Archival Issues: Journal of the Midwest Archives Conference* 31, no. 1 (2007): 83–103, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41102142>; Wendy M. Duff and Joan M. Cherry, "Archival Orientation for Undergraduate Students: An Exploratory Study of Impact," *American Archivist* 71, no. 2 (2008): 499–529, <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.71.2.p6lt385r7556743h>; Cory L. Nimer and J. Gordon Daines III, "Teaching Undergraduates to Think Archivaly," *Journal of Archival Organization* 10, no. 1 (2012): 4–44, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332748.2012.680418>; Melissa A. Hubbard and Megan Lotts, "Special Collections, Primary Resources, and Information Literacy Pedagogy," *Communications in Information Literacy* 7, no. 1 (2013): 24–38, <http://dx.doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2013.7.1.132>; Anne Bahde, "The History Labs: Integrating Primary Source Literacy Skills into a History Survey Course," *Journal of Archival Organization* 11, nos. 3–4 (2014): 175–204, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332748.2013.951254>.
11. Marcus C. Robyns, "The Archivist as Educator: Integrating Critical Thinking Skills into Historical Research Methods Instruction," *American Archivist* 64, no. 2 (2001): 376, <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.64.2.q4742x2324j10457>.
12. Trevor James Bond and Todd Butler, "A Dialog on Teaching an Undergraduate Seminar in Special Collections," *Library Review* 58, no. 4 (2009): 310–16, <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530910952855>; Dominique A. Tobbell, "Teaching Medical History with Primary Sources: Introduction," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 90, no. 1 (2016): 124–27, <https://doi.org/10.1353/bhm.2016.0034>; Marian J. Matyn, "Getting Undergraduates to Seek Primary Sources in Archives," *The History Teacher* 33, no. 3 (2000): 349–55, <https://doi.org/10.2307/495032>; David Pengelley, "Teaching with Primary Historical Sources: Should It Go Mainstream? Can It?" (International Meeting of the International Study Group on Relations Between History and Pedagogy of Mathematics, Mexico City, Mexico, 2008); Jonathan Vincent and Danny Mayer, "Teaching Radicalism from the University Archives," *Radical Teacher* 79 (Summer 2007): 19–26.
13. Ann Schmiesing and Deborah R. Hollis, "The Role of Special Collections Departments in Humanities Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching: A Case Study," *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 2, no. 3 (2002): 476–9, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2002.0065>.
14. Kelly Kolodny, Julia Zoino-Jeannetti, and Colleen Previte, "Teaching Resources: Teaching the History of Education Using College and Local Archives," *Historical Journal of Massachusetts* 37, no. 2 (2009): 124–38, <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:141700368>.
15. Lori Lynn Dekydtspotter and Cherry Dunham Williams, "Alchemy and Innovation: Cultivating an Appreciation for Primary Sources in Younger Students," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, and Cultural Heritage* 14, no. 2 (2013): 68, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5860/rbm.14.2.402>.
16. Reynolds, "Lay of the Land," 25; Doris Malkmus, "Plan for (Teaching) the Past! Reach Out Now to Middle and High Schools Gearing Up for National History Day," *MAC Newsletter* 41, no. 3 (2014): 32, <https://dr.lib.iastate.edu/handle/20.500.12876/54121>.
17. Jenny Robb, "The Opper Project: Collaborating with Educators to Promote the Use of Editorial Cartoons in the Social Studies Classroom," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts and Cultural Heritage* 10, no. 2 (2009): 70–94, <https://doi.org/10.5860/rbm.10.2.320>.
18. Michelle Visser, "Perspectives On... Special Collections at ARL Libraries and K–12 Outreach: Current Trends," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, no. 3 (2006): 313–19, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2006.02.012>.

19. Michelle Visser, "Inviting in the Rabble: Changing Approaches to Public Service and Access in Special Collections," *Public Services Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (2003): 36, https://doi.org/10.1300/J295v01n04_03.
20. Lee Ann Potter, "Education Programs in the Presidential Libraries: A Report from the Field," *The Public Historian* 28, no. 3 (2006): 133–42, <https://doi.org/10.1525/tpb.2006.28.3.133>.
21. Anne J. Gilliland-Swetland, Yasmin B. Kafai, and William E. Landis, "Integrating Primary Sources into the Elementary School Classroom: A Case Study of Teachers' Perspectives," *Archivaria* 48 (Fall 1999): 95, <https://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/12718>.
22. Anne J. Gilliland-Swetland, "An Exploration of K–12 User Needs for Digital Primary Source Materials," *American Archivist* 61, no. 1 (1998): 157, <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.61.1.w851770151576103>; Gilliland-Swetland, Kafai, and Landis, "Integrating Primary Sources into the Elementary School Classroom," 89–116.
23. Doris Malkmus, "Primary Source Research and the Undergraduate: A Transforming Landscape," *Journal of Archival Organization* 6, nos. 1–2 (2008): 61, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332740802235125>.
24. Peter Carini, "Archivists as Educators: Integrating Primary Sources into the Curriculum," *Journal of Archival Organization* 7, nos. 1–2 (2009): 47, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332740902892619>.
25. Anne Diekema, "Teaching Use of Digital Primary Sources for K–12 Settings," *D-Lib Magazine* 17, nos. 3–4 (2011), <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march11/diekema/03diekema.html>; Wendy Wasman et al., "Branching Out: Using Historical Records to Connect with the Environment," *The Journal of Interactive Technology & Pedagogy*, no. 14 (2019), <https://jitp.commons.gc.cuny.edu/branching-out-using-historical-records-to-connect-with-the-environment/>; Magia G. Krause, "Undergraduates in the Archives: Using an Assessment Rubric to Measure Learning," *American Archivist* 73, no. 2 (2010): 514, <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.73.2.72176h742v201115>; Shelley Arlen, Melissa J. Clapp, and Cindy L. Craig, "Producing Tutorials with Digital Professionals: Primary Sources, Pirates, and Partners," *Journal of Library Innovation* 6, no. 1 (2015): 3, <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:57454154>.
26. Gilliland-Swetland, "An Exploration of K–12 User Needs for Digital Primary Source Materials," 145.
27. Patricia Garcia, "Accessing Archives: Teaching with Primary Sources in K–12 Classrooms," *American Archivist* 80, no. 1 (2017): 193, <https://doi.org/10.17723/0360-9081.80.1.189>.
28. Sonia Yaco, Arkaigud Ramaprasad, and Thant Syn, "Themes in Recent Research on Integrating Primary Source Collections and Instruction," *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 20, no. 3 (2020): 449–74, <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2020.0025>.
29. Eleanor Mitchell, Peggy Seiden, and Suzy Taraba, eds., *Past or Portal? Enhancing Undergraduate Learning through Special Collections and Archives* (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2012).
30. Ryan Bean and Linnea Anderson, "Teaching Research and Learning Skills with Primary Sources: Three Modules," in *Past or Portal? Enhancing Undergraduate Learning through Special Collections and Archives*, 159; Doris Malkmus, "'Pulling on the White Gloves...Is Really Sort of Magic:' Report on Engaging History Undergraduates with Primary Sources," in *Past or Portal? Enhancing Undergraduate Learning through Special Collections and Archives*, 130.
31. Greg Johnson, "Introducing Undergraduate Students to Archives and Special Collections," *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 13, no. 2 (2006): 97, https://doi.org/10.1300/J106v13n02_07.
32. "About The Legacy Center Archives and Special Collections," Drexel University Legacy Center Archives & Special Collections College of Medicine, <https://drexel.edu/legacy-center/about/overview/>; "Mission & Values," NYU Libraries, New York University, <https://library.nyu.edu/about/general/values/>; "Manuscripts Collections in Special Collections & University Archives—Mission," UO Libraries, University of Oregon, <https://researchguides.uoregon.edu/manuscripts>.
33. See for example TeachArchives.org, funded by the US Department of Education Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and focused, as its funding suggests, on higher education students. The project website includes lesson plans and teaching suggestions but has only a single mention on the site that it could be adapted for use in a wide range of courses, from middle school to graduate programs. "Our Teaching Philosophy," TeachArchives.org, <http://www.teacharchives.org/articles/our-teaching-philosophy>.

34. Tara Laver, "Off the Shelf and Into the Classroom: Working with K–12 Teachers to Integrate Digitized Collections into Classroom Instruction," *The Southeastern Librarian* 50, no. 4 (2003): 35, <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/seln/vol50/iss4/9>.
35. Patricia Garcia, Joseph Lueck, and Elizabeth Yakel, "The Pedagogical Promise of Primary Sources: Research Trends, Persistent Gaps, and New Directions," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 45, no. 2 (2019): 99, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.01.004>.
36. Marian J. Matyn, "Getting Undergraduates to Seek Primary Sources in Archives," *The History Teacher* 33, no. 3 (2000): 354, <https://doi.org/10.2307/495032>; Robyns, "The Archivist as Educator," 364–5; Michael Eamon, "A 'Genuine Relationship with the Actual': New Perspectives on Primary Sources, History and the Internet in the Classroom," *The History Teacher* 39, no. 3 (2006): 297, <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/30036799>; Carini, "Archivists as Educators," 44; Abbott and Cohen, "Using Large Digital Collections in Education," 18.
37. Thomas Nygren, "Students Writing History Using Traditional and Digital Archives," *Human IT* 12, no. 3 (2014): 79, <https://humanit.hb.se/article/view/476>.
38. Celia Caust-Ellenboogen, Jordan Landes, and Robin Landes, "DBQ: Document-based Quarantine," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, & Cultural Heritage* 22, no. 1 (2001): 17, <https://doi.org/10.5860/rbm.22.1.16>.
39. J. Gordon Daines III and Cory L. Nimer, "In Search of Primary Source Literacy: Opportunities and Challenges," *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts, & Cultural Heritage* 16, no. 1 (2015): 22, 33, <https://doi.org/10.5860/rbm.16.1.433>; SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of and Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy, *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* (Society of American Archivists, June 2018), 1, <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/GuidelinesForPrimarySourceLiteracy-June2018.pdf>; Elizabeth Yakel and Deborah Torres, "AI: Archival Intelligence and User Expertise," *American Archivist* 66, no. 1 (2003): 61, <https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.66.1.q022h85pn51n5800>.
40. Daines and Nimer, "In Search of Primary Source Literacy," 22, 33; SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force, *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*.
41. SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force, *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy*," 1.
42. Ibid.
43. Society of American Archivists, "Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources (TWPS)," <https://www2.archivists.org/publications/epubs/Case-Studies-Teaching-With-Primary-Sources>. Disclosure: The author of this article served as series editor for the Case Studies from October 2019 through February 2021.
44. Bridget Garnai and Heidi Gauder, "Co-Curricular Innovation: Teaching about Patents as Primary Sources," Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources (Society of American Archivists, June 2020), https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/TWPSCase_14_Co-curricular_Innovation.pdf.
45. Common Core State Standards Initiative, "English Language Arts Standards » Introduction » Key Design Consideration," <http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/introduction/key-design-consideration>.
46. Common Core State Standards Initiative, "Standards in Your State," <http://www.corestandards.org/standards-in-your-state>.
47. Annette Lamb and Larry Johnson, "Social Studies in the Spotlight: Digital Collections, Primary Sources, and the Common Core," *Teacher Librarian* 41, no. 1 (2013): 62–65, <https://hdl.handle.net/1805/8574>; David Bates, "Achieving Close(r) Reading with Primary Source Bundles," *Illinois Reading Council Journal* 44, no. 1 (2015–16): 65–75; Gilliland-Swetland, Kafai, and Landis, "Integrating Primary Sources into the Elementary School Classroom," 93.
48. Visser, "Perspectives On..." 317; Robb, "The Opper Project," 79; Shawna Gandy, "Teaching U.S. History from an Oregon Perspective: A Multimedia Approach to Educational Outreach," *OLA Quarterly* 18, no. 3 (2012): 28–33, https://journals3.library.oregonstate.edu/olaq/article/view/vol18_iss3_8; Richard Cox, Janet Ceja Alcalá, and Leanne Bowler, "Archival Document Packets: A Teaching Module in Advocacy Training Using the Papers of Governor Dick Thornburgh," *American Archivist* 75, no. 2 (2012): 371–92, <https://doi.org/10.17723/AARC.75.2.04778333025635M0>.

49. Betsy Rymes, Nelson Flores, and Anne Pomerantz, "The Common Core State Standards and English Learners: Finding the Silver Lining," *Language* 92, no. 4 (2016): 257–58, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/lan.2016.0080>; Carol M. Connor et al., "Improving Reading Outcomes for Students with or at Risk for Reading Disabilities: A Synthesis of the Contributions from the Institute of Education Sciences Research Centers" (February 2014): 3, 11.
50. Elizabeth Cramer, Mary E. Little, and Patricia Alvarez McHatton, "Equity, Equality, and Standardization: Expanding the Conversations," *Education and Urban Society* 50, no. 5 (2018): 490, <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0013124517713249>.
51. American Association of School Librarians, "Crosswalk of the Common Core Standards and the Standards for the 21st-Century Learner" (2011), 128, <http://www.ala.org/aasl/sites/ala.org/aasl/files/content/guidelinesandstandards/commoncorecrosswalk/pdf/CrosswalkEnglishStandardAll1-4.pdf>.
52. Gilliland-Swetland, "An Exploration of K–12 User Needs," 153.
53. These reviewers included an archivist at a higher education institution who supports both K–12 and higher education students and an educator with a master of arts in teaching history with experience as a middle school classroom teacher and as a K–12 educator in cultural heritage institutions. Thank you to Matt Herbison and Julia Pelaez for their support and encouragement on this project.
54. Jen Hoyer, Kaitlin Holt, and Julia Pelaez, "Case 4: Crafting a Research Question," Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources, Society of American Archivists (2018): 2–3 https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/TWPSCase_4_Crafting_A_Research_Question.pdf.
55. Ibid., 12–13.
56. Garnai and Gauder, "Co-Curricular Innovation."
57. Chris Petersen and Tiah Edmunson-Morton, "Case 3: Fostering Historical Empathy in Unusual Times: A Case Study of the Course OSU, Women and Oral History: An Exploration of 150 Years," Case Studies on Teaching with Primary Sources, Society of American Archivists (2018), https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/TWPSCase_3_Fostering_Historical_Empathy.pdf.
58. Ibid., 4–5.
59. Ibid., 6, 8.
60. Vicki Zakrewski, "How to Integrate Social-Emotional Learning into Common Core," *Greater Good Magazine: Science-Based Insights for a Meaningful Life* (January 22, 2014), https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/how_to_integrate_social_emotional_learning_into_common_core.
61. Common Core State Standards Initiative, "Read the Standards," <http://www.corestandards.org/read-the-standards>.
62. As a starting point on bringing culturally responsive pedagogy to standards-based instruction, see Steffen Saifer, Keisha Edwards, Debbie Ellis, Lena Ko, and Amy Stuczynski, *Culturally Responsive Standards-Based Teaching: Classroom to Community and Back*, 2nd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin and Portland, OR: Education Northwest, 2011). For an introduction to empathy and affect-based use of archives, see Michelle Caswell and Marika Cifor, "From Human Rights to Feminist Ethics: Radical Empathy in the Archives," *Archivaria* 81 (Spring 2016): 23–43, <https://archivaria.ca/index.php/archivaria/article/view/13557>.