



UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES

General Instruction Task Force Report

May 8, 2014

Task Force Members:

Alex Carroll, Laura Cleary, Sara Hudson, and Eric Lindquist

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Literature Review.....	3
Summary of Librarian Interviews	4
Summary of PWP Faculty Survey	11
Assessment of Peer Institutions.....	14
Recommendations	18
Recent Changes to PWP.....	22
Appendices.....	23

Executive Summary

One of the most important functions of university libraries and librarians is to help improve the information literacy of its patrons, especially students. The principal means of doing so has traditionally been in-person library instruction by librarians (and sometimes other library staff or graduate students). The University of Maryland Libraries have long sponsored an extensive program of instruction. Subject liaisons teach many subject specific courses—in history, psychology, chemistry, and so forth. In addition, there are a number of more general programs on campus for which librarians provide instruction, notably the Professional Writing Program (hereafter PWP), which is generally aimed at third-year students; the Gemstone Program, a multidisciplinary four-year research program for selected undergraduate honors students of all majors; and College Park Scholars (hereafter CPS), an academic residential community for select freshmen and sophomores.

Arrangements for providing instruction in some of these programs have, however, been somewhat ad hoc. In addition, the overall landscape has shifted dramatically since UM librarians first began providing general instruction. The possible uses of technology in instruction have increased radically in recent years, but technology has only begun to be incorporated in library instruction for general education classes. The demands for library instruction have increased, but the number of librarians has not, and the Libraries have to be careful about allotting human resources. Assessment has assumed a larger and larger and more prominent role in instruction but has not been systematically used in general library instruction.

For these and other reasons it is important to assess the Libraries' current involvement in general instruction with a view to improvement. To that end, in December 2013, Yelena Luckert, head of research services, and Cinthya Ippoliti, head of teaching and learning services, created a task force consisting of Sara Hudson, user education librarian (chair); Alex Carroll, agriculture and natural resources librarian; Laura Cleary, head of Special Collections' instruction and outreach committee; and Eric Lindquist, librarian for history and other subjects in the humanities. The task force was directed to "study the Libraries' general instruction programs and make recommendations for new curriculum and general improvements.... This study should be broad in scope, looking into new ways of teaching and utilizing technology, including blended instruction and flipped classroom models, recommending new curriculum and identifying the best staff that could potentially provide these services." (The complete charge is included in Appendix A of this report.)

To fulfill its charge, members of the task force gathered information in a number of ways. We conducted a literature review; interviewed librarians involved in instruction for general education classes; surveyed PWP faculty; and examined general instruction in peer institutions. Summaries of the results of our inquiries are included in this report along with recommendations.

Summary of Recommendations

(Note that fuller explanations of these recommendations are provided on pages 18-21 in the report.)

A general instruction committee should be appointed to take overall responsibility for general instruction programs. In time, if resources become available, a librarian position should be created to take charge of these programs.

Librarians should continue to be involved in in-person instruction for general instruction classes but some instruction could be entrusted to graduate students.

Partnerships with PWP and other general instruction programs should be enhanced. Librarians should work more closely with PWP instructors and instructors in other general instruction courses to provide something more effective than a single one-shot session

Librarians should make much greater use of technology to increase the effectiveness of their instruction.

New resources, human and technical, should be devoted to helping librarians create and use online tools for instruction

Systematic and centralized assessment of library instruction should be implemented.

Literature Review

Emphasis on the importance of active learning and collaboration continuously arise in literature regarding the effectiveness of library instruction. Librarians are most effective at teaching when they are able to engage their students. Students are much more engaged when instruction supports students' goals and specific assignments. Librarians can only acquire this information after adequate collaboration with course instructors.

Designing student learning outcomes as a guiding principle for a lesson plan is the foundation of good pedagogy. For library instruction, working with the course instructors ensures that achievable information literacy learning outcomes are designed, and that library instruction sessions will help students achieve those learning outcomes. Dewald (1999) discusses how students are more receptive to library instruction when they can understand its relevance and usefulness for a specific assignment. Breivik (2005) asserts that collaborating with faculty so that assignments require using library resources and services is the most effective way to increase library use. This also helps engage students in the library session; if they know that they have to use the library for their assignments, they will pay more attention during the session because it directly applies to their class. Watson, et al. (2013) demonstrates how collaboratively developing one-shot library sessions with course instructors can result in lasting partnerships.

Much of the literature emphasizes the need for active learning in the classroom in order to engage and excite students. Technology and gamification are different ways of engaging students in active learning. Walker (2008) believes that games are a good way to get students to participate willingly, particularly if there is a prize of some sort involved. LaGuardia (2012) sees the potential of technology and games to encourage active learning, but cautions against using a technique just because it is the "latest thing" and emphasizes that it is important to focus on what will help student learning most.

Usova (2011), in discussing a hybrid teaching method, or blended learning, recommends using active learning exercises to apply knowledge gained in the pre-class exercises, rather than just memorizing concepts. Lacy and Chen (2013) discuss the need to use the learning outcomes for the class to structure the active learning exercises for the session because this allows students to demonstrate their attainment of the learning outcomes.

Much of the literature focuses on fundamental information literacy instruction for first-year undergraduate students. Bowles-Terry (2012), however, stipulates the need to differentiate between lower- and upper-division students and learning objectives. The students from her focus group suggested having refresher videos or tutorials for upper-division students to review, if needed, so that those skills do not need to be discussed again in their library sessions.

Summary of Librarian Interviews

INTRODUCTION

Fourteen people were interviewed in person (12 by Laura and 3 by Sara) and 4 completed an abridged version of the interview online in an open response survey. The views expressed in this section are a reflection of the views reported in the interviews and surveys, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the task force. (Questions included in Appendix C & D.)

LIBRARIAN FEEDBACK

In general, librarians reported that they enjoy teaching in their subject specialty. Feelings were mixed about teaching general instruction sessions; while some enjoyed teaching these types of sessions, most would be happy to shed this responsibility. Most librarians expressed preference for working with individuals or in small groups. Many reported that instruction can be very exhausting when doing it a lot, which many subject librarians are called upon to do. Some librarians reported a bit of burnout, especially for teaching general instruction sessions. Many librarians reported that the one-on-one interactions with students are their favorite instruction sessions.

Learning Objectives

Some librarians use learning objectives to design their instruction sessions. Most who do so use learning objectives within the framework established by the User Education Services Assessment protocol, utilizing the ACRL Information Literacy Standards (ACRL ILS). Many librarians did not feel the ACRL ILS tested the appropriate type of learning outcome, and that we might be able to better define our own learning outcomes. Additionally, when teaching faculty identify very specific learning outcomes, it can be incredibly difficult to match this to an ACRL ILS, and to do so, might make instruction irrelevant to the class. The most successful learning outcomes were those created in conjunction with course instructors. One librarian focused on the ACRL ILS of “finding a topic”, “working with a topic”, “evaluating information”, in order to focus instruction on the research process and not the tools themselves.

Assessments

Responses were mixed as to whether or not librarians use assessments. Many felt results were inconclusive or irrelevant to what skills it was important for students to actually learn. Librarians sometimes receive feedback from professors, but rarely solicit this feedback. When feedback is received it is often generally vague and unhelpful. Some type of long term assessment that could be delivered at various points throughout the semester, to test information retention might be most useful. Qualitative measures such as quality of student projects would also be more useful than the ACRL ILS assessments we are currently using.

Content

Some librarians stated that they always tailor instruction to an individual class, and do not have a menu of topics they cover regardless of class. Others report that they include general library orientation topics related to our tools (such as finding books, reading call numbers, using interlibrary loan, using Research Port, creating citations, using citation managers, contacting librarians, introducing the Terrapin Learning Commons, talking about how much money we spend on resources, identifying resources we have that can be used for career development, using the “Find It” link, linking to “Find It” from Google Scholar, identifying relevant LibGuides, using the Library Skills Guides - <http://www.lib.umd.edu/tl/welcome/library-skills-guides> , and exploring footnotes) or research concepts (such as evaluating legitimacy of sources, learning what students need to do to make an assignment successful, examining how to develop a topic). Some believe the distinction of focusing on research methods, as opposed to focusing on the tools, would make instruction more relevant and useful to students. Another idea was that we could have official learning outcomes for all general library skills class (of a particular type such as PWP, Gemstones, CPS, etc.), rather than specific ones for each course/section. It seems that many upper-level students need a complete rehash of the ENGL101 introductory topics either because they never took ENGL 101 or have forgotten what they learned through lack of use. Many librarians pointed out that students struggle to select good research topics. The ability to pick and refine a topic is a crucial component of the research process, and a classroom full of students that cannot develop a research topic prior to a library session can present a very significant impediment to library instruction.

Working with Faculty

Librarians emphasized that the ability to work closely with a professor greatly influences their enjoyment of a particular class. When professors are more engaged, it allows the librarian to create content that is relevant and useful to students. Because many of the instructors with whom librarians work are graduate students and adjunct faculty who come and go, it can be difficult to form fruitful relationships with faculty. All librarians emphasized how important it is to use the assignment to direct instruction. Many expressed frustration when an assignment is not available for the librarian to work with, or the timing for the project is off. Librarians believe having an assignment to tie to library instruction makes learning relevant and meaningful to students. One librarian reported that he asks the professor to reschedule the library instruction session for time in the semester when students have a project, so that instruction can be more meaningful. Librarian instructors often reported that their instruction would be much improved if they had a better idea of the learning that occurs prior to their session; when students are not well oriented to the goals of the PWP program, they often do not understand the relevance of the topics covered during the library instruction session.

Using Online Tools

Many, but not all, librarians are using LibGuides. There was not a clear pattern of using class specific or general LibGuides, and librarians had justifications for both class specific and subject overview guides. Librarians overwhelmingly agreed that keeping things streamlined and simple is best. Results were mixed as to whether instructors taught the LibGuide or simply mention it as a place to go for

information after instruction. Some librarians create general LibGuides, and add tabs for specific subject related classes. Librarians noted that these guides can quickly become outdated.

Few librarians are using CANVAS. Those that do use CANVAS mount information about course reserves or might link to guides. One particular librarian has developed a suite of materials for instructors to “shop” from. They can choose the options that suit their class and incorporate these modules into their own CANVAS site. These tools were developed in conjunction with the instructional technology specialist and chair of her teaching department. The CANVAS site was populated with existing material from the library website, LibGuides, and vendor tutorials. New content was not necessary as it existed elsewhere.

One librarian noted that many of the PWP courses are already being taught using some in-person and some virtual class sessions. Librarians agreed that in-person instruction cannot totally be replaced by online learning, but that many of the elements could be handled well by utilizing online tools such as tutorials, assessments, videos, etc. Many suggested that the individualized attention that occurs in in-person instruction sessions is invaluable to students, and seems to be the point where learning is cemented for many learners. Currently, some librarians are creating video tutorials, which are then embedded in LibGuides or CANVAS sites.

Active Learning Techniques

Not many librarians are using active learning techniques in their classes. Most librarians incorporate some time into each class to allow students to conduct their own searches using the tools/skills outlined during lecture. During this time, the librarian rotates around to individuals or small groups and discusses search strategies with students. This is the time when questions often arise, as opposed to during lecture or after the session is over. Other librarians feel that it is easier for everyone to work on a single, subject-related, topic. This allows for more guided practice.

Some librarians noted that working with smaller groups, in informal seminar type settings, is ideal for interacting with and connecting to students. This allows the instructor to respond to the unique needs of the students. One particular librarian requires students to develop their own criteria for identifying good resources, and does not spend time lecturing to teach this concept. Another librarian has student imagine a real-world (not school-based) scenario where they need to complete a task for their boss. This task is easily related to their academic work, and also makes the work their academic work seem relevant to what they will be doing after graduation.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Content of Classes

It was noted that one of the reasons students tend to feel disengaged with the content of library instruction sessions is that the skills and tools we teach are viewed as irrelevant to their success, both in the class and in life. Librarians emphasized the importance of grounding the library instruction sessions in relevancy, especially to students’ post graduate life. One librarian who was interviewed stated that

there does not need to be an extensive explanation, and relevancy of these skills and tools can probably be summed up in a few sentences, with a short example.

When an assignment is not provided by the course instructor, it is important for the librarian to design a research topic to use as an example throughout the class. This allows them to practice their skills. It was recommended by some librarians that the students practice on their own, rather than during a guided practice.

A number of librarians recommended refocusing general library instruction sessions on research skills, as opposed to tool-based skills. Sometimes, interactions with students are at a point in their project when their topics are not well formed. Teaching targeted searching is not helpful at this point in project development, and a focus on narrowing the research topic might be better received. It seems that there should be an adjustment for timing or adjustment for instruction focus so that we are better able to assist students.

Two librarians reported success with a library-instruction session in which students were assigned a complex critical thinking assignment for completion before class. Each student only took one concept to study, and then shared what they learned with the rest of the class.

A final, easy suggestion that was made by multiple librarians was to “Let your inner geek flag fly” and be sure to communicate your enthusiasm for libraries to students. Students seem most inspired for libraries when librarians are enthusiastic. People respond to authenticity and enthusiasm which can inspire engagement.

Building Relationships

Librarians suggested that we reach out and build a better relationship with the PWP program director. Library instruction should be part of a partnership in which we are working with the program to help students meet goals. This might mean that the way we provide instruction will look different, and might not occur in one, 50-minute session, but perhaps could be spread in small doses throughout the semester to support student learning at their point of need.

Librarians might also look for ways to be included in the Teaching Assistant’s orientation program, so we might let them know about our desire to collaborate on instruction and work with students on their projects.

Librarians also suggested that we reach out to departments and embed librarians within their buildings. This would allow librarians to be more visible to students, and the department.

There is some concern that the introduction of online tools will eliminate the interaction between instructors and librarians and everyone who was interviewed emphasized that making connections with instructors is one of the important elements of in-person instruction. This is a relationship that no one wants to disappear.

Some additional instructional opportunities were also suggested, including:

- New boot camps to target more graduate level courses; these students need help in order to write their theses/dissertations.
- The Summer Bridge Program to reach out to high school students before they begin college.

Online Tools/ Content

Many librarians suggested the development of CANVAS modules that could be utilized for instruction of core library skills. CANVAS is a place students are required to go for other course content, so rather than making them access something via the library website, it would be wise to meet these users where they are. Some would like to see live-action videos or screen casts, but realize this type of production is beyond their skill set and available time. Content might include tool-specific instruction or introduction to conceptual topics, which would be further explored during in-person instruction sessions.

Many stated that it will be important to create assessments to accompany tutorials in order to encourage engagement with the material. Additionally, it is important that we make more information available to students outside of class (as well as during instruction). Having online tools would easily allow us to do this. CANVAS would also provide a place for librarians to administer various assessments throughout a semester, including needs assessments prior to instruction and learning assessments after instruction.

Librarians thought that it might be useful to attempt to virtually embed librarians into the students' CANVAS sites. This engagement might require students to participate in discussions with the librarian. This type of engagement could help librarians catch misinformation that is being passed around within a particular class (like how to distinguish a primary vs. secondary source, which often varies between disciplines). Based on past experiences, several librarians suggested that this would likely only work if the instructor incentivized students to engage with the librarian in this way. Staffing for this type of virtually embedded librarianship might be accomplished by using our graduate students.

It was suggested that LibGuides need to correspond directly to each course; therefore, general skills guides might not be ideal in all situations. Some respondents stated that we should only be using CANVAS instead of using LibGuides; however, a significant number of librarians continue to use LibGuides extensively.

Many expressed interest in a tool that would allow librarians to share standardized content and incorporate it into their own course tools. This would be a place where updates to this content could be made and automatically reflected in all instances throughout tools.

In-person Instruction

If much of the generic or basic instruction takes place online, the librarian could come in for shorter, more targeted sessions to engage students in active learning opportunities (in their classroom, not in the library) throughout the semester. These would theoretically be more effective at driving home a skill. And by requiring less class time, perhaps librarian instructors could attend multiple sessions throughout the semester to provide targeted information at the point of need, rather than trying to jam everything, and every learning objective, into one single class.

Another suggestion for in person instruction was to provide “lab” or workshop sessions where students can come work on their project, with a librarian present to assist, but not necessarily lecture. Course instructors would likely need to provide some sort of incentive or credit for participating in the library sessions (online or in person) so that students are more inclined to participate.

Staffing

A common suggestion was that it is important to centralize these general library instruction programs (including PWP, Gemstones, CPS, boot camps, etc.) so that they are not being administered and coordinated by so many unconnected staff.

Almost all librarians reported that graduate students could provide instruction for general library skills courses. It was emphasized by many that they would need extensive training and mentoring, but that past graduate students have shown themselves to be very capable. However, a few respondents strongly disagreed, insisting that it was important for librarians to always teach this level of instruction. These librarians believe that the subject matter for these courses is still so specialized that it might be difficult to train a graduate student adequately. They feel very strongly that their subject expertise is necessary to teach these courses. Alternatively, by involving graduate students for some of the general instruction, subject specialists would be freed up to work with upper level courses, teaching advanced research methods. Graduate students could be used to teach the core library skills, directing the more specialized, subject-specific, instruction to the subject specialist.

Another common theme was that the library needs more general instruction staff. Librarians noted the need for an instructional coordinator, or a librarian who could take charge of outreach, instructional design, instructional technology, coordinate schedules, as well as provide instruction.

It was also noted that while librarians have access to a lot of technological capabilities, many do not necessarily have the know-how to best utilize the technology. Hiring a media specialist could provide librarians with the training and expert support needed to create professional level educational tools. The School of Business has had success using student workers to staff such a position.

Training Instruction Staff

Multiple librarians suggested developing a training program for library instruction staff and graduate student workers. A focus on pedagogical training would allow library instructors to recognize the need to consider different learning styles during instruction. This would improve librarian instructors’ ability to design effective library instruction sessions for PWP students. Pedagogical training might also refocus instruction away from tool based skills, understanding that students need to know what to do with a given tool, not necessarily that a given tool exists.

It was also suggested that we adopt a program of observation and evaluation of librarian instructors.

Another suggestion was for an official program or formal practicum to train and foster graduate student instructors.

Future Technologies

A number of suggestions for embracing future technologies surrounded some software we are already using. Librarians suggested that CANVAS be used in new ways, such as:

- Allow librarians access to all of a particular departments' courses as designers automatically before the beginning of the semester so we can help faculty
- Set up course and media reserves automatically for all courses, reducing the number of emails that librarians have to wade through at the beginning of the semester. Record library instruction sessions, and then post them as a reference after instruction
- Embed LibAnswers in online learning, and in the classroom
- Utilize publisher tools when they exist, especially for tools that change rapidly, such as databases

Other suggestions focused on creating tutorials. These included:

- Emulate tutorial styles that work, such as TED talks
- Create videos of overview of spaces and services
 - Main library/branches
 - TLC
 - Equipment loan program
 - Research Port
 - WorldCat
 - Boolean searching
 - Databases
- Create a standard assessment of needs
- Create tutorials that allow you to interact with a live website, within the tutorial

Final suggestions for future technologies included investigating use of software that allows you to project student's computer screens to main teaching screen, exploring gamification of tutorials and/or tours, and adopting various technologies to address accessibility needs for different learning styles and disabilities.

Summary of PWP Faculty Survey

Some 135 PWP classes are offered each semester. In about half those classes, a librarian meets with the class, almost always for a single, one-shot, instruction session (sometimes called library day). The decision to invite librarians to teach a session has traditionally been left up to the individual instructors and is not mandated by the program.

The task force thought that it would be useful to survey the PWP faculty and to hear from both PWP instructors who invite librarians to meet with their classes and those who do not. On April 3, 2014 a six-part survey was made available to all PWP instructors via the program's reflector and remained open until April 18. There are about 65 instructors in the PWP program. Nineteen completed the survey, a response rate of 29%, which the task force regards as a useful sample. The views expressed by the instructors ranged extremely widely. Overall the responses were detailed and thoughtful and included many useful suggestions. All the responses are provided verbatim in appendix E. The present document is a summary.

Question 1: Do you usually have librarians meet with your classes? Why or why not?

Eleven instructors responded yes while seven responded no. (One respondent did not answer this question.) Those who did not have librarians meet with their classes cited a variety of reasons, including boredom, inconvenience, lack of time, librarians' failure to provide useful instruction. Those instructors who had librarians meet with their classes mostly provided general comments about how librarians helped students with research and made resources known to them.

Question 2: Please rate your students' general ability to find quality sources of information on their own:

Excellent: 1

Good: 6

Fair: 9

Poor: 3

The correlation between instructors' opinions of their students' abilities and their use of library instruction is not exact. The respondent who said his students' ability was excellent was one of those who did not have librarians meet with his classes, but one of those who said their ability was poor and some who said it was fair also did not have librarians meet with their classes.

Question 3: Do you think librarians can help your students best through in-person instruction or by creating online tools?

Again the answers varied. Four instructors preferred online tools while five favored in-person instruction, but nine (nearly half the respondents) said that both were helpful.

Question 4: If librarians created online tools to help your students find quality sources of information, would you use them?

All the instructors said that they would use them, though some responses were qualified.

Question 5: What kind of tools would you find most useful?

Some respondents did not suggest anything specific or did not know how to answer, but others suggested a variety of tools. For example, one instructor proposed “tools that would help students think through research strategies for their topics, tools that would help students navigate and explore the vast array of databases and other tools available through the library website, tools that teach them to use Google more effectively.” Some of the suggestions offered in the survey might guide future planning.

Question 6: Please share any additional comments on how University Libraries can assist your teaching in Professional Writing Program courses.

Respondents provided a variety of useful suggestions that might be considered in future planning regarding the Libraries’ involvement in PWP, including the following:

It would be helpful to have a library training sessions for Professional Writing instructors, with different sessions for different varieties of Professional Writing - i.e, technical writing; business writing; writing for non-profits, for the environment, for the health professions, for the legal professions, etc.

Students are going to use Google. Don't pretend it doesn't exist. Help us teach them to use it more effectively. (Same for Wikipedia.)

Can you visit our classes?

It would be really nice to be able to meet with the librarian assigned to your library day beforehand.

The very best library instruction sessions have grown out of a librarian using current student topics as models for thinking.

If the library could create learn by doing as opposed to dull lectures, the students would learn more. For example, if the library session involved an actual research question that they could pursue, they would learn more. Lecturing about library resources goes in one ear and out the other.

General Conclusions

Not all PWP instructors think that there is value in having librarians meet with their classes, though some of them might be more open to it if it were more convenient (if, for example, librarians visited their classrooms instead of holding instruction sessions in the library). However, most PWP instructors see value in having librarians meet with their classes. Several respondents singled out librarians by

name for what they had done or were doing for their classes. Clearly good relationships have been established between some instructors and some librarians. Most PWP instructors think that their students have, at best, only a fair ability to find quality sources of information on their own, and most look to librarians to help students improve those abilities. If some instructors find librarians boring or not engaging enough, more seemed satisfied with the instruction librarians provide and apparently plan to continue inviting them to meet with their classes.

The results of the survey are not simply an endorsement of the status quo, however. There is a strong interest among PWP instructors in the Libraries providing online tools that could help their students though instructors mostly see these as complementing or supplementing instruction by librarians. The instructors also had a number of interesting and valuable suggestions about improving library instruction for PWP classes. The survey provides useful guidance for future planning.

Assessment of Peer Institutions

Introduction

The General Instruction Task Force interviewed the Heads of Teaching & Learning at seven research universities, public and private, for information about their general library instruction programs. Through this external environmental scan, the task force sought to gather information on the instruction programs at peer institutions. Additionally, the task force hoped to discover innovative approaches for improving general library instruction at UMD by discovering how other institutions are coping with the common challenges associated with general library instruction programs: staffing, assessment, and instructional technology, among others.

Staffing

Staffing models at other institutions varied significantly. Some institutions support a separate Teaching & Learning Department or Team, which have three to five librarians and one to two staff members. Other institutions use an Instruction Librarian from their Research and Information Services Department to administer general instruction programs in collaboration with subject librarians. In both cases, the role of the program administrators typically includes centrally organizing and scheduling the library's general instruction program, teaching a significant number of general library instruction classes, as well as training other library staff on emerging trends in pedagogy and instructional technology.

The involvement of subject librarians in general library instruction varied significantly from institution to institution. At some institutions, subject librarians taught the majority of in-person general library instruction sessions, while at others institutions their involvement in these programs was minimal.

One major factor in staffing models for these programs is the availability of LIS graduate students to assist with the heavy teaching load of general library instruction programs. Libraries on campuses that are home to a graduate program in library science use students extensively for general library instruction. Additionally, universities located near institutions with MLS programs also use graduate students on a more limited basis. At institutions where MLS students were not readily available for hire, librarians noted that MLS student assistants would be an extremely useful resource to have. Institutions that use MLS students as teachers invest significant resources in training and scaffolding support to ensure that these student teachers are successful, and that the instructor is satisfied with the content and quality of the session.

Assessment

The institutions included in this investigation all map their assessment results to the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. However, the challenge of performing assessment on a consistent and systematic level emerged as a consistent theme, with several respondents specifically describing this as an area of focus moving forward. While some institutions have begun to develop and administer assessment centrally, at many institutions assessment is conducted independently by the individual librarians who teach these courses. This decentralized approach to

instruction can complicate the libraries' ability to centrally review student achievement of learning outcomes on a systematic basis. One of the impediments that has hindered attempts at centralized assessment is subject librarian resistance to centrally administered assessment.

Some of the most popular methods of assessment being utilized include print and electronic pre-tests / post-tests of student understanding, as well as end of the semester faculty surveys to determine satisfaction with instructional programming.

Instructional Technology

Every institution surveyed identified instructional technology as a very useful supplement to in-person instruction sessions. Some institutions have developed online tutorials with built in assessment assignments, designed for the purpose of replacing an in-person session. However, most stopped short of claiming that their institutions' current implementation of instruction technology was sophisticated enough to completely replicate the quality of an in-person instruction experience. Some of the common challenges preventing further investment in instructional technology were dissatisfaction with available online platforms, lack of content to include in platforms, and instructor reticence to change. Hesitance on the part of instructors is particularly challenging problem which has slowed the introduction of new technology into general instruction programs. A few librarians noted that instructors often resist even small changes in programming, such as small as switching from one content platform to another. These librarians cautioned that a balance must be found between creating new programs to attract new instructors, while not alienating the base of instructors who participate in general instruction sessions each semester.

In terms of the technology being used to supplement instruction, LibGuides and video tutorials were the most popular choices. Several institutions made a distinction in regards to video tutorials, noting that they invested significantly more resources when creating videos that teach a concept rather than how to use a specific tool. When developing conceptual videos, many of these institutions choose to invest in higher production values, often contracting outside graphic design or IT help. Other examples of instructional technology used by peer institutions include mobile scavenger hunts, library orientation games, digital storytelling and multimedia assignments, and Poll Everywhere.

Campus Partnerships

The strongest partnerships for creating and administering general library instruction were with English departments, first year writing programs, and campus writing centers. The librarians at these institutions acknowledged that the strength of these partnerships often depended upon the Dean/Director/Chair of the academic program; program directors that were enthusiastic to work with the library consistently emerged as a key to a strong program. Several librarians mentioned that their instruction programs underwent major overhauls when new program directors were appointed. Select libraries also mentioned partnering with Centers for Faculty Teaching Excellence, especially as an opportunity to conduct outreach to newly hired faculty.

Several institutions suggested that although these traditional partnerships have been useful, there are endemic problems within this current model that will require new partnerships to be formed in the near

future. In recent years, an increasing number of students at many institutions are bypassing these first year English and writing courses through a variety of ways, including Advanced Placement credits, Dual Enrollment courses, and transferring in from other two or four year institutions. As a result, these students are not getting exposure to the library services and to the fundamentals of information literacy. Additionally, librarians at some institutions are advocating for information literacy to be integrated into the curriculum more holistically; rather than limiting information literacy instruction to first year writing courses, some institutions are seeking to incorporate general library instruction into first year courses in the humanities, social sciences, and STEM disciplines as well.

Sustainable Instruction

The most consistent thread throughout all the conversations with peer institutions was the increasingly important challenge of designing general library instruction that is scalable and sustainable. Many of these institutions are seeing increased undergraduate student enrollment numbers without a corresponding increase in library staff size, which has been causing Teaching & Learning departments to assess whether their current strategies for delivering general library instruction will be sustainable in the future. In the face of this challenge, institutions have developed some novel innovations.

Universal Learning Objectives

In one method currently gaining traction at multiple institutions, the library centrally creates a list of possible learning outcomes that a general library instruction session could address. After creating a list of learning outcomes, these options are included within an online instruction request form, which can be filled out by instructors who want to schedule a general library instruction session for their classes. Using this form encourages instructors to think about the library session in terms of what they want students to learn, while also limiting the scope of the session to an achievable number of learning objectives. These outcomes can easily be aligned with the current ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education or the forthcoming ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education to assist the library in conducting assessment of student learning on a systematic level.

This learning objective based instruction request form has been paired with other methods to further decrease the workload on individual librarians. Teaching and Learning Departments can create boilerplate lesson plans for each learning objective, including fully designed PowerPoint slides and in-class activities. These lesson plans are designed to be universally applicable to these general instruction courses regardless of specific course topics; as a result, librarians teaching these sessions are not required to spend time creating a lesson from scratch. This strategy practically eliminates the pre-class time normally required of subject librarians involved in general library instruction.

An additional component to this approach involves having students or the class instructor submit final research assignments into a library repository, which can later be analyzed by librarians or MLS students. Librarians and MLS students can conduct citation and content analyses on these assignments, revealing the types of sources students are using for evidence, as well as the topics students are choosing. This information can be used to inform future instruction sessions – librarians teaching these general library instruction sessions can have an idea of what topics are currently popular amongst

students, and can use this information when deciding which databases to demonstrate. This can also be an effective way to support MLS students that teach general library instruction sessions, as they can familiarize themselves with popular research topics in advance.

Instruction Consultation Approach

At institutions where instructor requests for general library instruction sessions have been trending downward, a different approach has emerged. These institutions have removed the traditional “Request a Library Session” form process with an instruction consultation model, inspired by the service model used at Centers for Faculty Teaching Excellence. Instructors that want to work with the library meet with instruction librarians, either in person or virtually, to discuss course syllabi and research assignments. Ideally, the results of these consultations lead to a holistic integration of information literacy into the entire course or assignment. To achieve this goal, instruction librarians award grants to faculty who opt to redesign an existing course to include information literacy as a significant learning objective for the course.

One of the keys to making this approach sustainable is using the “train the trainer” model. Instead of having instruction librarians teach every student and every session, librarians offer extensive training and support to faculty instructors and teaching assistants on information literacy. In addition to training on the core concepts of information literacy, librarians also assist in the design of assignments that incorporate information literacy skills, as well as design rubrics for assessing student performance on these assignments.

In one form or another, this “train the trainer” model is becoming increasingly popular in general instruction programs at other institutions. In addition to training faculty and teaching assistants, other institutions are training MLS graduate students as well as upper level undergraduate students to offer research consultations to first year and second year undergraduate students. While this training process can be time consuming, this model nevertheless can significantly lighten the instructional workload for librarians. As an additional benefit, using graduate and upper level undergraduate students as research consultants can make these sessions less intimidating for lower level undergraduates, who sometimes suffer from library anxiety.

Recommendations

The General Library Instruction Task Force (GITF) suggests the following recommendations, for the purpose of creating general library instruction programs that are sustainable and scalable to meet the increasing student enrollment at UMD. The GITF believes that these suggestions will still deliver high quality content capable of teaching students to achieve the learning objectives created by UM Libraries and the campus at large.

Summary of Suggested Changes to General Library Instruction Programs

Supplement in-class instruction sessions by creating online modules through Canvas. These modules should teach some of the same information literacy concepts that students learned during their English 101 courses. This intentional overlap will serve as a needed refresher for many students; additionally, it will provide many transfer students with their first exposure to the basic concepts of information literacy.

Develop assessments for these modules to test student competency. Consider pre-tests to assess student learning before the refresher training, and to assess the effectiveness of the modules.

Continue to offer in-person instruction sessions, with the online modules presented as a heavily encouraged prerequisite to the in-person session. With students completing the modules prior to the session, the instruction session can transition away from a lecture and demonstration heavy session in the traditional bibliographic tradition. Instead, the session can be presented as an active research consultation workshop. Sessions could also include active learning activities that give students the opportunity for guided practice of concepts learned through modules.

To accommodate instructors who do not want to use Canvas tutorials, continue to offer traditional general instruction library sessions. However, we recommend the creation of a list of learning objectives based on the forthcoming ACRL Information Literacy Framework that instructors will select from when requesting a session. In addition, we recommend the creation of sample lesson plans, PowerPoint slides, and activities to accompany each learning objective, which will be made available to librarians through SharePoint, collaboration software that librarians can use to share teaching materials. This will lighten the load on individual subject liaison librarians who teach these sessions, while also ensuring that the sessions will be centered on well-developed learning objectives.

Staffing and Coordination

Administration and Organization

Administration and organization of the general instruction program is one of the most onerous aspects of the general instruction program as currently designed, as it places a large burden upon librarians tasked with overseeing the program. Recent changes to PWP suggest that the Libraries' will be asked to participate in more and more classes each year, increasing the burden upon library staff. To address this,

the GITF has proposed a near term solution, as well as a long term vision to be given further consideration at a later date.

We propose the near term solution as a temporary and interim measure. It is not sustainable for a committee to manage the workload required of this program. Once we are able to hire a full-time librarian to support this and other general instruction programs, we envision outreach can be maximized and extended to other departments. Similar learning opportunities could be created for other groups of students. Additionally, we believe support to teaching staff to be at a more sustainable and appropriate level.

Near Term Solution: Creation of a General Instruction Committee (GIC), a three member committee comprised of a Chair-Elect, Chair, and Past-Chair, with the Teaching & Learning Librarian as a permanent ex officio member. Members will serve a three year term. The committee will report to Head, Teaching & Learning and Head, Research Services.

We have outlined two potential models for selecting members of this committee:

- Participation in the committee will be a voluntary service opportunity open to all for professional library staff working in PSD; OR
- GIC will be a sub-committee of the Instruction Council

This committee will be responsible for:

- Scheduling in-person instruction sessions to support PWP, CPS, and Gemstone Honors College.
- Assigning liaison librarians to Gemstone teams.
- Designing and updating a list of student learning objectives for instructors to choose from when scheduling a library session.
- Maintaining and updating online Canvas modules to supplement the current in-person library instruction being offered to these programs.
- Creating stronger campus partnerships by engaging in outreach to PWP, CPS, and Gemstone, and marketing the library's instruction services.
- Selecting and training field study students from the iSchool to teach in-person library sessions.

Long Term Vision: creation of a new professional librarian position, the Instruction and Outreach Librarian, as part of Teaching & Learning. This librarian will assume the duties of the GIC, providing leadership in general library instruction programs, conducting outreach to these programs, and creating learning objectives and instructional content that can be used to support the teaching and learning in these programs.

In-person Library Classroom Instruction:

We suggest that PSD liaison librarians continue to serve as the primary instructors for general instruction library sessions. However, given our recommendation to use online modules and to reframe the in-person session as a research workshop, these sessions will move away from the traditional model of a lecture and demonstration based class, which required the expertise of a professional librarian. As such, we propose the use of iSchool students to help facilitate these research workshops.

iSchool students could be hired as assistants or recruited as field study students. These MLS students could assist librarians in the classroom. At peer institutions, graduate and undergraduate students work as research consultants with great success, given the proper training and support. We see this as a very valuable partnership for both parties. The teaching load on the subject librarian is lightened, who no longer has to interact with 15-30 students alone. Meanwhile, iSchool students will get to learn from working librarians while also gaining valuable instruction experience, a prerequisite for many public services jobs in libraries.

Technology

Two technologies will be crucial for this proposed model to be successful - Canvas and SharePoint. Canvas will enable online modules to be distributed to widely to instructors in CPS, PWP, and Gemstone. We envision that the modules for these programs may prove useful for English 101 as well. SharePoint will enable the distribution of in-person lesson plans, slides, and activities to librarians teaching in-person sessions. Additional training on how to use Canvas and SharePoint for librarians involved in these programs may be required.

Assessment

The task force suggests that more centralized and systematic assessment be performed. We suggest the creation of assessment materials through Canvas, which students can complete following the tutorials. These assessments could be collected, and analyzed by Teaching & Learning to assess student learning. Assessment questionnaires should include both quantitative and qualitative questions. While quantitative questions can be analyzed systematically, qualitative questions could be analyzed by randomly selecting a sample number of responses from the population, a technique that the University of Minnesota Libraries has employed with great success.

Campus Partnerships

We have identified outreach to CPS, Gemstone, and PWP as areas in need of improvement, as there is a considerable lack of communication between librarians and the instructors in these programs. Forming the GIC or a similar group will create a central contact point for our partners in CPS, Gemstone, and PWP, which will improve communication between UM Libraries and these academic units. Improving communication and engaging in outreach should receive considerable attention from the GIC or the Instruction and Outreach Librarian. Additional outreach initiatives will enable the UM Libraries to forge stronger partnerships with these groups, which will be a pivotal step towards creating more effective general library instruction programs. Outreach efforts are critical for raising awareness of library instruction opportunities, which will be of increasing importance if UM Libraries elects to create online tutorials for these programs. Beyond general marketing activities, we envision a number of outreach

roles for this group, such as representing UM Libraries at new faculty orientations for these units. We imagine this group would define additional outreach goals to strengthen campus partnerships. Stronger partnerships with academic units will create general library instruction programs that better reflect and respond to the needs of instructional faculty in these programs.

Recent Changes to PWP

During the time that this task force was meeting, changes were made within PWP by their program administrators that may have an effect on any recommendations made in this report.

The first change that was implemented is a request that librarians create Canvas modules for PWP instructors to draw from for their courses. These modules are currently being built, so we are unsure how they will be used by the instructors. Because their creation was requested by the department, there assumedly was a demand for them, and will be some use.

The second change to the program was the announcement of department-wide learning outcomes. A new Professional Writing Assessment Approach was created by the department, which includes two learning outcomes that will be assessed by instructors. These state that “At the end of the Professional Writing course, students will be able to

1. Write for the intended readers of a text, and design or adapt texts to audiences who may differ in their familiarity with the subject matter.
2. Produce cogent arguments that identify arguable issues, reflect the degree of available evidence, and take account of counter arguments.”

As with the Canvas modules, the task force is unsure how these new learning outcomes will affect PWP, but they should be monitored and taken into account when applying our recommendations.

Finally, there is a plan to increase the number of PWP classes offered per semester. The plan is to increase the number of courses from 135 a semester to 165. According to the PWP program director, Scott Wible, this is due to a change in the General Education program, which has in the past allowed exemptions, which allowed 25% of the student body to avoid taking this course.

Appendix A: Task Force Charge

Project:

Study the Libraries' general instruction programs and make recommendations for new curriculum and general improvements. General instruction is defined as non-departmental driven instruction where a variety of staff is contributing time in teaching. This will include instruction for the Professional Writing Program (PWP) and multidisciplinary programs in the Honors College, including Gemstone and College Park Scholars (Scholars). This study should be broad in scope, looking into new ways of teaching and utilizing technology, including blended instruction and flipped classroom models, recommending new curriculum and identifying the best staff that could potentially provide these services.

The work of the General Instruction Task Force will primarily be assessment and evaluation of the current instructional programs as listed above, and recommendation of changes to better support user needs given the libraries' and academic changing landscapes.

Background:

The University of Maryland Libraries has been providing a very active and structured general instruction program for over 10 years, in which many of our subject liaison librarians have contributed their time and effort. However, these services have never been re-examined and/or evaluated for their effectiveness, level of robustness, user needs, curricular changes in the programs that they support, use of staff resources and time, new instructional methods, and teaching technologies.

Scope of the Work:

The General Instruction Task Force will do the following work:

- Examine the effectiveness of existing PWP, Gemstone and Scholars library programs. These programs should be examined separately when/if they vary in nature:
 - Do we cover these programs appropriately, for example do we cover all possible sessions?
 - Are our current instructional practices in these programs adequate and satisfy the needs of the programs? How can new instructional methods, such as blended learning and flipped classroom methods benefit overall instructional program for these areas? Can ELMS be successfully used in delivery of some of the teaching?
 - What staff should be teaching these classes (subject librarians, curators, graduate students, library staff, etc.)? Is it sustainable to do them with current staffing levels? Are there better, more effective and efficient ways to use our staff?
 - How these programs should be administered, i.e. centrally or divided by general subject areas?

- Assess data that will inform recommendations
 - Perform a literature review of how other institutions of higher learning are offering library instruction for their campus writing programs.
 - Perform an environmental scan of how our peer institutions and other institutions of higher learning are offering library instruction for their campus' writing programs.
 - Study User Education collected statistics of existing instruction.
 - Gather input from the subject liaison librarians to solicit ideas, and gather feedback on recommendations.
 - Perform a budget analysis of existing service, such as for example cost effectiveness based on existing staffing levels to cover this teaching.

- Look into the new technologies and methods, particularly into ELMS, blended learning and flipped classroom methods, and make recommendations about their incorporation into the new teaching models.

- Explore potential partnerships with the iSchool as related to general instruction.

Documents to consider:

1. Liaison Services Task Force Final Report, <http://libi.lib.umd.edu/sites/default/files/Liaison%20Task%20Force%20Final%20report%2010%20June%2020132%20copy.pdf>.
2. Statistics gathered from User Education.
3. Environmental scan and literature review of other institutions

Duration:

1. Work to commence in December 2013
2. Report Due to Cinthya Ippoliti and Yelena Luckert by March 24, 2014

Deliverables:

1. Assessment and evaluation of current instructional practices
2. Recommend a plan for redesigning general instruction model to better align it with user needs within a broader UM Libraries environment and overall academic landscape. This plan should define two to three possible service models, which will include the nature of instructional format and pedagogical practices, technology and staffing levels.

Contact persons: Cinthya Ippoliti, Yelena Luckert

Appendix B: Bibliography

- Anderson, K. and May, F. (2010). Does the Method of Instruction Matter? An Experimental Examination of Information Literacy Instruction in the Online, Blended, and Face-to-Face Classrooms. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(6), 495-500.
- Bowles-Terry, M. (2012). Library Instruction and Academic Success: A Mixed-Methods Assessment of a Library Instruction Program. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 7(1), 82-95.
- Eva, N. and Nicholson, H. (2011). DO Get Technical! Using Technology in Library Instruction. *Partnership: the Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, 6(2), n.p.
- Hoppenfeld, J. (2012). Keeping students engaged with web-based polling in the library instruction session. *Library Hi Tech*, 30(2), 235-252.
- LaGuardia, C. (2011). Library Instruction in the Digital Age. *Journal of Library Administration*, 52(3), 301-308.
- Lacy, M. and Chen, H. (2013). Rethinking Library Instruction: Using Learning-Outcome Based Design to Teach Online Search Strategies. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 7(2), 126-148.
- Rempel, J. and Cossarini, D. (2013). Communicating the relevance of the library in the age of Google: Improving undergraduate research skills and information literacy through new models of library instruction. *Nordic Journal of Information Literacy in Higher Education*, 5(1), 49-53.
- Soderhahl, P. (2011). Library classroom renovated as an active learning classroom. *Library Hi Tech*, 29(1), 83-90.
- Usova, T. (2011). Optimizing our Teaching: Hybrid Mode of Instruction. *Canadian Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research*, 6(2), n.p.
- Van Houlson MA. (2007). Getting Results from One-Shot Instruction. *College & Research Libraries*, 14(1), 89-108.
- Watson, S., Rex, C., Markgraf, J., Kishel, H., Jennings, E., and Hinnant, K. (2013). Revising the "One-Shot" through Lesson Study: Collaborating with Writing Faculty to Rebuild a Library Instruction Session. *College & Research Libraries* 74(4), 381-398.

Appendix C: Librarian Interview Questions & Survey (in-person)

In general

- Do you like teaching?
- Do you draft learning objectives?
- Do you use ACRL information literacy standards?
- What topics do you cover regardless of assignment?
- Do you use the assignment to direct instruction?
- Do you think it is necessary for staff to be involved (can we use students)?
- Can this be accomplished with online tools?

All instruction

- What types of classes do you lead?
- Do you use libguides?
- Do you use active learning activities?
- Do you do any follow up?
- Have you ever worked with an instructor to design an instruction session?
- What do you do during instruction?
- Is there a particular partnership outside the libraries that works well for funneling students into instruction?

PWP

- What PWP, gemstones, scholars courses have you taught?

Technology

- Do you use online tools now?
- What role might online tools play in instruction?
- Do you contribute to canvas sites?
- How do you contribute to canvas?
- Are you aware of anyone using technology in an innovative way?

Assessment

- Do you conduct assessments?
- What sort of metric to assess success? Do you receive other types of feedback from instructors/students
- What success have you noticed?

Final

- Is there anything else you would like to add? Anything I forgot to ask about?
- Is there anyone you think I should make sure I interview?

Appendix D: Librarian Interview Questions & Survey (online)

Do you enjoy teaching? Are there certain classes you enjoy more or less than others?

Describe any topics you cover in any given class, regardless of assignment.

Describe any active learning exercises (anything other than lecture) that you use during library instruction sessions.

Tell us about any online tools you use for instruction. Examples include, but are not limited to, LibGuides, CANVAS, and video tutorials.

List some Professional Writing Program, Gemstones, and Scholars classes for which you provided library instruction.

Explain why or why not it is necessary for librarians to lead library instruction sessions.

What role do you think online tools will play in library instruction in the near future?

Provide additional feedback about the Professional Writing Program, Gemstones or Scholars program, or about any other instructional needs/desires.

Appendix E: Survey of PWP Faculty

Question 1: Do you usually have librarians meet with your classes? Why or why not?

I have been teaching library research skills to my classes. I need to have flexibility in my course schedule. Also, I can tailor the instruction to the needs of the particular students, based on the projects that they are doing.
Not any more. It is disruptive to meet in the library and too boring for the teacher, who has seen it dozens of times.
I did once and have chosen not to do it again. The students in the class that met with the library presenter were bored (not interactive or engaging enough" someone who has some background in interactive teaching methods could improve the standard workshop). They said they already knew what was being presented"that it had been covered in English 101.
It seemed to me a standard workshop, not very related to Professional Writing, and even though I was asked to send my syllabus, not tailored at all to my course.
Yes
I find the sessions helpful to introduce them to library staff and resources
I've had librarians create excellent trainings on research using library databases
Also nice to have a break from leading the class!
I always schedule a library class with a librarian as my groups don't always know the best tactics to get research done in a time-efficient way.
Yes, to point students to library resources they are not familiar with and to encourage them to ask the librarians questions specific to their research.
Every semester!
Well, except for one, when I didn't get my application submitted in time. It was fascinating -- my Technical Writing students did not submit strong secondary sources.
No. My 50 minute classes are just too short to get into the depth I'd like.
No not enough time in syllabus
Yes, every semester. ly helps my students understand what resources the library has/
Yes, I have - it is a good way to get students into the library and to interface with a librarian. My hope is always that they will learn something about researching that they didn't know before.
Yes. It helps my students with understanding/ doing research.
Yes, to introduce students to databases and help them with research.
No, it is inconvenient to meet in library.

Yes, for two reasons. First, librarians provide hands-on guidance to the library's many resources. Second, librarians can model the research process for students. I consider the librarians' sessions to be a huge service to PWP students and to the program's faculty.
They are needed to aid student research.
Yes. It helps the students see what research options are available to them before they begin researching.
No. In my experience, when we have attended the library research sessions, they are not especially helpful with the most important question: how to frame a research question.
All the materials in the world are useless if you don't know what or how to ask.

Question 2: Please rate your students' general ability to find quality sources of information on their own:

Fair
Fair
Good
Fair
Excellent
Poor
Fair
Good
Poor
Poor
Fair

Question 3: Do you think librarians can help your students best through in-person instruction or by creating online tools?

Online tools are great-- as long as instructors know what they are and how to use them
Online
IDK

Combination! In-person and then make online available.
I need both for ENGL 393; I have put a couple on the class modules page so students could find them.
Both.
Both
Both. The in-person sessions at a lab, with every student at a computer, being walked through how to access information they haven't used before, is vital. But Steve and Felicity have created a great reference for my (writing about the arts) students to return to.
That's a good question. Maybe a trial run of each to find out.
In person. I encourage my student to talk with a re fence librarian. I tell them it is their secret weapon. Online is no substitute but many of my students will not go in person.
Combination of both
I think in-person instruction is great, but online instruction works well too. Tools developed by librarians that an instructor could incorporate into a classroom lesson would be especially useful.
Both
in-person
Online tools.
In-person instruction works best. Librarians in instructional sessions involve students. And librarians respond to student inquiries. After the session students thank me for providing them with such a valuable resource.
In person is always preferable to online.
Why not provide both?
In-person to explain everything in a way that is inferior and sometimes missing in online content.
On Line tools. I use materials on framing research questions from many other university libraries on line sources, and they are excellent.

Question 4: If librarians created online tools to help your students find quality sources of information, would you use them?

Yes
Yes
Yes, if the students found them to be useful. I refer them to the PWP website. But more often, I send them to Purdue OWL and to sources I find.
In limited capacity, if any. I would only link to it if it was a version of something they saw from that librarian's in-person presentation.
I would add them to existing research tool modules
Probably.
Yes.
See above. They already have, and they're great!
absolutely, but I would need training
Yes
It would depend on what they are. Links are very usable.
Yes! We continue researching all semester, so having tools beyond library day is always welcome.

Yes
Yes
Yes.
Yes, but not as a replacement for the librarians themselves. The face-to-face interactions encourage students to visit the libraries and to work with reference librarians. Undergrads need this kind of encouragement to go outside their comfort zones. And the library is definitely outside the comfort zone of many of my students when they arrive in my first class session.
I would direct my students to them.
I would certainly try them and have them available as a resource for the students.
Yes, if they were as good or better than the ones I use.

Question 5: What kind of tools would you find most useful?

For Business English -- how to identify trade journals and real-world business publications
websites with more visible links to databases.
Curated website links on topics related to teaching writing and working with college studentsâ€”current and progressive methods (not lectures and exams).
-- How to drill down to the data you need.
-- How to cite sources
--Managing digital research (how to use existing tools)
Tools that would help students think through research strategies for their topics, tools that would help students navigate and explore the vast array of databases and other tools available through the library website, tools that teach them to use Google more effectively.
Because my students are in the arts, they are most interested in finding out about grants and arts organizations, as well as funding sources. Anything along those lines would be terrific for them.
Links to resources (already there)
What might be helpful...
A refresher list of sources a student may need to consult, and where to find them. Ex: Listen to classical music? Go to Naxos! Need to watch a dance video? Go to Hornbake!
I can't say at this time
Assessing validity of source. Peer reviewed articles in professional writing. Unpublished documents such as organizatikn materials in pw
My students are pretty proficient with academic research; we do some work on finding academic articles about environmental and science related issues. However, what they need more of is how to research LOCAL issues while they create local-level projects and apply for grants (a typical PWP project). So, how can they use newspapers, municipal websites, census data, etc. to understand local audiences and issues?

do not know at present time
Do not know.
I'm not sure what kinds of tools you are thinking about, so I'm not competent to answer.
Areas to cover would include: effective search terms trade journal searches most useful sites for business students government site searches
Lists of databases.
Again, I think students need help in forming the questions, specifically, in taking their idea and broadening it to allow for access to the general world of information, and then returning to the specifics of their own idea. One of my best teaching tools is from http://www.lib.odu.edu/genedinfo/2defining/key_ideas_and_key_words.html . They provide a link to an online visual dictionary/thesaurus, which my students have found very helpful in refreshing their perspective on keywords.

Question 6: Please share any additional comments on how University Libraries can assist your teaching in Professional Writing Program courses.

It would be helpful to have a library training sessions for Professional Writing instructors, with different sessions for different varieties of Professional Writing - i.e, technical writing; business writing; writing for non-profits, for the environment, for the health professions, for the legal professions, etc.
A concise explanation of plagiarism with a quiz.
I think you should ask them. What about a set of facilitated participatory design sessions involving staff and students, designing and developing prototype tools " call me to design the sessions with you and to facilitate! Amy Kincaid 301-588-9108 www.changematters.com akincaid@umd.edu
So far has been very useful! Special thanks to Cinthya Ippoliti and Nedelina Tchangalova
I generally have good luck but I coordinate with the library staff early on; I also pitch the librarian who teaches the class as a resource to whom students should be turning with very research or library specific issues.
In general, my students also have to turn in drafts in stages, so they come in earlier than some others in your libraries; a few complain but the grades overall are better.
Students are going to use Google. Don't pretend it doesn't exist. Help us teach them to use it more

effectively. (Same for Wikipedia.)
I'm a very happy customer, whether working with Robin, the engineering librarian, or Steve and Felicity from CSPAC.
Some previous librarians did provide helpful content, but were not engaging speakers.
Is it too far fetched to propose a required tutorial for select students. Perhaps I could give a diagnostic test to determine those students who lag in skills and then arrange for the laggards to assemble.
Can you visit our classes?
If I can give enough information to the librarian ahead of time, then usually the lesson he/she prepares is well-designed and very student-useful.
It would be really nice to be able to meet with the librarian assigned to your library day beforehand. Both of the librarians I have worked with have been moderately helpful, and certainly enthusiastic, but have tended to underestimate my students. They seem to give more first-year type of advice rather than the more complex research problem-solving that my juniors and seniors are ready for. I do appreciate the time they give to preparing their lessons, and try to give as much instruction as I can about what my students need, but often they stick to their core topics anyway.
The very best library instruction sessions have grown out of a librarian using current student topics as models for thinking. Students arrive at these sessions not realizing how much creative thought the research process takes. Librarians model such creativity. My only concern--probably yours as well--is that the library has to schedule many sessions over a short time period. As a result, my library session is often scheduled at a time that is too soon in the semester for some students or too late for others. This is simply a fact of life that we all live with. But I would hate to see this one small problem lead to the end of the librarians' in-class presentations.
You are already serving my students well.
I usually have Lily Griner who not only does great job
in her presentation, but also encourages students with research needs to contact her for help.
On line is really the best resource. The students need access to information when they are working, which is not usually during faculty working hours.
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">If the library could create learn by doing as opposed to dull lectures, the students would learn more. For example, if the library session involved an actual research question that they could pursue, they would learn more. Lecturing about library resources goes in one ear and out the other.</p>

Appendix F: Additional Information on Library Instruction at Peer Institutions

Institutions Surveyed

- Duke University
- Indiana University (IU)
- North Carolina State University (NCSU)
- Ohio State University (OSU)
- Penn State University (PSU)
- University of Minnesota (UMN)
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC)

External Scan Questions

Interviews were qualitative in nature, and structured as informal conversations. Conversations were framed as an opportunity for the librarian at the institution to talk about their departments and programs. While the content of each conversation varied slightly, the following questions were at the core of each discussion:

- What instructional activities are you involved with on a programmatic level?
- What is the staffing for your department, and how do you staff the instructional programs that you offer?
- What challenges did you encounter when creating, or transitioning to the current instruction model used at your institution?
- What information technology are you using?
- How many students are you teaching?
- What assessment are you performing, and is this being done on a systematic level?
- What other departments and organizations on campus are you working with to deliver this instruction?

The institutions surveyed did not have a direct upper level writing program equivalent to the PWP. As a result, these discussions frequently centered on the institutions' involvement with English 100 or First Year Writing Program classes, which were the closest equivalent to UM's involvement in PWP, Gemstone, and CPS instruction.

Staffing

- **Departmental structures**
 - Department model: IU, NCSU, OSU, PSU, (UMN?)
 - Instruction librarian model: Duke, UNC
- **Use of MLS students in general library instruction**

- IU and UNC extensively use MLS students from their Schools of Information and Library Science
- Duke and NCSU hire and train MLS students from UNC's School of Information and Library Science.
- OSU, PSU, and UMN do not have local MLS students to draw upon.

Instructional Technology and Assessment

- **Online Tutorials with Quizzes**
 - UMN Introduction to Library Research (<https://www.lib.umn.edu/apps/instruction/itlr/>). This tutorial is offered to instructors who do not want to schedule an in-person library session. This tutorial is presented as standalone content, rather than a supplement to an in-person session.
 - Student learning is assessed through this worksheet (https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1KulqFySrl_3mEI64q4WYuoMCetN_1MJf05srrtLoftg/viewform), which students complete and submit through a Google form. Student responses are selected at random to test for achievement of learning outcomes.
 - NCSU LOBO (<https://www.lib.ncsu.edu/lobo/>). This is considered a legacy system; NCSU is in the process of replacing it with a combination of smaller online modular content and in-person instruction sessions.
- **Mobile Scavenger Hunts**
 - NCSU has begun using mobile scavenger hunts as a replacement to general library orientation programs. These scavenger hunts are run primarily by MLS students from UNC's School of Information and Library Science. For more information, see <http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/instruction/scavenger.html>
- **Video and Online Tutorials**
 - NCSU's Videos and Interactive Guides page: <http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/tutorials/index.html>
 - PSU's Library Tutorials and Informational Materials: <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/psul/tutorials.html>
 - UNC's Tutorials: <http://library.unc.edu/instruct/tutorials/>
- **Library Orientation Games**
 - OSU's Head Hunt: <http://library.osu.edu/headhunt/>
- **Digital Storytelling and Multimedia Assignments**
 - The OSU Digital Storytelling Program: <http://digitalstory.osu.edu/workshop/introduction/>
 - UNC Mozilla Popcorn Video Maker: <http://calendar.lib.unc.edu/event.php?id=221622>

Sustainable Instruction

- **Universal Learning Objectives**

- NCSU and UNC have both developed “learning objective menus” for faculty instructors that want to schedule an in-person general library instruction session.
- NCSU developed boilerplate lesson plans for general instruction sessions.
- UNC created a repository of assignments. These assignments are analyzed by MLS students.
- **Instruction Consultation Approach**
 - This model was launched by the Teaching & Learning department at Indiana University in the Fall of 2013.
 - Inspiration for the consultation model was based on the university’s Center for Teaching Excellence, which recently moved into a shared physical space with Teaching & Learning.
 - View the Instruction Consultation form here:
<http://www.libraries.iub.edu/index.php?pageId=530000416>
 - UMN hires upper level undergraduate students to work as “peer tutors.” These trainers are available to meet with first year students who have gone through UMN’s online general library instruction session, but still want additional, personalized instruction. For more information on the Peer Tutoring program, see <https://www.lib.umn.edu/smart/tutor-schedules>