INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS TASK FORCE

Membership:  A. Basso, C. Lee, T. Dilworth (Chair), M. Sholinbeck, J. Woolums

A) SUMMARY OF CHARGE

In fall 2005 an Instructional Materials Task Force (IMTF) was charged. The group was to consider methods that would best enable the exchange of instructional materials amongst library staff (for full charge see Appendix A).

B) BACKGROUND

The IMTF identified means of instructional exchange currently in use in the UCB libraries and reviewed electronic means available more broadly through the UC system and via national organizations.

Current UCB Library Methodologies

- Email Reflectors (Instruct, CSEIL, etc.)
- Meetings (Admire, etc.)
- Occasional workshops
- Informal collaboration & information sharing among colleagues
- UCB web guides (via subject & library collection pages), the ERF, staff personal pages
- Instruction Archive

Key Organizational Sites Reviewed (for site details see Appendix B)

- CDL Instructional materials website
- ACRL Information Literacy website
- PRIMO (Peer-Reviewed Instructional Materials Online)
- LIRT (Library Instruction Round Table)
- LOEX (Library Orientation Exchange)
- MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching)

Additionally, the group reviewed sites at peer institutions (UT Austin, UM Instructor College, UW, etc.). This later exploration was not intended to be complete or systematic, but only a means for discovering the kinds of sharing structure and content others relied upon.

One lesson learned through the current disuse of UCB’s Library Instruction Archive (www.lib.berkeley.edu/UCBonly/TLIB) is that without a sense of shared community as prerequisite a supporting online resource can become an electronic paperweight. Keeping this experience in mind, the IMTF paid close attention to the work of a sister task force, the Instructor Development Task Force. The IMTF believed its outcome and reception would be indicative of the instructional climate. The IMTF believed it would be indicative of the success of any avenue for exchange created in support of instructional development/community. For this reason the IMTF awaited the Instructor Development Task Force findings and reception, and built its recommendations upon their consideration.
Summary of Findings

Current UCB library methods for the exchange of instructional materials have no real programmatic methodology and are subject to the below issues:

- The size and diversity of the UCB Libraries makes large group meetings/workshops challenging -- sometimes less effective.

- Groups such as Admire and CSEIL are set up to address specific segments of the instructional community. Their targeted nature may avoid the complications noted above, but also means they are not effective avenues for all library instructors. *Additionally, these groups either have no regularly scheduled meetings or agendas that focus on issues other than the kind of material sharing envisioned in the IMTF charge.*

- Informal collaboration is fruitful. However, as an institutional strategy it would be sporadic and limited by proximity (smaller, more remote libraries may have less or no casual contact).

- The to-be-constituted Instructor Development Program will provide a vital avenue for in-person sharing and be a significant step in addressing instructor learning needs. However, there remains a necessity for avenues of self-discovery and moment-of-need access.

- Current online instructional content is largely aimed at patrons or students in a specific course.

- The Instruction Archive (created for library staff) was never used. A product of its time, it is now outdated and cumbersome for both submission and location of materials.

- The IMTF is not aware of any local effort to aggregate and make available online materials focused upon teaching and its technique. The Berkeley campus offers general advice ([http://www.berkeley.edu/teaching/](http://www.berkeley.edu/teaching/)), but a gap exists between what is available and what is needed to support the library instructor community.

- There are established library email reflectors for the instructional and reference communities, but this means is better suited to news of the day and lacks an organizational principal supporting longevity and ease of access to materials over an extended time span.

In exploring the UC system, national and other institutional sites that provide material exchange of relevance to library instructors, the IMTF found the following:

- Organizational schemes varied in focus, major differences being...
  - institution specific vs. broader
  - materials only vs. forum for discussion
  - access to locally developed materials vs. link library
  - resources about teaching vs. materials for classroom use
  - curated vs. clearinghouse
  - reviewed or annotated vs. not so
  - repository vs. current focus
The utility of material already available at non-UCB sites is apparent. However, its existence does not make the creation of a local solution redundant. Understandably, sites are frequently limited in scope (serving the specific needs of their constituency) and regular maintenance and lack of currency were issues.

An aside, and not casting aspersions on the good work of other institutions, is the instinct to "look within" as a first step; there is the expectation that a local support structure should be able to streamline time investment and aggregate content of most relevance to the local situation.

For the above reasons, the IMTF concluded that relying upon outside sites for the location of relevant materials would not provide a systematic, expedient, and unified way to cover the range of support needed by UCB library instructional community.

The next step the IMTF took was to closely review the outcome of the Library Instructor Development Task Force, specifically their report of July 2006. As a bottom line, it recommended establishing an instructor development program, a recommendation favorably received by administration. By extrapolation of its survey results, it was also viewed favorably by staff (see Instructor Development Task Force Report, Appendix C).

Of particular interest to the IMTF was the inclusion in the report of specific survey results. A targeted survey of key library email reflectors representing a cross segment of UCB’s library system posed questions about a program’s focus, format and frequency. The values reflected in staff responses dovetailed with questions the IMTF was charged to answer. The following was evidenced in that report and its appendices:

- A supportive peer community of those involved in library instruction needs to be built.
- A well-developed program should enable staff to learn from one another.
- A "variety of approaches and formats" are needed, including online learning and access to adaptable instructional materials. Preference was for in-person learning; however, 3/4 of respondents indicated they would use online guides, tutorials, and collaborative spaces for idea sharing, 2/3 would use an online archive of instructional materials.
- Instructional obligation varies among staff, as does the time they can devote to instructional development. 45% of survey respondents indicated they would likely attend in-person events once a semester or less -- stressing the importance of enabling participation in "manageable increments" and thus the value an electronic resource could provide.
- Staff showed strong interest in learning to design effective instructional materials and sharing teaching techniques. This and other topical content surveyed are well suited to online exchange.
- An online archive was the favored method of staff contribution to an instructor development program.

C) RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary: If the role of library instruction is to be a core value and there be the expectation that a diverse group of staff with participate in it, a more effective avenue to share and obtain materials in support of library instruction is needed.
The IMTF believes the creation of a local electronic method for instructional exchange would serve a unique and meaningful purpose, strengthen instructional support and compliment in-person growth opportunities. A locally created resource would provide a point of centralized access where content, structure, and currency are under UCB control. It would ensure access to materials when needed, the ability to discover at one's own pace and to identify materials that address specific needs. It could encourage the sharing of adaptable course materials amongst instructors and holds the adjunct possibility of discovering staff who have dealt with similar instructional challenges -- paving the way for greater peer support. Moreover, if the group surveyed in the Library Instructor Development Task Force made use of such a resource, as evidence suggests they would, it has a user base.

The IMTF makes the following specific suggestions regarding resource focus, function, content and administration. These are intended to serve as ideas that require further, educated exploration at the point of resource creation (likely requiring input from the library instructor community at large, the Library Systems Office, and administrative commitment).

**Focus | Function | Content | Administration**

1. Audience would be UCB library instructors. It would be an internal resource and have its scope defined by what is deemed useful for that community.

2. Access via the UCB Library staff website. It seems reasonable to treat this content in a manner similar to other staff materials. While accessible to the public, the staff site is not indexed by search engines. As such, it is semi-private -- users must navigate to content via the staff web or already know the document URL. This method does not preclude access; it simply would not promote visibility. *If desired, access can be limited to UCB IP address, further restricting access.*

3. Provide a unified portal (a central point of access) with the dual ability of promoting exchange amongst instructors and access to teaching tips and adaptable course materials.

4. The resource should have a "dynamic" nature. By "dynamic" the IMTF is not implying specific types of technology (though technology may prove part of the picture); rather, it is used in a traditional sense to imply activity and change. *At a minimum the IMTF assumes the first step is to have a site administrator who not only maintains but also actively develops the site.* *(Appendix D offers further considerations regarding possible scenarios).*

5. Content should reflect what is being done locally -- strong presence of UCB created materials.

6. Link to select previously existing "outside" (non-UCB library) content supportive of general good practices for instruction and information literacy. *One example might be linking to appropriate documents within the ACRL Information Literacy section's website: www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/acrlinfolit/informationliteracy.htm*

*Together 5 & 6 would recognize the larger instructional community, yet provide a site shaped by and meeting UCB specific needs.*

7. Link to materials of common or programmatic importance to UCB library instructors, for example those created by the library instructor program, materials supporting new instructor orientations, links to online articles of particular utility or interest, etc.
8. Provide access to material about instruction. Material would be selected and provide an example of best practices. It would be applicable to the entire instruction community, and have a broader focus than material designed for an individual class/audience. One example of this kind might be viewed @ http://www.lib.utexas.edu/services/instruction/tips/index.html

9. Provide access to adaptable classroom material (with ability to include any electronic format/media UCB systems are equipped to view). Content would come from voluntary submissions by the UCB library-wide instructor community. As one task force member put it, this section offers "proof of concept".

In order to avoid the stigma of "best example" and build community where contribution is encouraged, it is recommended that management of this content be limited to broad policy issues regarding submission criteria, retention, duplication, etc. Descriptive entries might be noted but formal review seems antithetical to the spirit of the tool as imagined.

The IMTF does not recommend including guides or tutorials for resources. This type of material already has multiple avenues of distribution: subject specialty web pages, database/vendor help, and the CDL Instructional Materials website.

10. In order to assure consistency and timeliness, the IMTF recommends site administration be assigned to an individual (or group as needed). The administrator would provide both content oversight and maintenance (though his/her agent might handle the latter function). At a minimum, it is imagined that this implies a strong grasp of library instructional issues.

11. If the product is to have longevity, it should reflect the needs and input of the UCB instructional community -- broadly. One obvious possibility for administration and representation would be for the resource to be owned and administered through the Library Instructor Development Program with input provided by the Educational Initiative Council (and the larger instructional community as required). As these "yet to be assumed" roles are currently understood, the coordinator of the IDP will have a library-wide focus, and the EIC will have broad representation from the libraries' instruction community. Other possible configurations for administration might be explored assuming the necessary instructional and/or technical expertise, but it is imagined in any scenario that the nature of the resource would imply close ties to the Instructor Development Program and the EIC.

12. The IMTF recommends the removal of the current Library Instructional Archive along with its contents, which are now antiquated.

13. The IMTF sees the various content and functionality mentioned in the above recommendations as providing unique aspects of a resource designed to meet the needs of the library instructional community as a whole. However, it realizes that implementing everything simultaneously may prove to be impractical. Implementation may need to occur in stages to achieve a model in which overhead matches utility.

One might build the core function/content first with future development contingent upon analysis of what proves useful and feedback from the instructional community served. Development might also parallel the establishment of the Instructor Development Program and discovery of its online needs. Indeed, the class materials section suggested in #9 would not be useful until populated by contributions, which might benefit from the pre-establishment of the community the Instructor
Development Program will hopefully facilitate.

Whatever combination of the above results, it ought to amount to something substantive. From the beginning, close attention needs to be paid to instructor perception of utility and its buy-in. The IMTF imagines decisions regarding ease and priority of implementation might be the domain of the Education Initiatives Council and require consultation with the Library Systems Office.

14. Resource specifics and technical detail lie beyond the scope of the IMTF and would be premature. Appendix D notes issues touching on technology that arose in the course of IMTF deliberations. They are provided should they prove useful at a future juncture.
Appendix A, Instructional Materials Task Force Charge:

In 2002, the Library introduced the Instruction Archive as a way for library staff to share all kinds of instructional materials they developed such as Word files, PDFs, PowerPoints, web pages and more. There have been a number of developments since 2002 including the revision of the Library web site, creation of subject pages with links to subject-specific guides, development of the CDL Instructional Materials site, and an increase in the number of library staff experimenting with new approaches in their teaching.

The working group will be considering what types of documents and resources would be most valuable for library staff to share and which methods and/or technologies would best enable that exchange. Avoiding duplication with similar types of clearinghouses such as LOEX and CDL Instructional Materials sites; and identifying a model that is easy to use, maintain, and to sustain is imperative. The recommended model should be developed with the intention of creating a forum for exchange of instructional materials internal to the Library, rather than more publicly available. Recommendations may include in-person and/or online solutions. The working group will submit a report to Elizabeth Dupuis with recommendations by April 2006, and help develop the initial systems and/or processes decided upon.

Related links:
Instruction Archive <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/UCBonly/TLIB/>  
LOEX Clearinghouse <http://www.emich.edu/public/loex/collections.html>  
CDL Instructional Materials page <http://www.cdlib.org/inside/instruct/>
Appendix B, Select Organizational Sites Examined:

- **UCB Library Instruction Archive**
  Searchable archive of UCB created instructional materials. An HTML page with descriptive information about the material(s) submitted is created for each entry. These descriptive pages are what is searched and provide links to the actual materials. All formats of material can be downloaded. Access is limited to the UCB community. Last submission was in 2003. Contribution was limited and never really materialized.
  
  http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/UCBonly/TLIB/

- **CDL Instructional Materials Website**
  Links to instructional materials created by the California Digital Library, UC library staff, and external vendors. Aggregates database guides, tours, and tutorials.
  
  http://www.cdlib.org/inside/instruct/

- **ACRL Information Literacy Website**
  Resources for understanding and applying the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education. Resources for enhancing teaching, learning, and research in the higher education community.
  
  http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlissues/acrlinfolt/informationliteracy.htm

- **LIRT (Library Instruction Round Table)**
  ALA roundtable, advocates of library instruction. Membership represents all types of libraries. Site has publications & library instruction sites sections.
  
  http://www3.baylor.edu/LIRT/

- **LOEX (Library Orientation Exchange)**
  Nonprofit educational clearinghouse serving as conduit for institutional members regarding information on instruction and information literacy. Quarterly publication, monthly e-letter, annual conference and access to historical archive of instruction materials (1970s through mid 90s) for members. Links to limited sampling of instructional materials.
  
  http://www.emich.edu/public/loex/

- **MERLOT (Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching)**
  Free access to online learning materials along with annotations, peer reviews, assignments, etc. Designed primarily for faculty and students of higher education. Some class materials relating to information technology & information literacy (Browse Path: All > Science and Technology > Information Technology > Information Literacy).
  
  http://www.merlot.org/

- **PRIMO (Peer-Reviewed Instructional Materials Online)**
  ACRL project to promote and share peer-reviewed instructional materials created by librarians to teach people about discovering, accessing and evaluating information in networked environments.
  
  http://www.ala.org/ala/acrlbucket/is/iscommittees/webpages/emergingtech/primo
Appendix C, Library Instructor Development Task Force Report and Reception:

- **Staff Reception**: See Appendix C of above report for analysis of survey results.
- **Administrative Reception**:

  Date: Fri, 04 Aug 2006 19:08:30 -0700
  To: instruct@lists.berkeley.edu, admire@lists.berkeley.edu
  From: Elizabeth Dupuis <edupuis@library.berkeley.edu>
  Subject: Report from Task Force on Library Instructor Development
  Cc: istirlin@library.berkeley.edu, swong@library.berkeley.edu
  In-Reply-To: <1129739715.435675c37d066@webmail.lib.berkeley.edu>
  References: <1129739715.435675c37d066@webmail.lib.berkeley.edu>
  Mime-Version: 1.0
  Content-Type: multipart/mixed;
     boundary="============ =========_1391976947==_"
  Sender: owner-admire@lists.berkeley.edu
  Precedence: bulk
  X-UIDL: Ojb*!{V<!~K2|V^!!

  Instruct and Doe/Moffitt folks,

  In October I issued a call for volunteers for a Task Force on Library Instructor Development. The task force has submitted their final report, including an analysis of the survey they sent to Library staff for inform their recommendations. I want to thank this committee -- Sarah McDaniel, Kathleen Gallagher, Pat Maughan, Bette Anton, and Michaelyn Burnette -- for their work on this group and in helping to shape what I feel will be a crucial staff development program. Please feel free to share this report with others.

  There is much in this report to consider, and I have made decisions about next steps. Since a number of positions are in a transitory period (including mine!) and we are nearing the end of the Mellon Fellowship, I have decided to temporarily hold off on identifying a Coordinator of Library Instructor Development. While I feel that we will need to identify someone for that role to sustain this program, a decision about an appropriate approach will require some more thought and discussion in light of other related programs and goals. In the meantime, I agree that we should pursue the development of a training plan and materials for library staff new to our campus and to library instruction. I will be drafting a charge for a New Instructor Orientation Task Force and putting out a call for volunteers in fall semester. Again, this is just the first stage of what I believe will be a long and fruitful initiative in support of library staff and their roles as instructors and educators.

  Best,
  Beth

  cc: IS, SW
Appendix D, Technology Asides that Arose in the Task Force Investigations:

A. Regarding Suggestion # 4 (creating a dynamic resource)

Introduction of some combination of services such as a Wiki, current news & events, and possible integration of new collaborative technologies (tagging ?) designed to diminish overhead and allow informal contribution from the user community, might lend currency as well as the opportunity for participation. One possibility is using the campus LMS, bSpace. While it has certain structural limitations in terms of material arrangement and display, it has forum functionality, is readily available, easy to learn, and will likely to be a part of the campus information structure for the foreseeable future.

Some scenarios could have the side benefit of providing staff with a chance to become more acquainted with new technologies. Resource design would need to take into account which services and which specific materials would benefit from inclusion -- for example, would classroom materials content benefit from tagging? How would a Wiki be beneficial and for what materials? In sum, any group designing a resource for the exchange of instructional materials would do well to examine the possibilities offered via bSpace, Wiki, and other web accessible technologies currently in use, consider the learning curve and learning benefit for staff, as well as the overhead involved in implementation and ongoing administration of the resource.

The IMTF imagined possibilities from the perspective of use without a real understanding what it would mean to implement them. Certainly the introduction of "new generation" technologies and increased staff understanding of them falls in line with priority items identified in development themes for the Doe/Moffitt libraries. While these themes have been identified for those libraries and address services to patrons, they are not D/M centric and are also staff needs -- highlighting interactive participation as the future of information products and technological advances relevant throughout the library instructional community (consider sections 1.C.4 and 4.C.2 via of the theme document noted below).

- **bSpace Features Overview**
  https://bspace.berkeley.edu/portal/site/!gateway/page/!gateway-300

- **Oregon Library Instruction Wiki Example**
  http://instructionwiki.org/Main_Page

- **Doe & Moffitt Libraries 4 Themes**
B. In terms of providing access to classroom materials (recommendation # 9), the IMTF initially considered a keyword searchable model that assumed database functionality. This model had us asking ourselves about search fields and representative content. It was an aside that took us beyond the scope of our purview. Upon consideration, a database model would likely mean significant overhead. Even so, the rubric of fields and examples the IMTF discussed in the course of our deliberations may have future utility (possibly for tags, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fields</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Subjects same as A-Z list on library website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/AboutLibrary/libraries_collections.html">http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/AboutLibrary/libraries_collections.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>Exercise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online tutorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PowerPoint presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Web page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Podcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Approach</td>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guided discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hands-on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Types same as listed in the ERF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>Developing keywords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selecting a resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Search strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finding controlled vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popular vs. scholarly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary vs. secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plagiarism &amp; citing sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Copyright</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Setting</td>
<td>(physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projection system available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No technology available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Created By</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Added</td>
<td>Semester, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>