INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS July 31, 2006

Bette Anton, Michaelyn Burnette, Kathleen Gallagher, Sarah McDaniel (Chair), Pat Maughan

INTRODUCTION

In Fall 2005, Head of Instructional Services for Doe/Moffitt Libraries Elizabeth Dupuis charged an Instructor Development Task Force (IDTF) to explore models of in-house instructor development programs in other academic libraries and propose a model for the UCB Library (full charge Appendix A).

A review of the literature on instructor development programs (see bibliography) confirmed the existence of a body of knowledge and proficiencies that are foundational to good teaching. The IDTF examined documentation about librarian instructor development programs at four large research universities¹ to compile a list of program features that might be transferable to UC Berkeley. The IDTF then developed a Survey on Instructional Development Programs (Appendix B) to gather input on the content, formats, and program structures of greatest interest to library staff, administered the survey online, and compiled a detailed analysis of the survey results (Appendix C).

The recommendations that follow are based on broad conclusions the IDTF was able to draw from responses to the Survey. Specifically, we believe the survey provides evidence of a critical mass of library staff interested in participating in some form of instructor development program, and a core group of staff willing to make active contributions. In other words, the Survey confirms that the Library has the minimum requirement for a successful program: willing participants. Though clear priorities and preferences emerged regarding the specifics of program content and format, respondents indicated interest in the full range of proposed options. Respondents also indicated a willingness to participate or contribute regularly,

IDTF Recommendations 7/31/2006 1

¹ Ohio State University Libraries - Instruction In-Services Days (http://www.lib.ohio-state.edu/Staff/ioc/inservice/) and Tips for Evaluating Teaching (http://www.lib.ohio-state.edu/Staff/ioc/resources/), University of Michigan Libraries - Instructor College (http://www.lib.umich.edu/icollege/), University of Texas at Austin - General Libraries - Tips and Techniques for Library Instruction (http://www.lib.utexas.edu/services/instruction/tips/index.html). And University of Kansas - KU Libraries - Peer Review (http://www.lib.ku.edu/instruction/lib/peerreview/)

provided that events and related opportunities are of high quality; topics meet their needs and interests; presenters are respected local or national colleagues; participation is valued by the Administration; and the program builds a supportive community of peers around instruction. Any program intended to reach larger numbers of staff must include compelling motivators for staff participation.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In the opinion of the IDTF, the conditions for success can be met only through the commitment of the Library Administration, which must articulate the importance of the instructional role of library staff and commit resources to create an organizational framework that can sustain a meaningful, Library-wide program.

The IDTF recommends the appointment of a Coordinator of Instructor Development (percentage of FTE to be determined) to lead the development of a program addressing the needs of library staff interested in enhancing their skills and knowledge. The Coordinator will chair the Library Instructor Development Committee that will assist in the development and implementation of a program of regularly scheduled in-person events, and select, plan and implement projects to provide materials and training in other formats. In addition, the IDTF recommends the creation of an ad hoc New Instructor Orientation Task Force to address the needs of new instructors: both new hires and staff new to instruction. Overseen by the Coordinator, the New Instructor Orientation Task Force will draw on a range of information sources to propose and develop a training plan and materials. Once this has been accomplished, the Task Force will submit to the AUL for Educational Initiatives and the Coordinator of Library Instructor Development written recommendations about how the organization can best maintain materials created and support orientation activities in the future.

PROGRAM PRINCIPLES

The IDTF proposes the following principles to guide the program:

 There is a body of knowledge and proficiencies that are foundational to good teaching. This content, which is transferable to a full range of instructional situations, is distinct from subject and format knowledge.

- 2. Both library instruction and the professional development of library instructors are initiatives of strategic importance to the future of libraries and the promotion of campus learning.
- 3. Rather than sporadic or episodic, the UC Berkeley Library's Library Instructor Development Program must be ongoing and driven by long term, coordinated, and systematic planning and oversight.
- 4. The UC Berkeley Library Instructor Development Program is rooted in and models current good practices in and research on teaching and learning. It continually scans the larger environment for national and local trends in learning, higher education, educational technologies, and library instruction that will inform the program's direction.
- 5. The development of a well conceived and executed Instructor Development Program requires significant time and resources.
- 6. A well developed program of library instructor development
 - a. incorporates a variety of approaches and formats such as presentations, workshops, informal discussion, online learning modules, and adaptable learning materials;
 - b. takes into account the needs expressed by participants, collected from multiple sources of information;
 - c. taps into the staff's own experiences so that participants can learn not only with but from one another; and
 - d. incorporates incentives to participation.
- 7. Library instructor development is a key component to preparing and supporting library staff as they work with students, faculty and staff of the University to create learning experiences that promote the development of research and information-seeking knowledge and skills.

8. The UC Berkeley Library Instructor Development Program has three major focuses: the development of individual library instructors, the development of a community of teaching practice grounded in collegiality, and the improvement of library and campus effectiveness in support of student learning.

SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE

Coordinator of Library Instructor Development

The Coordinator of Library Instructor Development will chair the Library Instructor Development Committee and oversee and communicate with the New Instructor Orientation Task Force. To facilitate the alignment of the instructor development program with Library training needs and priorities, as well as campus-level educational initiatives, the Coordinator should be appointed to and serve on the proposed advisory group to the AUL for Educational Initiatives. Coordination of instructor development activities will require significant instructional and program management knowledge and a significant commitment of time, and the IDTF proposes three alternatives for the structure of the appointment:

- Rotating Appointment: Rotating the coordinator position every 1-2 years
 would periodically provide the program with fresh perspectives and
 opportunities for greater participation from across the Library. Selecting a
 new coordinator from the Library Instructor Development Committee
 membership could provide continuity.
- 2. Program Officer Model: A program officer is appointed for a limited term to plan and implement a program, then makes recommendations as to how the organization might best take over and support the program on an ongoing basis.
- 3. Permanent Appointment: A permanent appointment would allow an individual to take greater ownership and stewardship of the program, and could result in greater continuity and stability for the Library.

Responsibilities:

- Provides vision based on formal and informal assessments of need, starting with the Survey Analysis, and trends in higher education.
- Oversees planning, continuity, quality and coherence of programs, making use of available resources such as the ACRL Instruction Section's "Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators."
- Explores feasibility and sustainability of the non event-based formats identified in the Format Preferences section of the Survey and sets project priorities.
- Articulates the requirements for success (staffing, technical needs, etc.) of individual projects.
- Leads development of approved projects.
- Recommends a budget to cover expenses such as speaker honoraria, refreshments, equipment rental, and project-based initiatives.
- Chairs Library Instructor Development Committee and oversees New Instructor Orientation Task Force; identifies potential synergies between them.

Library Instructor Development Committee

Chaired by the Coordinator, the Committee provides input on and assists in the development and implementation of a program of regularly-scheduled, in-person events and helps plan and implement projects to develop training materials and programs in other formats. The 4-5 Committee members should be appointed by the AUL for Educational Initiatives, with representation from Doe/Moffitt, Subject Specialty, and interested Affiliated Libraries. Additional staff may be tapped to work on specific projects as needed, based on special skills or intersections between proposed projects and other areas of responsibility.

Responsibilities:

- Provides input on program priorities.
- Provides input on and assists in program planning.
- Assists in exploring feasibility and sustainability of non event-based formats and provides input on project priorities.

- Assists in articulating the requirements for success (staffing, technical needs, etc.) of individual projects.
- Participates in the development of approved projects.

New Instructor Orientation Task Force

With the oversight of the Coordinator of Instructor Development, the New Instructor Orientation Task Force should lead the development of a training plan and materials for new instructors. The Chair and 2-3 members should be appointed by the AUL for Educational Initiatives, with representation from Doe/Moffitt, Subject Specialty, and interested Affiliated Libraries. The Task Force's work should be complete at the end of a one year term.

Responsibilities:

- Articulates training needs of new instructors by making use of available resources such as the ACRL Instruction Section's "Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators."
- Explores range of delivery formats and develops a short proposal for a training plan and materials, addressing requirements for both development and sustainability (staff, technical requirements, etc.) and budget.
- Leads development of training plan and materials for new instructors.
- At conclusion of its one year term, submits written recommendations to Coordinator and AUL for Educational Initiatives about processes and infrastructure for regularly reviewing and updating training materials and supporting new instructor orientation.

PROMOTING PARTICIPATION

The IDTF believes that the survey respondents' desire for quality programming is best addressed through the creation of a robust supporting infrastructure that ensures coordinated, systematic planning and oversight. The infrastructure promotes participation by allowing volunteers to contribute on a committee or task force that creates tangible products such as written recommendations, programs, and projects. These types of contributions, particularly when their impacts are

documented, are clearly recognized within existing structures of evaluation for librarians and staff.

Due to varying assignments and levels of instructional responsibility across the library, the IDTF believes that an individual's level of participation in and the amount of time invested in developing their skills should be negotiated individually with his/her supervisor. Regularly scheduled programming will allow individuals to participate with a limited time commitment and provide a clear way to document their efforts to improve their teaching. Proposals for non event-based formats should address time commitment required for participation and motivation: How long will it take to complete the training? Can it be completed in segments? How can participants document their participation for review purposes? A variety of programming and formats will enable individuals to allot time to their development as instructors in manageable increments.

Finally, recognizing the Administration's role in articulating both Library priorities and expectations of staff, the IDTF urges Library Administration to support instructor development by formally acknowledging the strategic importance of instructional activities to the Library's overall mission, by setting appropriate instructor development goals and objectives within the context of the review process, by recognizing individual initiative in meeting these goals, and by rewarding successful instructors through advancement.

<u>Bibliography</u>

Association of College and Research Libraries. Instruction Section. Task Force on Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators. March 28, 2006. Draft. Online: http://www.ala.org/ala/acrlbucket/is/newsacrl/proficienciescall.htm

Walter, Scott. "Instructional Improvement in Academic Libraries." Online: http://people.ku.edu/~slwalter/instruction/index.html

Walter, Scott and Lisa Janicke-Hinchliffe. Instructional Improvement Programs. ARL SPEC Kit #287. Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 2005.

APPENDIX A

CHARGE

Recognizing that many people have not received formal training about teaching, Library staff have recommended the creation of an organized program to help them develop their skills. Over the past few years the Library has experimented with discussing these types of issues through various venues such as the Mellon Library Partner program, Library Fellowships for Teaching and Learning, discussions in Library Council meetings and Doe/Moffitt meetings, and by sharing articles and ideas through the instruct@library reflector. It seems an appropriate time to plan for a more organized instructional development program for the Library. Instructional development activities focus on enhancing one's performance in the classroom and through other instructional venues. Components of an instructional development program might include a variety of approaches such as peer coaching, portfolios, self-paced training, group discussions, in-service presentations, and more.

I am charging a Task Force on Library Instructor Development to explore models of in-house instructor development programs in other academic libraries and propose a model for the UCB Library. The amount of time library staff would need to invest in developing their skills, the varying levels of instructional responsibilities, types of support needed to encourage participation, and types of feedback and/or recognition that would be most valuable and manageable to provide should all be considered. Separate recommendations may be created for new library staff who would be getting introduced to instruction responsibilities, and for current library staff who are interested in enhancing their skills and knowledge. The task force will submit a report with recommendations to me by July 2006.

--- Email from Elizabeth Dupuis dated 10/19/2005

APPENDIX B

SURVEY ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

The Task Force on Library Instructor Development is charged with proposing a model for in-house instructor development for the UCB Library. Instructional development activities focus on enhancing one's performance in the classroom and other instructional venues.

The purpose of this survey is to gather input on the content, formats, and program structures of greatest value to library staff interested in enhancing their instructional skills and knowledge. Your responses will inform the recommendations of the Task Force.

The survey should take 10-15 minutes to complete.

I. CONTENT: INSTRUCTIONAL TOPICS

In considering your ongoing development as an instructor, please rank your interest in each the following six topical areas. Place a "1" next to your top choice, a "2" next to your second choice, etc. Add other topics if you wish to.

	EDUCATIONAL THEORY changes in higher education, learning styles, principles of instructional design
	FACULTY CONSULTATION AND ASSIGNMENT DESIGN collaboration, research assignment design, campus teaching initiatives
	DESIGNING EFFECTIVE INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS handouts, tutorials, web pages, a/v materials
	INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNIQUES & TEACHING TIPS creating the learning environment, learning outcomes, lesson plans, student engagement, active learning, public speaking, preventing burnout
	INSTRUCTIONAL & CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGIES presentation software, interactive technologies, course management systems, emerging technologies
	EVALUATION & ASSESSMENT classroom assessment techniques, evaluating your teaching, assessing student learning, developing a teaching portfolio to document your teaching
Other	topics I would like to suggest

II: FORMATS

Which of the following formats would you be most likely to participate in or make use of? For each option listed, circle a number to indicate how likely you would be to participate.

(Scale: 1=not at all likely, 3= likely, 5=extremely likely)

Print guides and checklists	1	2	3	4	5
Self-paced online guides and tutorials	1	2	3	4	5
Online archive of instructional materials	1	2	3	4	5
Online collaborative space to share instructional ideas	1	2	3	4	5
One-on-one peer coaching	1	2	3	4	5
One-on-one coaching by a teaching consultant	1	2	3	4	5
Filming your presentation to a class for your own review	1	2	3	4	5
Filming your presentation to a class for discussion with experienced library staff					
Filming your presentation to a class for discussion with a campus teaching consultant	1	2	3	4	5
Informal group discussions on specific topics	1	2	3	4	5
Formal presentations/workshops by local teaching experts	1	2	3	4	5
Formal presentations/workshops by off-campus teaching experts	1	2	3	4	5
Formal presentations/workshops by database vendors/other content providers	1	2	3	4	5

Other formats I would like to suggest			
Which of the following types of in-person events would you be likely to attend? Check all that apply.			
Brown bag lunch			
Early bird			
Half-day workshop			
All day workshop with speakers & breakout sessions			
Regularly scheduled discussion group			
Other types of in-person events I would like to suggest			

How for responsi	requently would you be likely to attend an in-person event? Select a single nse.			
	Once a year			
	Once a semester			
	Bi-monthly			
	Monthly			
	Other (specify)			
<u> 111. I</u>	NDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION			
instru	of the following types of contributions would you be willing to make to an ctor development program focused on issues of teaching and learning? Select tapply.			
	Propose and lead a group discussion about an article or other publication			
	Make a presentation on any issue of theory or practice			
	Develop and lead a hands-on workshop			
	Contribute concise, written teaching tips, techniques, or best practices to an instructor development program site or archive			
	Participate on a reciprocal peer coaching team, both providing feedback to, and receiving from, a partner in the organization			
	Serve as mentor to a less experienced teaching librarian			
	Plan a formal presentation or event			
	Prefer not to contribute			
Other contribution I would like to make:				
IV. PROMOTING PARTICIPATION				
	would motivate you to participate in or contribute to an in-house instructor opment program?			
<u>V. AD</u>	DITIONAL SUGGESTIONS			

The task force should consider ...

APPENDIX C

INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE: SURVEY ANALYSIS

The Survey on Instructional Development Programs was designed to gather input on the content, formats, and program structures of greatest value to library staff interested in enhancing their instructional skills and knowledge. The survey was administered online via a trial version of Zoomerang survey software. The option of completing the survey in paper format was also offered, but no one requested a paper version. The survey announcement was emailed to the Doe/Moffitt Instructional Services email list (dmis, now subsumed by the admire email list), the Arts and Humanities Council email list (arthumco), the Social Sciences Council email list (socscico), and the Science Librarians email list (scilibs). The survey announcement was sent to a total of 106 unique individuals, of whom 34 completed the survey, yielding a 32% response rate. Approximately half the respondents filled in their names (optional), revealing participation from across the library.

The response rate and names provided reveal the existence of staff that are interested enough in the topic of instructional development to provide feedback. However, the number of respondents indicates that the core group that is motivated to participate in and possibly contribute to a well-articulated and developed program is small. Any program intended to reach larger numbers of staff must therefore be tied to administrative mandates and include compelling motivators for staff participation.

QUESTION 1-2: INSTRUCTIONAL TOPICS

Question 1 of the Survey asked respondents to rank, in order from highest to lowest, their interest in improving their knowledge and skills in six topical areas: 1) Educational Theory, 2) Faculty Consultation and Assignment Design, 3) Designing Effective Instructional Materials, 4) Instructional Techniques and Teaching Tips, 5) Instructional & Classroom Technologies, and 6) Evaluation and Assessment.

The data provide a good indicator of instructor development priorities among staff. In particular, interest was highest in Designing Effective Instructional Materials (78% ranked this topic in the top three); Instructional Techniques and Teaching Tips (77% ranked in top three); and Instructional & Classroom Technologies (52% ranked in

top three). By a margin of 10 percentage points, Instructional Techniques and Teaching Tips also ranked as the number one choice of the greatest proportion of respondents (33%).

Interest was lowest in Educational Theory, with a significant proportion of respondents (33%) ranking it last, and 70% putting it in the bottom three. The mix of responses to this topic is noteworthy, though, since a full 20% also ranked it second highest. Evaluation and Assessment ranked only slightly higher than Theory, with 69% putting the topic among their bottom three choices. Faculty Consultation and Assignment Design fared somewhat better, but a majority (55%) still ranked the topic in the bottom three.

The overall pattern of responses suggests that most staff currently see improvement in the practical aspects of instruction—techniques, material preparation, use of technology—as their highest priority. It may also be worth noting that these priorities fall within the traditional "library instruction" domain, rather than the more broadly-focused "information literacy" paradigm, where one would arguably place the (lower-priority) topics of theory, assessment, and faculty collaboration. While it is interesting to speculate whether the smaller number of respondents who ranked the latter topics high in priority are more experienced instructors who feel a greater degree of mastery of "the basics," or whether, perhaps, they are more interested in national trends in information literacy, the survey provides no data to answer these questions.

QUESTION 3-4: FORMATS

Question 3 asked respondents to indicate the likelihood that they would use or participate in 13 instructional formats, on a scale of 1 ("not at all likely") to 5 ("extremely likely"). The survey results show a generally positive response to all formats, with over 50% of respondents indicating they would be likely to participate in 12 of the 13 choices. The table below lists each of the 13 format options, followed by the percentage of respondents who regarded themselves anywhere from "likely" to "extremely likely" to use or participate in the format.

	FORMAT	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES IN "LIKELY" TO "EXTREMELY LIKELY" RANGE
1	Formal pres by campus experts	88%
2	Formal pres by off-campus experts	85%
3	Informal group discussions	81%
4	Coaching by campus teaching consultant	79%
5	Print guides and checklists	75%
6	Online guides and tutorials	75%
7	Online collaborative space for idea sharing	75%
8	1-to-1 peer coaching	74%
9	Online archive of instructional materials	69%
10	Formal pres by database vendors	62%
11	Filming/campus consultant	57%
12	Filming/personal review	51%
13	Filming/library staff	42%

Formal presentations by teaching experts came in at the top of the list, with the largest number of staff indicating an interest in participating in this type of professional development opportunity. A number of other formats garnered a high level of interest as well, including informal group discussions (81%), coaching by a campus teaching consultant (79%), use of print checklists (75%), online guides (75%), an online collaborative space for idea sharing (75%), and peer coaching (74%). While use of an "online archive of instructional materials" had a smaller following (69%), a significant proportion of those inclined to make use of such a resource indicated they would be "extremely likely" to do so (33%). Similar "enthusiasm" toward four other formats—reflected in high proportions of respondents checking the "extremely likely" end of the scale—was noteworthy: Formal presentations by campus experts (41%); formal presentations by off-campus experts (38%); print guides and checklists (34%); and informal group discussions (32%).

The idea of having one's teaching performance filmed for review and/or discussion whether by oneself, a fellow library staff member, or a campus teaching consultantwas clearly the least popular of options. The responses did, however, show a greater number of staff willing to review their videotaped presentations with a campus teaching expert (57%) than with a fellow library staff member (42%). The three filming options were also notable for having the largest proportion of responses in the emphatic "not at all likely" category: 42% were "not at all likely" to review their videotaped presentation with another library staff member; 27% "not at all likely" to work with a campus teaching consultant; and 24% "not at all likely" to be filmed for their own review.

QUESTIONS 5-6: TYPES AND FREQUENCY OF EVENTS

Question 5 asked respondents which types of in-person events they would be likely to attend; question 6 asked about frequency of such events.

For types of events, respondents were asked to check "all that apply." Both earlybird and half-day workshop were checked by 79% (27) of respondents. Close second and third choices were brown bag lunch, 74% (25) and regularly scheduled discussion group, 71% (24). While all-day workshops received the least number of votes, it was nevertheless noted as "likely to attend" by 50% (17) of respondents. In addition, three respondents suggested other formats they would be likely to attend: informal peer support events, specific learning events, and conferences. One respondent commented that "attendance really depends on the subject matter."

Question 6, on the frequency of events, requested a single response. Of the 34 respondents to this question, both once a semester and monthly received 29% (10 votes). Second place was bi-monthly at 18% (6) and once a year, 15% (5). Two respondents wrote that their attendance depended upon either the time of the semester, or the subject matter of the event. One respondent replied s/he would attend "as frequently as good programs are scheduled."

QUESTION 7: INDIVIDUAL CONTRIBUTION

Question 7 of the Survey asked respondents to select the kinds of contributions they would be willing to make to the instructor development program. Respondents were directed to select all that applied. This chart summarizes the options and the responses:

	CONTRIBUTION	NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WILLING
1	Contribute concise written teaching tips,	16 (48%)
	techniques, good practices to a program	
	site or archive	
2	Propose and lead group discussion about	14 (42%)
	an article or other publication	
3	Participate in a reciprocal peer coaching	14 (42%)
	team	
4	Plan a formal presentation or event	13 (39%)
5	Mentor a less experienced teaching	11 (33%)
	librarian	
6	Make a presentation	11 (33%)
7	Develop and lead a hands-on workshop	10 (30%)

Respondents could submit other ideas, and three (9%) chose to add the options of content-based presentations on specific subjects; contributing samples of one's own guides, lesson plans, etc.; and providing comments (on unspecified topics).

That survey participants are willing to be active in the program is obvious; only three respondents (9%) indicated they were not willing to contribute. Almost half the respondents were willing to help build an archive of tips, techniques, and good practices. The high number choosing to contribute tips might be the result of the respondent's assuming that the contribution would be his/her own instructional materials rather than finding best practices elsewhere. The concept of building an archive of materials is attractive to the respondents; they appear to value a readilyavailable resource with information about teaching which could be consulted when needed or when the respondent had time.

Volunteers saw the value of taking an active role in the development of teaching competencies. Proposing and leading group discussions about an article and participating in a peer-coaching pair each drew fourteen positives. Planning events, making presentations, mentoring each drew fourteen volunteers and

developing/leading a workshop also garnered positive responses. Respondents would gladly learn and gladly teach.

QUESTION 8: MOTIVATORS TO STAFF PARTICIPATION & CONTRIBUTION

Question 8 of the survey asked respondents to describe what would motivate them to participate in or contribute to an in-house instructor development program. Twenty-eight of the thirty-four survey respondents (82%) replied to this question. Some respondents also discussed motivation in their responses to a final, openended question, and those responses are included here as well. Several themes emerged in the responses.

Professional Development & Altruism

A number of respondents were motivated by the desire to sharpen or improve their own teaching, to learn new skills, and to learn from the experiences of others in order to improve the overall quality of instruction within the Library. Some also expressed interest in opportunities for professional development of the library staff as a whole, "bringing everyone up to speed who so desires."

Recognition

Other respondents expressed the desire to see real change in how teaching is valued and supported within the Library culture as well as recognition that participation in (and contribution to) an Instructor Development Program is a necessary part of continuing professional development on the part of the staff. One respondent suggested that the program receive formal endorsement by the Library Administrative Group and/or the LAUC-B. Another suggested the idea of awarding "continuing education" credits for participation in the program. A third recommended that acknowledgement of active participation and contribution to the program form a noteworthy part of the librarian review process. A fourth mentioned the need to develop a "culture of instruction" wherein instruction and instructional design assume greater importance and gather critical mass within the Library.

Quality of Programming

Some respondents indicated that the quality of the program and the reputation of the presenters would be an important factor in choosing whether or not to participate. They mentioned the quality of the instruction, the expertise of the instructors, the use of innovative instructional techniques, and knowing that people whose work they respected would be participating as critical factors in determining whether or not they would participate.

Technology

A number of respondents mentioned they wanted to learn more about current and emerging classroom technologies. This was expressed in a number of ways, e.g., as developing "confidence in use of the latest technologies," as "hands on work with new software and technologies, with demos of effective use," as "getting ahead of the technology curve," as "designing online tutorials and other online methods," and as learning "how to teach finding and using digital images."

Programmatic and Future Directed

Several respondents expressed a desire for an ongoing, organized, consistent, and programmatic approach to instructor development that provides for consistent follow though where needed and the development of new programs of instruction for the campus. Some staff mentioned a desire for a more future-directed perspective, e.g., "trying new approaches or looking at what [we] do in new ways, rather than just talking about what [we] already do" and developing "activities that get people trying new approaches."

Community

Still other respondents mentioned wanting to become part of an active and supportive community committed to improving instruction on the campus, whether it be within the library or grow beyond it. One respondent in particular mentioned the tie in with other campus teaching staff initiated with the Mellon Library/Faculty Fellowship for Undergraduate Research as a particularly appealing element. Another

mentioned integrating library instructional goals with those of the campus as a potential outcome of the program.

Several of the respondents talked about the need for inclusion, collegiality, and a non-judgmental program, at the same time trying to bring in those who might be less skilled at instruction or enthusiastic about it, and the need to build momentum among those who are enthusiastic.

Time

Contrasting with the above themes representing elements that encourage staff to participate in an instructor development program, time was mentioned by several respondents as an impediment to their participation. This was expressed both as the need for "more time," the timing of program events within the academic semester ("not at the beginning of the school year, please") and the re-assignment of individual responsibilities to other staff so that staff could "develop as an instructor on work time."

Question 9: ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS AND GENERAL COMMENTS

Most responses to an open-ended question are folded into relevant sections of the summary. Additional considerations included a concern for addressing "content mastery" for instruction and a reminder to consider the needs of small, one-librarian units.