

---

# Using Appreciative Inquiry Methods to Build a Culture of Assessment and Library Instruction Program from the Bottom Up: Uncovering Librarian Values, Assumptions, Beliefs, and Best Practices

Donna Ziegenfuss  
University of Utah, USA

---

## Abstract

The purpose of this research study was to explore the underlying culture of library instruction and the identity of teaching librarians by using a qualitative methodology called appreciative inquiry. Cooperrider, Whitney, and Stavros describe appreciative inquiry as being “based on the simple assumption that every organization has something that works well, and those strengths can be the starting point for creating positive change.”<sup>1</sup> Fourteen interviews were audio taped, transcribed, and analyzed. LibQUAL<sup>®</sup> survey data, as well as end of course student evaluation data, were used to triangulate the findings. Sixty-one codes emerged from the data, and seven categories were developed. Categories were winnowed down to five main themes. A grounded theory core variable was also identified and related back to the literature and the five themes.

## Introduction

Change topics in higher education such as emerging technologies, shifting student demographics, and an increasing focus on accreditation and assessment are common themes in the higher education literature. Academic research libraries are not immune to this wave of change. In fact, the establishment of the new ACRL framework, and an increased focus on library value and impact on student learning, makes it even more imperative to uncover and understand the changing library context and roles of librarians on college and university campuses.<sup>2</sup> Library change is a complex process and calls for strategic thinking, organizational buy-in, and evaluation of the change process. But where do you start? Traditionally, change initiatives originate at the top of the organization and are pushed downward to initiate change. However, change methodology is evolving and there is increasing consideration for the buy-in of all stakeholders.<sup>3</sup> This paradigm shift in change management places more value on participatory practices and a “leading from place,” or

from anywhere within the organization.<sup>4</sup> This paper will present a case study of one approach to thinking about grassroots level change in the library. To get at the underlying culture of library instruction and the role of librarians who teach in an academic library, a qualitative methodology called appreciative inquiry was utilized to gather interview data from librarians at one institution. Appreciative inquiry shifts the focus from identifying organizational problems and challenges to building on the possibilities, and applying research findings to initiate positive change.<sup>5</sup> This “positive-focused” methodology was selected for this study because recent library reorganization resulted in strong opinions and a less than optimal work environment. In addition, the researcher, although an associate librarian in this library for over five years, is not an MLS-educated librarian. She is what is often referred to as a “feral librarian”<sup>6</sup> and often disparaged for not understanding the librarian culture. Conducting this research has helped this researcher come to a better appreciation of the culture and history of teaching librarians, and academic libraries in general, and therefore has better informed her possible contribution to the teaching and learning mission of this academic library.

In addition to uncovering the values, perceptions, and attitudes of teaching librarians, study data will also be used to rethink library instruction programming based on the strengths of the organizational members. As libraries evolve due to emerging technologies, changing student demographics, and university financial constraints, findings from this case study might also be of interest to other institutions undergoing similar library reimaging initiatives and strategic planning processes.

The four research questions that guided this study were:

1. What are the best teaching/research/consultation stories and experiences reported by teaching librarians at the University of Utah?
2. How do these experiences relate to their teaching librarian identity?
3. What are the core principles and values related to teaching that librarians at this one institution report?
4. What are the themes and threads that cross over the librarian experiences that could be used for creating synergy, a community of practice, and evidence for program planning?

### Literature Review

This research builds on the body of literature that investigates the identity and role of teaching librarians. Previous research conducted on the “emotional work” of instructional librarians,<sup>7</sup> Seymour’s ethnography work on instructional librarians,<sup>8</sup> and the different ways of interpreting theory and practice provided the groundwork for this research.<sup>9</sup> Much is also written about whether or not librarians should even be teachers, and how teaching impacts the professional role of the librarian,<sup>10</sup> but the belief of this researcher is that the value of the teaching librarian will play a critical role in the academic library of the future. Therefore, this study focuses on uncovering the beliefs, values, and practices of teaching librarians, specifically at the University of Utah, with the intention of using data to inform library program design and assessment practices at this particular library.

A review of the librarian identity literature that goes back several decades indicates controversy around the teaching role and identity of librarians. In the past, not only was a librarian teaching role controversial, but some researchers have also questioned whether librarians should even be teachers and hold faculty status.<sup>11</sup> Wilson presents a negative picture and contends that librarian faculty status is not equal to the disciplinary faculty status.<sup>12</sup> Today, however, the status of librarians is changing and depends on the organizational structure of the institution. In addition, early literature contends that since librarians serve in support roles they may be less respected teaching partners.<sup>13</sup> Even though the word “service” is often associated with the work of librarians and the mission of libraries, these perceptions are changing. Nalani-Meulemans and Carr recommend that librarians advocate for a non-service librarian teaching role and be more proactive in dealings with faculty.<sup>14</sup> Other researchers

report on strategies for improving faculty-librarian relationships especially in the areas of communication and collaboration.<sup>15</sup> Since librarians are not usually the “teacher of record” and are often seen more as guest lecturers in the college classroom, they can lack access and interaction with students, as well as ownership of assignments and assessments. Finally, information literacy concepts are sometimes not valued or understood by disciplinary faculty. This makes it difficult for librarians to collaborate with faculty or convince faculty to set aside valuable class time for library instruction.<sup>16</sup>

Similar to other disciplinary faculty teaching in higher education, librarians do not often receive teacher training as part of their library school programming, and are therefore often resistant to teaching once employed in academic libraries.<sup>17</sup> Other organizational structures in the university can cause additional barriers to the relationship between librarians and disciplinary faculty. As part of doctoral training, disciplinary faculty are encultured into the Boyer module of higher education with roles and responsibilities defined by a three-part model of teaching, research, and service; but libraries have different organizational models.<sup>18</sup> Disciplinary faculty often work with a small number of students focused within a single discipline. Librarians, on the other hand, have more varied roles and responsibilities in academic libraries with less adherence to the Boyer teaching, research, and service structure. Due to this gap in the higher education and librarian cultures, disciplinary faculty can often be unaware of the skills and expertise that librarians can bring to the classroom.

Scalability and sustainability are also becoming issues as librarian roles change. In addition to teaching and mentoring students in many different disciplines across campus in research and information literacy, librarians are also assuming new roles in academic libraries such as in data management, instructional design, scholarly publishing, and digital scholarship.<sup>19</sup> As librarian roles become more specialized, it becomes even more important to investigate, support, and promote the teaching librarian role within this complex library structure. Newer trends in the literature are exploring other changes such as embedded librarianship,<sup>20</sup> and what Whitchurch calls “third space” professional staff.<sup>21</sup> Although not specifically associated with librarianship, another theoretical framework emerging in the literature, called boundary crossing, may become more relevant to the

work of librarians who regularly cross disciplinary, organizational, and functional boundaries.<sup>22</sup>

### Methodology

#### Rationale for the Study

For this research study, an appreciative inquiry approach was selected to help uncover what librarians describe as their best and most rewarding teaching librarian experiences. Due to a recent reorganization, a department originally called education services, with a primary focus on teaching and learning, was renamed and changed. Although some teaching responsibilities are distributed across other departments in this academic library, the bulk of the teaching responsibilities are housed in this unit. For these teaching librarians, their teaching identities were fractured due to the top down reorganization process. With a weak culture of library assessment and with a sense that their “invisible labor” of planning, designing, and implementing teaching was not fully appreciated at the administrative level, the researcher hoped to use a positive and more proactive approach to define and articulate the value of the teaching librarians. Since this researcher is a library outsider, this study also provided an opportunity to study the perceptions and attitudes of teaching librarians and better understand the library teaching culture. Coming to the library with a very different professional enculturation experience (EdD program in education and instructional design), this research provided a unique lens through which to uncover commonalities in librarian identities.

#### Sampling and Methods

Purposive sampling was used to identify volunteers for the research study. Twelve teaching librarians and two professional teaching staff, with a wide range of liaison subject specialties and work experience, participated in the interview process. Eight females and six males were interviewed. As a group, the study participants have a wide range of teaching experience such as being embedded librarians where librarians meet 10 times with a cohort of students across two semesters; in freshman writing one-shot sessions; in one-shots and orientations for international students; in undergraduate upper level courses and graduate level courses; in faculty and graduate student workshops and seminars; and one librarian who mainly conducts advanced research consultations for graduate students, faculty, and visiting scholars in a very specific disciplinary area. The appreciative

inquiry methodology approach focused on asking the fourteen librarians questions about their most positive and best teaching experiences. Instead of focusing on the negative aspects of barriers and challenges of teaching library instruction, four core questions were designed to trigger their best memories or dreams. The appreciative inquiry questioning structure consists of four components: discovery, dreaming, designing, and destiny.<sup>23</sup>

The four interview questions were:

1. Can you share a story about a teaching or librarian experience that you have had where you felt energized or felt you really impacted a student or group students? (discovery—what gives life)
2. What do you value about your role as a librarian and/or teacher? (discovery—what gives life)
3. If you had three wishes for how to impact student learning through your library instruction in the future, what would they be? (dream and design—what might be)
4. What would the future look like if you adapt these experiences and values you talked about today to create greater or better new teaching experiences in the future? (destiny—what should/will be)

To begin the project, the researcher hired an undergraduate MUSE (My University Signature Experience) research intern through a grant.<sup>24</sup> The MUSE intern, already with training in interviewing and qualitative methods, conducted all of the interviews and assisted with the preliminary coding of the data. She also brought a student-focused perspective to the data analysis. The main reason that the MUSE intern conducted the interviews was to help limit any bias that the non-MLS researcher might have had in asking questions and conducting the interviews with her peers. Fourteen interviews were conducted, audiotaped, transcribed, and analyzed using grounded theory qualitative methodologies.<sup>25</sup> Preliminary analysis of the interview data by the intern researcher was triangulated by the primary researcher.

Interview data were first open coded by the MUSE intern in Excel. The librarian researcher then repeated the open coding process on the data using Microsoft Excel as the preliminary analysis tool because the MUSE intern did not know how to use NVivo. Coding from across the two coders were discussed, consolidated, and winnowed down into

one set of open codes. Over 600 coded instances emerged from the interviews and 61 codes were identified. Excel spreadsheets were then imported into NVivo and recoded again by the primary researcher using three additional rounds of axial coding and a constant comparison method to reevaluate the coding categories. Through the NVivo coding process, the 61 codes were reduced to seven main categories. The seven categories were then consolidated and winnowed down to five unique and main themes. Selective coding processes were then used to analyze relationships between the five themes to identify a core variable. Corbin and Strauss define selective coding as “selecting the core category, systematically relating it to other categories, validating those relationships, and filling in categories that need further refinement and development.”<sup>26</sup> A core variable is the main theme of the study and all major themes must relate to it. In addition, qualitative comments collected during a previous LibQUAL survey, as well as end-of-semester student course feedback from the librarian embedded courses, were analyzed and used to triangulate the findings.

This conceptual collection of categories, themes, and the core variable was then used to supplement the brainstorming and discussions from departmental strategic planning workgroups and to create a departmental framework to help define the identity of the unit and to articulate guidelines for teaching best practices for library instruction (see Appendixes A and B for draft planning documents).

## Results

The findings provide a detailed description of the experiences and aspirations of instruction librarians, as well as an understanding of the library context in which they work and teach information literacy. From the 600 coded instances, 61 codes emerged. Of the 61 codes, the most prominent codes were: *reward of helping, faculty-librarian collaboration, teaching approach, engaged learning, making connections and personalization of the learning process*. Through continued analysis, seven main categories were identified: (1) **teaching approaches/values**;

(2) **a helping profession**; (3) **personalization priorities**; (4) **faculty-librarian relationships**; (5) **mentoring culture**; (6) **lacking control**; and (7) **beyond information literacy expectations**.

From these seven categories and reevaluation of the relationships of these categories to the 61 original codes, five main themes emerged from the data. The five main themes are: (1) **Emerging and Converging Identities**; (2) **Moving Beyond Helper to Mentor**; (3) **Overlapping Cultures and Identities**; (4) **Value-Added Roles and Responsibilities**; and (5) **Blurring Professional and Personal Boundaries**. Some codes occur as threads across several themes and some are more localized in specific themes. The relationship of the 61 codes, the seven categories, and the five themes is represented in Table 1. The “X” on the table indicates in which themes the 61 codes occur. For example, the first code in the table under **Category #1, Teaching Approaches/Values** is *engaged teaching approaches/values*. This code had the largest number of coding instances. This code occurs under all five main themes. This is not surprising, since the participants were prompted to talk about their “best” teaching experiences.

In addition to content coding, each code was also classified as either being a positive “benefit/opportunity” or a negative “challenge” code. The positive versus negative codes are presented together in Table 1. However, the codes in Table 1 with an asterisk indicate that these are negative codes. Only 12 of the original 61 codes were labeled as all negative codes. The rest of the 61 codes were mixtures of positive and negative code instances. Using the appreciative inquiry process did result in a proportionately higher percentage of more positive codes (70.2%) versus negative codes (29.8%). Table 2 shows the percentages of positive and negative codes broken down across the five main themes. The highest percentage of negative code instances occur in the **Overlapping Cultures and Identities** theme and the smallest percentage of negative coding is associated with the **Blurring Professional and Personal Boundaries** theme. Positive coding is generally more evenly distributed across the five themes.

**Table 1. Relationship of 61 codes, 7 categories, and 5 main themes identified from 14 interviews**

<b>Themes:</b>  <b>7 Categories/61 Preliminary Code Categories</b>	<b>Emerging and Converging Identities</b>	<b>Moving Beyond Helper to Mentor</b>	<b>Overlapping Cultures and Identities</b>	<b>Value-Added Roles and Responsibilities</b>	<b>Blurring Professional and Personal Boundaries</b>
<b>Category 1: Teaching Approaches/Values (29.1% of codes)</b>					
engaged teaching approaches/values	X	X	X	X	X
engaged learning values	X	X	X	X	X
assessment strategies	X	X	X	X	
real world assignments			X	X	X
continuous improvement	X	X		X	
technology as a barrier *	X			X	X
motivation to keep learning	X				X
group experiences	X				
needs-based approach	X				
facilitating discovery/curiosity	X				X
anxiety in grading and people skills *	X				
timing an issue *				X	
student ownership				X	
learning by doing					X
<b>Category 2: A Helping Profession (15.5% of codes)</b>					
reward of helping	X	X	X	X	X
making a difference		X		X	
job satisfaction	X	X			
library culture			X		
being more proactive	X				
learning from students	X				
rewarding		X	X		
helping profession					X
growing through learning					X
developing style and identity	X				
<b>Category 3: Personalization Priorities (14.3% of codes)</b>					

<b>Themes:</b>  <b>7 Categories/61 Preliminary Code Categories</b>	<b>Emerging and Converging Identities</b>	<b>Moving Beyond Helper to Mentor</b>	<b>Overlapping Cultures and Identities</b>	<b>Value-Added Roles and Responsibilities</b>	<b>Blurring Professional and Personal Boundaries</b>
making connections	X	X	X	X	X
personalization of the learning		X	X	X	
personal approach					X
personal interests		X			X
personal preferences			X		X
learning preferences			X		X
continuous improvement/students	X	X			
<b>Category 4: Faculty-Librarian Relationships (12% of codes)</b>					
faculty-librarian collaboration	X	X	X	X	
collaboration	X				X
communication breakdown *	X		X	X	X
lacking awareness of librarian work *	X				
developing awareness	X		X	X	
integration of library and course			X	X	
cultural differences *			X		
common interests					X
impact—lack of *					X
Library value not visible *				X	
<b>Category 5: Mentoring Culture (12% of codes)</b>					
librarian values	X	X		X	X
mentoring	X	X	X		
lifelong learners	X		X	X	
scaffolding learners	X		X	X	
can't reach all students *			X	X	
contextual issues				X	
not disciplinary related				X	
<b>Category 6: Lacking Control (9.4% of codes)</b>					
lacking control *	X	X	X	X	

<b>Themes:</b>  <b>7 Categories/61 Preliminary Code Categories</b>	<b>Emerging and Converging Identities</b>	<b>Moving Beyond Helper to Mentor</b>	<b>Overlapping Cultures and Identities</b>	<b>Value-Added Roles and Responsibilities</b>	<b>Blurring Professional and Personal Boundaries</b>
develop awareness of library work *	X		X	X	
prior experiences					X
information overload *	X		X	X	
communicating—the ‘why’					X
on the fringe—cultural & pedagogical differences	X		X		
isolated in library *	X				
<b>Category 7: Beyond Information Literacy Expectations (7.7% of codes)</b>					
beyond information literacy		X	X	X	
skill set—beyond information literacy	X			X	
beyond books/resources				X	
beyond the classroom				X	
value of resources			X	X	

\* indicates the codes with only challenging coding; all other codes were a mix of positive-opportunity type codes and negative-challenging codes

**Table 2. Percentages of the Positive (Opportunity) Codes vs. the Negative (Challenging) Codes Distributed by Theme**

Themes	Percentage of All Coding	Percentage of All Coding
Emerging and Converging Identities	21.1%	15.1%
Moving Beyond Helper to Mentor	17.1%	10.7%
Overlapping Cultures and Identities	22.2%	43.4%
Value-Added Roles & Responsibilities	26.5%	24.5%
Blurring Professional and Personal Boundaries	13.1%	6.3%

The five main themes identified in this study are defined here.

**1. Emerging and Converging Identities**

This theme encompasses all of the coding related to how the participants discussed their continual growth and change as a teacher. A majority of the coding associated with this theme related to how rewarding teaching is for

them, what they value about teaching, and the approaches they use in their teaching. Important codes in this theme are *continuous improvement*, *trial and error*, *not being afraid to fail*, *making a difference*, and *how much they learn from their students*. The negative codes that describe this theme are *lack of control in a classroom* and *lack of communication with faculty partners*. An

example from this theme is how one participant talks about his trial and error method and improvement of teaching, which was coded as *teaching approaches/values*: “I only get 5 visits for LEAP [an embedded librarian experience] in the 1st semester... but I feel that I need to experiment with them. And you know every year you’ll experiment. You can try a process and it has failed then you have learned something from that.”

## 2. **Moving Beyond Helper to Mentor**

This theme depicts how the participants discussed the continuum of their librarian role as they have moved from helper to mentor. Many of the participants discussed how *rewarding “helping” students* can be, and how they establish relationships with students as they assume more of a mentor role. Data coded to this theme discussed how a helping or support role can have a negative impact on their collaboration with faculty partners. They voiced a common goal of wanting to move beyond providing just support or a service, and move more into a teaching mentor role. An example quote to demonstrate this theme is, “There was a student who came in and he wanted to be an engineer. He didn’t want to know how to write and he even said that: ‘I am going to be an engineer; I don’t need to know how to write.’ And he came in with this attitude that everything else was no good. And so to be able to change that attitude... was a best experience.”

## 3. **Overlapping Cultures and Identities**

This theme had the most negative codes associated with it. Librarians described how difficult it is to go into a classroom one time without knowing the students and try to create an engaging and relevant learning environment. They discussed the disadvantages of not being the instructor of record and not always on the same page as the faculty member. The participants discussed challenges of *integration* of library activities and content with course content and they felt the library and course components were often separate. They also discussed how the *culture of the library* and the cultures of disciplines were different. They also complained about lack of overlap and would like to see more overlap. One participant said, “I always ask for the assignment. But if they don’t give it to me, I kind of have to go in cold and just hope that I am getting across what they need. But yes I prefer it when they give me the assignment ahead of time and I wish more of

them wanted the help of a librarian in creating the assignment.”

## 4. **Value-Added Roles and Responsibilities**

In the value-added theme, participants discussed the possibilities and their wishes for having library instruction more valued by faculty and the administration. They discussed a lot of different ways they could add value to the classroom and also described ideas for creating “value” for students. One participant stated, “It is also hard to integrate. Another challenge is to integrate the library instruction in a way that the students see it as being a valuable contribution to the course. So a lot of times we go into a course or we get feedback from a student and they say, ‘this was just busy work’ or ‘this was a waste of my time’ or ‘I already knew this stuff.’” Librarians discussed the value of “teaching moments” or having “one-on-one time” with students. Another participant discussed shifting values from finding information to using information, “Well we live in an age where information is easy to get and it is hard to use. They might not necessarily need as much help getting the information, finding the information... right, on both sides both the student and the teacher side getting to the point where they can more effectively teach and learn how to use the information as opposed to find it.”

## 5. **Blurring Professional and Personal Boundaries**

The last theme contains the codes and categories that discuss how teaching librarians blend or blur their personal and professional boundaries. The coding about the participants’ passion and *helping students* or *caring about students* encompasses this theme. Participants talked about how rewarding it is to help students integrate their interests into their research assignments and often helped student “blur their own boundaries.” This category also had the smallest percentage of negative codes. Codes under this theme relate to participants’ *teaching passions, how much they learned from working with students, and how they were being “selfish” by bringing their own interests into the library classroom* to try to engage students. One participant claimed, “It is that kind of stuff that is fascinating to me. People come in and ask such interesting questions. I love that part about being a librarian. I love and really enjoy facilitating the discovery. To me it is just an emotional high, that discovery.”





On completing the bulk of the data analysis, I believe we need to look more holistically at the teaching librarians' role and not just be concerned with the logistics of teaching tools and techniques. Analysis of the data reveals that librarians value a more *personalized approach* to both their pedagogy and librarian professional role. The codes related to *caring* and *scaffolding more holistic learners* were prominent in the **Moving Beyond a Helper to a Mentor** category and also in the **Blurring of Personal and Professional Boundaries** category. Participants described more interest in helping students "act like a researcher" or develop dispositions of a researcher than they did in demonstrating information literacy tools and knowledge. As related to the changing character of their identities, librarians expressed an interest in focusing more on an integrated identity with a more visible leadership role. They also discussed "dreams" that could be couched as value-added work that could extend beyond the scope of their library role, especially in the area of collaboration with faculty and departments. One particularly important theme that emerged was discussion around the mention of continual "crossing of boundaries" between their personal and professional goals, and across different disciplines, and when working with students at different levels, and how this boundary crossing requires a continuous improvement mindset for learning. The importance of the personal touch in the learning process and one-on-one personalized learning appears more important for librarians in developing research dispositions, confidence, and attitude in students. Participants also acknowledged the importance of stepping up and out into new librarian roles and a desire for professional development for developing dispositions, confidence, and attitudes to help them adapt to newly emerging roles. The identity as a mentor and not just a helper will require a refocusing from being a service provider to a learning leader. All 14 of the study participants discussed the importance of self-reflection and evaluation of their teaching expertise and rethinking their approach to their teaching librarian role. Although the core variable of boundary crossing (or boundary spanning) has been confirmed as embedded in the codes, categories, and themes, there is still work to be done on designing a conceptual framework on how the teaching librarian literature can be best integrated with the boundary crossing body of literature.

### Practical Implications

Exploring the librarian "dreams" and "wishes" provided insights and evidence-based data to incorporate into teaching guidelines documents, logic model planning for departmental goals, and an action plan for librarian professional development. The values, dispositions, and beliefs uncovered through the appreciative inquiry process were valuable elements when working to develop a logic model and framework for library instruction. Moving forward, findings and lessons learned from this study will be incorporated into face-to-face, hybrid, and online library instruction and modules. Identifying librarian expectations and discussing faculty expectations provided a richer description of the affective aspects of learning and teaching. The next step for this research is to interview faculty partners at this institution to uncover a more nuanced understanding of the librarian/faculty relationships existing in this institution. Appendix A and B contain some preliminary draft documents that were drafted to integrate some of the findings from this study into designing a teaching guidelines document (Appendix A) and a logic model for departmental planning (Appendix B). Librarian values uncovered in this study became a prominent component of the planning document. Due to the challenges identified in the study around communicating and collaborating with faculty, strategies for working with faculty are more explicitly represented and outlined in the teaching guideline document.

The identification of the boundary crossing core variable has also opened new avenues for future research and concepts for consideration. There is a paucity of research about how librarians might be considered boundary crossers. Further investigation of this new body of literature could open up a wider perspective on aspects of outreach librarianship and how librarians might better integrate with campus-wide partners. Using the theoretical and practical aspects of the boundary crossing literature could also help inform how librarians might better work with students transitioning from high school into college, and from college into the work environment, as well as with interdisciplinary teams of faculty.

### Limitations of Study

Data was only collected from one institutional context and from those librarians mostly teaching in first-year or lower level information literacy class instruction. Data from additional interviews outside this institution may shed more light on

better defining the teaching identity of academic librarians. We cannot extrapolate these findings to other institutions with different teaching and academic librarianship cultures, however, the unique process used in this study, appreciative inquiry, can be translated and used to study teaching librarian identity at other institutions. Based on the fact that more positive responses were gathered during this appreciative inquiry process, this method might be a useful strategy for studying other library challenges and logistical problems. Additional analysis the data collected as part of this study could include looking at the coding responses by participant, not by theme, to try and identify specific persona types and strengths of teaching librarians which could then be used in librarian mentoring and professional development.

### Conclusion

This study provided insight into the teaching and learning culture and teaching librarian identity at the academic library at this particular institution. On a personal level, this study has provided a different lens for me to view the teaching identity of librarians. It also provided an opportunity for me to blend my previous “outside of library world” teaching and learning experiences with the library literature and provide an evidence-based foundation for library instruction planning. Most importantly this experience provided evidence needed to align our departmental teaching expectations and “dreams” with learning outcomes, instructional planning, and teaching practice.

—Copyright 2017 Donna Ziegenfuss

**Donna Ziegenfuss**, Associate Librarian, J. Willard Marriott Library, University of Utah

Email: [donna.ziegenfuss@utah.edu](mailto:donna.ziegenfuss@utah.edu)

Phone: 801-585-0542

### Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Cindy Yocum, the undergraduate MUSE intern student who assisted with the data collection and analysis for this project. Her student perspective and insight were invaluable and added a richness to the data analysis.

### Notes

1. David Cooperrider, Diana D. Whitney, and Jacqueline M. Stavros, *The Appreciative Inquiry Handbook: For Leaders of Change* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2008), 3.
2. Christen Cardina and Donald Wicks, “The Changing Roles of Academic Reference Librarians over a Ten-year Period,” *Reference & User Services Quarterly* (2004): 133–142;
3. Association of College and Research Libraries, *Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Review and Report*, researched by Megan Oakleaf (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010), [http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value\\_val\\_report.pdf](http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value_val_report.pdf). Adrianna Kezar and Jaime Lester, *Enhancing Campus Capacity for Leadership: An Examination of Grassroots Leaders in Higher Education* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011).
4. Tinker Massey, *Managing Change and People in Libraries* (London: Chandos Publishing, 2009); Jon F.Wergin, *Leadership in Place: How Academic Professionals Can Find their Leadership Voice*, vol. 93, (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing, 2007). Maureen Sullivan, “The Promise of Appreciative Inquiry in Library Organizations,” *Library Trends*, 53, no. 1 (2004): 218–229; Diana D. Whitney and Amanda Trosten-Bloom, *The Power of Appreciative Inquiry: A Practical Guide to Positive Change* (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2010).
5. Urban Dictionary, “Definition of Feral Librarian,” last modified April 7, 2010, accessed November 22, 2016, <http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=feral+librarian>; Chris Bourg, “The Great Librarian Identity Crisis of 2013,” *Feral Librarian* (blog), March 11, 2013, <https://chrisbourg.wordpress.com/2013/03/11/the-great-librarian-identity-crisis-of-2013/>.
6. Heidi Julien and Shelagh K. Genuis, “Emotional Labour in Librarians’ Instructional Work,” *Journal of Documentation* 65, no. 6 (2009): 926–937; Heidi Julien and Shelagh K. Genuis, “Librarians’ Experiences of the Teaching Role: A National Survey of Librarians,” *Library & Information Science Research* 33, no. 2 (2011): 103–111.

7. Celene Seymour, "Ethnographic Study of Information Literacy Librarians' Work Experience: A Report from Two States," *Transforming Information Literacy Programs: Intersecting Frontiers of Self, Library Culture, and Campus Community* 64 (2012): 45–71.
8. Christine Bruce, Sylvia Edwards, and Mandy Lupton, "Six Frames for Information Literacy Education: A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting the Relationships Between Theory and Practice," *Innovation in Teaching and Learning in Information and Computer Sciences* 5, no. 1 (2006): 1–18.
9. Trevor Austin and Janine Bhandol, "The Academic Librarian: Buying Into, Playing Out, and Resisting the Teacher Role in Higher Education," *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 19, no. 1 (2013): 15–35; Laura Bewick and Sheila Corral, "Developing Librarians as Teachers: A Study of Their Pedagogical Knowledge," *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* 42, no. 2 (2010): 97–110; Scott Walter, "Librarians as Teachers: A Qualitative Inquiry into Professional Identity," *College & Research Libraries* 69, no. 1 (2008): 51–71.
10. David Peele, "Librarians as Teachers: Some Reality, Mostly Myth," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 10, no. 5 (1984): 267–71.
11. Pauline Wilson, "Librarians as Teachers: The Study of an Organization Fiction," *The Library Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (1979): 146–162.
12. Wade R. Kotter, "Bridging the Great Divide: Improving Relations between Librarians and Classroom Faculty," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 25, no. 4 (1999): 294–303.
13. Yvonne Nalani Meulemans and Allison Carr, "Not at Your Service: Building Genuine Faculty-Librarian Partnerships," *Reference Services Review* 41, no. 1 (2013): 80–90.
14. Stephanie Sterling Brasley, "Effective Librarian and Discipline Faculty Collaboration Models for Integrating Information Literacy Into the Fabric of an Academic Institution," *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, no. 114 (2008): 71–88; Deborah B. Gaspar and Karen A. Wetzel, "A Case Study in Collaboration: Assessing Academic Librarian/Faculty Partnerships," *College & Research Libraries* 70, no. 6 (2009): 578–591.
15. Catherine Coker, Wyoma van Duinkerken, and Stephen Bales, "Seeking Full Citizenship: A Defense of Tenure Faculty Status for Librarians," *College & Research Libraries* 71 no. 5 (2010): 406–420; Joshua Kim, "The Future for Teaching and Learning: Librarians' Deepening Involvement in Pedagogy and Curriculum," *Inside Higher Education Technology and Learning* (blog), November 30, 2016, <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/technology-and-learning/librarian-teaching-team>.
16. Kaetrena D. Davis, "The Academic Librarian as Instructor: A Study of Teacher Anxiety," *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 14, no. 2 (2007): 77–101.
17. Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990); Rachel A. Fleming-May and Kimberly Douglass, "Framing Librarianship in the Academy: An Analysis Using Bolman and Deal's Model of Organizations," *College & Research Libraries* 75, no. 3 (2014): 389–415.
18. Janice Jaguszewski and Karen Williams, *New Roles for New Times: Transforming Liaison Roles in Research Libraries* (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2013).
19. Stephanie J. Schulte, "Embedded Academic Librarianship: A Review of the Literature," *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 7, no. 4 (2012): 122–138.
20. Celia Whitchurch, "Shifting Identities and Blurring Boundaries: The Emergence of Third Space Professionals in UK Higher Education," *Higher Education Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (2008): 377–396.
21. Peter Michael Miller, "Examining the Work of Boundary Spanning Leaders in Community Contexts," *International Journal of Leadership in Education* 11, no. 4 (2008): 353–377; Yrjö Engeström and Annalisa Sannino, "Studies of Expansive Learning: Foundations, Findings and

- Future Challenges,” *Educational Research Review* 5, no. 1 (2010): 1–24.
22. Hallie Preskill and Tessie Tzavaras Catsambas, *Reframing Evaluation through Appreciative Inquiry* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2006); Cooperrider, et al., *The Appreciative Inquiry Handbook*, 3.
  23. University of Utah MUSE Project, “About the MUSE Project,” <http://muse.utah.edu/>.
  24. Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research*, vol. 15 (Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1990).
  25. Ibid, 116.
  26. Amy BM Tsui and Doris YK Law, “Learning as Boundary-Crossing in School–University Partnership,” *Teaching and Teacher Education* 23, no. 8 (2007): 1289–1301; Celia Whitchurch, “Shifting Identities, Blurring Boundaries: The Changing Roles of Professional Managers in Higher Education,” 2008, retrieved October 1, 2016, from University of California, Berkeley, Center for Studies in Higher Education Web site, <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/3xk701cn>; Yrjö Engeström, Ritva Engeström, and Merja Kärkkäinen, “Polycontextuality and Boundary Crossing in Expert Cognition: Learning and Problem Solving in Complex Work Activities,” *Learning and Instruction* 5, no. 4 (1995): 319–336.
  27. Ibid, 332.
  28. Ibid, 333.
  29. Christine Bruce, “Faculty-Librarian Partnerships in Australian Higher Education: Critical Dimensions,” *Reference Services Review* 29, no. 2 (2001): 106–116; David Herron and Lotta Haglund, “Mismatch between the Demands for Tenure and Those of Public Services is Creating a Crossroads in Academic Librarianship,” *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 2, no. 4 (2007): 73–76.
  30. Ina Fourie, “Librarians and the Claiming of New Roles: How Can We Try to Make a Difference?” In *Aslib Proceedings*, vol. 56, no. 1 (Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2004), 62–74; Alexander W. Astin and Helen S. Astin, “Leadership Reconsidered: Engaging Higher Education in Social Change,” (East Battle Creek, MI: W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 2000); David J. Staley and Kara J. Malenfant, “Futures Thinking for Academic Librarians: Higher Education in 2025,” *Information Services & Use* 30, no. 1–2 (2010): 57–90.
  31. Yrjö Engeström, *Learning by Expanding* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014).
  32. Deborah G. Ancona and David F. Caldwell, “Bridging the Boundary: External Activity and Performance in Organizational Teams,” *Administrative Science Quarterly* (1992): 634–665.
  33. Deborah G. Ancona and David F. Caldwell, “Bridging the Boundary: External Activity and Performance in Organizational Teams,” *Administrative Science Quarterly* (1992): 634–665.

## Appendix A. Teaching Best Practices Guidelines Draft Incorporating Librarian Values and Articulated Faculty-Librarian Collaboration Tasks

As Instruction Librarians We Value:	Faculty Partnerships and Collaboration	Effective Instructional Practices	Supportive and Shared Learning Environments	Professional Responsibility
<b>Phase 1: DESIGN Instruction</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contact the professor before the scheduled class (in person, email or on the phone) to identify class needs, goals, and outcomes for the session(s)</li> <li>Plan the session length and content based on professor and student needs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design a coherent lesson plan that includes: outcomes, assessments, and teaching and learning activities in written or online format</li> <li>Align lesson plan to the course syllabus. Ask for a syllabus in order to see what is included in the readings and what the projects will be. This will help shape and integrate your library instruction presentation.</li> <li>Align lesson plan to the ACRL framework and/or AACU LEAP outcomes (review the Framework for Information Literacy prior to developing an instructional plan)</li> <li>Align lesson plan outcomes to the GUS Information Literacy Outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Compile a variety resources (tutorials, handouts, examples) to incorporate into lesson planning to support student learning</li> <li>Use relevant or real world examples if possible to help engage students in the session</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use professional experience and teaching expertise to select appropriate content for library sessions</li> </ul>
<b>Phase 2: BUILD Learning Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collaborate with faculty on the development of the session to include teaching and learning activities and assessments, as well as relevant materials, databases, handouts, and activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop strategies to integrate students' prior experience/knowledge or questions into lesson</li> <li>Gather relevant library resources and examples needed for the lesson plan</li> <li>Create handouts or take-aways to help students navigate the lesson and use after the session</li> <li>Develop tutorials or other materials if needed for inclusion in the instruction or materials</li> <li>Design formative feedback opportunities to gather student feedback about the value of the library instruction session</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Create library guides or Canvas pages to supplement lesson that are easily to navigate</li> <li>Build into the lesson opportunities for support into the Canvas course, library guide, and session (like tutorials or step-by-steps) to encourage learning beyond the session</li> <li>Incorporate the best type of media for presenting materials related to the lesson plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a plan for implementing the lesson</li> <li>Create professional looking materials</li> <li>Provide contact information for post-instruction follow-up and consultations</li> </ul>

As Instruction Librarians We Value:	Faculty Partnerships and Collaboration	Effective Instructional Practices	Supportive and Shared Learning Environments	Professional Responsibility
<b>Phase 3: TEACH F2F or Online</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Engage the course instructor in the information literacy session(s) if possible by asking questions, etc.</li> <li>Request to be embedded into the Canvas course to provide better connection and access to students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outline what the session will cover (on board or in canvas)—learning targets/outcomes and content</li> <li>Prepare and show command of the material</li> <li>Use engaged teaching strategies to engage students in the session</li> <li>Use questioning and discussion techniques (one example is think/share/pair) to break up lecture components</li> <li>Use appropriate pacing (including waiting more than 3 seconds for students to respond to questions)</li> <li>Finish the session by reviewing what was covered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish a rapport with students</li> <li>Create a respectful, supportive and shared learning environment</li> <li>Check to see if students are lost or off task</li> <li>Is aware of student questions or raised hands</li> <li>Encourage student-student discussion and sharing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be on time for the instructional session to get set up and greet students</li> <li>"Optional" recommendation to keep a teaching journal and track what we do with assessment and making changes to our teaching</li> <li>Appear interested in and excited about the material</li> <li>Adhere to standards of ethical conduct in the classroom</li> <li>Grade the assessment if asked to do that by the instructor Create a safe and comfortable learning environment in each session that is respectful and inclusive for all students</li> </ul>
<b>Phase 4: REVISE Instruction: Close the Assessment and Evaluation Loop</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After the session, share reflections, observations, and ideas about the session(s) with the instructor as well as your plans for improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflect on how the teaching session went. What to improve? What to omit?</li> <li>Review formative feedback if collected from students for improving instruction</li> <li>Ask for feedback from the instructor once an assignment is completed by the students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gather data about the student research experience and attitudes about doing research</li> <li>Track follow-up incidences, subject guide stats or canvas analytics to measure how students utilize resources</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan for professional growth and development in the area of teaching</li> <li>Design and implement assessment strategies to monitor the teaching and learning experience</li> <li>Maintain accurate records of teaching, improvement strategies and assessment data</li> <li>Record instructional sessions in Desk Stats</li> <li>Request feedback from peers about teaching</li> </ul>

## Appendix B: Logic Model for: Graduate and Undergraduate Services Priorities and Visioning

GUS planning Logic Model [Compatibility Mode]

Needs and plans for before events/programs/tasks begin			Outcomes for during and after the events/programs/tasks begin		
What you will need	What you will do	(Your outcomes for the projects)	What you expect/hope will happen in the short term	What you expect/hope will happen in the mid term	Big picture outcomes/impacts for how your project will impact others in the long term
INPUTS / RESOURCES <i>In order to accomplish our goals we will need the following resources</i>	ACTIVITIES / TASKS <i>Activities that will result in the measurable outputs or deliverables (listed to the right)</i>	OUTPUTS / DELIVERABLES <i>Evidence of progress (deliverables or benchmarks) in the project</i>	SHORT TERM OUTCOMES <i>We expect the following measurable changes during or after the tasks and deliverables are created</i>	MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES <i>We expect the following measurable changes within the next one to three years</i>	IMPACTS OR LONG TERM OUTCOMES <i>We expect the following impacts/trends within the next three to seven years or more</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Librarian collaboration to create materials, lib guides, tutorials, lessons, canvas pages</li> <li>Dedicated time and staffing to design materials</li> <li>Grant (MUSE or campus teaching grant) to engage undergrad and grad students in the process of designing library instruction</li> <li>Cooperation and input of departmental and regular faculty partners (LEAP, WRTG 2010, EDPS 2600, Honors, etc)</li> <li>Library administrative support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conduct a needs assessment across all departments – not just LEAP and get faculty feedback on library instruction needs</li> <li>Articulate our own library instruction framework for program based on ACRL threshold concepts and learning outcomes defined by Ed Services/GUS</li> <li>Rethink our instructional focus and served populations (1st year experience, advanced level, honors, transfer, capstone, graduate, international, etc.)</li> <li>Scaffold learning outcomes across the UG and Grad learning span (1<sup>st</sup> yr, entering discipline, capstone, graduate, doctoral)</li> <li>Create generic one-shot activities for each of ACRL frames and canned presentations for departmental presentations</li> <li>Experiment with formats – Canvas Commons, Equella, Canvas pages, Lib guides</li> <li>Design workshops aligned to program outcomes (create an online presence for these as well)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use data collected from needs assessment to design new instructional approaches, types of opportunities (online, blended, face-to-face) delivery formats etc.</li> <li>Map learning outcomes across the learning span and align to created learning activities – make visible on website</li> <li>Report back to stakeholders on needs assessment and examples of library learning activities (create a report for posting and sharing to develop awareness of services)</li> <li>Post new workshops and related framework</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library teaching resources are consolidated, refined, updated, and accessible for all librarians to use in planning library instruction and organized by the 6 ACRL frames (ex equella, canvas pages, canvas commons, and library guides)</li> <li>New services are created to meet new needs identified in the needs assessment and old services phased out if not needed</li> <li>Availability of new shared resources will create an increased interest in teaching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library instruction becomes truly embedded in general education and disciplinary courses where the librarian is an instructional partner</li> <li>Librarians are invited to co-teach new courses and become partners in different courses</li> <li>Library will design and teach their own research courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Increase impact on Student Success</b></li> <li>Students are mentored across the college experience more systematically by librarians and leave the U of U with not only information seeking and analysis skills but also research dispositions to be successful in whatever they decide to do</li> <li>Librarians will become a valued partner in the campus-wide student success initiatives</li> <li>Library instruction will become more than just a service, but will become integrated into U of U programs and curriculum</li> </ul>

Ziegenfuss based on Ed Services and GUS input 2014-2015

Page 1 of 4 1164 Words English (US) 170%

GUS planning Logic Model [Compatibility Mode]

Needs and plans for before events/programs/tasks begin			Outcomes for during and after the events/programs/tasks begin		
What you will need	What you will do	(Your outcomes for the projects)	What you expect/hope will happen in the short term	What you expect/hope will happen in the mid term	Big picture outcomes/impacts for how your project will impact others in the long term
INPUTS / RESOURCES <i>In order to accomplish our goals we will need the following resources</i>	ACTIVITIES / TASKS <i>Activities that will result in the measurable outputs or deliverables (listed to the right)</i>	OUTPUTS / DELIVERABLES <i>Evidence of progress (deliverables or benchmarks) in the project</i>	SHORT TERM OUTCOMES <i>We expect the following measurable changes during or after the tasks and deliverables are created</i>	MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES <i>We expect the following measurable changes within the next one to three years</i>	IMPACTS OR LONG TERM OUTCOMES <i>We expect the following impacts/trends within the next three to seven years or more</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A core group of librarians interested and dedicated to quality teaching and willing to take part in assessment activities</li> <li>An assessment advisory committee or taskforce to create an assessment plan</li> <li>Cooperation from administration on accessing library data for research purposes</li> <li>Policies and procedures for those teaching library instruction courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creation of a public assessment plan</li> <li>Creation of policies and procedures for teaching librarians (peer review, SCF access)</li> <li>Analysis of current data (Student Course Feedback data, Lib qual data, strategic plan data)</li> <li>Collection of new data as outlined in the assessment plan</li> <li>Creation of some standard assessment instruments to be used in library classes</li> <li>Design and implementation of research studies focus on library instruction</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment Plan public on GUS website</li> <li>Policies and procedures related to teaching on GUS website</li> <li>Set of assessment tools for use by all librarians teaching courses</li> <li>Publications and presentations on library instruction assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Make assessment data public and transparent in a yearly report</li> <li>Generate special reports for major partners (LEAP, WRTG etc.)</li> <li>Use of assessment data to change/improve teaching practices</li> <li>Documented improvement in teaching quality through peer observations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased teaching requests and partnerships</li> <li>Increased number of general education courses including the Information Literacy LEAP access</li> <li>Increased partnerships with other types of faculty-librarian partnerships (grants, publications, co-teaching projects, train the trainer projects)</li> <li>Presence in the library literature of U of U library publications and presentations</li> <li>Increased grants for library instruction once we have data to use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Assessment</b></li> <li>Demonstrated the value that library/research instruction brings to students, programs, departments, colleges through formalized assessment</li> <li>Changed teaching and assessment culture in the library</li> <li>Elevated the level of respect across campus for librarian teachers</li> </ul>

Page 2 of 4 1164 Words English (US) 170%

# 2016 Library Assessment Conference

Microsoft Word interface showing a table titled "Needs and plans for before events/programs/tasks begin" and "Outcomes for during and after the events/programs/tasks begin".

Needs and plans for before events/programs/tasks begin			Outcomes for during and after the events/programs/tasks begin		
What you will need	What you will do	(Your outcomes for the projects)	What you expect/hope will happen in the short term	What you expect/hope will happen in the mid term	Big picture outcomes/impacts for how your project will impact others in the long term
<b>INPUTS / RESOURCES</b> <i>In order to accomplish our goals we will need the following resources</i>	<b>ACTIVITIES / TASKS</b> <i>Activities that will result in the measurable outputs or deliverables (listed to the right)</i>	<b>OUTPUTS / DELIVERABLES</b> <i>Evidence of progress (deliverables or benchmarks) in the project</i>	<b>SHORT TERM OUTCOMES</b> <i>We expect the following measurable changes during or after the tasks and deliverables are created</i>	<b>MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES</b> <i>We expect the following measurable changes within the next one to three years</i>	<b>IMPACTS OR LONG TERM OUTCOMES</b> <i>We expect the following impacts/trends within the next three to seven years or more</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Budget for swag and materials for outreach events</li> <li>Staff outside of GLUS willing to participate in outreach activities with K-12, community and college students</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Finalize policies and procedures for outreach</li> <li>Get outreach form for registration and tracking of outreach requests and work up on the web</li> <li>Design of assessment tool for measuring the success of outreach efforts</li> <li>Design a MOFC for outreach into K-12 Utah schools</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More efficient flow of how outreach requests are handled, implemented and assessed</li> <li>More visible presence of library in outreach activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved way to measure outreach efforts are in place</li> <li>Increased high school to college outreach efforts in the area of research and information literacy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased involvement in campus-wide outreach projects</li> <li>Outreach efforts are more student-centered focused and not marketing focused</li> <li>Successful grant projects to develop a high school outreach program for developing researchers</li> </ul>	<b>Sustainable Outreach Programs:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Become a valued outreach partner</li> <li>Continued presence and partnership at all student and family outreach events</li> <li>Become outreach leaders on campus</li> <li>Documented contributor to recruitment of students through outreach activities</li> </ul>

Microsoft Word interface showing a table titled "Needs and plans for before events/programs/tasks begin" and "Outcomes for during and after the events/programs/tasks begin".

Needs and plans for before events/programs/tasks begin			Outcomes for during and after the events/programs/tasks begin		
What you will need	What you will do	(Your outcomes for the projects)	What you expect/hope will happen in the short term	What you expect/hope will happen in the mid term	Big picture outcomes/impacts for how your project will impact others in the long term
<b>INPUTS / RESOURCES</b> <i>In order to accomplish our goals we will need the following resources</i>	<b>ACTIVITIES / TASKS</b> <i>Activities that will result in the measurable outputs or deliverables (listed to the right)</i>	<b>OUTPUTS / DELIVERABLES</b> <i>Evidence of progress (deliverables or benchmarks) in the project</i>	<b>SHORT TERM OUTCOMES</b> <i>We expect the following measurable changes during or after the tasks and deliverables are created</i>	<b>MEDIUM TERM OUTCOMES</b> <i>We expect the following measurable changes within the next one to three years</i>	<b>IMPACTS OR LONG TERM OUTCOMES</b> <i>We expect the following impacts/trends within the next three to seven years or more</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Willing (not forced) teaching participants</li> <li>Grant money to develop librarians as teacher/researchers</li> <li>Administrative support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop a teacher/researcher workshop program</li> <li>Develop a community of practice of teachers in the library</li> <li>Create infrastructure for supporting teachers who are teaching and researching their teaching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased number of presentations and publications by librarian teacher/researchers</li> <li>Completed professional development series of workshops that were assessed and improved based on participant data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More librarians engaged in teaching AND research activities</li> <li>Improved culture for teaching to segway into for-credit courses efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library offering for-credit courses and librarians developed and ready to contribute</li> </ul>	<b>Professional Development for Librarian Teachers</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reputation of librarian teachers increased across campus which leads to more faculty partnerships</li> <li>Program of teaching as research culminated in other college programs</li> </ul>