

Settling Uncharted Territory: Documenting & Rewarding Librarians' Teaching Role in the Academy

--April Cunningham & Carrie Donovan

Introduction

Seizing the opportunity to increase the scope and impact of their efforts, librarians across all academic contexts are expanding their role as teachers. Describing, documenting and measuring the effect of librarians as educators have, therefore, become formative challenges for our future. Teaching in libraries has never been limited by the traditional boundaries that typically define learning in higher education (e.g. course credits, classroom time, etc.). This freedom from standardization allows for creative approaches to library instructional initiatives that fit unique academic settings. But a lack of standardization across institutions or as a top-down effort from national professional organizations leaves librarians without a regular and consistent way to describe and assess their teaching. Each institution determines to what extent librarians can engage in teaching and how the committees that decide on tenure, promotion or contract renewals will evaluate and weight librarians' performance as educators. When a librarian contributes to her institution's educational mission with regularity and meaning she should be assured that a recognized mechanism for gauging her impact will make it possible for her to gain access to the institution's established system of rewards. Based on survey data and documented research, this chapter will describe discrepancies among methods of assessment for teaching librarians in different types of institutions of higher education, as well as possibilities for more purposeful and strategic methods of describing and documenting their teaching activities with the goal of rewarding success.

As the authors for this chapter, we represent perspectives and experiences shaped by our work as librarians from a research university and a community college, respectively. In conversations about our unique processes for tenure and the value our libraries place on teaching, we realized that differences abound. Without any justification for these differences, beyond varying institutional missions and organizational cultures, we searched for something in the professional literature to define a connection in our pedagogical practice, in terms of definitions, benchmarks, and standards. Finding nothing definitive, we set out to review the literature and survey our colleagues in order to determine how librarians construct their teacherly roles and what, if any, indicators their organizations use to measure or value these. We are hopeful that our findings and recommendations will create an opportunity for librarians to examine how they document their teaching and what it means for their institutions, their careers, and librarianship.

Review of Literature

Changes in Higher Education in the United States

Concerns that higher education is out of touch with the needs of students and wider cultural trends are not new. Critics of the ivory tower mentality of professors and academics currently have an easy mark when they attack higher education for failing to produce the economic benefits that are so often promised to students. Instruction librarians must navigate this unsettled environment as the profession strives to make progress toward improved integration with the academy.

The United States does not have a national vision for higher education (in contrast with the

European Union's Bologna Declaration, for example) and age-old arguments still smolder and flare because of the friction between workforce development goals and academic idealism (Gaston 2010). Some commentators have even sounded the alarm that we may be in the midst of an education bubble in which the government subsidies and the personal debt dedicated to educational costs prop up a system that no longer fulfills its perceived value (Adamson 2009). Flaws in the assumptions about the macro- and micro-economics of the benefits derived from credentialing and degrees are starting to raise concerns at the same time that the current White House administration is promoting an agenda to significantly increase the number of students completing their college education (Wolf 2009). Large numbers of students are entering college but are not completing it (Bowen 2009). This has long been a problem at community colleges where open access and limited resources combined to leave many students ill-equipped to complete degrees or certificates. More recently, it has become an increasing problem at colleges and universities with entrance requirements as well (Bowen 2009). Among those who see higher education as unresponsive and elitist, this trend is further evidence that colleges and universities have not been accountable enough to the expectations of stakeholders, including students, parents, and tax payers.

Different types of institutions are responding to these pressures in different ways (Oakley 1997). One common theme in the literature about the future of higher education is competition. Ivy League schools and flagship public universities facing unprecedented losses in endowments or cuts in funding have relaxed breadth and depth requirements that could scare off prospective students (Aronowitz 2000). Traditional colleges and universities have reacted to the technological changes driving competition with alarm rather than embracing them pro-actively. At the same time, the fastest growing sector of higher education, the for-profit schools, have leveraged technology to facilitate growth and reach previously untapped markets of students as well as students who probably would have attended traditional schools in the past (Morey 2004). Community colleges in particular are responding to the influence of for-profit colleges and some have looked to the for-profit sector to help ease demand for classes that the community colleges do not currently have the funds to provide (Willen 2010).

Another related issue that many analysts consider a significant pressure in higher education is the accountability movement (Bruininks, Keeney, and Thorp 2010). Much of the momentum for the accountability movement comes from the crisis that many believe awaits the economy if students do not receive the education that our labor market demands (Wolf 2009). The central role that the academy is expected to play in the knowledge economy leads to scrutiny of its processes and outcomes and gives outside forces, including government and corporate bodies, a voice in how higher education is to function. This intensified connection between higher education and the labor market means that the stakes are higher and learning and productivity are seen as having a causal relationship. One commentator remarked that "to be able to learn today is to be able to be productive today" (Do 2008). While some resistance to the managerial trends and the accountability movement is slowing this transition, many universities and colleges are adopting the vision of their role as engines for the economy and producers of productive knowledge-workers (Ohmann 2000).

Part of the inspiration for increased concern about the economic consequences of ineffective education is the perception that the student population has changed. Because the negative economic impact of a large population of underemployed young people is an alarming prospect that could reduce America's power internationally, many analysts are looking to higher

education to change our economic outlook by creating more skilled workers (Wolf 2009). This anxiety has created a “de facto ‘college for all’ strategy” that may be misguided because it ignores the vital role of work-based and career-focused training for underprepared students who are least likely to see a significant return on their investment in college (Lerman 2007, 41-90). Regardless of its limitations, the faith in higher education as a catalyst for economic growth persists. Given this enduring faith, statistics showing that future generations of workers will have lower average education levels than in the past (Kelly 2005) is increasing the pressure to adapt higher education to the needs of adult learners and other non-traditional students (Chao, DeRocco, and Flynn 2007; Levine 1997).

In an effort to respond to the combined pressures of competition, scrutiny of student success, perceived changes in student characteristics, and intensified valuation of workforce development, many colleges and universities have started to emphasize a set of core skills that students will develop (Dunne, Bennett, and Clive Carr 1997). This may be seen as undermining the classical emphasis on developing specialized disciplinary knowledge and is a controversial move away from what many valued as the disinterested pursuit of knowledge that characterized rigor in traditional higher education (Fox 2002). Shifting its resources toward developing students’ inquiry skills and raising doubts about the traditional emphasis on content, higher education has adopted a framework of instrumental rationality in response to corporatist demand for flexibility (Aronowitz 2000). This is the primary change in higher education that has affected librarians’ roles, often broadening the appeal of the profession’s skills and creating a closer match between librarians’ pedagogical approaches and the core mission of the academy.

Taken together, these trends in favor of instrumentalist undergraduate general education are increasing tension about how faculty should be evaluated and rewarded and they will have significant effects on the working conditions of most college faculty. They have even led some to question the presumed value of the PhD for the future of higher education (Brien 2009). Faculty who find that their scholarship is no longer valued at colleges and universities where undergraduate enrollment in their disciplines has dwindled and the only classes left to teach are survey courses that fulfill students’ breadth requirements are looking for opportunities to pursue their avocation outside the academy (Aronowitz 2000). Administrators are questioning the assumptions underlying the tenure system and critiquing tenure for slowing innovation and responsiveness in higher education (Premeaux 2008). Some commentators question the value of the academic research at the heart of promotion and tenure reward systems because it takes resources away from undergraduate education (Hacker and Dreifus 2010). The long-standing assumption that tenure is necessary for academic freedom is being steadily eroded (Tierney and Bensimon 1996). Tenure always represents a cost to the institution because it reduces budgetary flexibility and the discretion of managers (Kingma and McCombs 1995). According to some critical postmodern critiques, it may also contribute to the stagnation and “entrenched closed-mindedness [that] has eroded public confidence in the academy” (Tierney and Bensimon 1996). Because tenure remains valuable to different types of institutions for different reasons, it is too complex a topic to make broad generalizations about its future prospects. The trend, however, toward a bifurcated system of the dwindling tenured and growing contingent faculty is firmly established. Faculty employed outside of any system of tenure far outnumber tenured faculty and the trend will not be reversed (Gappa 2008). The implications of this systematic inequality also affect librarians because they are marginal insiders with an indirect relationship to the core functions of higher education.

Changing Nature of Librarianship

For a profession so concerned with maintaining its relevance and centrality to the academy, librarians have worked tirelessly to make collections and services networked and available in such a way that the library becomes almost invisible to students and researchers. Without the bulwark of library space or collections to define how librarians' work is perceived and valued, stakeholders and decision-makers may question the necessity of libraries. While the digital information environment requires librarians to be more transparent about their work in facilitating organization and access of information, it also frees librarians to engage in initiatives beyond these. According to Crowley (2001), librarians are right to focus more on developing and maintaining service programs that parallel the values of the institution. In many cases, this involves the librarians' participation in outreach and educational initiatives.

As teachers, librarians can inform and improve upon other areas of their work, based on the understanding that comes from facilitating and observing information seeking and use in authentic contexts, such as the classroom. Librarians teaching information literacy courses have found that direct classroom involvement influences resource selection decisions based on what is practical for students (Donnelly 2000). Barring this instructional role, librarians would be left with only measures of inputs and outputs, rather than student application and learning, to guide their collection management strategies.

Incorporating teaching into a diverse repertoire of professional skills does not happen seamlessly for many librarians. In a survey of 328 public services librarians, Johnson and Lindsay found that instruction was among the top two areas of work that respondents found most satisfying, although it was also identified as the most challenging of all the areas (Johnson and Lindsay 2006). In terms of preparing future professionals for teaching as a core component of librarianship, MLS-granting institutions do not consistently offer coursework in developing pedagogical knowledge and strategies for future libraries. In fact, the University of Washington has been identified as the only institution to make such a course required (Julien 2005).

With the lack of professional preparation and the challenges that accompany teaching, some librarians may struggle to accept this new role as educator; however, it is imperative that they do. Declining reference desk statistics and fewer people in the library indicate a shift in usage behavior that is unlikely to reverse. If librarians' teaching was valued somewhat in the traditional library environment, it should be of primary value now that learners' need for understanding information seeking and use have compounded as a result of the influx of electronic information (Rapple 1997). Additionally, the service-orientation of librarianship is a near-mandate for embracing teaching, as librarians are incumbent to provide the knowledge and abilities necessary to navigate the world of networked information to those who will ultimately become its primary consumers, creators, and curators.

Librarians' Teaching

Most academic librarians still teach in the type of traditional course-integrated one-shots or stand-alone workshops that have characterized library instruction for generations. Many ambitious projects have developed from these efforts and frequently librarians are being asked to participate more fully in students' research, whether as guest instructors who meet with classes multiple times during their research (Gandhi 2005) or as research mentors (Stamatoplos 2009). Studies on the effectiveness of supplemental information literacy and library instruction show mixed results for student outcomes (Cmor, Chan, & Kong 2010; Koufogiannakis & Wiebe

2006; Matthews 2007). At the same time, studies on the impact of this traditional instructional setting on instruction librarians' anxiety and burn-out often raise concerns (Affleck 1996; Becker 1993; Sheesley 2001).

In addition to the supplemental instruction that librarians have long provided as support for the curriculum, many schools are now offering credit instruction on information literacy in classes taught by librarians. Many librarians see this is an essential step toward legitimizing librarianship (Owusu-Ansah 2007). Some of these credit classes are offered as parts of learning communities (Galvin 2006; Lebbin 2005). Student learning assessment remains an important issue for credit instruction on information literacy (Burkhardt 2007; Hufford 2010). Results of these assessment efforts have not been uniformly positive and reveal the complexity of teaching information literacy whether in credit classes or through supplemental instruction (Mokhtar, Majid, & Foo 2008).

Information literacy is now often thought of as a generic skill that students should be able to transfer across diverse learning situations and it has been included in lists of core skills for college students (ICAS, 2000). The current higher education trend that favors generic skills integration throughout the curriculum has been a boon to librarians who are positioned as experts in developing students' research skills and can be a resource for faculty who need to improve their students' academic literacy learning outcomes. Some librarians' research has even measured the effect of information literacy instruction by faculty in other disciplines, suggesting that librarians' interventions with faculty remain a powerful means of promoting the information literacy agenda (Birmingham et al. 2008). In addition to individual courses, librarians are also influencing the development and assessment of core competencies like research skills and information literacy in undergraduate co-curricular programs and activities (Lampert 2005).

As with most other areas of librarianship, technology is also changing the nature of instruction. Whether in credit courses, in tutorials that are analogous to one-shot sessions, or through personalized instruction (Lillard 2003), distance education has become an important mode for librarians to reach students and brings its own challenges and questions. For example, librarians study whether learning is equivalent in face-to-face and online formats (Beile and Boote 2004). They are also involved in collaborations to support cooperative learning online (Bielema et al. 2005).

Overall, librarians' research on teaching and learning follows the same trends that are influencing instruction throughout higher education. Although librarians' role as teachers has met with some controversy, librarian-instructors as a group have embraced student-centered learning and the need to innovate. Just like faculty throughout the academy, librarians have stepped up to demands for evaluation and instructional improvement.

Teaching Role of Librarians: Intra-Professional Perspectives

The question of professional identity, especially as it relates to librarians' role in the academy, has long been debated and lamented by those in the profession as a crisis that contributes to everything from a lack of integration into institutional missions to the inability for effecting change at organizational levels. This internal debate is especially pronounced when librarians' teaching role is the central topic. With the variance in types of higher education institutions and the differing educational cultures they foster, librarians have a spectrum of experiences and

views regarding how their teaching can make the greatest impact.

Since Wilson argued in *Library Quarterly* that teaching is an insignificant part of the wide array of characteristics that constitutes the role of librarians to the extent that it is “fiction,” (1979) Miller and Tegler described librarians’ teaching as “quixotic self-deception,” (1987) and Gorman (1991) predicted that technological advances would make libraries so easy to use that instruction should be unnecessary there has been little serious debate about whether or not librarianship should involve an instructional component. Instead, librarians have agonized over the challenges they face in receiving adequate preparation for teaching (Bewick and Corral 2010; Sproles, Johnson, and Farison 2008) and establishing a sense of teacher identity, as it has been clouded by long-standing stereotypes that require justification of librarians’ professional worth (Loesch 2010) and teacherly purpose. More recently, librarians have had less of a reason to focus on these questions of identity and are moving toward the more pressing issue of how information literacy instruction should be enacted, assessed, and rewarded, instead of continually justifying it.

Many librarians have achieved success as teachers in the academy through partnerships with disciplinary faculty. As the ultimate proponent for collaborative efforts that facilitate teaching partnerships between librarians and faculty, Evan Farber created a movement that positioned information literacy as an institutional imperative that should be curriculum-integrated and discipline-related (Gansz et al. 2007). Echoes of this approach are apparent in the writing of Ilene Rockman, as well, in her advocacy for the alignment of information literacy standards with the general education curriculum, which resulted in great successes for student learning in the California State University system (2002). Librarians involved in course-integrated information literacy initiatives participate in the design of syllabi and assignments, the development of rubrics, and the assessment of student work as a part of the overall course grade (Auer and Krupar 2005). Involvement in course design and learning assessment situates librarians in a position of consultant and facilitator, in addition to that of instructor.

Beyond participation in existing courses, many librarians encourage the creation and proliferation of new information literacy courses for which librarians would be the sole instructors. While acknowledging some successes have come about through collaborative efforts with faculty, Edward Owusu-Ansah called for librarians to reject their limited instructional function through partnerships with faculty and to engage in the teaching of credit-bearing courses, as these define the parameters for what is taught, learned, and assessed formally in higher education (2007). Echoes of encouragement for librarians to evolve into more strategic instructional roles can be found in the writings of librarians who have taught courses, either information-related or within disciplines beyond libraries. In describing her experience of teaching for the Department of Communications, one librarian labeled the experience as a “renewal” opportunity that allowed her to make a direct contribution to the mission of the college (Partello 2005). Others include self-improvement (Kemp 2006), lasting relationships with students, and insights into the working lives of faculty as additional benefits to teaching credit courses (Donnelly 2000).

While teaching credit courses may seem like the ideal solution for librarians to make a lasting impact on the educational process of their institutions, it is not without its drawbacks. Many of those involve the lack of time librarians have to devote to teaching in light of other various job duties and whether teaching courses should be among librarians’ prioritized responsibilities.

Librarians who focus on teaching, rather than other “traditional” professional duties (e.g. reference), may encounter colleagues who do not understand or recognize the value of librarians as teachers (Donnelly 2000), in addition to those colleagues who regard teaching courses outside the library as irrelevant to librarianship (Partello 2005). Because teaching often happens in addition to the other professional functions of reference, management, and collection development, librarians may seek work release for time spent teaching or face the difficulties of being overburdened.

Tenure: Challenges & Opportunities for Librarians

It is likely that the debate regarding tenure for librarians will continue to plague the profession, with both sides steadfast in their justifications and conclusions. For proponents, the benefits are clear: salary, status, and academic freedom. While tenure does serve to leverage librarians’ salaries upward (Meyer 1999), it is direct engagement in the primary functions of the institution which brings status equal to faculty that is often more attractive. Librarians who have the opportunity to achieve tenure are well-suited to collaborate with teaching faculty as partners toward integrating information literacy into the curriculum, participate on campus governing bodies, and contribute to the work of committees that shape the strategic planning and evolution of the campus.

Without the same status as teaching faculty, librarians’ potential for further isolation from the educational community and its overarching mission is imminent (Slattery 1994). As early as 1972, the Association of College & Research Libraries issued a *Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College & University Librarians*, stating that the “the function of the librarian as participant in the processes of teaching and research is the essential criterion of faculty status.” This statement of advocacy was followed by a set of standards from the ACRL on *Faculty Status for College and University Librarians* (2006). The standards demand tenure for librarians, as well as performance and peer review processes aligned with campus requirements. Finally, a 2010 issuance of *Guidelines on the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Academic Librarians* is the ACRL’s more recent statement indicating the importance of librarians’ criteria for promotion and tenure equaling that of faculty, although the criteria listed mention teaching only as something that “may” be included in the review process.

While the consensus among academic librarians seems to be that librarians’ work warrants standing and status on campus equal to that of their faculty colleagues, the path to achieving such status remains amorphous. Throughout the literature, we see references to the awkwardness that comes from librarians’ attempts to match their professional competencies to faculty tenure requirements when they do not engage in formal teaching (Cubberley 1996; Hall and Byrd 1990; Hill 1994). Even the faculty who educate future librarians are ambivalent about faculty status in academic libraries because of a perception that the requirements are not a good match for librarians’ daily responsibilities (Wyss 2010). Applying the label “teaching” to the variety of activities (e.g., one-shot library instruction sessions, tours, drop-in workshops, credit-bearing courses, e-learning, and teaching in other disciplines) in which librarians engage only serves to further complicates efforts to measure or document student learning in any consistent way for the purposes of professional review. This is compounded by the institutional differences that often result in the use of local criteria and standards for librarians’ professional review procedures.

Without a consensus on the professional role of librarians, especially with regard to teaching,

the issue of tenure will continue to be problematic. Moreover, if librarians are unable to define their professional identity as including a teaching role, establishing criteria for review and reward of that role will never be widely accepted. In a survey designed to discover the commonalities among criteria for promotion and tenure for academic librarians, Vesper and Kelley (1997) found that teaching was not a tenure requirement for 61% of respondents. Similarly, a survey of librarians from research, doctoral-granting, comprehensive, and liberal arts institutions found that less than half (47.2%) of respondents indicated teaching to be a factor in review for tenure (Park and Riggs 1993). This lack of support and reward structures for teaching could be detrimental to the engagement of librarians in instruction-related activities and even contribute to a sense of “fragmentation” within the profession overall (Slattery 1994).

Survey Data & Results

Methodology

In order to address the perceived effects of evaluation procedures and reward structures on librarians’ teaching and the effect of librarians’ teaching on their evaluations and rewards, the authors sought the opinions of the instruction librarians themselves. Recent studies and commentaries on the effects of tenure and reward structures on academic librarians’ work have not included any explicit evaluation of relationships between status, performance review, and teaching (Gillum 2010; Meyer 1999; Ruess 2004; Welch and Mozenter 2006). The 15-item survey for the current study was designed to measure opinions quantitatively using multiple-choice questions and to collect opinions for qualitative analysis using open-ended questions. The teaching rewards investigated through the survey focus on the institutional contexts that can enhance teaching and learning (Wright et al. 2004). The following data from this survey illuminates the current status of librarians’ involvement in teaching in higher education, how this teaching is valued and rewarded, and participants’ levels of dedication and satisfaction regarding teaching.

Messages inviting librarians to participate in the survey were posted to professional library listservs, some of which focus on academic libraries and library instruction. The authors decided this was the best way to contact librarians at a variety of institutions, where differing commitments to teaching and various approaches to assigning status to librarians (e.g. staff, faculty, contingent faculty) would result in different types of evaluations and rewards. The survey was distributed over four separate electronic listservs to primarily academic librarians during a span of 3 weeks in October 2010. The population of listserv subscribers resulted in a sample size of approximately 5,000. After removing data from incomplete surveys and from respondents who were not academic librarians with some level of responsibility for instruction, the resulting sample used in this analysis consists of 290 individual responses.

Because there are no other published studies that report instruction librarians’ perceptions of the role their teaching plays in their tenure/promotion or other rewards, this study, despite its flaws, is the first step in exploring those relationships. We are careful not to generalize to the population of librarians on the listservs or to the larger population of instruction librarians at academic libraries because of limitations in our methods and the low response rate. However, the themes identified in the survey responses not only provide a foundation for our recommendations for practice, but should also support future investigations into the relationship between librarians’ teaching and their professional rewards.

Profile of Respondents

Respondents provided information related to their jobs and institutions. 86% of respondents (N=250) indicate that teaching is one of their primary responsibilities. 37% of respondents (N=106) identified themselves as academic staff, non-faculty. 25% and 28%, respectively, indicated they are tenured (N=73) or currently on the tenure track (N=81). 10% (N=30) were contingent faculty not eligible for tenure. These figures match closely with the proportions of librarians nationally who are academic staff, tenure-eligible faculty, and contingent faculty (Lindquist and Gilman 2008; Lowry 1993).

The majority of respondents (54%) (N=156) hail from teaching-intensive institutions. 23% (N=68) are from research-intensive institutions and 23% (N=66) from comprehensive institutions. These classifications were selected in place of Carnegie Classification because they were considered to represent institutional features related to teaching and learning that are most salient to instruction librarians' work. Comparing these proportions to a national study of librarians by institution type, it is possible that this sample may somewhat over-represent teaching-intensive institutions (most commonly, community colleges and liberal arts colleges) and under-represent research-intensive institutions. Nationally only about 28% of librarians work at community colleges and baccalaureate institutions (corresponding most closely to the teaching-intensive category in this study), while 48% work at doctoral institutions (corresponding with research-intensive) and 24% work at master's institutions (corresponding with comprehensive institutions) (Applegate 2007). Based on our observations, the difference between our sample and the national figures may reflect the fact that librarians who teach make up a smaller proportion of the librarians at doctoral institutions where subject experts and bibliographers who do not regularly teach are more likely to be part of the library staff. At community colleges and baccalaureate institutions, the number of subject specialists in the library is likely to be much lower, and a higher proportion of the librarians on staff are expected to teach.

24% of respondents (N=70) report having a "light" teaching load, 48% (N=139) report having a "moderate" teaching load, 23% (N=66) report having a "high" teaching load, and 5% (N=15) report having an "extremely high" teaching load. The following table presents the median number of non-credit sessions librarians in each category report teaching in a year.

<u>Reported teaching load</u>	<u>Median number of non-credit sessions/year</u>
Light	16
Moderate	40
High	50
Extremely High	75

Librarian Status

Cross-tabulations suggest that there are significant relationships between librarians' status (i.e., faculty v. non-faculty) and rewards, satisfaction, and perceptions. The majority of academic staff, non-faculty (53%) report that promotion is not a reward that is available to them. In contrast, 85% of faculty librarians, whether tenured, tenure-track, or contingent, report that they have access to promotion. This large, significant difference between faculty and non-

faculty librarians' access to promotion ($\chi^2 = 42.788$, $N = 275$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$) may indicate a need in the profession to define appropriate reward structures in environments where non-faculty librarians are not eligible for promotions but still need to be accountable for excellent teaching and, therefore, should be rewarded for their performance.

Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with the emphasis on teaching as part of their performance evaluation. Most librarians are satisfied with how teaching is emphasized in their evaluation process; 26% ($N=73$) reported feeling very satisfied and 55% ($N=152$) reported feeling somewhat satisfied. Overall 19% of the respondents ($N=53$) were not at all satisfied. In order to determine if there is a relationship between satisfaction with evaluations and the librarians' status, a cross tabulation was calculated. A significant relationship exists between status and satisfaction with how important instruction is in the evaluation process ($\chi^2 = 9.991$, $N = 278$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$). Although 19% of the total sample was not satisfied, among academic staff, non-faculty, dissatisfaction rose to 29%. Only 13.5% of faculty librarians were not at all satisfied with the emphasis on teaching in their evaluation process. The effect of this relationship is small, but suggests that the ways non-faculty librarians' teaching is evaluated is often not satisfying.

A small but significant relationship was also found between librarians' status and their perception of their department culture ($\chi^2 = 7.059$, $N = 284$, $df = 2$, $p < .05$). Faculty librarians (79%) were more likely than academic staff (65%) to describe their department as collaborative and transparent. 30% of academic staff described their department culture as "don't ask don't tell" when it comes to teaching, while only 18% of faculty librarians describe their department that way.

Librarians' responses to open-ended questions clarify the relationship between evaluation procedures and satisfaction. Survey respondents reacted positively, overall, to the notion of conducting and using teaching evaluations as an opportunity to improve teaching; however, many indicated that their use beyond that would have minimal impact on performance review or rewards. Evaluations of teaching that are conducted for non-tenure purposes or strictly performance-based reviews are widely seen as ineffectual for mechanisms to recognize or reward teaching. Several responses indicate that teaching evaluations are ignored by supervisors overall, unless they are negative in nature. Even librarians who have formal processes for evaluating teaching as part of tenure review, indicate that it does not "count" as much as research/writing. Although, there is little consensus on this, since criteria for tenure-based teaching evaluations are not well communicated and, as one librarian stated, often considered "a mystery" by those whose teaching they are designed to measure. While an increased dedication among librarians to valuing results of teaching evaluations must happen across hierarchies and organizations, the need for supervisors and administrators to reward teaching as part of formal review processes would help this movement. In addition, these responses suggest that the process by which librarians and their teaching are reviewed must be illuminated in order to engage in assessment and evaluation of teaching as a process for development and improvement, rather than a punitive burden.

Librarians' perceptions of how their evaluation criteria compare with other faculty on their campuses are also significantly related to their status ($\chi^2 = 12.876$, $N = 289$, $df = 2$, $p < .01$). 30% of librarians who have faculty status report that teaching is equally or more important in their evaluations than it is for other faculty on their campus while only 13% of academic staff, non-faculty librarians report the same. More importantly, however, is the lack of awareness among

non-faculty regarding evaluation criteria for other faculty on their campuses. A third of academic staff, non-faculty replied that they did not know how the emphasis placed on the evaluation of their teaching compared with evaluation criteria applied to other faculty on their campuses. Only 19% of faculty librarians reported that they did not know how their evaluation compared to the evaluation of other faculty. There is also a significant difference between faculty and non-faculty views on whether the same criteria should be used to evaluate librarians' teaching and other faculty teaching ($\chi^2 = 8.683$, $N = 289$, $df = 2$, $p < .05$): 44% of faculty disagree with the statement that the same standards should be used to evaluate teaching by librarians and other faculty, only 30% of non-faculty disagreed. 8% of faculty librarians did not know if the same standards should be used, while 17% of academic staff librarians did not know. These differences suggest that academic staff may lack awareness of institutional values that are communicated through evaluation procedures and criteria.

Evaluation and Value Placed on Teaching

<u>Means for evaluating quality of teaching</u>	<u>% of respondents</u>
By student surveys or assessments that go directly to the librarian	45%
As part of the annual performance review	38%
Through informal peer review	31%
By colleagues or supervisor as part of the tenure process	25%
By student surveys or assessments that go directly to the supervisor	17%
Through formal, regular peer review	10%
By external reviewers as part of the tenure process	7%
By no one	25%

The most common type of evaluation available to librarians comes from student surveys or assessments that go directly to the librarians. This matches well with the high level of trust that librarians put in their students to evaluate the quality of their teaching. 85% ($N=247$) of librarians trust their students' evaluations. Reviews of librarians' teaching by their peers are less common; only 31% of respondents ($N=89$) indicate participating in an informal review process and only 10% ($N=30$) are formally reviewed by their peers.

25% of respondents ($N=71$) report that they do not have the quality of their instruction evaluated in any way. While the likelihood that a librarian will not have their instruction evaluated at all increases as the librarian's teaching load decreases, (34% of librarians with light loads report never being evaluated at all), we were surprised to find that 16% of librarians who report high or extremely high teaching loads never have their teaching evaluated either formally or informally. A significant relationship was found between never having your teaching evaluated and not being satisfied with the emphasis on teaching as part of your evaluation ($\chi^2 = 11.442$, $N = 278$, $df = 2$, $p < .01$). 28% of the librarians who do not have their teaching evaluated at all are not satisfied with the emphasis on teaching in their evaluations compared with 16% of librarians who do get their teaching evaluated but are still not satisfied.

Participants were asked how the tenure and promotion processes affected the quality of their teaching. Of the librarians for whom tenure and/or promotion were available rewards, those who had the quality of their teaching evaluated during an annual performance review were more likely than average to say that those processes improved their teaching (tenure: $\chi^2 = 4.609$, $N = 152$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$; promotion: $\chi^2 = 7.301$, $N = 192$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$). Of the librarians who are eligible for tenure or promotion and have the quality of their teaching evaluated during performance review, half say that the processes improve their teaching. Only a third of the librarians who are tenure or promotion eligible but who do not have the quality of their teaching evaluated during performance review reported that the tenure and promotion processes improve their teaching. Reward structures, like tenure and promotion, should be designed to improve performance. The positive relationship found between annual evaluation of teaching quality during performance review and beneficial effects of tenure or promotion on teaching shows that those processes can be designed in ways that improve their effect. Conversely, 75% of librarians who were tenure or promotion eligible but reported that their teaching is not evaluated at all responded that tenure and promotion processes have no effect on the quality of their teaching.

When responding to open ended questions, many respondents cited intrinsic motivators, primarily recognition from students, as the most valued teaching reward. Beyond any formal evaluative or assessment data gathered, teaching librarians who responded to this survey gain important perspectives of the quality of their teaching from students and from interactions with non-library faculty. This feedback is often collected randomly at the request of teaching librarians, in the event that there would be a need to “prove my success as a teacher someday.” Several respondents questioned the implication that teaching rewards would need to come from any other source (the least of those being monetary) than evidence of student learning or student praise. In fact, many responses implied that librarians need not look further than feedback from students and faculty, stating “they are the customers” and “they are the people I’m trying to connect with.” Still other respondents lamented the fact that teaching recognition and rewards “are personal, not professional” and that the emphasis of evaluative efforts “is more on quantity, not quality.” In addition to the discrepancies among methods for gathering evidence of teaching success, librarians’ satisfaction with their departmental and institutional approach to these practices also varies greatly.

If the primary means of measuring librarians’ professional contributions are not structured in a way that influences the quality of their teaching then the profession has little hope for large-scale improvement of teaching performance. The survey did show that some rewards are very likely to improve librarians teaching. 80% of librarians with access to participation in teaching initiatives and 83% of librarians with access to compensation for professional development reported that these rewards improve the quality of their instruction. For librarians with access to public recognition of their teaching and compensated prep time, these rewards improved teaching for 66% and 65% of respondents, respectively. However, 51% reported that compensated prep time is not an available reward and 36% reported that public recognition is not available to them. The survey revealed a significant relationship between having your teaching evaluated through informal peer review and having access to public recognition for your teaching ($\chi^2 = 9.242$, $N = 277$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$).

Relationship with the Institution

The rewards that librarians believe improve their performance are part of the institution's structural support for teaching. Respondents were asked to indicate how much their institution valued their teaching compared with how much they valued their own teaching. Most respondents (59%, N=153) reported that they valued their teaching more than their institution valued their teaching. A significant and meaningful relationship was found between librarians' satisfaction with the emphasis on teaching in their evaluation process and their perception that their institution valued their teaching as much as they did ($\chi^2 = 16.345$, $N = 259$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$). A similarly significant and even stronger relationship was found between satisfaction with the emphasis on teaching in the evaluation process and the perception that librarians' values closely matched their departments' values when it came to their teaching ($\chi^2 = 36.470$, $N = 261$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$). Although in the entire sample only 39% of librarians (N=107) felt that there was a close match between their valuation of their teaching and their institution's value of their teaching, only 8% of those who perceived a close match in values still reported being unsatisfied with the emphasis on teaching in their evaluations. 28% of librarians who reported valuing their teaching more than their institution valued their teaching, and 30% who reported valuing their teaching more than their department did, were not satisfied with the emphasis on teaching in their evaluations.

Regardless of how librarians perceive their institution to value their teaching, the overwhelming majority of respondents (76%, N=220) said that they trust faculty outside the library to evaluate the quality of their teaching. In terms of gathering evaluative feedback on librarians' teaching, several respondents indicated in their open-ended responses that non-library faculty bring a valuable perspective due to their knowledge of the success of students' final research output. In addition, these faculty know how well-connected information literacy instruction is to the course goals and curriculum. Many other respondents rely on these outside evaluators simply because they are the ones present during library instruction. Without any internally organized system of review and feedback, this is the only teaching evaluation option for many librarians.

The following rewards were important to survey respondents in influencing their teaching participation:

	Highly important	Not available
Connecting with students	91%	< 1%
Connecting with faculty	87%	< 1%
Changing students' lives	78%	< 2%
Getting respect from faculty	74%	< 1%
Instructional mission	74%	4%
Increased prestige	46%	5%
Overload pay	11%	62%

Relationship with the Department

Regarding departmental culture as it pertains to teaching, the responses were varied. 34% (N=96) indicate they work in a “highly collaborative and transparent environment when it comes to teaching” while 35% (N=98) work in a transparent but not collaborative environment. 23% of respondents (N=64) identified with a “don’t ask, don’t tell” teaching culture. Department cultures were found to have significant relationships with whether and how librarians’ teaching was evaluated. Librarians’ attitudes about how their teaching was valued and whom they trusted to evaluate them was also related to the type of department culture where they worked.

A significant relationship was found between department cultures and librarians’ teaching evaluations. Overall, 38% of respondents (N=110) reported that a teaching evaluation is part of their annual performance review but only 20% of librarians in don’t ask, don’t tell cultures are evaluated on their teaching as part of their review. Librarians in collaborative and transparent work environments were much more likely to have their teaching evaluated during performance review (49%). ($\chi^2 = 13.476$, $N = 284$, $df = 4$, $p < .01$). More troubling was the finding that 42% of librarians in don’t ask, don’t tell cultures were not evaluated at all, compared with 25% of the overall sample who do not get evaluated. Only 14% of librarians who describe their departments as collaborative and transparent report that their teaching is not evaluated at all, suggesting that the overwhelming majority of librarians in collaborative and transparent department cultures do get evaluated. This highlights the relationship of department culture to the policies and procedures for evaluating librarians’ teaching ($\chi^2 = 18.211$, $N = 284$, $df = 4$, $p = .001$).

Departments’ teaching cultures are also significantly related to librarians’ satisfaction and their attitudes about their colleagues. 36% of librarians in don’t ask, don’t tell department cultures reported that they were not satisfied with the emphasis that their library placed on teaching as part of their promotion and/or tenure process, compared with only 11% librarians in collaborative and transparent environments who said that they were not satisfied ($\chi^2 = 16.361$, $N = 273$, $df = 4$, $p < .01$). 58% of librarians in don’t ask, don’t tell cultures trust their instruction librarian colleagues to evaluate the quality of their teaching. While this is a strong majority, it raises troubling questions when compared with the 87% of librarians who trust their colleagues to evaluate their teaching in collaborative and transparent departments and suggests that there is a significant relationship between department culture and trust among colleagues ($\chi^2 = 24.581$, $N = 284$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$). Similar effects of department culture on trust were also found to carry over to librarians’ attitudes toward their deans or directors. Only 11% of librarians in don’t ask, don’t tell departments reported trusting their dean or director to evaluate their teaching, compared with 39% of librarians who trust their deans or directors to evaluate them in collaborative and transparent departments ($\chi^2 = 18.511$, $N = 284$, $df = 4$, $p = .001$). Most troubling of all were the six librarians in don’t ask, don’t tell department cultures who reported that they did not trust anyone to evaluate their teaching.

Respondents’ open-ended answers help to give context to the findings about librarians’ experiences with peer evaluations. Formalized processes among peers for evaluating teaching are not as common as top-down evaluations related to overall job performance. When systems are formalized among peers, they are cited as “insightful and helpful,” due to library colleagues’ understanding of challenges in providing information literacy instruction. Survey respondents who did not have opportunities for peer review indicated they would appreciate it more than

evaluations from supervisors or administrators. Systems of peer review are not always perfect, however, and several open responses throughout the survey indicated that without guidelines for feedback, colleagues are nearly always positive and problems are rarely identified. One respondent shared that colleagues are “too kind”, not offering “useful criticism,” but responses indicate that feedback from more experienced library instructors is still valued, overall.

Among librarians surveyed, students were selected as the most trusted evaluators:

<u>Trusted teaching evaluators</u>	<u>% selected</u>
Students	85%
Faculty outside the library	76%
Instruction colleagues in the library	71%
Instruction librarians from other libraries	36%
Dean or director	27%
Department chair	21%
Non-instruction colleagues in the library	15%
No one	3%

Participants were asked whether their department valued their teaching as much as they did. 53% of respondents (N=155) perceive a close match between how much they value their teaching role and how much their department values it. 40% of respondents (N=117) indicated that they value their teaching more than their departments do. Librarians from transparent and collaborative departmental cultures are more likely to enjoy a close match in values (80%) compared with only 34% of librarians in don't ask, don't tell cultures who reported that their values and their departments' values closely matched. This relationship between department culture and values was significant and strong ($\chi^2 = 40.458$, $N = 268$, $df = 4$, $p < .001$).

A significant relationship was also found between having the quality of your instruction evaluated during an annual performance review and the perception that your department values your teaching as much as you do ($\chi^2 = 8.747$, $N = 284$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$). Although only 38% of librarians report that their teaching is evaluated as part of an annual performance review, 46% of librarians who believe that their department values their teaching as much as they do are getting their teaching evaluated during performance reviews. While the effect of this relationship is small, this finding suggests that including an evaluation of teaching as part of performance review shows librarians how much their teaching is valued and that departments where librarians' teaching is valued are more likely to include it as an element of performance review.

Librarians were also asked if their teaching was more, equally, or less important as a factor in their evaluations than it was in evaluations for other instructional faculty at their institutions.

After calculating a cross-tabulation between this evaluation factor and librarians' view of the relative value that their department places on their teaching, we found a significant relationship between perceiving that your teaching is less important in your evaluation than it is for other faculty and the feeling that you value your teaching more than your department does ($\chi^2 = 18.349$, $N = 271$, $df = 2$, $p < .001$). 67% of librarians who felt they valued their teaching more than their department also said their teaching was less important in their evaluation than it was for other faculty, which compares with 41% of the librarians who said their departments valued their teaching as much as they did but also said that their teaching was less important in their evaluation than it was for other faculty. No similar relationship was found to exist between librarians' reports of the relative value that their institutions placed on their teaching and their perception of how teaching figured in their evaluation compared with its importance for other faculty evaluations ($\chi^2 = 2.358$, $N = 269$, $df = 2$, $p = .308$).

Survey Limitations & Future Recommendations

Many of the discussions and issues that arose in researching processes by which teaching is evaluated and the ways in which those evaluations are used shed light on the lack of opportunity for librarians to be rewarded for their teaching. Investigations into merit-based benefits that librarians receive as part of their reward for teaching and for documenting teaching excellence were not a focus of our survey, but surfaced as an issue for participants. While intrinsic motivators are certainly encouraging for teachers, librarians must work toward defining librarianship as a teaching profession and joining existing communities of instructional practice, as well as developing our own. To this end, release time for teaching-related activities, the freedom to teach outside library departments, the chance to join faculty teaching organizations, and the support to participate in professional development opportunities related to teaching are of the utmost importance. Not only will this encourage librarians to continue to grow as teachers, but it will also engage librarians in the teaching and assessment continuum similarly to other educators at colleges and universities.

Underlying this discussion of processes for librarian's review and structures for rewarding teaching are issues of organizational culture and trust, specifically as they impact the opportunities for peers to collaborate and participate in symbiotic review processes. Libraries that embrace change and encourage librarians to expand their spheres of influence beyond traditional roles and departmental boundaries are well-suited to adopting teaching evaluative criteria and systems for peer review. Issues of trust can also impact intradepartmental culture that would influence the success or failure of a system of peer review for teaching. While librarians may enjoy the solitary nature of some aspects of their work, teaching is not something that should happen behind closed doors. Instead, it is an activity that should be planned, reviewed, and reflected upon openly and could become, when addressed appropriately, an opportunity to build trust and respect among library colleagues. Additional research in this area would do well to explore librarians' evaluation of teaching and the impact of organizational culture on this endeavor.

Proposed Best Practices

Based on commonalities and discrepancies in these survey data combined with the literature reviewed for this chapter, we were able to identify opportunities for developing best practices for documenting and reviewing librarians' contribution to teaching in higher education, these include: librarian status, librarian involvement in evaluative processes, librarian peer review of teaching, and librarians' criteria for teaching excellence. These best practices are based on the

assumption that academic librarians agree that teaching is an important part of librarianship and should be evaluated as something that is valued, both departmentally and institutionally.

Librarian Status

Librarians should have the same status as their campus colleagues involved in teaching. A long debated topic among librarians, tenure and faculty status, is inherent in the problem of librarians' teaching going largely undocumented and unrecognized even as the information literacy movement grows greater all the time. While advocating for librarians' tenure seems a simple solution to many of these issues, it is not a panacea. As an alternative, we advocate for librarians to enjoy the same status, whatever it may be, as faculty on their campus. Findings from the survey suggest that faculty status rather than tenure eligibility make the greater difference in librarians' access to evaluations and rewards for their teaching. Because of variations in structures and policies, different institutions will apply their own labels for the status of the people focused on carrying out the primary mission of colleges and universities, which is teaching. Whatever status institutions bestow upon this work should also be awarded to librarians in order to better align their work with the primary purpose of the organizations in which they work and to support the overall integration of librarians into the institutions' teaching cultures. With status similar to other faculty, librarians will have equality in campus governance, decision-making, and curricular planning in order to ensure the full integration of information literacy education into the curriculum during this current period of renewed dedication to teaching and learning throughout higher education (Bruininks, Keeney, and Thorp 2010).

Librarian Involvement in Evaluative Processes

Librarians should be more aware of and involved with the tenure and promotion process for all faculty. Having an understanding of the criteria by which faculty are evaluated for their teaching will inform librarians' perspective on their role as teachers and what it means for their own promotion and tenure. While librarians at many institutions will undergo a process for tenure or promotion that differs from other faculty, the two processes need not be completely separate. In fact, librarians may benefit from serving on campus committees for promotion and tenure where they will learn the norms that are expected of their colleagues outside the library. An informed perspective on curricular and disciplinary activities will create opportunities for librarians to have an enhanced understanding of campus priorities and goals related to instruction. Similarly, librarians who invite faculty to partake in the review process for their teaching will benefit from disciplinary-focused perspectives on teaching and come to understand their instructional activities on a larger scale.

Peer Review of Teaching

Librarians should be formally peer reviewed in their teaching within an open culture of assessment in their department. Feedback from non-library faculty can be useful in understanding information literacy instruction in a disciplinary context and should be used to guide curricular integration decisions and strategies for improving collaborative efforts. Similarly, student input is invaluable in gauging quality, relevance, and transferability of information literacy instruction. From the research presented here, there is consistent feedback and evaluation offered from students and faculty already. What is missing is a systematic process by which librarians are reviewed by their own colleagues.

The value of peer review among librarians comes from the informed perspective librarians inherently possess regarding the unique challenges and opportunities involved in information literacy education, as well as a shared background in education and professional development. In addition, librarians who participate in peer review are more engaged in the teaching and learning process, from instructional design, to implementation, to assessment and finally reflection. Looking at this process from the outside can allow for self-reflection on the part of the reviewer who achieves a thoughtful approach to critically addressing a colleague's teaching.

Through a formal mechanism involving all librarians at an institution, the movement to understand and advocate for librarians as educators will grow from the ground up and will encourage librarians who may not have been previously involved in teaching to endeavor to understand it, support it, and become involved in it. In addition, formalizing peer review will lessen librarians' tendency toward informal evaluation of teaching; thereby allowing them to feel freer to offer critical and constructive, as well as positive, feedback to colleagues.

Rewards for Librarians' Teaching Excellence

Whether they participate in promotion and tenure or an annual review process, librarians deserve to have formal evaluations of their teaching included as part of these reviews. As a reward for improved performance, as well as an incentive for assessing and documenting teaching, these survey results show that librarians will feel that their teaching is valued more if it is included as part of their review. In addition, libraries and institutions would do well to reward this work through public recognition, invitations to join teaching colloquia, support for professional development, sabbaticals, and release time for teaching in order to help further librarians in their movement toward reinvigorating librarianship as a profession focused on what is most important in higher education: teaching and learning.

Librarians' Criteria for Teaching Evaluation

Librarians' criteria for teaching evaluation should be transparent and consistent. While the faculty model for teaching evaluation is something that librarians should consider as a successful example, teaching for many librarians comes in a variety of forms that may not necessarily correspond with traditional credit-bearing, classroom-based instruction. For this reason, librarians' criteria for measuring teaching quality should be unique to their particular environment with consideration for varying job duties and performance expectations.

The criteria by which librarians are evaluated on their teaching must be well communicated among librarians and across institutions in order to remove the element of mystery surrounding the standards by which librarians' teaching will be evaluated. Librarians should also be made aware of the weight given to the criteria that will influence their performance and tenure reviews (Arreola 2007). These criteria should go beyond articulating expectations for quantity toward addressing outcomes for student learning and acceptable evidence of such learning. Just as information literacy learning outcomes are fundamentally similar across institutions, so should librarians' practice be defined and measured by clearly articulated expectations that could be transferable within and among educational environments.

Consistency & Transparency

Many of the perspectives put forth in the current library literature point toward libraries and librarians in the academy taking on more instructional activities in order to create stronger connections between libraries and the core teaching and learning purpose of their institutions.

The question, then, is not whether librarians should be reviewed and rewarded based on their teaching contribution, but how. While it is widely agreed that librarians' teaching contributes to the relevance of libraries and librarians in the academy, there is no clear format for documenting, assessing, or rewarding this activity across institutions. The variance in status of librarians from institution to institution contributes to the discrepancy in teaching reward structures, as does the level of involvement in instructional activities and the type of teaching librarians do which varies greatly by institution and individual. While this is problematic for standardization of practice and assessment, it is imperative for the success of librarians as teachers. The findings from this study suggest that librarians' roles in the academy are dictated more by our profession than by the structure of the institutions in which we work; therefore it is important for each individual librarian to decide how teaching fits into his or her professional life and how it can best contribute to student learning and engagement. What must be consistent is that librarians do continue to contribute to teaching and learning and that the contribution is valued, reviewed, and rewarded, whether monetarily or through other systems of merit or status. Department teaching cultures that are don't ask, don't tell must transition into transparency by examining (and perhaps changing) what they value and finding methods for supporting and evaluating librarians' work as teachers (Wright et al. 2004).

As long as the credit hour and the semester constitute the most widely accepted framework for teaching, learning, and assessment in higher education, much of the instructional activities of librarians will go undocumented and underestimated in official institutional capacities for measurement such as grades, number of classes taught, and number of students reached. Similarly, librarians who teach cannot easily quantify their impact on student learning as they can with the number of hours worked at a reference desk, the amount of time spent on building collections, and by how many individuals those materials were used toward research purposes. To remedy this problem, librarians must begin to establish their own formats for formalization of teaching-related activities in order to create a system of review and rewards. While the criteria for teaching quantity and quality will never be standardized, librarians' teaching at least needs to be documented and reviewed. In an ideal situation, these criteria would then be built into the rewards structure for librarians at each institution. By establishing criteria for measuring and communicating the effect of librarians' teaching, the invisible work of preparing for and improving instruction will become apparent (vanDuinkerken, Coker, and Anderson 2010) and the teaching that is usually done in isolation will instead be the focus of discussion, collaboration, and evaluation (LaCelle-Peterson and Finkelstein 1993). This is the first step toward a clearer understanding of how librarians are being supported by their institutions and will direct attention to the structural deficits that persistently diminish librarians' effectiveness (Wright et al. 2004).

Review criteria should be flexible enough to represent the types of teaching that occurs across positions and institutions, including the following categories:

<u>Criteria:</u>	<u>Examples:</u>
Instructional role	Instructor of record; co-instructor; guest instructor; instructional designer; assessment expert; facilitator; consultant
Instruction type	Credit-bearing course; stand-alone workshop; one-shot

	session; online learning object; seminar; tour
Instructional impact	# of students directly/indirectly impacted; # of sessions/classes/workshops taught; # of hours spent on teaching-related activities
Instructional assessment	Student work; student feedback; pre- and post-test results; compilations of information literacy data/reports; formal and informal peer review of teaching
Instructional advancement	Evidence of reflective practice; evidence of increased teaching responsibility; evidence of enhanced instructional performance; leadership in creating, developing, or assessing teaching initiatives; continuing education in pedagogy and information literacy instruction
Instructional recognition	Recipient of teaching awards/honors; acknowledgement of teaching excellence; rating of excellent [or equivalent] in performance review for teaching activities

The purpose for establishing criteria is to address the largest current gap in instructional initiatives in academic libraries, i.e. the standards by which we describe and measure the teaching contributions of librarians. It should be up to each institution or library to determine benchmarks for excellence in each area. The quantifiable aspects may be more or less important for certain organizations or positions within those organizations depending upon organizational mission and values, but each librarian should be expected to describe his or her work in terms of its impact on student learning, at a minimum.

Whether these criteria are used for performance or tenure reviews, documentation of librarians' teaching and its impact should be collected, reviewed, and valued with transparency and consistency whenever possible. The symbiotic relationship between performance review and rewards structures also demands that criteria for teaching be agreed upon and used by librarians and administrators. For librarians who spend their career at a singular institution, as well as those who choose to change institutions, this will create consistent methods for setting expectations and measuring excellence as they relate to teaching endeavors. Transparency in documenting and communicating these expectations is important for new hires and seasoned librarians alike. Librarians who are newly hired should understand that teaching or participating in activities that impact teaching and learning is expected. Likewise, librarians whose work has previously been focused on non-instructional activities deserve to have formalized documentation that represents review criteria based on institutional values.

Librarians who are measured by the same or similar criteria as faculty on their campus will already have these teaching criteria built into their review process. For librarians who do not have faculty status or are reviewed inter-organizationally, criteria for measuring teaching will align their work more seamlessly with that of faculty and will create a purposeful connection between librarians and the overall mission of their institution. In addition, similar expectations for teaching excellence among librarians at institutions of varying size and type will allow for enhanced and permanent status of information literacy instruction and librarians as educators in the academy, similar to that which faculty enjoy as members of a discipline, instead of those

values being only institution-specific. While standardization among learning outcomes for information literacy makes sense across types of institutions, rigid criteria for defining and measuring teaching excellence is problematic for librarians. A formalized yet flexible approach to review criteria development and implementation will serve to connect librarians to the educational mission common to all institutions of higher education and provide a framework for librarians' improvement and advancement as teachers.

Recommendations & Conclusions

While it may be argued that librarians' work is to support scholars in their research and teaching and seeking anything more (let alone reward for these activities) goes against the service-oriented professional underpinnings of librarianship and undermines its altruistic motivations, our contention is that the future of the profession depends upon librarians' direct participation and influence on the teaching and learning process. Having progressed from a bibliographic instruction model that situated librarians strictly in the library context, information literacy now provides an opportunity for librarians to expand their sphere of instructional influence beyond the library into the realm of learning across courses, disciplines, and institutions. Through information literacy instruction and programs, librarians are leaders in integrating knowledge discovery and creation into teaching practice with innovative and practical pedagogy.

The Association of College & Research Libraries has provided exceptional support for librarians in their shift toward a more innovative and influential academic library model, especially with regard to the libraries' instructional role. The *Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians & Coordinators* (2007) has been immeasurably useful in guiding the progress of information literacy programs and the librarians who develop and implement them; however, its limited focus on librarians' whose primary professional duty is instruction makes it irrelevant to librarians who do not manage or oversee information literacy programs. For these librarians, teaching or teaching-related activities should still be articulated and measured. The ACRL would be helpful in drafting and endorsing criteria by which all librarians' teaching could be defined and reviewed, as suggested here.

In order for such criteria to be widely accepted in such a way that they become standard factors for review across a variety of institutions and positions, library deans, directors, and administrators must support librarians in their professional development as teachers and in their teaching activities that may take time away from more traditional library work. Department norms can be altered through the adoption of policies that communicate the expectation that librarians will dedicate time to sharing ideas about teaching, observing each others' classroom teaching, attending professional development activities, sharing lesson plans and syllabi, and introducing new teaching methods (Woods 1999,268-290). In addition, performance standards should be updated to include teaching impact factors for all librarians. The result of implementing criteria to measure teaching activity and quality is not to demand librarians take on additional work or work that does not suit their professional strengths, but instead to align all librarians with the core mission of the institution and to communicate the importance of teaching, in all its forms. Teachers, whether they are librarians or not, feel rewarded when the challenge and intensity of teaching are recognized by their institutions (Wright et al. 2004). Only through evaluation, review, and compensation can the time they spend preparing and improving their teaching be acknowledged. Through such formal review practice, librarians' teaching will be built into the process for merit-based pay, tenure and

promotion, and performance review in an appropriate and official way; thereby situating teaching in a place of prominence and purpose in academic librarianship.

As librarians further engage in teaching activities, they will benefit from creating and participating in communities of practice that progress their knowledge of pedagogy and produce opportunities for their unique contribution to conversations on teaching at the institution-level. Librarians who seek to form partnerships with faculty to further their instructional goals or librarians who self-identify as teachers and are therefore singular in their library organizations will enjoy the community and collaboration that comes from joining campus teaching colloquia or participating in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). In identifying student learning as something that warrants original, evidence-based research, SoTL situates teaching activities in the realm of research, thereby making it potentially more valued by institutions that are research-intensive. While the benefits for librarians who seek support from inter-disciplinary communities of teaching beyond their libraries and professional organizations were not addressed in our survey, we recognize that these opportunities could have great potential for librarians attaining faculty status, furthering teaching partnerships, and re-envisioning teaching as a research-related activity. As librarians continue to increase their sphere of instructional influence, so should they explore such broad communities of practice that may have previously been the province of classroom faculty. Through such investigations, librarians will become familiar with the language, culture, and identity associated with teaching and will be better equipped to offer evidence and justification for the value it holds for librarianship.

Finally, librarians who embrace their teaching role will be the most influential in furthering the progress of review criteria for teaching and advocating for enhanced instructional roles among their colleagues. While the shift in our professional roles is inevitable, we cannot simply sit back and wait for it to happen around us. A more proactive approach to encouraging and inspiring our colleagues to co-teach with us, participate in peer-review of teaching, and document and assess our teaching and its impact on student learning will create a grassroots movement toward the acceptance and eventual celebration of librarians' teaching.

References

- Adamson, Morgan. "The Human Capital Strategy." *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 9, no. 4 (2009): 271-284.
- Affleck, Mary Ann. "Burnout Among Bibliographic Instruction Librarians." *Library & Information Science Research* 18, no. 2 (1996): 165-183.
- American Library Association. "Guidelines for the Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure of Academic Librarians", 2006.
<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/promotiontenure.cfm>.
- . "Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians", 1972.
<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/jointstatementfaculty.cfm>.
- . "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians", 2006.
<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/profstandards.cfm>.
- . "Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators", 2007.
<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/profstandards.cfm>.
- Applegate, Rachel. "Charting Academic Library Staffing: Data from National Surveys." *College & Research Libraries* 68, no. 1 (2007): 59-68.
- Aronowitz, Stanley. *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2000.
- Arreola, Raoul. *Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System: A Guide to Designing, Building, and Operating Large-Scale Faculty Evaluation Systems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2007.
- Auer, Nicole J., and Ellen M. Krupar. "Librarians Grading: Giving A's, B's, C's, D's, and F's." *The Reference Librarian* 43, no. 89 (2005): 39-61.
- Becker, Karen A. "The Characteristics of Bibliographic Instruction in Relation to the Causes and Symptoms of Burnout." *RQ* 32, no. 3 (1993): 346-357.
- Beile, Penny M., and David N. Boote. "Does the Medium Matter?: A Comparison of a Web-based Tutorial with Face-to-face Library Instruction on Education Students' Self-efficacy Levels and Learning Outcomes." *Research Strategies* 20, no. 1-2 (2004): 57-68.
- Beilema, Cheryl, Dan Crocker, Joan Miller, Jennifer Reynolds-Moehrle, and Helen Shaw. "Faculty and Librarian Collaborations: A Case Study and Proposal for Online Learning Environments." *Research Strategies* 20, no. 4 (2005): 334-345.
- Bewick, Laura, and Sheila Corral. "Developing Librarians as Teachers: A Study of Their Pedagogical Knowledge." *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science* 42 (March 2010): 97-110.
- Birmingham, Elizabeth J., Luc Chinwongs, Molly Flaspohler, Carly Hearn, Danielle Kvanvig, and Ronda Portmann. "First-year Writing Teachers' Perceptions of Students' Information Literacy Competencies, and a Call for a Collaborative Approach." *Communications in Information Literacy* 2, no. 1 (2008).
- Bowen, William G., Matthew M. Chingos, and Michael S. McPherson. *Crossing the Finish Line: Completing College at America's Public Universities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Brien, Donna Lee. "Unplanned Educational Obsolescence: Is the 'Traditional' PhD Becoming Obsolete?" *M/C Journal* 12, no. 3 (2009).
- Bruininks, Robert H., Brianne Keeney, and Jim Thorp. "Transforming America's Universities to Compete in the 'New Normal'." *Innovative Higher Education* 35, no. 2 (2010): 113-125.
- Burkhardt, Joanna M. "Assessing Library Skills: A First Step to Information Literacy." *Portal* 7, no. 1 (2007): 25-49.

- Chao, Elaine L., Emily S. DeRocco, and Maria K. Flynn. *Adult Learners in Higher Education: Barriers to Success and Strategies to Improve Results*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor, 2007. <http://wdr.doleta.gov>.
- Cmor, Dianne, Alison Chan, and Teresa Kong. "Course-Integrated Learning Outcomes for Library Database Searching: Three Assessment Points on the Path of Evidence." *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 5, no. 1 (2010): 64-81.
- Cronin, Joseph M., and Howard E. Horton. "Will Higher Education Be the Next Bubble to Burst?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 2009): A56.
- Crowley, Bill. "Tacit Knowledge, Tacit Ignorance, and the Future of Academic Librarianship." *College & Research Libraries* 62, no. 6 (2001): 565-584.
- Cubberley, Carol W. *Tenure and Promotion for Academic Librarians: A Guidebook with Advice and Vignettes*. London: McFarland, 1996.
- Do, Paolo. "No Future." *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization* 8, no. 3 (2008): 303-311.
- Donnelly, Kimberly. "Reflections on What Happens When Librarians Become Teachers." *Computers in Libraries* 20, no. 3 (2000): 47-49.
- Dunne, Elisabeth, Neville Bennett, and Clive Carr. "Higher Education: Core Skills in a Learning Society." *Journal of Education Policy* 12, no. 6 (1997): 511-525.
- Fox, Claire. "The Massification of Higher Education." In *The McDonaldization of Higher Education*, 129-142. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, 2002.
- Galvin, Jeanne. "Information Literacy and Integrative Learning." *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 13, no. 3 (2006): 25-51.
- Gandhi, Smiti. "Faculty-Librarian Collaboration to Assess the Effectiveness of a Five-Session Library Instruction Model." *Community & Junior College Libraries* 12, no. 4 (2005): 15-48.
- Gansz, David, Richard H. Werking, Lynn S. Cochrane, and Pyke Jr. Johnson. "College Libraries and the Teaching/Learning Process: Selection from the Writings of Evan Ira Farber", 2007.
- Gappa, Judith M. "Today's Majority: Faculty Outside the Tenure System." *Change* 40, no. 4 (2008): 50-54.
- Gaston, Paul L. *The Challenge of Bologna: What United States Higher Education Has to Learn from Europe, and Why It Matters That We Learn It*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2010.
- Gillum, Shalu. "The True Benefit of Faculty Status for Academic Reference Librarians." *The Reference Librarian* 51, no. 4 (2010): 321-328.
- Gorman, Michael. "Send for a Child of Four! Or Creating the BI-less Academic Library." *Library Trends* 39, no. 3 (1991): 354-362.
- Hacker, Andrew, and Claudia Dreifus. *Higher Education?: How Colleges Are Wasting Our Money and Failing Our Kids and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2010.
- Hall, H. Palmer, and Caroline Byrd. "The Librarian in the University: Essays on Membership in the Academic Community", 1990.
- Hill, Janet S. "Wearing Our Own Clothes: Librarians as Faculty." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 20, no. 2 (1994): 71-76.
- Hufford, Jon R. "What are They Learning? Pre- and Post-Assessment Surveys for LIBR 1100, Introduction to Library Research." *College & Research Libraries* 71, no. 2 (2010): 139-158.
- Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges and the University of California. *Academic Literacy: A Statement of Competencies Expected of Students Entering California's Public Colleges and Universities*. Sacramento, CA: ICAS, 2002. <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/acadlit.pdf>.

- Johnson, Corey M., and Elizabeth B. Lindsay. "Why we do what we do: exploring priorities within public services librarianship." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 6, no. 3 (2006): 347-369.
- Julien, Heidi. "Education for Information Literacy Instruction: A Global Perspective." *Association for Library and Information Literacy Education* 46, no. 3 (2005): 210-216.
- Kelly, Patrick J. *As America Becomes More Diverse: The Impact of State Higher Education Inequality*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, 2005. <http://www.higheredinfo.org/raceethnicity/InequalityPaperNov2005.pdf>.
- Kemp, Jane. "Isn't Being a Librarian Enough? -- Librarians as Classroom Teachers." *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 13, no. 3 (2006): 3-23.
- Kingma, Bruce, and Gillian M. McCombs. "The Opportunity Costs of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians." *College & Research Libraries* 56, no. 3 (1995): 258-264.
- Koufogiannakis, Denise, and Natasha Wiebe. "Effective Methods for Teaching Information Literacy Skills to Undergraduate Students: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis." *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice* 1, no. 3 (2006): 3-43.
- Lacelle-Peterson, Mark W., and Martin J. Finkelstein. "Institutions Matter: Campus Teaching Environments' Impact on Senior Faculty." In *Developing Senior Faculty as Teachers*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1993.
- Lampert, Lynn, Katherine Dabbour, and Jacqueline Solis. "When It's All Greek: The Importance of Collaborative Information Literacy Outreach Programming to Greek Student Organizations." *Research Strategies* 20, no. 4 (2005): 300-310.
- Lebbins, Vickery K. "Students Perceptions on the Long-range Value of Information Literacy Instruction Through a Learning Community." *Research Strategies* 20, no. 3 (2005): 204-218.
- Lerman, Robert I. "Career-focused Education and Training for Youth." In *Reshaping the American Workforce in a Changing Economy*, edited by Harry J. Holzer and Demetra S. Nightingale, 41-90. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press, 2007.
- Levine, Arthur. "How the Academic Profession Is Changing." *Daedalus* 126, no. 4 (1997): 1-20.
- Lillard, Linda L. "Personalized Instruction and Assistance Services for Distance Learners: Cultivating a Research Relationship." *Research Strategies* 19, no. 3/4 (2003): 204-212.
- Lindquist, Thea, and Todd Gilman. "Academic/Research Librarians with Subject Doctorates: Data and Trends 1965-2006." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 8, no. 1 (2008): 31-52.
- Loesch, Martha. "Librarian as Professor: A Dynamic New Role Model." *Education Libraries* 33, no. 1 (2010): 31-37.
- Lowry, Charles B. "The Status of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Twenty Year Perspective." *College & Research Libraries* 54, no. 2 (1993): 163-172.
- Matthews, Joseph R. *Library Assessment in Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2007.
- Meyer, Richard W. "A Measure of the Impact of Tenure." *College & Research Libraries* 60, no. 2 (1999): 110-119.
- Miller, Connie, and Patricia Tegler. "In Pursuit of Windmills: Librarians and the Determination to Instruct." *The Reference Librarian* 18 (Summer 1987): 119-134.
- Mokhtar, Azura, Schubert Foo, and Shaheen Majid. "Information Literacy Education: Applications of Mediated Learning and Multiple Intelligences." *Library & Information Science Research* 30, no. 3 (2008): 195-206.
- Morey, Ann I. "Globalization and the Emergence of For-Profit Higher Education." *Higher Education* 48, no. 1 (2004): 131-150.
- Oakley, Francis. "The Elusive Academic Profession: Complexity and Change." *Daedalus* 126, no. 4 (1997): 43-66.

- Ohmann, Richard. "Historical Reflections on Accountability." *Academe* 86, no. 1 (2000).
- Owusu-Ansah, Edward K. "Beyond Collaboration: Seeking Greater Scope and Centrality for Library Instruction." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 7, no. 4 (2007): 415-429.
- Park, Betsy, and Robert Riggs. "Tenure and Promotion: A Study of Practices by Institutional Type." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 19, no. 2 (1993): 72-77.
- Partello, Peggy. "Librarians in the Classroom." *The Reference Librarian* 43, no. 89 (2005): 107-120.
- Premeaux, Shane R. "Administrative Versus Faculty Perspectives Regarding Academic Tenure." *The Journal of Academic Administration in Higher Education* 4, no. 1 (2008): 47-55.
- Rapple, Brendan A. "The Librarian as Teacher in the Networked Environment." *College and Teaching* 45, no. 3 (1997): 114-116.
- Rockman, Ilene F. "Strengthening Connections between Information Literacy, General Education, and Assessment Efforts." *Library Trends* 51, no. 2 (2002): 185-198.
- Ruess, Diane E. "Faculty and Professional Appointments of Academic Librarians: Expanding the Options for Choice." *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 41, no. 1 (2004): 75-84.
- Sheesley, Deborah F. "Burnout and the Academic Teaching Librarian: An Examination of the Problem and Suggested Solution." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 27, no. 6 (2001): 447-451.
- Slattery, Charles E. "Faculty Status: Another 100 years of Dialogue? Lessons from the Library School Closings." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 20, no. 4 (1994): 193-199.
- Sproles, Claudene, Anna Marie Johnson, and Leslie Farison. "What the Teachers Are Teaching: How MLIS Programs Are Preparing Academic Librarians for Instructional Roles." *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* 49, no. 3 (2008): 195-209.
- Stamatoplos, Anthony. "The Role of Academic Libraries in Mentored Undergraduate Research: a Model of Engagement in the Academic Community." *College & Research Libraries* 70, no. 3 (2009): 235-249.
- Tierney, William G., and Estela M. Bensimon. *Promotion and Tenure: Community and Socialization in Academe*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1996.
- VanDuinkerken, Wyoma, Catherine Coker, and Margaret Anderson. "Looking Like Everyone Else: Academic Portfolios for Librarians." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 36, no. 2 (2010): 166-172.
- Vesper, Virginia, and Gloria Kelley. *Criteria for Promotion and Tenure for Academic Librarians: CLIP Note #26*. Chicago: Association of College & Research Libraries, 1997.
- Welch, Jeanie M., and Frada L. Mozenter. "Loosening the Ties that Bind: Academic Librarians and Tenure." *College & Research Libraries* 67, no. 2 (2006): 164-176.
- Willen, Liz. "Amid Budget Cuts and Overcrowding at Community Colleges, For-Profit Institutions Seek a Niche." *The Hechinger Report*, 2010. http://hechingerreport.org/content/amid-budget-cuts-and-overcrowding-at-community-colleges-for-profit-institutions-seek-a-niche_4493.
- Wilson, Pauline. "Librarians as Teachers: The Study of an Organization Fiction." *The Library Quarterly* 49, no. 2 (1979): 146-162.
- Wolf, Alison. "Misunderstanding Education." *Change* 41, no. 4 (2009): 10-17.
- Woods, Jennifer Q. "Establishing a Teaching Development Culture." In *Faculty in New Jobs: A Guide to Settling In, Becoming Established, and Building Institutional Support*, 268-290. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999.
- Wright, Mary C., Nandini Assar, Edward L. Kain, Laura Kramer, Carla B. Howery, Kathleen McKinney, Becky Glass, and Maxine Atkinson. "Greedy Institutions: The Importance of

Institutional Context for Teaching in Higher Education." *Teaching Sociology* 32, no. 2 (2004): 144-159.

Wyss, Paul A. "Library School Faculty Member Perceptions Regarding Faculty Status for Academic Librarians." *College & Research Libraries* 71, no. 4 (2010): 375-388.