

Best of Both Worlds: Training for New and Experienced Library Instructors

*David X. Lemmons, Ashley Blinstrub,
Kayla M. Gourlay, Maoria J. Kirker, Janna
Mattson, and Anna K. Murphy-Lang*

LEARNING OUTCOMES

Readers will be able to

- articulate the importance of pedagogical training for library instructors;
- describe the process of developing the Library Teaching Institute (LTI); and
- identify strategies for bringing a series similar to LTI to their context.

Introduction

During the summer of 2021, the George Mason University (Mason) Libraries' Teaching & Learning Team piloted a new instructional training program, the Library Teaching Institute (LTI). This training program, which is open to all Mason Libraries employees, is designed to give both new and experienced instructors the tools and strategies they need to be successful in the classroom. Because it was created to include instructors with no prior teaching experience, the training covers a comprehensive range of topics and issues. By building a broad teaching community, the program aims to improve awareness

of library instruction across the libraries, improve confidence and preparedness among library instructors, and foster interest in teaching.

This chapter engages with the existing literature on competencies for library instructors, current approaches to instructional professional development and training, approaches to project management in libraries, and instructional design in libraries. It also outlines the process of designing and implementing LTI, including the process for establishing core competencies and learning outcomes for participants. The chapter concludes with a section detailing lessons learned from each LTI iteration as well as related recommendations for other institutions hoping to adopt a new instructional training program or expand on an already-existing program.

Literature Review

Lack of Teacher Education in LIS Curriculum

It is well-documented in library science literature that teacher education is lacking in LIS curricula. Godsett and Koziura's research indicates that while practical experience is most lacking in LIS programs, right behind that are "courses in instruction."¹ This perception is echoed in Saunders' study on LIS syllabi:

Despite the fact that LIS programs are offering courses on instruction, studies of practicing librarians indicate that most did not learn instruction or teaching skills in their master's program, and many feel underprepared to take on a teaching role. Although librarians largely agree that they would prefer to learn instruction competencies in their LIS programs, it appears that most learn their skills on the job. Learning opportunities on the job largely consist of observation and feedback from colleagues, and many librarians also pursue professional development opportunities.²

Further, the LIS courses that do exist in teacher education rarely include immersive teaching experiences such as apprenticeships or student teaching.³ Bryan notes that librarians with non-library graduate degrees believe that required internships and teaching assistantships in these programs provided them with noteworthy teaching experience.⁴

In all these cases, hands-on experience is key, but what about foundational education knowledge?

Why Teacher Training and Education Matter

Brecher and Klipfel point out that "a background in pedagogy is particularly important for these librarians, who are increasingly expected to collaborate on equal terms with faculty in teaching information literacy and critical thinking skills."⁵ Negotiations with faculty are key in determining learning outcomes and activities for library sessions. To take an even wider view, if academic librarians want a seat at the table when discussing new and revised curriculum changes, they must be able to speak the language. Hensley writes that

“becoming well-versed in and practicing the elements of educational theory, curricular learning goals, and student learning assessment could significantly aid in advocating for and shaping institutional long-term goals of guiding students along the long road of information literacy.”⁶ Students, finally, are at the center of it all because it is “difficult to help students learn without a basic grounding in the theory and psychology of how students learn.”⁷ Creating on-the-job teacher training opportunities to fill any gaps in the LIS curriculum is key to a successful information literacy program.

Teaching Competencies and Roles for Librarians

In 2007, ACRL outlined a set of skills for effective teaching in information literacy programs through its “Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators.”⁸ The twelve categories outlined in this document read like a checklist for skills ranging from administrative and planning to instructional design and subject expertise. This approach aligned with the checklist style of the ACRL *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*.⁹ What followed in the years after the approval of these documents was institutional adaptations to translate these documents to local needs. One example of this comes from Oregon State University Libraries (OSUL), where they created internal teaching proficiencies for all librarians with teaching responsibilities.¹⁰ In focusing on new and experienced teaching librarians, OSUL envisioned that their local adaptation could serve as a model for other institutions wishing to adapt the ACRL Proficiencies.

When the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*¹¹ replaced the Competency Standards, the Proficiencies also received an update. The ACRL *Roles and Strengths of Teaching Librarians*¹² shifted from proficiencies to roles, from skills to strengths, and from a checklist approach to a conceptual framework. In essence, it was “designed to act as a bridge between concept and practice”¹³ with one of its objectives being to aid in goal-setting for professional development of teaching librarians. As with the Proficiencies, examples of combining the Framework and the Roles and Strengths documents emerged. Armstrong¹⁴ suggested the role of lifelong learner could be integrated with the framework by substituting the word “research” with “teaching.” With such amalgamations as “Teaching as inquiry” and “Teaching as strategic exploration,” what resulted was a suggested list of dispositions and knowledge practices for teaching librarians.

Professional Development—From National to Local

Many national and association-level professional development programs have tried to meet the needs of teaching librarians. As new librarians enter the field with little to no pedagogical training or experience, professional development programs attempt to fill that gap. In the United States, one of the most notable examples is the ACRL Immersion program.¹⁵ Immersion not only builds librarians’ teaching skills but also provides a conceptual, theoretical, and social justice basis for teaching librarians. Other countries have also attempted national or multinational approaches to post-LIS training, focusing on their respective national information literacy standards with emphasis on community-building among peers and practical skill development.¹⁶ Local solutions for training

teaching librarians existed long before the ACRL Competency Standards and Proficiencies. Sare, Bales, and Neville called for academic libraries to begin identifying and tracking these informal learning experiences of librarians “in order to develop appropriate learning toolkits for new librarians.”¹⁷ Institutions begin creating internal competencies or skills lists as a necessity for training ill-prepared new teaching librarians.¹⁸ As academic libraries developed local proficiencies, they also developed local professional development. Many focused on new teaching librarians, while some saw the need to reach both new and experienced teaching librarians.¹⁹ This push to include experienced teaching librarians into regular professional development continues. In her study on librarians’ teaching identities, Nichols Hess found that a librarian’s time at their institution, opportunities for professional development, and relationship-building with colleagues all had an impact on teacher identity formation. These inputs can be fostered and shared with new teaching librarians through local professional development.

And overall, library leaders invested in building teaching capacity should support both newer and more veteran instructional librarians in pursuing these targeted, meaningful influences over those inputs which perhaps have less resonance. While these types of support may mean more than a one-size-fits-all professional learning environment, it may help to foster teaching transformation across instructional units.²⁰

Since the publication of ACRL’s *Roles and Strengths of Teaching Librarians*,²¹ local professional development programs have continued to fill the gaps where LIS education lacks.

Planning LTI

Historical Background

The Library Teaching Institute was created to supplement and expand an existing training program for library instructors, known as the Introduction to Instruction Training. This initial summer training program, developed in 2018, was primarily used as an onboarding tool for members of Mason’s undergraduate-focused Teaching & Learning Team. The Introduction to Instruction training was modeled after the Association of College & Research Libraries’ (ACRL) Immersion program, which provides extended training to give attendees the tools they need to gain skills and confidence in library instruction. Our program was designed to introduce library employees to basic instructional concepts, such as the ACRL Framework and Backward Design, as well as teaching logistics, such as booking a library classroom space, setting up teaching technology, negotiating with faculty members, public speaking, and classroom management.²² The outcome for training participants was to create an activity with learning outcomes and lead a brief teaching demonstration.

When a new Instruction Coordinator began at Mason Libraries in 2020, they inherited the Introduction to Instruction training. Along with two instructional staff members, they

began exploring the idea of expanding that training to be more formalized and inclusive of other library employees. Library employees across the Libraries taught information literacy sessions, but the Teaching & Learning Team was the only team that received any sort of training or onboarding with teaching. The vision, as established by this smaller team, was to create a training program to fill that gap.

Starting the Planning Process

After establishing that an internal training program in library instruction was needed at the Mason Libraries, the team established a planning process involving key stakeholders and experts in various aspects of library instruction. Each of these stakeholders convened a planning committee in January 2021 to establish the curriculum for the teaching institute, with the Instruction Coordinator taking the lead on this process. First, the committee established three guiding principles to frame the curriculum.

The first guiding principle is “to support those who are new to library instruction by providing clear direction for our library instruction efforts.” This is important to the program because it establishes a baseline of support for new instructors and ensures that they know the direction of the instruction program at Mason Libraries.

The second guiding principle is “to have a set of core competencies that we can expect from library instructors that have participated in this program.” This tenet of the program allows the Instruction Coordinator to have an established set of skills that LTI graduates need in order to teach the most common library and research skills in our context. It also allows for a wider pool of participants in library instruction, as more library employees have access to standardized training in teaching.

The third guiding principle is “to have something to point to that helps us define what library instruction at Mason looks like.” This is an important tenet as the Mason Libraries had many new staff and faculty members and it was crucial to create a shared understanding of what is expected during library instruction. It helped the Instruction Coordinator create documentation on how to do different aspects of instruction, such as booking rooms and responding to instructors. Each of these principles was considered throughout the planning process, especially during the planning phases.

Creating Core Competencies

Once the planning committee established these guiding principles, they worked to create a list of core competencies that participants should have after participation in LTI. The idea of this institute is that everyone has room to grow, and this institute is designed to help library instructors continually improve their teaching skills. During this process, the planning committee consulted the ACRL *Roles and Strengths of Teaching Librarians* to create competencies for this program. The full list of core competencies for LTI is available in the chapter appendix.

One set of core competencies revolved around knowledge of important information literacy concepts and guiding frameworks. The planning group identified that familiarity with the ACRL Framework, Universal Design for Learning, the Teaching & Learning

Team's teaching philosophy, and major learning theories were necessary for effective library instruction.

Another set of core competencies revolved around the lesson planning process. Creating learning outcomes, conducting student learning assessment, principles of active learning, and other related concepts were all identified as necessary for library instructors. Being able to interpret lesson plans, modify them, and create their own were all covered in these competencies.

The final set of core competencies was attitudinal in nature. From negotiating with faculty to feeling confident in the classroom, we wanted to ensure that our library instructors felt prepared for the classroom. These attitudinal pieces were the most challenging to learn and the most likely to come with practice. Because LTI was designed to orient new instructors without needing to go through their personal experience, these were a focus of many of the sessions.

Two Tracks

During the planning processes for LTI, it became clear that there needed to be two tracks for the institute—one that heavily focused on someone delivering a lesson created by another person and another track focused on creating a new lesson. This development came about because we had a diverse set of teaching experiences and responsibilities within the Libraries. Additionally, because we have a repository of lesson plans for Mason Libraries, many newer instructors can rely on lesson plans others have created instead of creating their own.

Training Format

LTI takes place over the summer with a series of weekly ninety-minute sessions. These sessions are held online via Zoom. LTI began in 2021, so the first sessions were held on Zoom to limit the spread of the COVID-19 pandemic. Since then, LTI has continued on Zoom for those reasons and to allow colleagues at our distributed campuses to participate. Hosting sessions on Zoom allows the facilitators to record the sessions and post them after the fact, which enables asynchronous participation in the series as needed.

In addition to Zoom sessions, LTI includes an accompanying Blackboard course. This course contains content for participants to review and engage with, including recordings of all LTI sessions, homework assignments, and additional resources—e.g., important links, supplemental readings, and guiding library documents. The Blackboard course also remains open after the series concludes, which allows LTI participants to go back to the content and refresh their memories.

Requirements for Participants

Library faculty and staff were able to participate in LTI in a variety of ways. Full participation in LTI culminates in a certificate of completion. Criteria for full participation include attending all LTI sessions and completing all assigned homework outside of the

sessions. Those who intended to receive a certificate but were not able to attend one or more sessions were given an option for an asynchronous attendance assignment, which involved watching a session recording and completing an assignment via Blackboard in place of live attendance. Examples of assigned homework include an introductory discussion board or a reflection journal asking participants to apply concepts learned in a particular session.

Alternatively, participants who did not wish (or were unable) to receive a certificate were offered an à la carte approach where they could attend any of the workshops. This à la carte option allowed returning LTI participants to attend sessions of interest in each training iteration without having to retake the training. It also opened sessions to those who could not complete the entire program due to summer commitments and vacation schedules but who still wanted to benefit from the sessions.

Inclusion of All Library Employees

One key feature of LTI is that all employees are invited, regardless of teaching responsibilities or employment classification. Because Mason Libraries is a large organization, one reason for this inclusivity was to ensure that everyone who taught, regardless of placement in the organization, was included. Additionally, the coordinators felt it was important to provide a professional development opportunity for all employees in case a current Mason employee was interested in learning more about instruction to expand their professional toolkit.

The Library Teaching Institute

List of Sessions

The table that follows outlines the sessions from both years of the Library Teaching Institute at George Mason University Libraries. The team adjusted the format between the two years, so the 2022 series does not include the same number of sessions as the 2021 series. The table identifies the three sessions that were cut between years as well as how the outcomes from those cut sessions were incorporated into the other sessions.

TABLE 22.1

An outline of the sessions from both years of the Library Teaching Institute at George Mason University Libraries.

Session Title	2021 Learning Outcomes Participants will:	2022 Learning Outcomes Participants will:
Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define library instruction • Identify Mason Libraries' instruction initiatives • Review the logistical steps for in-class instruction • Review the logistical steps for workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define information literacy • Identify the infrastructure of library instruction at Mason • Discuss major learning theories used in adult learning • Apply the ACRL Framework to library instruction

TABLE 22.1

An outline of the sessions from both years of the Library Teaching Institute at George Mason University Libraries.

Session Title	2021 Learning Outcomes Participants will:	2022 Learning Outcomes Participants will:
Anatomy of a Lesson Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summarize the role and key features of a lesson plan • Describe learning outcomes • Identify the role of learning activities • Define learning assessment for our library instruction context(s) 	This session was not a part of our 2022 series; outcomes from this session were covered in sessions on Learning Outcomes, Activities, and Student Learning Assessment.
Building Confidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a checklist to prepare for class sessions • Apply best practices for classroom management • Identify steps to take after class to prepare for the next class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect on their role in the classroom and their relationship to instructional faculty • Develop a checklist to prepare for class sessions • Apply best practices for classroom management • Identify steps to take after the class to prepare for the next class
Conclusion (Delivering a Lesson)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synthesize their work during the Delivering a Lesson series • Reflect on the Delivering a Lesson series • Deliver a 5-minute portion of a lesson 	This session was not a part of our 2022 series; outcomes from this session were moved into homework assignments for other sessions.
Learning Theory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define major learning theories used in adult learning • Determine the most effective learning theory for an instructional context • Apply learning theories to the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education 	This session was not a part of our 2022 series; outcomes from this session were streamlined and redistributed to the Introduction session.
Learning Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop measurable learning outcomes • Create learning outcomes specific to your instructional context • Articulate best practices for creating learning outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the importance of learning outcomes • Write measurable learning outcomes for their instructional context • Articulate best practices for creating learning outcomes
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe activities' importance to the learning process • List commonly used activities in the library classroom • Connect a session's learning activities to its learning outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe activities' importance to the learning process • List commonly used activities in the library classroom • Connect a session's learning activities to its learning outcomes

TABLE 22.1

An outline of the sessions from both years of the Library Teaching Institute at George Mason University Libraries.

Session Title	2021 Learning Outcomes Participants will:	2022 Learning Outcomes Participants will:
Student Learning Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss best practices for library instruction assessment techniques • Apply best practices to design an instructional assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describe the importance of student learning assessment in the library classroom • List commonly used assessment techniques • Identify Mason-specific resources for student learning assessment

Format

LTI 2021, the first year of the program, was comprised of two separate series. Delivering a Lesson, the first series, was aimed at the true beginner, with a goal of participants being able to confidently deliver a lesson that someone else had created. Sessions focused on learning the basic definition of library instruction, logistics for how to lead a session, the anatomy of a lesson plan, how to build confidence in the classroom, and concluded with participants delivering a short portion of a lesson for feedback.

The second series, called Designing a Lesson, was held after the first. This series targeted an intermediate audience and aimed for participants to be able to design their own lessons. Sessions focused on learning theory, writing learning outcomes, designing and leading activities, and student learning assessment.

Overall Impressions and Lessons Learned

LTI had a good turnout in its first year, especially for the Delivering a Lesson series. The Delivering a Lesson series had twelve to fifteen participants per session, with three eventually completing the certificate. The second series, Designing a Lesson, had a lower turnout with six to eight participants per session and no one completing the certificate. Feedback from these sessions was primarily positive, with participants indicating that their confidence and knowledge had grown as a result of participating in the program.

However, one major piece of feedback was that the division between the two series was confusing to the participants. Participants were unclear, for example, if they could participate in Designing a Lesson if they had not completed Delivering a Lesson. The distinction between the two series was another point of confusion. When beginning to plan for the second year of the program, the team decided to take this feedback and make some major adjustments.

LTI 2022

LTI's second year began in Summer 2022. The second version of LTI was based on the first: the list of core competencies, for example, was unchanged. However, one major change was the elimination of the two-track system in favor of a condensed single series. Feedback from the 2021 edition revealed that the division between the two tracks was confusing and led participants to not know how to participate. Additionally, upon reflecting on the process, the planning committee for the second year realized that newer instructors would benefit from, for example, writing their own learning outcomes. We condensed the series into the shorter one-series model, with one certificate of completion at the end. What follows is a short discussion of each of the five sessions in this new series.

Introduction

In the first session in 2022, participants were introduced to LTI and some of the major theories that underpin our work at Mason Libraries, including a section about learning theories and the ACRL Framework. One example of an activity we conducted during the session asked participants to do a deep dive on a specific frame and then report out to their colleagues about that frame and what it includes. For homework, participants wrote an opening reflective piece that set some intention for their participation in LTI.

Building Confidence

The second session focused on ways to build comfort and confidence in the classroom. We discussed how to interpret body language from students, for example, and participants built a toolkit of materials they'd bring to an in-person session to feel more comfortable. Reflective practice was also emphasized here as well as how our library instructors might relate to the teaching faculty as partners.

Learning Outcomes

In the third session, participants learned about learning outcomes. The homework for this week asked participants to think about their own setting—teaching in classes, workshops, or other contexts—and write some sample learning outcomes for that setting. Participants built on those learning outcomes for the remainder of the homework assignments.

Activities

This session modeled learning activities and problem-based learning by using these techniques to show participants how to facilitate activities and learn about other active learning techniques. For example, we provided participants with a list of activity types, then broke them into groups which were each assigned an activity. Then, we reshuffled the groups to include members of each original group; using this jigsaw format, each member of each original group was able to become an expert on a type of activity and introduce it to their fellow participants.

Student Learning Assessment

For the final session of LTI 2022, participants were introduced to student learning assessment. Grounded in the assessment program at Mason Libraries,²³ participants learned the many ways to assess student learning in a library instruction context. For homework, participants used the learning outcomes they wrote in a prior homework assignment and designed a student learning assessment technique to use to assess those outcomes.

Overall Impressions and Lessons Learned

In its second year, LTI had approximately fifteen participants per session from across the Libraries. Five of those participants completed the certificate. Some participants even returned to LTI for a second year in a row, citing its sense of community among instructors as a major reason to return.

As we move into planning for our 2023 session, we are making some improvements to the series. One major change we hope to make, in response to participant feedback, is to add more ways for participants to apply our content outside of a teaching context. Because we invite participation from across the Libraries, having a more explicit discussion of, for example, running effective meetings using teaching techniques will improve the ability of non-instructors to directly apply this content. We also plan to move some of the introductory content about the certificate into an asynchronous introduction session, allowing us more time in the first live session to focus on items like the ACRL Framework.

Recommendations

Dual Audience: Challenge and Opportunity

Designing a training program for both new and returning library instructors was a challenge. It necessitated creating multiple modes of participation, for example, and creating scaffolding for both those who attended the entire series and those who attended only one workshop. This, however, also created two important opportunities: repeat attendance and mixing of experience levels.

In the second year of LTI, some instructors who had participated in the first year returned for a couple of workshops. For example, if someone who earned the certificate in 2021 wanted to refresh their knowledge about student learning assessment, our flexible schedule allowed them to do so. This ability to attend in subsequent years also underlines that developing as a teacher is a consistent and recursive process: by attending after you have been teaching for a year, you will learn different things.

Additionally, allowing for flexible participation enabled experienced and new instructors to learn together. Both groups contribute something unique to the learning process, and this mixture has become a signature of the breakout rooms and other activities during LTI. Sharing knowledge and building community, especially during an era of web conferencing rather than in-person meetings, were both benefits gained by this mixture of experience levels across LTI.

Include, Rather Than Exclude

A major focus during the planning process for LTI was identifying the program's audience. Would LTI only include those people who currently teach or work within the department that focuses on teaching? What we ultimately decided, however, was to open LTI to all library employees at our institution, whether they currently taught for their job or not. This decision was made specifically with inclusivity in mind: as a professional development opportunity, keeping LTI as open as possible was important.

This decision led to participation from employees outside the Teaching & Learning Team during both iterations of LTI. Perspectives from employees in Access Services, Metadata Services, Interlibrary Loan, and other departments brought in diverse ideas of what teaching encompasses. These employees were then able to take what they learned during LTI and either document that they had some exposure to library instruction for future positions or apply it in other contexts, like training student staff or leading meetings.

Simplify When Possible

In the first year of LTI, it included two tracks: Delivering a Lesson and Designing a Lesson. The hope with the two-track model was that instructors would have an easier time identifying which sessions they would want to attend. After the 2021 iteration, however, we found that this distinction left the audience unclear about which sessions to attend. Additionally, because the Designing a Lesson series occurred later in the summer, its attendance was not as high as the first series.

By the second year of LTI, the planning committee condensed it into one series. While this did necessitate streamlining or cutting content altogether, the committee also found that the flow of the series was more natural and easier to understand. This also eliminated the need to run the series twice during the summer, so the committee could select a time during the summer when most people would be in the office.

Scaffolding and Final Product

Throughout LTI, participants interested in the certificate complete homework assignments. These short, asynchronous assignments reinforce the skills taught during a session. For example, after a session about learning outcomes, the homework assignment might be to create learning outcomes for a specific class session or workshop. These assignments are further scaffolded by asking participants to build on past work: taking the learning outcomes they wrote in a previous week, for example, and creating a student learning assessment to measure that learning outcome. Creating the homework assignments to build on each other in this way helped to build continuity between sessions for those who participated in the certificate.

Structuring homework like this also gave participants a tangible product at the end of LTI. Beyond obtaining a certificate of completion, for example, participants could also leave with a mostly complete lesson plan for a class or workshop in their context. Bringing

skills into a practical and individual focus for participants was an important part of our design, as well, as LTI was designed to be useful and timely for each participant.

Collaborate When Planning

The planning process for LTI involved experts from across the Teaching & Learning Team. Because LTI was designed to provide a baseline level of knowledge for all library instructors, a big tent was necessary to ensure participants learned important knowledge across the many facets of instruction. Having a large group did mean that the process went slower than it otherwise would have, but the knowledge that each member of the team contributed was invaluable. Building in enough time at the beginning of the program to include these diverse perspectives was a crucial part of LTI's success.

Have a Point Person

LTI at Mason Libraries, while a collaborative process, also had either one point person or a small team of point people leading the charge, depending on the year. This point person made sure that the Blackboard course for LTI included all homework assignments and session recordings and that each homework assignment was read and evaluated. Having a small group ensured that everyone who participates receives feedback on their work and a certificate at the end. It also helps to have a leader when participants have questions or want to further discuss something they learned during a session.

Moving Forward

At the time of writing this chapter, the team behind LTI is in the beginning stages of planning for the 2023 edition of the program. Much of the program is currently planned to remain the same, including the option for a certificate or à la carte attendance and recruiting all library employees. Some questions to consider include whether the core competencies list needs to be revisited or revised as well as whether the 2022 LTI program adequately covered the teaching skills and concepts needed by library faculty and staff. Our goal with LTI as we plan for the future is for the program to be as dynamic and responsive to participants' needs as our teaching.

Conclusion

A local training program might be implemented for a variety of reasons. In our case at George Mason University, we had a large and distributed network of library instructors with a variety of experience levels. By creating a training program that could be flexibly applied, we were able to create a program that would be useful for many participants. The community we continue to build as a part of LTI is another crucial component of our success: by bringing participants together across the Libraries, we are able to build connections between employees who would not normally work together.

APPENDIX

List of LTI Core Competencies

1. Foundational Knowledge
 - a. Know what lesson plans are and why they are important.
 - b. Define learning outcome, learning activity, and student learning assessment.
 - c. Define library instruction and information literacy.
 - d. Familiar with the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*.
 - e. Familiar at a basic level with major adult learning theories: Universal Design for Learning, Backward Design, anti-racist pedagogy, and feminist pedagogy.
2. Applied Knowledge
 - a. Write learning outcomes based on their own instructional context.
 - b. Design learning activities and student learning assessment to support their created learning outcomes.
 - c. Negotiate with teaching faculty surrounding classroom expectations and the content of the library instruction lesson plan.
3. Attitudes and Values
 - a. Facilitate activities and lead lessons comfortably and confidently.
 - b. Committed to continued professional development.
 - c. Understanding of reflective practice in teaching.
4. Logistics and Local Context
 - a. Understand which teaching rooms are available, what technology they include, and how to reserve them.
 - b. Understand how library instruction requests work and how to take a request that comes in via the form.
 - c. Understand the local library instruction landscape, including what courses and workshops we frequently teach and which modalities we teach in.
 - d. Familiar with Mason-specific library instruction support documents and resources.

Notes

1. Mandi Goodsett and Amanda Koziura, “Are Library Science Programs Preparing New Librarians? Creating a Sustainable and Vibrant Librarian Community,” *Journal of Library Administration* 56, no. 6 (September 8, 2016): 707, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2015.1134246>.
2. Laura Saunders, “Education for Instruction: A Review of LIS Instruction Syllabi,” *The Reference Librarian* 56, no. 1 (January 2, 2015): 5, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2014.969392>.
3. Merinda Kaye Hensley, “Improving LIS Education in Teaching Librarians to Teach,” in *ACRL 2015 Proceedings* (Portland, OR: American Library Association, 2015), 318–19.

4. Jacalyn E. Bryan, "The Preparation of Academic Librarians Who Provide Instruction: A Comparison of First and Second Career Librarians," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 42, no. 4 (July 1, 2016): 348, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.05.010>.
5. Dani Brecher and Kevin Michael Klipfel, "Education Training for Instruction Librarians: A Shared Perspective," *Communications in Information Literacy* 8, no. 1 (March 2014): 44.
6. Hensley, "Improving LIS Education," 315.
7. Brecher and Klipfel, "Education Training for Instruction Librarians," 44.
8. "Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators," Association of College & Research Libraries, ACRL Instruction Section, 2007, <https://acrl.ala.org/IS/instruction-tools-resources-2/professional-development/standards-for-proficiencies-for-instruction-librarians-and-coordinators/>.
9. *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, Association of College & Research Libraries, January 18, 2000, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>.
10. Uta Hussong-Christian, "Adapting and Using Instruction Proficiencies to Encourage Reflection, Goal Setting and Professional Development," *Communications in Information Literacy* 6, no. 2 (September 2012): 160–72.
11. *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*, Association of College & Research Libraries, February 2, 2015, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.
12. *Roles and Strengths of Teaching Librarians*, Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), May 15, 2017, <https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/teachinglibrarians>.
13. *Roles and Strengths of Teaching Librarians*, ACRL.
14. Annie Armstrong, "New Models for Instruction: Fusing the ACRL Framework and Roles and Strengths of Teaching Librarians to Promote the Lifelong Learning of Teaching Librarians," *College & Research Libraries News* 80, no. 7 (August 7, 2019): 378–86, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.80.7.378>.
15. "Immersion Program," Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), 2020, <https://www.ala.org/acrl/conferences/immersion>.
16. Mary Delaney et al., "Library Staff Learning to Support Learners Learning: Reflections from a Two-Year Professional Development Project," *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 26, no. 1 (January 2020): 56–78, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2019.1681483>; Agnes Namaganda, "Continuing Professional Development as Transformational Learning: A Case Study," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 46, no. 3 (May 1, 2020): 102152, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102152>.
17. Laura Sare, Stephen Bales, and Bruce Neville, "New Academic Librarians and Their Perceptions of the Profession," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 12, no. 2 (April 2012): 200, <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2012.0017>.
18. Carroll Botts and Mark Emmons, "Developing Teaching Competencies for Instructors in the Academic Library: A Case Study," *Public Services Quarterly* 1, no. 3 (March 2002): 65–81, https://doi.org/10.1300/J295v01n03_07.
19. Botts and Emmons, "Developing Teaching Competencies"; Hussong-Christian, "Adapting and Using Instruction Proficiencies."
20. Amanda Nichols Hess, "Academic Librarians' Teaching Identities and Work Experiences: Exploring Relationships to Support Perspective Transformation in Information Literacy Instruction," *Journal of Library Administration* 60, no. 4 (June 5, 2020): 345–46, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2020.1721939>.
21. *Roles and Strengths of Teaching Librarians*, ACRL.
22. "Immersion Program," ACRL.
23. Maoria J. Kirker and Ashley Blinstrub, "Improving Information Literacy Instruction through Programmatic Student Learning Assessment," in *Leading Dynamic Information Literacy Programs*, ed. Anne C. Behler (London, UK: Routledge, 2023).

Bibliography

Armstrong, Annie. "New Models for Instruction: Fusing the ACRL Framework and Roles and Strengths of Teaching Librarians to Promote the Lifelong Learning of Teaching Librarians." *College & Research Libraries News* 80, no. 7 (August 7, 2019): 378–86. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.80.7.378>.

- Association of College & Research Libraries. *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. February 2, 2015. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.
- . “Immersion Program.” Text. Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL). 2020. <https://www.ala.org/acrl/conferences/immersion>.
- . *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*. January 18, 2000. <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>.
- . *Roles and Strengths of Teaching Librarians*. Text. Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL). May 15, 2017. <https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/teachinglibrarians>.
- . “Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators.” ACRL Instruction Section. 2007. <https://acrl.ala.org/IS/instruction-tools-resources-2/professional-development/standards-for-proficiencies-for-instruction-librarians-and-coordinators/>.
- Botts, Carroll, and Mark Emmons. “Developing Teaching Competencies for Instructors in the Academic Library: A Case Study.” *Public Services Quarterly* 1, no. 3 (March 2002): 65–81. https://doi.org/10.1300/J295v01n03_07.
- Brecher, Dani, and Kevin Michael Klipfel. “Education Training for Instruction Librarians: A Shared Perspective.” *Communications in Information Literacy* 8, no. 1 (March 2014): 43–49.
- Bryan, Jacalyn E. “The Preparation of Academic Librarians Who Provide Instruction: A Comparison of First and Second Career Librarians.” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 42, no. 4 (July 1, 2016): 340–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2016.05.010>.
- Delaney, Mary, Ann Cleary, Philip Cohen, and Brendan Devlin. “Library Staff Learning to Support Learners Learning: Reflections from a Two-Year Professional Development Project.” *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 26, no. 1 (January 2020): 56–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2019.1681483>.
- Goodsett, Mandi, and Amanda Koziura. “Are Library Science Programs Preparing New Librarians? Creating a Sustainable and Vibrant Librarian Community.” *Journal of Library Administration* 56, no. 6 (September 8, 2016): 697–721. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2015.1134246>.
- Hensley, Merinda Kaye. “Improving LIS Education in Teaching Librarians to Teach.” In *ACRL 2015 Proceedings*, 315–22. Portland, OR: American Library Association, 2015.
- Hussong-Christian, Uta. “Adapting and Using Instruction Proficiencies to Encourage Reflection, Goal Setting and Professional Development.” *Communications in Information Literacy* 6, no. 2 (September 2012): 160–72.
- Kirker, Maoria J., and Ashley Blinstrub. “Improving Information Literacy Instruction through Programmatic Student Learning Assessment.” In *Leading Dynamic Information Literacy Programs*, edited by Anne C. Behle. London, UK: Routledge, 2023.
- Namaganda, Agnes. “Continuing Professional Development as Transformational Learning: A Case Study.” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 46, no. 3 (May 1, 2020): 102152. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102152>.
- Nichols Hess, Amanda. “Academic Librarians’ Teaching Identities and Work Experiences: Exploring Relationships to Support Perspective Transformation in Information Literacy Instruction.” *Journal of Library Administration* 60, no. 4 (June 5, 2020): 331–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2020.1721939>.
- Sare, Laura, Stephen Bales, and Bruce Neville. “New Academic Librarians and Their Perceptions of the Profession.” *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 12, no. 2 (April 2012): 179–203. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2012.0017>.
- Saunders, Laura. “Education for Instruction: A Review of LIS Instruction Syllabi.” *The Reference Librarian* 56, no. 1 (January 2, 2015): 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2014.969392>.