Adapting and Using Instruction Proficiencies to Encourage Reflection, Goal Setting and Professional Development

Uta Hussong-Christian
Oregon State University, uta.hussong-christian@oregonstate.edu

[ARTICLE]

ADAPTING AND USING INSTRUCTION PROFICIENCIES TO ENCOURAGE REFLECTION, GOAL SETTING AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Uta Hussong-Christian
Oregon State University

ABSTRACT

Librarians at Oregon State University undertook a teaching competency project to lay the foundation for practices that improve teaching by adapting the core teaching proficiencies in the *ACRL Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators*. This article describes one model for locally adapting those proficiencies, the Oregon State University Libraries (OSUL) Framework for Teaching Excellence. This framework promotes reflection on, goal setting for, and professional development around teaching. The project team utilized a survey to determine the proficiency categories most valued by OSUL instruction librarians. The development and inclusion of context material for each proficiency category included in the OSUL Framework encourages use of the document in the intended way. Also included in the document are specific use guidelines for three stakeholder groups: library faculty with teaching responsibilities, supervisors, and faculty involved in the tenure process.

INTRODUCTION

Academic instruction librarians undertake teaching duties with varying levels of preparation for this increasingly important role. A branch of the library literature shows that they are not feeling prepared or are not actually trained for their roles as teachers (Botts & Emmons, 2002; Walter, 2005; Westbrock & Fabian, 2010). Instruction librarians are not alone. They join their higher education colleagues who struggle with the broader issue of college and university teachers not being adequately prepared by their graduate institutions to take on the primary instruction role of the institution. Walter (2005) specifically draws parallels between academic librarians' efforts to define teaching excellence and develop effective practices and the broader faculty development movement in higher education geared toward improving faculty teaching practices. Such efforts are critical since, unlike teachers or library media specialists in primary and secondary education who must be certified, those teaching in higher education face no such requirement. Obtaining the terminal degree in one's field of study is all the qualification needed to undertake teaching in this setting.

Although Oregon State University Libraries (OSUL) does not have a formal training program for librarians new to teaching, the Teaching and Engagement Department (TED) does host a regular monthly professional development workshop on a variety of teaching-related topics. This series aims to help both new and experienced instruction librarians develop or improve their teaching practices. What had been lacking was a clear articulation of the teaching competencies valued by and expected of OSUL instruction librarians. A set of teaching competencies is one tool that can be used by librarians to guide their

development as teachers (Botts & Emmons, 2002). Experienced instruction librarians may also find such tools useful in their continuing professional development. To remedy this lack of a guiding document, a team of TED librarians, along with one Archives librarian, undertook a teaching competency development project in late 2009. The OSUL Framework for Teaching Excellence (OSUL Framework) was finalized and implemented in late spring of 2011.

This paper addresses the development of the OSUL Framework and discusses its various roles in reflection (a particular focus of the project), goal setting, and professional development related to library instruction. A unique aspect of the project was the adaptation of the *ACRL Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators* (2007 Proficiencies) for local use This is the first published use of the 2007 Proficiencies for this purpose. Guidelines developed for use of the OSUL Framework by multiple OSUL stakeholder groups are presented. While assessment measures have not been fully completed, follow up projects currently underway and in the planning stage will be also be presented.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teaching competency and proficiency initiatives or related projects have been undertaken in a variety of settings both domestically and internationally. Some initiatives have been created at the national level, intended for local adaptation and use, while others have been undertaken at the local level because of a perceived deficit of available tools.

161

Nationally-Developed Instruction Competencies and Guides

Instruction librarians in higher education in the United States are fortunate to have had nationally-developed teaching proficiencies or practices to guide their development as teachers starting with the Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians (1985 Proficiencies) developed by ACRL's Bibliographic Instruction Section. Although a primary purpose of the 1985 Proficiencies was to "advise library schools in their curriculum and course planning," (Westbrock & Fabian, 2010, p. 569) it seems only logical that the proficiencies would have also formed the basis for related or future efforts in this area. Unfortunately this has not completely proven to be case. For example, the Library Instruction Teaching Tips (LIRT Teaching Tips), developed by ALA's Library Instruction Round Table (2001), did not cite the 1985 Proficiencies as a source document. There is also no indication that either the 1985 or the 2007 Proficiencies influenced the ACRL's recently updated *Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline* (2012), even though pedagogy is expressly stated in the guidelines.

The ACRL Instruction Section took steps to remedy such oversights by building upon the 1985 Proficiencies document when it was charged in 2004 with developing a set of standards in part "to help instruction librarians define and gain the valuable skills needed to be excellent teachers in library instruction programs" (ACRL, 2007, Introduction). The development of the 2007 Proficiencies addresses "the professional concerns of academic librarians struggling to define effective practice" (Walter, 2005, p. 364). Walter's concern is echoed by the 2007 Proficiencies authors who highlight in their introduction that the *lack* [emphasis added] of professional standards for library

instructors has contributed to difficulties with creating professional development programs that help instruction librarians define and develop effective instruction practices (ACRL, 2007). Although the 1985 Proficiencies *should* be considered an early example of professional standards for library instructors, it is clear that the profession has not recognized them in this important way. With ACRL's official approval and acceptance of the 2007 Proficiencies, instruction librarians and leaders of library instruction programs now have a set of core proficiencies by which to guide instruction improvement initiatives. Even so, there is little literature indicating how individual institutions are implementing the new Proficiencies.

Locally-Developed Proficiency-Related Projects

While nationally the ACRL Instruction Section was aware of, and sought to build upon existing proficiencies, local instruction proficiency projects have largely drawn upon a wide variety of other resources. Ware (2002) utilized the Instructional Development Needs Analysis (IDNA) survey tool from the U.S. Department of Energy and Westinghouse Electric to identify teaching competency areas and specific proficiencies in need of professional development attention at Penn State University Libraries. Like Ware, Starkey (2010) also utilized a survey approach to determine that academic teaching librarians in Kansas would benefit from professional development in multiple library instruction competency categories. Unlike Ware, however, Starkey drew upon the 2007 Proficiencies for survey development. It is unclear if either project resulted in local proficiency documents to guide librarians engaged in self-directed learning or reflection or other professional development initiatives. A document used

for these purposes was a goal of the OSUL Framework project.

Moving beyond needs assessment projects, Botts and Emmons (2002) specifically worked to develop a library instruction competency document, and the OSUL Framework project was inspired by their work. Although they did not draw upon the 1985 Proficiencies, Botts and Emmons did utilize librarian-focused standards in the form of the Reference and User Services Association's (RUSA) *Guidelines for Behavioral Performance for Reference and Information Service Providers* (RUSA, 2004) and the competencies for Canadian primary and secondary teacher-librarians. Their Teacher Competencies document at the University of New Mexico's General Library lays out individual proficiencies in twenty competency categories grouped more broadly into four focus areas. One notable feature of this project is the inclusion of context statements at the beginning of each group of proficiencies that provide some rationale why the proficiencies in each section are important.

Saunders' (2005) approach to librarian teaching competencies resulted in narrative "best practices", drawing upon LIRT's Teaching Tips (ALA, 2001) among other sources. This approach did allow for incorporation of examples to situate the best practices, something a simple listing of proficiencies does not allow. This idea of specific examples further influenced the OSUL Framework project development.

The improvement of teaching skills for academic instruction librarians is not limited to domestic efforts. The EduLib project team, based in the United Kingdom, developed a workshop series covering essential teaching skills for librarians (McNamara, 1998, p. 1). A primary

motivator for undertaking this project was the recognition that librarians' roles were evolving to include that of "key educator." Peacock (2001) and her colleagues at the Queensland University of Technology (QUT) Library in Australia worked to adapt the EduLib professional development program for their own needs. Their work on building a Professional Information Literacy Development (PILD) Model proposed to address librarian teaching development in a stepwise manner. While it is unclear if the PILD Model process actually resulted in a proficiencies document, the broad intent to create a set of common expectations and outcomes for teaching librarians is certainly evident. One notable feature of the PILD Model is that it adapted the EduLib project framework to suit local needs, an approach the OSUL Framework project took in adapting the 2007 Proficiencies.

Most of the projects described tapped into existing proficiencies, though not necessarily nationally-developed proficiencies. The OSUL instruction proficiency project set out to specifically build upon existing nationally accepted library instruction proficiencies so as to not reinvent the wheel at the local level. By doing so, OSUL provides one example for moving the profession forward in this area. Different but related examples provide additional models for what is possible in this area. A quick review of the instruction literature reveals that the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education (ACRL, 2000) are at the core of many current instruction program or instruction assessment efforts. The 2007 Proficiencies should also be seen as core to any local instruction competency efforts.

163

DEVELOPING THE OSUL FRAMEWORK

Valuing Our Competencies

At OSUL, adaptation of the 2007 Proficiencies to create the OSUL Framework began with efforts to enhance the project relevance for both new and experienced instruction librarians and a decision to focus on those competencies that were held in common value. This followed ACRL's recommendation that library instruction programs use the 2007 Proficiencies "in a manner best suited for [their] environment... [including] emphasizing some criteria over others..." (ACRL, 2007, Application of Proficiencies). The project team deployed a short survey consisting of the twelve 2007 Proficiencies categories and two open-ended questions (Appendix) to all OSUL instruction librarians, including subject and archives librarians with teaching responsibilities who are not members of TED. This followed ACRL's recommendation that "the entire library

instruction staff should be consulted and given an opportunity to provide input" (ACRL, 2007, Application of Proficiencies). The targeted librarians were instructed to review the full 2007 Proficiencies document on the ACRL website before responding to the survey. Respondents were asked to rank order the top six proficiency categories they *most valued in their own instruction* and respond to the two open-ended queries.

Rating instruction proficiencies has been utilized by previous researchers (Shonrock & Mulder, 1993; Westbrock & Fabian, 2010) as a way to determine their relative importance to instruction librarians. The current approach deviated slightly in that OSUL instruction librarians were asked to not rate but, instead, rank order their top six proficiency categories in order to initiate in-depth reflection on their value to individual instruction practices. The resulting ranked list presented in Table 1 takes into account both the number of responses each category received as well as the total ranking points

TABLE 1—2007 PROFICIENCY CATEGORY RANKINGS BY IMPORTANCE TO INDIVIDUAL INSTRUCTORS

Ranking	Proficiency Category	# of Top 6 Rankings	Total Points
1	Teaching skills	11	42.00
2	Communication skills	9	41.00
3	Instructional design skills	9	29.00
4	Presentation skills	8	30.00
5	Information literacy integration skills	8	22.00
6	Assessment and evaluation skills	8	18.00
7	Curriculum knowledge	6	23.00
8	Subject expertise	4	16.00
9	Planning skills	4	12.00
10	Promotion skills	3	7.00
11	Leadership skills	2	10.00
12	Administrative skills	2	2.00

received. The responses to the open-ended queries are not presented as they were not substantive.

Adapting, Not Duplicating

Because the 2007 Proficiencies contains a dozen proficiency categories, the project team decided at the outset of the project to largely focus on the six top-ranked proficiency categories in developing the OSUL Framework. While this approach presents the process of selecting categories to focus on as relatively straight-forward, in reality this proved not to be the case. The team discovered that the 2007 Proficiencies categories (and their individual proficiencies) are more strongly connected and intertwined than the separate categories would otherwise make them seem. For instance, proficiencies in the Communication category focus on communicating with students, while proficiencies in the Leadership category clearly address communication but specifically with faculty. This situation is not unique to library instruction competencies. In the broader literature on teaching effectiveness, Stronge (2007) identifies four dimensions (or competency areas) that contribute to effectiveness but researchers acknowledge that the individual subcomponents (or proficiencies) are not mutually exclusive (Stronge, Ward, & Grant, 2011).

While the 2007 Proficiencies categories are presented in a manner that might suggest their independence of one another, the project team chose to embrace the interrelatedness of the proficiencies and categories. The OSUL Framework combines (and renames) proficiency categories in a way that acknowledges this. For example, proficiencies related to Communication and proficiencies related to Promotion were combined into one

Communication & Outreach category. To a degree, the project team utilized the librarian rankings as simply a guideline for which categories to include and which to exclude from the final competency document. The final categories included: Communication & Outreach, Instructional Design & Assessment, Teaching, Presentation, and Leadership.

The most significant departure from the top six categories was the inclusion of a Leadership category. The rationale for doing so was influenced by how OSUL is structured; some librarians have teaching-specific primary assignments (assigned to TED) while other librarians with teaching responsibilities have primary assignments such as Collection Development or Special Collections and Archives. Even though Leadership did not rank in the top six categories, the project team felt it was important to acknowledge the unique instruction leadership role of the TED librarians. The resulting Leadership category in the OSUL Framework directly addresses this leadership role and is much more robust than the corresponding category in the 2007 Proficiencies. It should be noted here that those seeking a one-to-one mapping of 2007 Proficiencies to the OSUL Framework will be disappointed. The adaptation process required the project team to be flexible and shape the document to reflect organizational culture. For example, the OSUL Framework contains the following two proficiencies:

OSU library instructors strive to:

- Communicate with TED to ensure that their individual instruction goals align with the OSUL's Instruction Program goals.

- Communicate the OSUL Instruction

Program goals, as appropriate, to both established and potential partners whenever and wherever they are found throughout OSU's colleges, departments and programs (OSUL, 2011, Communication & Outreach).

The first item is not addressed in the 2007 Proficiencies but is of importance to the OSUL instruction program. The second item is essentially addressed only as a proficiency for instruction coordinators in the Curriculum Knowledge section of the 2007 Proficiencies, but it is an essential element of what OSUL's subject liaison librarians are expected to communicate to their departmental faculty. Any such adaptation project is likely to encounter similar issues. Proficiencies not mapping one-to-one should not be seen as a flaw but as a potential strength, one reflecting efforts to incorporate institutional priorities and culture into the project.

In terms of document structure, one difference between the OSUL Framework and other teaching competency projects described earlier is that there is no further grouping of proficiency categories into broader functional areas. Botts and Emmons (2002) worked with broad behavioral, professional, and personal competency groupings while Peacock (2001) used technical, content knowledge, professional, and teaching skills groupings. For some, seeing the proficiency categories grouped in these larger ways may help with forming a simpler mental picture of the types of proficiencies needed. For others, this more complex hierarchy may be a barrier and make the proficiencies more intimidating. It is up to each group working with the 2007 Proficiencies to make their own determination about which approach best fits their needs.

RELEVANCY FOR ALL

A specific goal (and challenge) of the OSUL Framework project was to develop the document in such a way that it had relevancy for all OSUL librarians engaged in instruction, not just members of TED whose primary assignment is instruction. A long, bulleted list of teaching proficiencies could easily become yet another checklist, an approach the project team specifically set out to avoid. A checklist approach to teaching proficiencies places emphasis on the attainment of specific proficiencies with no thought to continuing development. Brookfield (1995), Schön (1987) and Stronge (2007) all refer to the idea that teachers, among other professionals, need to continually develop and grow their skills. While new teachers may, understandingly, be initially focused on skill development, developing into effective teachers ultimately means revisiting and improving acquired skills and practices. Just as instruction librarians focus on developing lifelong learning skills in their students, they themselves need to cultivate a practice of lifelong learning about their own professional practice. Continual changes in technology, changing pedagogical practices, and even shifting student experiences demand that all who teach continually update and refine their skills to remain relevant and effective.

Although it was mentioned earlier that OSUL has no formal training programs for new teaching librarians, the TED Department Head does meet with all new librarians who are undertaking teaching duties, regardless of their home department. The OSUL Framework is now one important resource that is highlighted by the TED Department Head as a way to introduce teaching expectations for all

166

faculty librarians at OSUL. Meeting these expectations in a way that goes beyond items on the checklist involves reflection, goal-setting and ongoing professional development.

Guiding Reflection and Goal-Setting

To get beyond the checklist mentality, an important component of the OSUL Framework is its focus on reflection around teaching practices. The checklist approach to teaching also presumes that once all the required skills are learned, one is automatically a strong, effective teacher. But effective teaching takes more than just a set of gathered skills; reflection on how and what we teach moves us toward practices of lifelong learning. Schön (1983) recognizes that experienced professionals may begin to approach their practice in predictable ways and miss opportunities to think about how they practice. He describes both reflection-in-action (while in the midst of practice) and reflection-on-action as ways in which practitioners seek greater knowing and understanding about how and why they act. Brookfield underscores the need for reflection in *good* teaching saying that "good teaching becomes synonymous with continuous and critical study of our reasoning processes and pedagogic actions" (1995, p. 42). While specific teaching incidents may prompt in-action or on-action reflection, both new and experienced library instructors may benefit from choosing specific aspects of their teaching on which to focus, a process the OSUL Framework can help guide. Specific language in the Preface encourages use of the document in this way, "These standards are presented as aspirational goals; they should serve as a framework for identifying opportunities for and guiding continual improvement" (OSUL, 2011, Preface). ACRL, itself, models this approach by providing guidance in the 2007

Proficiencies Preface on how to use the document. Such language and guidance further discourages use of the proficiencies as a checklist and presents them as a guide rather than a mandate to simply acquire all listed skills.

A specific example of how the OSUL Framework guides reflection comes from the OSUL teaching buddy program (Mellinger, King, & Buck, 2011) developed around Vidmar's (2005) reflective peer coaching model. Teaching buddy program participants were encouraged to use the OSUL Framework to select one or more teaching proficiencies around which to structure their reflective conversation. While reflection in this example is a group activity, the OSUL Framework has also been used to guide individual goal-setting. All OSUL librarians engaged in instruction have been encouraged to incorporate instruction-related goals into their annual agreements. In preparation for doing so, librarians were encouraged to review the OSUL Framework as a way to guide this goal-selection/goal-setting process.

Proficiencies in Context

Another tactic that addressed the checklist conundrum and encouraged librarians y to relate the OSUL Framework to regular activities around instruction was prefacing each proficiency category included in the document with its own context statement. Botts and Emmons' (2002) proficiency category context statements strongly influenced this decision. For instance, the beginning of their Teacher Competencies Communication section reads: "The effective instructor keeps students at ease. As a good communicator, the instructor…" (2002, p. 76) and goes on to list individual proficiencies associated with the category. Where the 2007 Proficiencies simply lists each set of proficiencies under

167

the perfunctory statement, "the effective instruction librarian will…" (ACRL, 2007, Proficiencies), the Teacher Competencies document provides some rationale why the proficiencies in each section are important. The OSUL Framework includes this feature to help communicate why the proficiencies in each category are important to teaching practices for all library instructors. For example, the preface for the OSUL Framework Instructional Design & Assessment category addresses the importance of individual instruction librarians contributing to a strategic instruction program:

> Library instructors need to design instruction and measure the impact of the instruction they do whether it is classroom-based, computer-mediated, or web-based. We recognize that not all library instructors have formal training in instructional design and educational assessment. However, we also recognize that an effective, responsive, strategic instruction program requires that every library instructor develop their own skills in this area. Library faculty with liaison responsibilities also need to be familiar with the curriculum and research practices in their assigned subject area in order to effectively design instruction and assessment for their students. Across the range of instruction and liaison responsibilities, we work together to identify important shared learning goals (OSUL, 2011, Instructional Design & Assessment).

While non-TED librarians might assume that assessment is the sole responsibility of TED librarians, the Instructional Design & Assessment preface highlights that each individual librarian doing instruction bears some responsibility for contributing

assessment data that can be used by TED librarians in order to conduct assessment at the programmatic level. In addition to setting the context in which instruction is carried out, these statements carry prompts for reflection. In the previous example it is implicit in the statement about needing to be familiar with curriculum in assigned liaison areas. If reflection reveals that further familiarity is warranted then librarians may set goals in order to follow up appropriately.

In addition to the preface for each category, each set of proficiencies within the individual categories was prefixed with "OSUL instruction librarians strive to" language. The "strive to" phrase was used intentionally to cultivate an attitude of reflection and goal-setting related to individual and collective practices of instruction. An example in the Instructional Design & Assessment category deals with designing instruction that includes the appropriate amount of content. "OSUL library instructors strive to…advocate for students and their learning needs when faculty partners ask for too much information, or inappropriate information, to be included in an instruction session or online learning module" (OSUL, 2011, Instructional Design & Assessment). While the language is not identical to the respective 2007 Proficiencies item (Proficiency 6.5), the intent is the same. For a session that felt rushed, an instruction librarian may reflect on the amount of content addressed in the session and set a goal to work with faculty partners in the coming term or near future to develop sessions that encompass a reasonable number of learning goals.

Professional Development
Reflection and goal-setting may lead to individuals undertaking professional development opportunities related to

168

instruction. While individuals may be internally motivated to engage in professional development, there are external reasons to do so as well. The recently revised Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline (ACRL, 2012) provides guidance in Category 8 that staff of information literacy programs should engage in professional development and training. Another way the OSUL Framework has been used is to shape in-house professional development programs. While the OSUL Framework, in and of itself, did not result in training workshops like the QUT project (Peacock, 2001), another group of TED librarians did subsequently utilize the OSUL Framework to guide a monthly workshop series on instruction-related topics which is open to all OSUL library instructors.

The librarians organizing the 2011-2012 OSUL Professional Development Series requested that TED librarians review the OSUL Framework in the summer of 2011 with the intent of collectively choosing a proficiency category around which to focus the upcoming series. Because of renewed emphasis on assessment throughout the university, assessment was chosen from among the OSUL Framework proficiency categories as the series focus. As all OSUL library instructors are invited to the monthly TED Professional Development series, this example illustrates one way in which the OSUL Framework is used to programmatically support instruction at OSUL.

STAKEHOLDER USE OF THE OSUL FRAMEWORK

A final strategy to promote effective use of the OSUL Framework and specifically to encourage and guide use of the Framework

by multiple stakeholders was the development of use guidelines for three stakeholder groups: library faculty, supervisors (of faculty librarians), and tenure-track/tenured librarians involved in all aspects of the tenure process. These stakeholder guidelines help tie the OSUL Framework to existing processes for goal-setting and promotion and tenure review. For example, library faculty are guided "to use the document to articulate instruction-related goals during the annual planning process" (described earlier) while supervisors are guided to "document a library instructor's process of developing teaching skills over time" (OSUL, 2011, Using the Framework). Tying into existing processes (e.g. annual goal-setting) is a strategy also implemented by other libraries to encourage meaningful use of such documents (Botts & Emmons, 2002).

NEXT STEPS

While an underlying goal of any proficiency document is to set expectations for acceptable performance, the approach taken to implementation will impact its utility. Proficiencies might be seen as negative when used only for purposes of evaluation. But when used as a tool to help guide practices that contribute to continual development or promote life-long learning, instruction proficiencies can function to strengthen teaching practices. One follow-up project that is still in early stages of development will gather feedback from instruction librarians to determine how useful the OSUL Framework is in guiding their reflection, goal-setting and professional development processes around instruction. Another project already undertaken but not yet written up is interviews with OSUL teaching librarian supervisors to determine how useful or impactful *they* consider the OSUL

169

Framework to be in guiding goal setting and describing library instruction in the promotion and tenure dossier. A final follow up will be to more closely tie the OSUL Framework to existing peer-review of instruction processes (Middleton, 2002) for OSUL tenure-track librarians, a strategy recommended by Botts and Emmons (2002).

CONCLUSION

Whatever the outcomes of the nascent or in-process projects and studies noted above, the OSUL Framework has served its intended role of creating a foundation that supports and encourages reflection, goal-setting and professional development related to instruction. The project also served more broadly as an opportunity to talk about how instruction librarians at OSUL develop as teachers and the responsibilities we each have to continually work toward meeting the expectations of our profession (as expressed in the 2007 Proficiencies). Conversations related to the project revealed that some librarians would view a "teaching standards" document negatively and that library managers expect standards to have a corresponding evaluation component. These concerns led to the approach of encouraging personal responsibility through reflection, goal setting and professional development. Though the process of seeking input from all librarians with instruction responsibilities was intended to prompt focus and reflection on instruction, participation in TED-sponsored professional development opportunities by non-TED librarians has been spotty. The follow-up interviews project should help to clarify reasons for this. Even so, it is clear that the OSUL Framework has served as a tool for more programmatic efforts around developing librarians as instructors.

While other libraries undertaking such a project may choose to focus on different teaching proficiencies (and appropriately so), it is hoped that the OSUL Framework can serve as a model for adapting the 2007 Proficiencies for local use. The resulting conversations around individual and programmatic responsibilities for our development as teachers and our evolving roles as "key educators" are perhaps most important of all. However those projects are undertaken, careful consideration should be given to approaches that tie into and enhance exiting practices and programs, or serve to inspire new ones, so as to build a broad foundation for instruction improvement practices and opportunities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

American Library Association (2001). LIRT library instruction teaching tips. Retrieved from http://fleetwood.baylor.edu/lirt/brochures.html

Association of College and Research Libraries (1985). Proficiencies for instruction librarians. Retrieved from http://library.csus.edu/services/inst/indiv/acrl_bis_profic.htm

Association of College and Research Libraries (2000). Information literacy competency standards for higher education. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency

Association of College and Research

170

Libraries (2007). Standards for proficiencies for instruction librarians and coordinators. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/profstandards

Association of College and Research Libraries (2012). Characteristics of programs of information literacy that illustrate best practices: A guideline. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/characteristics

Botts, C., & Emmons, M. (2002). Developing teaching competencies for instructors in the academic library: A case study. *Public Services Quarterly, 1*(3), 65-81. doi:10.1300/J295v01n03_07

Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McNamara, D. (1998). *The edulib project : Teaching for learning in libraries and information services, a series of educational development workshops*. Hull England: EduLib Project Office.

Mellinger, M., King, V., & Buck, S. (2011). Teaching buddy program. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University.

Middleton, C. (2002). Evolution of peer evaluation of library instruction at Oregon State University Libraries. *portal: Libraries and the Academy, 2*(1), 69-78. doi:10.1353/pla.2002.0019

Oregon State University Libraries. (2011). OSU Libraries framework for teaching excellence. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1957/32736

Peacock, J. (2001). Teaching skills for teaching librarians: Postcards from the edge

of the educational paradigm. *Australian Academic & Research Libraries, 32*(1), 26-42. Retrieved from http://www.alia.org.au/publishing/aarl/32.1/full.text/jpeacock.html

Reference and User Services Association (2004). Guidelines for behavioral performance of reference and information service providers. Retrieved, from http://www.ala.org/rusa/resources/guidelines/guidelinesbehavioral

Saunders, L. (2005). Teaching the library: Best practices. *Library Philosophy and Practice, 4*(2). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/51/

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Shonrock, D., & Mulder, C. (1993). Instruction librarians: Acquiring the proficiencies critical to their work. *College and Research Libraries, 54*(2), 137-149.

Starkey, A. (2010). *Kansas academic librarian perceptions of information literacy professional development needs*. Kansas State University, Manhattan. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/2097/3856

Stronge, J. H. (2007). *Qualities of effective teachers*. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Stronge, J. H., Ward, T. J., & Grant, L. W. (2011). What makes good teachers good? A cross-case analysis of the connection between teacher effectiveness and student

achievement. *Journal of Teacher Education, 62*(4), 339-355. doi:10.1177/0022487111404241

Vidmar, D. J. (2005). Reflective peer coaching: Crafting collaborative self-assessment in teaching. *Research Strategies, 20*(3), 135-148. doi:10.1016/j.resstr.2006.06.002

Walter, S. (2005). Improving instruction: What librarians can learn from the study of college teaching. In H. A. Thompson (Ed.), *Currents and convergence : Navigating the rivers of change : Proceedings of the twelfth national conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, April 7-10, 2005, Minneapolis, Minnesota* (pp. 363-379). Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Ware, S. A. (2002). IDNA for librarians: Assessing instructional development needs. *portal: Libraries & the Academy, 2*(3), 401-412. doi:10.1353/pla.2002.0067

Westbrock, T., & Fabian, S. (2010). Proficiencies for instruction librarians: Is there still a disconnect between professional education and professional responsibilities? *College & Research Libraries, 71*(6), 569-590. Retrieved from http://crl.acrl.org/content/71/6/569.full.pdf+html

APPENDIX

2007 Proficiency Categories Ranking Survey and Open Feedback

1. Please provide your Top 6 ranking of the following ACRL Instruction Proficiencies in the order that you value them as factors in your Teaching Excellence (1 indicates the most valued proficiency).
   - Administrative skills
   - Assessment and evaluation skills
   - Communication skills
   - Curriculum knowledge
   - Information literacy integration skills
   - Instructional design skills
   - Leadership skills
   - Planning skills
   - Presentation skills
   - Promotion skills
   - Subject expertise
   - Teaching skills

2. Is there a proficiency not covered by ACRL Instruction Proficiencies which you value highly and which you feel should be addressed as part of the OSUL Teaching Excellence project? If so, please note it here.

3. Please share other thoughts you may have regarding OSUL Teaching Excellence.