

12-2023

Quality Matters: Using a Peer-Review Process to Create a Cohesive Multi-Campus Library Online Instruction Program

Stephanie Jacobs

University of South Florida, sajacobs@usf.edu

Maryellen Nash

Nashville State Community College, Maryellen.Nash@nsc.edu

Theresa Burress

University of South Florida, tburress@usf.edu

Kaya van Beynen

University of South Florida, kayatown@usf.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/comminfolit>



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), and the [Information Literacy Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Jacobs, S., Nash, M., Burress, T., & van Beynen, K. (2023). Quality Matters: Using a Peer-Review Process to Create a Cohesive Multi-Campus Library Online Instruction Program. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 17 (2), 487–509. <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2023.17.2.9>

This open access Innovative Practice is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License \(CC BY-NC-SA 4.0\)](#). All documents in PDXScholar should meet [accessibility standards](#). If we can make this document more accessible to you, [contact our team](#).

Quality Matters: Using a Peer-Review Process to Create a Cohesive Multi-Campus Library Online Instruction Program

Stephanie Jacobs, University of South Florida
Maryellen Nash, Nashville State Community College
Theresa Burress, University of South Florida
Kaya van Beynen, University of South Florida

Abstract

Librarians within a newly combined, multi-campus research and instruction department undertook a large-scale peer review of their online instruction program and materials. This collaborative assessment project sought to unite three library departments with a cohesive vision for self-guided online library instruction while establishing consistent quality standards and building a shared sense of ownership and accomplishment. These goals were achieved through a collaborative assessment of online instructional modules that included the development of a novel rubric based on the Quality Matters Course Design Standards. This article reports on that ongoing journey, as well as the goals, challenges, and outcomes of the process, which at its core was dedicated to ensuring that high-quality online research, information, and data literacy programming are available for faculty and students. The processes and structures that the team built to facilitate collaboration and quality assurance may serve as a model for other academic libraries experiencing similar transitions.

Keywords: Quality Matters, information and data literacy, asynchronous online instruction

Innovative Practices

edited by Andrea Baer, Carolyn Gamtso, and Merinda McLure

Jacobs, S., Nash, M., Burress, T., & van Beynen, K. (2023). Quality matters: Using a peer-review process to create a cohesive multi-campus library online instruction program. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 17(2), 487–509.

Copyright for articles published in *Communications in Information Literacy* is retained by the author(s). Author(s) also extend to *Communications in Information Literacy* the right to redistribute this article via other scholarly resources and bibliographic databases. This extension allows the authors' copyrighted content to be included in some databases that are distributed and maintained by for-profit companies. All other rights of redistribution are licensed by *Communications in Information Literacy* under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).

Quality Matters: Using a Peer-Review Process to Create a Cohesive Multi-Campus Library Online Instruction Program

College and university libraries have been offering asynchronous, online information literacy programming to varying degrees and purposes for decades. Often, staff or librarians with instructional design expertise coordinate this type of programming to serve distance-learning programs. With the advent of the COVID-19 pandemic in the spring of 2020 and the abrupt move to remote learning across the globe, many research and instruction departments quickly increased the scope of their existing online instruction or developed online instructional materials for the first time. Online pedagogical and accessibility standards can help ensure the development of a cohesive portfolio of online instructional materials, especially when the creators of individual tutorials have varying levels of expertise and familiarity with specific learning management systems. Quality Matters (QM) Course Design Standards (Quality Matters, 2023), a national certification program for developing and assessing online courses, can be employed as a common framework for ensuring the best quality and standardization practices for online information and data literacy instruction.

A newly consolidated, multi-campus Research & Instruction (R&I) Department initiated a collaborative assessment of online instructional modules to accomplish three goals: (a) unite three separate R&I departments with one shared vision for online library instruction, (b) establish consistent standards by utilizing a peer-review process for quality improvement, and (c) create a common instructional access point for faculty and students on all three campuses. This case study documents each stage of a large-scale assessment initiative, including the development of a rubric for best practices in online library instruction based on QM Standards, professional development sessions to unite research and instruction librarians from three campuses, and the implementation of a cross-campus peer-review process using the rubric to ensure that all online workshops are accessible, informative, engaging, and consistent. Being newly consolidated, the librarians of this new R&I department could use the ensuing peer-review period as a time to get to know each other and each other's work products while simultaneously working toward goals of overall improvement. The model of previously unconnected units being brought together in this way could inspire other libraries going through reorganizations or onboarding new librarians and spur innovation through continuous improvements to the materials. The

Jacobs et al.

*Quality Matters: Peer Review to Create Cohesive
Online Instruction Program*

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

choice of the QM framework also served the multiple goals of this project – a high-quality, efficient, and non-judgmental means to establish common ground among librarians of varying levels of experience in asynchronous learning design (Newby et al., 2014).

Background

The University of South Florida (USF) has three campuses which are located in Tampa, St. Petersburg, and Sarasota-Manatee, cities surrounding Tampa Bay. In 2018, the Governor of Florida signed into law the requirement that the three separately accredited campuses of the University of South Florida become consolidated into one university as of July 1, 2020. Librarians on all three campuses had provided library instruction through a variety of formats, such as one-shot sessions, embedded lessons, and video tutorials. Librarians developed and implemented these services independently within their respective R&I units, with collegial but limited interactions among the campuses. As this article focuses on asynchronous workshops, the following descriptions specifically illustrate each unit's engagement with asynchronous instruction pre-consolidation.

USF Tampa Campus

The Tampa campus is the largest USF campus, serving approximately 44,000 students, and is classified as an R1: Doctoral University. Pre-COVID and pre-consolidation, the R&I librarians did not provide online asynchronous instruction, and none of the librarians were familiar with QM. Instead, they used an in-person drop-in workshop model aligned with the campus's General Education curriculum (University of South Florida, 2018). Students who completed the workshops would earn a digital badge as evidence of skill and knowledge acquisition in required areas. Each librarian independently designed one or more workshops with distinct learning objectives, learning activities, and assessments that comprised a catalog of face-to-face workshops.

USF St. Petersburg Campus

The USF St. Petersburg campus serves approximately 5,000 undergraduate and master's level students. Prior to consolidation, the St. Petersburg campus's online library instructional model consisted of a series of self-guided, interactive research skills workshops based on the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL, 2000) *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*. Additionally, the campus had a strategic goal requiring all online courses to undergo QM peer review and certification. All librarians

were familiar with the QM Standards and associated peer-review process, and one librarian was a QM-certified peer reviewer. An instructional designer created a workshop template utilizing the Google Forms platform, integrating elements of QM best practices and accessibility into its format and structure. Creation of the information literacy content was the responsibility of the individual librarians, and a peer-review process was utilized whenever workshops were created or updated.

USF Sarasota-Manatee Campus

The USF Sarasota-Manatee campus serves approximately 1,800 students, focusing on undergraduate students and professional graduate programs in business and hospitality. Before consolidation, the Sarasota-Manatee campus did not provide asynchronous online library instruction. However, the campus librarian had a long history of working collaboratively with instructional designers on that campus and was a certified QM peer reviewer.

COVID-19 & Consolidation

In March 2020, USF moved to remote work in response to the global COVID-19 pandemic. The R&I librarians in Tampa quickly converted their face-to-face curriculum to an online format using the university's Canvas Learning Management System (LMS), embedding digital badges within each of the twelve online workshops. However, the speed of the conversion process resulted in issues of consistency, quality, and accessibility. The consolidation effort further complicated this situation because the modules went live at the beginning of the 2020 summer semester without coordination with the other campuses that had active online instructional materials with considerable overlapping content.

The USF St. Petersburg campus librarians recognized that their online workshop portfolio needed to move to a new platform based on the IT changes introduced during consolidation. Situated within the context of consolidation and realizing that some workshops on each campus covered duplicative content, the St. Petersburg librarians were reluctant to embark on a major conversion project without coordinating with their colleagues in Tampa and Sarasota-Manatee. Thus, the St. Petersburg librarians prioritized the conversion of workshops that were (a) frequently used by USF St. Petersburg faculty and (b) not duplicative with the Tampa campus's workshops. To facilitate the conversion process, an instructional designer on the St. Petersburg campus provided a Canvas course template using QM best practices.

On July 1, 2020, the three separate campuses of USF became a single accredited university, geographically distributed. In August 2020, USF St. Petersburg promoted the senior R&I librarian to Associate Dean of R&I for the USF Libraries, overseeing the R&I librarians on all three campuses. As such, the administration charged her with providing overall departmental leadership, promoting cross-campus library collaboration, identifying efficiencies, and integrating unit activities to meet the new One USF requirements. Thus, the context was set for this initiative: the COVID-19 pandemic, consolidation, and remote work created an urgent need for a shared online information and data literacy workshop program.

Literature Review

The pressures from the pandemic to pivot to primarily online or remote services and resources have spurred increases in and continuous improvements to library-centered curricula on a wide scale (Becker, 2020; Boczar & Jordan, 2022). Assessment and improvement of these online instructional materials are part of a cycle that can—and should—repeat. It is a natural outcome of the desire to improve the efficacy of library instruction and student learning. The library literature has described various assessment types, improvements, and innovations in instructional materials and curricula. Assessment of in-person library instruction has often taken the form of teaching observation (Alabi & Weare, 2013), assessment of student learning (Dahlen & Leuzinger, 2020), evaluation of syllabi (Alcock & Rose, 2016), or combinations thereof, while rubrics feature in these assessments as well (Fielden 2010). The utility of rubrics in assessing in-person library instruction curricula has been represented heavily in reports that address assessment through evaluation of teaching materials, but the use of rubrics has also been described in texts dealing with attitudinal/engagement surveys and usability testing/focus groups, as Dahlen and Leuzinger modeled in their 2020 article.

As the call for synchronous and asynchronous online instruction has increased, the higher education community has looked to the QM Course Design Rubric Standards (Quality Matters, 2023) as a resource for improving credit-earning courses. Many librarians seeking to strengthen their non-credit-earning instruction programs have also utilized this tool (Goodsett, 2017; Newby et al., 2014). Allowing librarians to interrogate their work through the standards of the QM Rubric—structure, objectives, measurable assessment, materials, activities, interaction, platform, support, and usability—provides a starting point to examine

their research, information, and data literacy skills curricula against the same standards as credit-bearing courses. Librarians using the QM Rubric may modify or adapt it to address specific institutional needs and circumstances while still hewing closely to its principles. Overall, reports on using this rubric have been very positive, with the QM Standards providing high-quality benchmarks against which instruction materials can be compared (Newby et al., 2014).

Assessment of teaching materials is a cornerstone of the QM review process, which relies on peer review to implement that program's standards (Quality Matters, 2023). Peer review of online instructional materials is one way for librarians to improve the quality of their content, but it also has other utilities. Finley et al. (2005) identified their "peer planning" project to "create a supportive environment for experimentation" (p. 112), and Oberlies et al. (2020) reported on the use of peer observation as a way to strengthen mentorship in a teaching library. These case studies, together with the QM Rubric, helped guide this project team in their goal to engage newly merged groups of librarians with each other and each other's work to improve the instruction curriculum.

With the rapid move to large-scale online library instruction, the library literature has yet to focus on strategies to parlay individually created digital learning objects programmatically. Foster, Shurtz, and Pepper (2014) discussed the creation of an evaluation rubric to assess freely available online evidence-based practice instructional modules. In this case, the digital objects were created by different librarians at different institutions, with the goal of selecting quality modules for use rather than evaluating or improving their own librarians' creations. Gola et al. (2014) discussed how the use of a "common rubric with standardized language ... contributes to the provision of a cross-disciplinary, common learning experience for students" (p. 141). Similarly, Gardner and Acosta (2010) noted that the use of a rubric "led to increased standardization in library instruction" (p. 165). These approaches inform the process discussed in this case study. The restructuring and standardization of instruction materials across groups was a key goal of the project described in this paper. The QM framework can provide a structure to facilitate assessment and improvement, even in libraries with multiple content creators using a range of creation styles, as well as librarians who may be new to the process of digital object development. The use of rubrics, QM, and peer review for assessing online learning materials is a fertile area for discussion in libraries.

Project Planning & Implementation

With consolidation, the USF libraries needed to present stakeholders with a unified library web presence and a cohesive instructional program, particularly for electronic services and resources. For the R&I librarians, this requirement entailed combining virtual reference systems, integrating instances of LibGuides, and creating a single online library instruction program. The vision for the online instruction portfolio included self-paced, interactive workshops delivered via the Canvas LMS, where students could self-enroll and complete each workshop as directed by their instructors. Faculty and students were already familiar with Canvas, so using it to deliver workshops seemed practical.

Using the LMS had the additional advantage of providing a built-in means of student tracking. Canvas Analytics allows for data collection and assessment of the usage and efficacy of the workshops, enabling librarians to connect their work more explicitly to the university's student success mission. However, librarians only have access to this information if they are the owners of the Canvas course shells, which house the instructional content. If course instructors copy a Canvas module into their own courses, librarians lose this data. Although it may have been more convenient for faculty to import workshops into their own Canvas courses, the discrete course shells provided three main benefits: (a) the ability for faculty and students to browse the full list of workshops, (b) a mechanism to identify topics most relevant to instructional goals, and (c) the ability to maintain control over library instructional content to ensure that outdated course materials do not get replicated and perpetuated by instructors who copy their existing course content from one semester to another.

To realize these visions, a small planning team (comprised of the Associate Dean for R&I, the Director of R&I on the Tampa campus, the Assistant Director of R&I on the St. Petersburg campus, and an instructional design librarian on the Tampa campus), drafted planning documents, spreadsheets, and timelines housed within the institution's collaborative cloud-based storage space. The planning team discussed and refined the documents with input and feedback from departmental team members on all campuses. The first task that the team addressed was the planning and delivery of a slate of professional development sessions designed to introduce the project and to establish three primary project components: (a) instructional design best practices, (b) QM Standards, and (c) an overview of the peer-review process.

Communicating a Vision of a Shared Online Instructional Program

The planning team organized a series of virtual professional development sessions for all the R&I librarians in the fall semester. Their purpose was to work together to establish a baseline set of best practices and expectations for online workshop design, including learning objectives, workshop format and structure, accessibility, and assessment. The workshops covered the following topics:

- **Learning Objectives:** The Director of R&I on the Tampa campus led this workshop, which addressed two major areas: (a) criteria for constructing measurable learning objectives and (b) use of active verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy that contribute to quality, robust objectives that align with instructional activities and assessments.
- **QM Standards for Online Education:** An instructional designer on the St. Petersburg campus provided an overview of QM Standards with a focus on accessibility and described how these guidelines could be practically implemented within the Canvas LMS.
- **USF Libraries R&I Peer Review Rubric Introduction:** The authors co-led this workshop to introduce librarians to the draft rubric and the proposed structure and schedule of the peer-review process. During and after the workshop, librarians provided comments and suggestions that were used to refine and improve the rubric and the peer-review process.

Between the second and third workshops, the authors updated the St. Petersburg campus library's Canvas course template to explicitly incorporate the QM Standards and to provide guidance for the accessibility of multimedia content. The Tampa campus library's workshops needed to implement this template as well to ensure consistency of standards, format, and appearance, while the St. Petersburg campus library's workshops needed updating to incorporate the agreed-upon improvements.

Adapting QM Rubric for Librarian Peer Review

The planning team used QM Standards (2023) to guide the development of a rubric. The team initially structured the draft rubric in accordance with the order of the standards in the QM Rubric, but it quickly became apparent that these standards required tailoring to suit the needs of the library instruction program. The QM Standards were created to provide best practices for online instructional delivery of for-credit courses that can include up to 15

modules. In contrast, each library information and data literacy workshop was comprised of only one to two modules. Additionally, some elements of each QM standard pertained to longer-term aspects of course management and communication and were not directly applicable to workshops intended as one-use, self-guided instructional objects.

Beginning with the QM Standards most relevant for asynchronous workshops, the authors grouped similar standards and best practices and reordered the content to create a rubric that the librarians could use as they reviewed an online workshop (see Appendix A). Table 1 shows the rubric organization as mapped to the QM Standards.

Table 1: QM Standards Used in Rubric

Rubric	QM Standard
Welcome, Outcomes, and Instructions	1 - Course Overview/Introduction 2 - Learning Objectives 6 - Course Technology 7 - Learner & Instructor Support
Assessments and Activities	3 - Assessment and Measurement 5 - Course Activities
Content, Media, and Accessibility	4 - Instructional Materials 8 - Accessibility and Usability
Concluding Page	7 - Learner and Instructor Support
Navigation Bar	6 - Course Technology

The team strove to create an instrument that all the R&I librarians could use to review specific online workshops efficiently. In addition to the peer-review instrument, the planning team instructed the librarians to examine the workshop learning outcomes in terms of the following characteristics:

- Short statements describing the specific knowledge or skills the student is expected to achieve by the end of the module.
- Action-oriented language following the model of Bloom’s Taxonomy.
- Number and scope of objectives aligned with module content.

- Objectives written in proper format (condition, performance, criteria). For example: “Given an example research question, identify at least three keywords that can be used when searching a database.”
- Module topic and learning outcomes aligned with USF Enhanced General Education Objectives (2018) and the ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (2015).

The librarians were encouraged to provide both positive comments and constructive recommendations that the workshop creators could use to revise and improve the workshops, as in the following examples:

- Offer guidance on what the workshop creator should consider, including possible solutions.
- If the comment is regarding format:
 1. Consult rubric for specifications – what changes should be made?
 2. Would the creator benefit from the template?
- If the comment is regarding content:
 1. Should the content be expanded – how?
 2. Should the content be condensed – how?
 3. Should the flow be reorganized – how?
- Be specific in comments as to the individual item, referencing the page and section of the workshop where items are located:
 1. What was missing? (e.g., closed captioning, video transcripts, etc.)
 2. What needed to be fixed? (e.g., broken URL, incorrect or not working quiz question, etc.)

The final, open-ended section labeled “Questions for the Reviewer” solicited input on programmatic concerns such as appropriate scaffolding and how the content of each workshop fit within the context of the entire portfolio. These comments were used for planning and developing the USF Libraries’ website, which would be the common access point for faculty and students across all campuses.

Each discrete element of the rubric included space for the peer reviewer to provide a rating based on a three-point scale, along with space for notes and questions. Instead of being a scorecard, the planning team intended for the rubric's three-point scale to be used as an indicator of the extent of required edits, not a wholesale judgment of success or failure. Instead of a total point tally, the planning team asked the librarians to use the rating to indicate discrete areas that needed attention. In addition to the substantive peer review, the project team (the authors) conducted a brief programmatic review of each Canvas workshop for purposes of standardization as well as ensuring continuity and access in the event of future personnel changes. For example, planning team members checked each workshop to ensure that both the original creator and their departmental supervisor were owners of the Canvas course. For purposes of technical assistance, the USF Tampa workshops also included the departmental instructional designer as a course co-owner. Finally, each team member reviewed one or more workshops to certify that the following standard course settings were used:

- Each instructional module contains a self-enrollment link serving as a student access point.
- All modules include a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Share Alike license.
- Modules are labeled as viewable to the public.
- Each title image that appears on the Canvas dashboard may be a stock image that is subject-related. The librarians did not use any university logos in this area because using the logo would make the modules more difficult to distinguish from one another.

Peer Review and Project Outcome

The initial scope of this project comprised 20 library workshops hosted on Canvas (see Appendix B for workshop titles). The workshops were assessed by 19 librarian reviewers from all three USF campus libraries. As this occurred during the first phase of the COVID-19 pandemic, all the librarians were working remotely, communicating virtually via the Microsoft Teams platform. The Associate Dean for R&I created and shared an administrative spreadsheet to be maintained by the departmental supervisors on each

campus to track the workshops and the peer-review assignments and to ensure the timely completion of updates.

During the planning process, the project team identified peer reviewers for each workshop, considering several guidelines:

- At least two reviewers, located on different campuses, would review each workshop.
- Each librarian would review at least one workshop.
- The reviewer's area of expertise was relevant to the workshop topic.
- Blind peer reviews could not be conducted due to the need for reviewer subject expertise and the group's small size; however, reviewer names were not listed on the peer reviews to make workshop creator or peer reviewer identities less obvious.

As stated earlier, the planning team held a professional development series to launch the assessment project and established a project timeline to accommodate the academic calendar. The peer reviews were completed and submitted to departmental supervisors late in the fall 2020 semester. The supervisors compiled each pair of reviews, providing one merged review to each workshop creator. Once the librarians completed their peer evaluations, the project leaders distributed the rubric to four of the libraries' student workers to collect assessment data from their perspectives. Using the same rubric as the librarians, the students assessed the same criteria while keeping a student-centered experience in mind. The student workers submitted the completed rubrics to the departmental supervisors, and the supervisors then consolidated all feedback into a single compiled rubric, which was given to the workshop creators for consideration. This additional feedback was valuable, as it highlighted usability issues such as confusing language, quiz inconsistencies, and irregularities in the micro-credentialing (badging) process. The workshop creators completed revisions by the start of the spring 2021 semester. In total, USF librarians and library student workers completed over 40 peer reviews for the existing 20 Canvas workshops. The department then marketed its consolidated, updated digital instructional portfolio to all three campuses via a unified Information + Data Literacy Online Workshop webpage and Toolkit (USF Libraries, 2021).

During the spring semester, 2,877 unique students completed 4,981 Canvas workshops, with 50% completing two or more workshops. While somewhat out of the scope of this case study, it is worth noting that the Canvas working group decided to define workshop

completion as the student having passed each workshop's final quiz with a qualifying score to earn the workshop badge. The group has not yet explored correlations between workshop badge acquisition and student success metrics such as GPA, retention, and persistence, but these areas represent a possible line of inquiry for further research, along with a cross-tabulation of completion by workshop type.

The top five workshops in terms of student use were: 1) *Help, I Need This! How Do I Find It?* 2) *Avoiding Plagiarism*, 3) *Creating Manageable Topics and Research Questions*, 4) *Primary Sources in the Sciences*, and 5) *Discovering Evidence for Opposing Claims*. The top 10 departments with students that completed the workshops were: 1) Chemistry, 2) Environmental Science & Policy, 3) Psychology, 4) Communication, 5) Public Health, 6) Criminology, 7) Integrative Biology, 8) History, 9) Childhood Education & Literacy Studies, and 10) Global Studies. These preliminary usage statistics imply that faculty are using both general and disciplinary-focused workshops across the curriculum.

Sustainable Management and Improvement of Online Instruction Portfolio

To ensure the continued relevance and sustainability of the newly established workshop portfolio while building upon the strengthening atmosphere of cross-campus professional compatibility, departmental supervisors convened a working group with members from each campus. They charged them with formulating guidelines and processes governing all self-guided Canvas workshops within the Information + Data Literacy Workshop portfolio. The main priorities of this working group include:

- Define the scope of the Canvas workshop portfolio within the context of the library instruction program.
- Develop sustainable processes for managing and coordinating creator access, regular update cycles, and shared Canvas workshop template responsibility.
- Establish processes and guidelines for programmatic assessment, including vetting new workshop topics and determining criteria for retiring workshops.

At the time of this writing, this working group has been meeting for approximately 18 months and has made substantial progress on all three priorities. This post-implementation work has provided opportunities to reflect on lessons learned while uncovering additional

aspects of workshop portfolio management necessary for this multi-campus program's continued effectiveness and sustainability, as described below.

Peer Review

Using a peer-review process to establish a common framework for the university's online library instruction portfolio proved to be an effective start to the development of a longer-term assessment plan that would codify the value of content experts and students as reviewers, thus mitigating future potential disagreements regarding instructional content and programmatic guidelines. As mentioned in the section detailing the structure and coordination of peer review, the librarians conducted an in-depth peer review using the rubric. Their information and data literacy expertise was crucial in assessing the alignment between learning objectives and content, identifying coverage gaps, and providing solution recommendations.

Review/Update Schedule

Although the leadership team had anticipated that the workshops would require regular updates every two to three years, the working group determined that at least some review needed to be done annually to reflect changes in library systems and associated user interfaces. For example, one year into the new program, a condensed, accelerated workshop review undertaken by the members of the working group took place to reflect a new discovery tool implemented across the state university system that affected the look and feel of user interfaces. This review schedule also highlighted the corresponding need to limit the number of workshops within the portfolio to ensure sustainability of maintenance efforts.

Decision-Making About Content and Retiring Workshops

The large-scale peer review described in this article was less effective at addressing overarching programmatic content and scaffolding because each librarian reviewed only a small subset of the portfolio. The condensed peer review referenced above provided an opportunity for the smaller working group to review a larger subset of workshops, thus gaining a broader programmatic perspective.

This secondary (condensed) review concurrently revealed duplicative content among multiple workshops, presenting an opportunity to further consolidate or retire some workshops, thus streamlining the portfolio. This prompted additional discussion on the review of usage statistics. Some workshops with high usage by general education instructors

had outdated content; others with newly developed content on relevant topics, such as data literacy, had lower usage. Additionally, the team was able to see that instructors generally assigned two workshops for their courses.

With this in mind, the working group merged five workshops into two. Three separate workshops were combined into a single introductory workshop called *Finding, Evaluating, & Using Information*. Consolidating these workshops reduced duplication and aligned complementary content. The working group also merged *Data Literacy 1: Finding & Evaluating Data* with *Data Literacy 2: Interpreting Graphs, Tables, and Charts* to create a single workshop. This merger, however, was not as successful, as the group learned that the *Data Literacy 2* workshop met the curricular needs of several Business and Engineering instructors. In response to faculty feedback, the group returned *Data Literacy 2* to our portfolio. Overall, the working group is still grappling with best strategies for determining how and when a workshop should be consolidated or retired, as well as communication practices that effectively inform faculty about changes made to the portfolio while ensuring that librarians are aware of all courses that use our workshops.

Faculty and Student Feedback

Because students use a self-enrollment link to sign up for and complete each workshop, Canvas's analytics tool does not collect data regarding which faculty are assigning workshops in their courses. A Qualtrics survey was embedded in each course to collect this information and address this issue. The two-question survey simply asks students whether the workshop is required as part of a course and, if so, the name of the instructor. This data was not meant to be evaluative, but it is extremely important so workshop creators can understand which courses use the workshops. It is also potentially helpful for liaison librarians to understand which of their faculty may be utilizing this instructional material. However, the working group is still developing a workflow to disseminate this information to all R&I librarians effectively.

Workshop Marketing and Outreach

Based on preliminary statistics, the working group found that usage of individual workshops seemed to be linked closely to the campus of the workshop creators. For example, workshops with a disciplinary focus were widely used by faculty on the workshop creator's campus, while the corresponding liaison librarians on the other campuses did not

necessarily promote these if they were not the original creators. As a result, the department has initiated a cross-campus marketing campaign for faculty.

Workshop Ownership

Since the beginning of this project, several of the original creators have retired, and new R&I librarians have been hired. The working group is considering adjustments to workshop ownership to better align ownership responsibilities with librarians in similar liaison disciplines and to allow new librarians to contribute their insights to the online instruction program. This transition has proved to be an opportunity for librarians to develop deeper levels of familiarity with a range of workshops and to foster multi-campus collaboration in workshop promotion writ large.

Meeting Consolidated R&I Unit and Distinct Campus Needs

As described in the background of this article, each campus engaged with asynchronous learning materials to varying degrees. While the benefits and drawbacks of consolidating this program will become clearer with continued assessment, some initial benefits are accruing to each campus. For example, the maintenance and updates of a single portfolio of 20 workshops are now spread amongst a larger group of librarians, rather than librarians on each campus independently maintaining 12 and 20 workshops, respectively. In addition, students and faculty from the USF Sarasota-Manatee campus now have access to the entire portfolio, which opens new capacity for the sole librarian on that campus to focus on customized information literacy instruction.

Conclusion

Throughout this project, the development and peer review of a cohesive portfolio of online library instruction workshops served as a new beginning for all three campuses. While all three campuses had previously produced their own instructional materials of varying types, including face-to-face instructional presentations, library workshops (both in person and online), short (micro-learning) and longer (recorded lecture) instructional videos, and individual instructional modules situated within courses, this project marked the first cross-campus instructional effort and collaborative work product.

These workshops are one component of a larger instructional effort, with the consolidated R&I unit also offering a series of synchronous library workshops, a large library of instructional videos, class instruction, and more. Librarians from the consolidated USF

Libraries' R&I unit have continued their collaborative efforts beyond the scope of this project and will extend their focus to continued assessment and improvement. The USF Libraries' R&I unit will continue to use this peer-review process, updating the rubric and Canvas workshop templates as our asynchronous library instruction program evolves. Ongoing challenges include sustaining momentum and maintaining the capacity to manage a comprehensive portfolio of digital objects effectively. Further assessment that integrates varied stakeholder voices and perspectives into our library instruction program is needed. These assessment methods include the following:

- Faculty focus groups: Soliciting feedback through targeted focus groups with USF faculty who utilize the workshops to ascertain areas for further refinement and to determine how the USF Libraries' instruction program, including Canvas workshops and other instructional resources, can better meet their needs.
- Analysis and reflection on usage data and faculty feedback: Strategically considering how to expand or reduce the range of workshop offerings while scaffolding learning from foundational to mastery-level skills.
- Systematically mapping workshop content to the ACRL *Framework* and companion documents (ACRL Science and Technology Section IL Framework Task Force, 2022; ACRL Women's and Gender Studies Section Instruction Committee, 2021) to identify duplicative content and conceptual gaps across workshops.

Recent working group investigations of *Framework* companion documents may be particularly valuable in guiding revisions that address non-Western conceptions of knowledge and the role of patriarchy in scientific publishing and dissemination practices (ACRL Science and Technology Section IL Framework Task Force, 2022; ACRL Women's and Gender Studies Section Instruction Committee, 2021; Oberlies et al. 2020).

During the COVID-19 pandemic and consolidation, our journey to build the cohesive Information + Data Literacy Online Workshop program across multiple campuses while engaging many librarians has not always been easy. That said, the assessment rubric based on the QM Standards was an effective tool for establishing common ground, developing shared standards, and improving the quality of our instructional objects. The professional development series allowed librarians with varying areas of expertise to contribute and learn from one another. The peer-review process was successful in cross-campus team

building and has led to the collaborative development of new workshops. Whether this initiative would have been as successful without the move to remote work and the dominance of virtual communication that erased the distance created by physical geography will never be known. However, the processes and structures that successfully facilitated collaboration and quality improvement can be used as a model for other university libraries undergoing similar transformative processes.

References

- Alabi, J. & Weare, W. H. (2013, August 23). *The power of observation: How librarians can benefit from the peer review of teaching even without a formal PROT program* [Conference presentation]. Georgia International Conference on Information Literacy, Statesboro, GA, United States. <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/gaintlit/2013/2013/1>
- Alcock, E. & Rose, K. (2016). Find the gap: Evaluating library instruction reach using syllabi. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 10(1), 86–98. <https://doi.org/10.11645/10.1.2038>.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2000). *Information literacy competency standards for higher education*. <https://alair.ala.org/handle/11213/7668>
- Association of College and Research Libraries (2015). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. <https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>
- Association of College and Research Libraries. Science and Technology Section IL Framework Task Force (2022). *Companion document to the ACRL Framework for information literacy for higher education: Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics*. https://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/standards/Framework_Companion_STEM.pdf
- Association of College and Research Libraries. Women's and Gender Studies Section Instruction Committee. (2021). *Companion document to the ACRL Framework for information literacy for higher education: Women's and gender studies*. https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/wgs_framework
- Becker, D. A. (2020). Creating online teaching resources and suggesting mobile apps in the time of COVID 19. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries*, 17(3–4), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15424065.2020.1829233>

- Boczar, A., & Jordan, S. (2022). Continuity during COVID: Critical digital pedagogy and special collections virtual instruction. *IFLA Journal*, 48(1), 99–111.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/03400352211023795>
- Dahlen, S. P., Leuzinger, R. (2020). Impact of library instruction on the development of student skills in synthesis and source attribution: A model for academic program assessment. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 46(6), Article 102254
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102254>
- Fielden, N. (2010). Follow the rubric road: Assessing the librarian instructor. In B. Seitz, R. Baier, S. de Vries, S. Fabian, S. Memmott, & R. Stevens (Eds.), *Bridging and beyond: Developing librarian infrastructure: Thirty-eighth National LOEX Library Instruction Conference proceedings, Dearborn, Michigan, April 29–May 1, 2010* (pp. 149–157). Eastern Michigan University. <https://commons.emich.edu/loexconf2010/27>
- Finley, P., Skarl, S., Cox, J., & VanderPol, D. (2005). Enhancing library instruction with peer planning. *Reference Services Review*, 33(1), 112–122.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00907320510581423>
- Foster, M. J., Shurtz, S., & Pepper, C. (2014) Evaluation of best practices in the design of online evidence-based practice instructional modules. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 102(1), 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.102.1.007>
- Gardner, S. & Acosta, E. (2010). Using a rubric to assess freshman English library instruction. In S. Hiller, K. Justh, M. Kyrillidou, & J. Self (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2010 Library Assessment Conference: Building effective, sustainable, practical assessment: October 24–27, 2010* (pp. 159–173). Association of Research Libraries.
https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/librarian_pubs/7/
- Gola, C. H., Ke, I., Creelman, K., & Vaillancourt, S. P. (2014) Developing an information literacy assessment rubric: A case study of collaboration, process, and outcomes. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 8(1), 131–144.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2014.8.1.157>
- Goodsett, M. (2017) *An eLearning partnership: Applying the Quality Matters rubric to online library instructional materials* [Poster presentation]. ALAO Conference. Michael Schwartz Library Publications, 148. https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/msl_facpub/148

- Newby, J., Eagleson, L., & Pfander, J. (2014) Quality matters: New roles for librarians using standards for online course design. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, 8(1-2), 32–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1533290X.2014.916245>
- Oberlies, M. K., Buxton, K., & Zeidman-Karpinski, A. (2020) Adapting evidence-based practices to improve library instruction: Using customized tools to support peer mentoring and observation. *The New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 26(1), 6–30. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2019.1628078>
- Quality Matters. (2023). *QM higher education rubric* (6th ed.). <https://www.qualitymatters.org/qa-resources/rubric-standards>
- University of South Florida. (2018). *Enhanced general education*. <https://www.usf.edu/undergrad/general-education-council/enhanced-gened/enhanced-curriculum.aspx>
- University of South Florida Libraries (2021). *Faculty toolkit*. <https://lib.usf.edu/research-and-instruction/>

Appendix A: Rubric for Peer Review of Library Modules

Module Title: _____

Point Scale: 3 = No Suggestions 2 = Minor revisions 1 = Major revision

Welcome, Outcomes, and Instructions	Points	Notes/Questions
<p>Welcome Page (part 1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Learning objectives are stated on the Welcome Page. They should adhere to Bloom's Taxonomy. <p>Example: After participating in this workshop, you will be able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify... Define... Understand... <p>Questions to ask:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you required to take this module for a course? If yes, please provide the course name and instructor. 		
<p>Welcome page (part 2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimated completion time (including tallying video run times) <p>Example: To successfully complete this module,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Read this introduction Take the Pre-Module Survey View the short video (1:45) View the short video (2:10) View the video presentation (6:32) Complete Activity Complete Final Quiz <p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upon successful completion of this online workshop, you will earn a badge that can be emailed to your instructor. If you are experiencing technical difficulties, please contact the module creator(s) (Provide name and their contact information). 		
Assessments and Activities		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the content of the assessments accurate and relevant? 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peer reviewers will determine whether the learning activities align with the stated learning objectives. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-assessments or non-quiz activities, if included, should provide an example of possible answers for students to compare to. Module should include a min. of 1 interactive activity. Group questions at section breaks rather than throughout to limit required clicks. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All quizzes - must be self-marking through Canvas. All module quizzes should have between 6 and 12 quiz questions. To earn a badge, students must score at least 60%. 		

Content, Media, and Accessibility		
Peer reviewers will provide suggestions on missing content, need for expanded or condensed material.		
<p>Images</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carefully consider images and only use if directly related to content. • All images should have Alt Text description or tagged “Decorative.” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hover over image to see Alt text. 		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you are going to a library website, start at the homepage. • Hyperlinks: hyperlinks should include a title/description on what they lead to (e.g., Library home page). 		
<p>Videos: Title and description should be included before each video.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Text complements videos; a reiteration of content. • All videos have transcripts. • All videos have closed captioning that can be turned on. • It is ideal if videos are embedded, but if video cannot be embedded and requires a subscription login, include instructions on how to do this. <p>Videos should have no more than 4 learning objectives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That is per video, not per module. • Ideally, should include multiple short videos that cover content, rather than a very long single video. • If module includes a video longer than 4 minutes, can the peer reviewer identify any logical place(s) to break into shorter separate videos? 		
Concluding page		
<p>About Module Page (concluding):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide reference to additional resources: relevant USF student support services; e.g., Writing tutors info, etc. • Model best practices and include a bibliography at end of the module; cite all external content, external videos, images, etc. • Link to Research consultation page • Link to USF Libraries home page (lib.usf.edu). • Acknowledgment of module creator(s) & contact information. 		
Navigation Bar		
<p>The navigation bar only includes sections that are actively used and germane to the workshop.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggested Navigation Items that are visible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Home, modules, course Kaltura, badges • Other sections – it’s suggested that they not be visible 		

Appendix B: Consolidated List of Workshop Titles

- *Avoiding Plagiarism*
- *APA Citation Style*
- *Changing Scholarly Perspectives*
- *Chicago Citation Style*
- *Conducting a Literature Review*
- *Creating Manageable Research Topics*
- *Creating Research Poster Presentations*
- *Data Literacy 1: Evaluating Graphs, Tables & Charts*
- *Data Literacy 2: Communicating with Graphs, Tables, and Charts*
- *Finding History*
- *Finding Relevant Information for Research*
- *Help, I Need This! How Do I Find It?*
- *Introduction to Databases*
- *It's a TRAAP: Evaluating Sources*
- *Library Resources for Marketing*
- *MLA Citation Style*
- *Opposing Claims*
- *Primary Sources in the Humanities*
- *Primary Sources in the Sciences*
- *Scholarly Conversations and Modalities*