

LIBRARIAN-FACULTY COLLABORATION IN THE CONNECTICUT STATE
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM: AN EXAMINATION OF CURRENT PRACTICES

Proposal for a Special Project in the Field of
Information and Library Science in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for a Master of Library Science
Degree

Southern Connecticut State University
Department of Information and Library Science
Summer 2011

Frank J. Skornia

skorniafl@owls.southernct.edu

Anticipated Date of Graduation: December 2011

Special Project Proposal Director: Dr. Mary E. Brown, Ph.D., Graduate Faculty

Proposal Review/Action

Approved _____

Revisions Needed _____

Date _____

Introduction and Overview

It is unmistakable that during the past couple of decades the information universe has undergone some radical changes, and these changes continue to come at an ever-increasing rate. It used to be that libraries were a central foundation and gateway to information resources. The rise and spread of the Internet combined with the growth of powerful personal computing and mobile technologies has now created a more distributed world of information. There has been a difficult transition for libraries as their perceived value has decreased among the variety of available information resources. Wendy Lougee (2009) writes about the diffuse library which recognizes that the library no longer is a center of the information universe and in which collaborations and mechanisms to share information are developed. She states that “the digital age has prompted new research methodologies, new modes of learning, and expectations for seamless discovery and access” (p.613). In response, libraries cannot just adapt current methods; they must explore new models and seeking new ways to extend their services to their users. Just as information has spread, librarians must extend their services outside the library as well. One way to perform this outreach is for librarians to form partnerships and collaborate with faculty and other campus agencies.

The need for the academic libraries at the Connecticut State University System (CSUS) to enrich their user services through partnerships and collaborations is even more vital. Not only do they need to meet the changing needs of their service communities, but they need to demonstrate their value to their funders in order to prevent significant budget cuts in the upcoming years. The current condition of the Connecticut State budget is calling for nearly \$59 million to be cut from the CSUS budget for this year and an additional \$61.8 million for 2012-2013 (Phaneuf & Emma, 2011). Libraries are competing for an ever-smaller allotment that

needs to be shared with the entire campus. Therefore, it is crucial they show their value to not only their communities of patrons, but also to the people that make the budgeting decision.

David Shumaker (2009) wrote that reference librarians have immense potential to benefit their communities, but “we can only unlock that value when we establish the relationships that allow us to join their conversations – to identify their information needs” (p. 240). The colleges and universities will not fully know the value of their libraries, unless the librarians are able to tell them. Librarians need to go beyond just marketing their services and need to actively demonstrate how they provide value to their campuses. Becker (2010) writes that increased librarian-faculty collaboration leads to the “increased recognition of one another’s subject expertise” (p. 239). Collaborating outside the library with faculty and other programs is the first step, and it improves the library’s services as well.

There are different degrees of collaborations between librarians and faculty that can all aid in building relationships on the campus. Most academic reference librarians are departmental liaisons, which means they communicate with their assigned academic departments to provide and collect information on collection development and services the library can offer. Often, these librarians are responsible for teaching library instruction courses for classes in their assigned departments; although this is a far from universal situation. The library instruction sessions offer the opportunity for librarians to instruct students on research skills and information literacy. This used to be the extent of the librarians’ interactions with their communities beyond their normal responsibilities in the library.

Recently, librarians have been reaching out and working to serve their patrons closer to their point of need by becoming embedded librarians. Embedded librarianship involves a librarian becoming an active participant of a course, usually this is done virtually through online

course management software, but it is not necessary. Embedded librarians participate in class discussion when students express an information need, such as a research question. The advantage of this situation is that the librarian is present precisely when a student needs him or her and in a venue that is convenient to the student. In addition, as the librarian is observing the course he or she will be able to offer assistance, even when a student does not think he or she needs it, or anticipate a research question and have a response prepared that can be shared with the entire course. Embedded librarianship reflects a major shift in user services at academic libraries where the librarians are no longer waiting for their community to come to them. They are going out to serve the community instead.

Collaborations can reach beyond just the faculty members. Libraries are making partnerships with writing programs and tutoring centers. Like embedded librarianship, these partnerships bring the librarians to the place and time that students need their services. The possibilities for partnerships do not end there, though; librarians are also collaborating with instructional designers and technologists to develop courses and tools to better educate the students. These collaborations either allow librarians to make adjustments to courses to improve research skills or to actually instruct their own courses focused on information literacy and developing research skills.

The purpose of my special project will be to try and determine the range of collaborations between librarians and the other faculty in the Connecticut State University system. As the twelve community colleges in Connecticut are being reorganized under the same mantle as the four state universities, I intend to include them as well in my research. As I mentioned earlier, the academic libraries in Connecticut are going to have to vie to maintain their budget. I believe that librarians are going to have to reach out to their campuses to sell their value as an important

asset to the institution. To be able to effectively know what the libraries should be doing, it is important to examine what is currently being done and establish a baseline. That is what the first part my special project is intending to determine.

The second part of my project will be to give a series of recommendations about the likely ways that CSUS academic libraries can increase their collaborations and partnerships with their campus. This will require studying what other institutions have done and determining what may work best at the CSUS libraries. I intend to combine these two parts into a summary of findings that will be provided to the CSUS libraries so they can see the picture of their current state and possible recommendations for the future.

Significance and Relevance

There are a couple of major factors that may trouble the Connecticut State University System (CSUS) in the future. The first is the changing face of information and knowledge. Hunter and Ward (2011) write that the “dynamic information world points to the importance of diversifying librarian skills sets to include competence with a wide variety of technologies, assessment methodologies, and strategies for collaborating with students and faculty” (p. 267). Librarians are going to need to adapt as their environment shifts around them. Libraries are no longer recognized as the primary repository for information; they now compete with other information products, services, and venues. Libraries and librarians cannot be trying to catch up to the information environment today, but must be ready to evolve for the changes that will come tomorrow.

The second major factor is that of diminishing resources for higher education in Connecticut. Due to the ongoing budget crisis in the state, the state government is heavily cutting the budget for the CSU system. The university system is already undergoing significant strain as the four state universities and the twelve community colleges are being folded under the same administration. All of this means that the CSUS libraries The CSUS libraries now deal with increased competition for patrons’ attention and required operational resources. An example of the resource strain is shown by the director of Buley Library at Southern Connecticut State University, Christina Baum (2010), being asked to submit a budget for 2011-2012 with 15% cuts to the base (p. 2). The CSUS libraries need to demonstrate their value to their governing boards and committees and gain favor from the people making the decisions in order to get their necessary share of financial resources. They can do this by having services that reach beyond the library and have a noticeable impact on the academics of the institution.

One of the steps in an instructional design is a needs assessment. This step determines whether there is a need for an individual or organization that is not being met by current knowledge or behavior. Part of the needs assessment is to set a baseline threshold so that an instructor can determine if there has been improvement. If the CSUS libraries are going to change to meet evolving demands and challenges, they have to have a tool to measure the effectiveness of the change. The author's intent is that this study will serve as a needs assessment for the current state of librarian-faculty collaboration in the Connecticut State University System (CSUS). It is important to understand the status quo and the reasons for it, before knowing ways to make adjustments.

The Special Project aligns with the author's professional desire to become an academic reference and instruction librarian. There are several major advantages to the author's professional development and program of study. It gives the author mentored experience in the library research process. Library research is a key aspect to the careers of academic librarians, so gaining initial experience with the availability of experienced advice decreases the anxiety of such an undertaking. The second benefit is that it will give the author valuable insight into the current status and viewpoints of instruction librarians in Connecticut. The author will be able to learn what challenges the librarians encounter and ways that they overcome them. The author is also seeking to discover what initiatives have worked elsewhere, and he hopes to acquire insight into how they may be adapted to wherever he may be employed. Finally, there is the chance that the author may learn about additional skills and competencies for academic instruction librarians and be able prepare himself accordingly when seeking employment.

Literature Review

The Development of the Librarian Collaborations

The idea of embedded librarianship did not just develop out of a vacuum. Much of the thinking behind it is derived from activities and duties that academic librarians already perform. Many academic libraries in the United States have some form of liaison system to connect librarians to academic departments in the institution. The “Guidelines for Liaison Work in Managing Collections and Services” (2001) from the Reference and User Services Association (RUSA) division of the American Library Association (ALA) provides the suggested activities that a departmental liaison librarian should be involved in, including involving “their clientele in collection management as much as possible” (6.3.1). Therefore, it is already expected that academic libraries are interacting with agencies outside the library for collection development purposes. Increased collaboration with teaching faculty and campus organizations and providing user services outside the traditional library framework are just the next steps down the path for changing libraries.

The needs of the libraries’ communities are changing rapidly, and many academic libraries are seeking ways to “reconfigure their role on campus, modify their collections, and enhance the technological skills of the staff” (Hunter & Ward, 2011, p. 264). One of the ways they are accomplishing this is by adding to the partnerships they have on campus: working closely with faculty on instructional designs and making themselves available through new mediums. The librarians are still working for their core goals, but are doing it in new fashions.

Library Instruction

Embedded librarianship and collaboration with the teaching faculty commonly begins as an extension of the library or bibliographic instruction that is already included in the duties for many academic reference librarians. Before the advances in technology lowered the barriers to information searching, much of the library instruction was focused on the mechanics of using the information resources. Now, searching information resources has become more accessible, but the breadth and variety of the information has expanded greatly. Agosto, Rozaklis, Craig, and Abels (2011) write that the relationship that librarians have with their clients is expected to go beyond just providing an answer to an inquiry. Their instruction role has changed as well, from being less required for teaching the basics of information searching:

They are now needed more than ever for their expertise in teaching users about the nature of modern information, for sharing their knowledge of the wide range of available information resources, for collaborating with users during the various stages of the search and research process, and for evaluating information quality. (Agosto et al. p.242)

The instructional role of academic librarians has become more complex as the information needs of students and faculty have evolved. As information has become more intricate to manage and varied, librarians have found that their traditional methods of library instruction are no longer enough. Walstrum, Garcia, and Morisson (2011) write that in their program at National-Louis University, librarians typically only have a single opportunity for librarian instruction for many classes, which severely limits the amount of instructional content that can be taught to the students. These traditional “one-shot” instruction sessions do little to provide an effective education to the students, which, as Sterngold (2008) points out, are made more ineffectual when the classroom faculty fails to continue the training during the rest of the semester (p. 87).

In order to become more effective as information instructors, Bennett and Gilbert (2009) suggest that librarians should be partnering with faculty to experiment and develop new educational methodologies (p. 131). As many institutions have added online courses to their curriculum, the opportunities for traditional library instruction have decreased further, requiring librarians to expand their instructional role into the online space. This challenge was shown at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire (UW-Eau Claire) when the university added an online section for a popular marketing course. Markgraf (2004) writes that the on-campus course “relied heavily on library resources and librarian assistance” (p. 7); they wanted to provide a similar level of library support in the online environment. They accomplished this by including or embedding a librarian into the course roster to interact directly with the students and professor in the online environment. In order to educate the students effectively, the librarian needs to go to where they are located, and can no longer expect the students to be able to come to them.

Online Course Management Software

In the early 2000s, much of the discussion regarding the increased participation of librarians in instructing students focused on involvement in various online Course Management Software (CMS). This discussion was driven by the increase in online courses offered by academic institutions and the continued need of the students for library and information literacy instruction. Becker (2010) points out that much research has been done recently to integrate technology with library services to meet the students at their point of need. Embedding a librarian into a CMS brings the librarian allows the students to have direct access to the librarian when they need it, not when it was convenient for a library instruction class to be scheduled. He continues to write that this better fits the learning style of the current generation of students as they tend to begin their research on the internet and typically access library resources remotely

(p. 238). The librarians can become involved in the CMS through a variety of ways, from “providing links to external Web pages to offering highly interactive tutorials” (p. 237). In one of Burke’s examples of embedded librarianship from Athens State University some of the standard services include creating a discussion forum for questions; posting information literacy documents; posting video tutorials; and assisting as needed through the discussions, phone, and email (p. 238).

When UW-Eau Claire began their online courses, the distance education (DE) librarian had to figure out the best way to ensure that the online students were able to use the library in the same degree as the on-campus ones (Markgraf, 2004). Markgraf found that the online students preferred to have a specific person to contact if they needed research help, instead of just the general library reference desk. She also found that the students tended to need assistance on the same issues at roughly the same times, and that during those times it would have been useful to be able to communicate with all the students at the same time (p. 8). These obstacles were overcome when UW-Eau Claire adopted the use of a CMS the following year. Markgraf found that with improved communication offered by the CMS, she was able to help more students, including ones that may have been too shy to ask themselves (p. 9). In addition, she found that while observing the class in the CMS she had a better context to understand the professor’s assignments and the students’ information needs (p. 10). Overall, Markgraf explains that there was a measurable improvement in the quality and research and writing done by the students (p. 13), and she gained additional means to assess the effectiveness of the library’s services (p. 12). Finally, Markgraf notes that, unlike on-campus courses where the professor generally has sole control, online classes usually require contributions from a team of individuals. The professor remains responsible for the content, but he or she may enlist the aid of instructional designers or

information technology staff (p. 15). This opens a new avenue for librarians to collaborate with the teaching faculty.

Campus Partnerships

As academic librarians participate more closely in the learning processes at their institutions, it only makes sense that they become involved with various services that offer educational support to the campus. Traditionally, there have been partnerships with writing programs and teaching and learning centers, but as students and faculty approach their education differently, Bell and Shank (2010) suggest that academic librarians need to reach out to additional colleagues “who include instructional designers, instructional technologists, and information technologists” (p. 61). As academic librarians seek to create closer connection with faculty and improve the awareness of their services, they have begun to add training in instructional design and technology to their traditional library skills (Bell & Shank, p. 10). When the Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology (SIAST) developed its “Virtual Campus”, they found that when the librarians collaborated with the course designers, they were able to build relationships that expanded their own expertise and allowed them to share their own training with a broader audience (Shepley, 2009). The course designers at SIAST need the same services that the librarians provide to their community; acting as research consultants, reference points, and collection development selectors (p. 93). Kesselman and Watstein (2009) note that librarians have had a major role in designing and teaching a multidisciplinary course at Rutgers University (p. 387) ensuring that research skills learning is integrated into the structure of the course.

The benefits of the librarian-faculty collaboration was demonstrated at The College of Brockport when faculty met with librarian “as a faculty learning community (FLC) to share information about their instructional methods for teaching research skills” (Little, Fallon, Dauenhauer, Balzano, & Halquist, 2010, p. 431). According to Little et al., there were members of the FLC that were new to teaching and unsure of how to teach their research experience to students and older members that had the experience but were missing the new ideas and methods to work with their current students (p. 432). As academic librarians are trained in research skills, they make a good mediator between the two groups. They did so at The College of Brockport by facilitating in the creation of a LibGuide to share the best practices across the campus.

Integrating Information Literacy into the Curriculum

In a move that takes embedded librarianship to its logical pinnacle, some libraries have gone beyond just being a presence in the classroom and have organized full courses dedicated to teaching research skills and information literacy. As mentioned earlier, Walstrum et al. (2011) found their one-shot instruction sessions too limited to properly instruct the students, therefore they created semester long course to go beyond just the technical skills and tools for research (p. 174). The librarians found that having a longer time has allowed them to more completely address the ideas of information and digital literacy. In addition, they are able to better assess the development of the students’ skills and their own effectiveness (p. 178).

Kobzina (2010) provides some words of caution regarding teaching a general course on research skills. One of the challenges she encountered was having students with a wide range of backgrounds in regards to information literacy training (p. 296). The course she collaborated on was open to all undergraduates, so it resulted in a mix of first-years that had never done library

research to seniors preparing to write their senior theses, and everything in between. The other main challenge she encountered was not having definite goals for what the collaboration was trying to accomplish (p. 308). This uncertainty made it difficult for Kobzina to determine the full effectiveness of her collaboration with the professor, but it does offer changes that can be made for the next time.

Challenges and Obstacles

Despite the benefits present in embedded librarianship and increased collaboration with faculty, the literature is full of cautionary tales and the challenges encountered by librarians. These challenges appeared to fall into a couple of different categories: resource availability, lack of participation. Each of these issues is something that must be dealt with or overcome in order to have a successful collaboration.

Markgraf (2004) felt concern when she realized how much access she had to the students' information. This included not only their personal enrollment information, but also, through the CMS, access to data about what they read and when. Under certain provisions of the PATRIOT act, she may have been obligated to supply this information if requested (p. 14). Another obstacle to library-faculty collaboration is the divisions between the two roles.

Markgraf also mentions about the considerable amount of additional time she needed to spend reviewing the discussion forums and responding to questions from the students (p. 14). This time is spent in addition to her regular duties at the UW-Eau Claire library. The workload and time involved in an embedded librarianship program is something that needs to be considered prior to launching. Both are finite resources, and generally the librarians have additional duties.

Of course, developing a program and having enough time and staff to properly implement it is not enough. You need the other side of the equation, the faculty and the students, to become involved as well. Many of the attempts in the literature made by librarians to increase their collaboration with faculty, including embedding, have faced the problem of low interest. Walstrum, Garcia, and Morisson (2011) mention that their first attempts at a full information literacy course were cancelled due to low enrollment, until it became a required course for the students (p. 177). Lougee (2009) writes that for libraries to be successful it “will need to be far more intentional in motivating adoption and more active in collaborating with target communities in the design and execution of the services” (p. 620).

One obstacle to librarian-faculty collaboration is the division between the two roles on campus. Christiansen, Stombler, and Thaxton (2004) write that these divisions as being based on the low interaction between the two parties, affecting the opportunity for collaboration, and culturally. Most faculty members are located around the campus, and, with the growth in electronic resources, need to physically enter the library less. Furthermore, the schedules for faculty is more flexible, compared to the more rigid schedules for librarians. Both of these issues lower the chances of the paths of the librarians and faculty from crossing and according to Christiansen et al. influences the opportunity for mutual respect between the two parties (p. 118). Culturally, the writers explain that libraries encourage sharing and an environment of accessible knowledge, whereas faculty culture “is generally more isolated and proprietary (p. 118). These divisions have to be overcome to ensure that the faculty will be willing to collaborate closely with librarians.

Yu (2009), during her program to have faculty volunteer to become library specialists for their departments encountered the problem with a lack of participation from the faculty. Her

suggestions to deal with this include making sure that the administration backs the program, and that by offering incentives, such as small financial rewards or extra points on their annual teaching evaluation, improves the interest in the program (p. 447).

Need for Evaluation and Assessment

The final theme that showed up through the literature was that after planning an embedded librarianship program, there is a need to be able to evaluate and assess the success of that program. One of the themes that Shumaker and Talley (2009) used to categorize their 22 factors measuring embedded librarianship in special libraries was service evaluation (p. 7). An embedded librarian should be able to effectively measure the programs outcomes and report this to his or her superiors. This is not an easy task, as there are many different ways that a librarian can collaborate with faculty. David Shumaker says “that there’s no real litmus test for whether an information center follows an embedded model or not. It’s really a continuum” (as cited in Kho, 2011, p. 35). Therefore, the assessment tools for each program needs to be developed by the librarian individually.

Becker (2010) writes that one way to assess a program is by measuring the improvement in the work done by the students. He cites a case study where after a librarian was embedded in a CMS at Athens State University, “the student papers then showed an overall trend toward using more peer-reviewed materials and sources available through the library’s databases” (p. 238). In addition, the faculty collaborating with the librarian reported an improvement in her knowledge of the library’s resources.

At Daytona Beach College, the faculty and embedded librarian designed two assignments, in pre-test and post-test fashion, to be able to measure the change in the

performance of the students (Owens, 2008, p. 9). These were to be part of the class grade, to ensure that the students took them seriously. Owens also mentions that by using the exams, she knew that the students learned to use the library's resources, even if they chose to do their research online (p. 9).

Literature about the Connecticut Public Universities

A search of library literature databases revealed no research studying embedded librarians or librarian-faculty collaborations in the Connecticut State University System or the state's community colleges.

Methodology

Rationale

The proposed Special Project will consist of two sections. Each section will gather information in separate ways. Part A is a study of the range of librarian-faculty collaborations in the Connecticut State University System and community college libraries. This will examine the extent of the collaborations and partnerships and the possible reasons of there are any deficiencies or failed programs. Part B is a study of successful librarian-faculty collaboration programs in institutions outside of the CSU system. This part will examine the reasons why they were successful and possible ways that they could be adapted for use in the CSUS libraries.

Subjects

Part A:

The subjects from Part A will be reference and instruction librarians from the academic libraries in the four Connecticut State universities and twelve community colleges. Based on information from the libraries' online staff directories, there are approximately 76 reference and instruction librarians. It will be my goal to attain a response rate of at least 30 individuals (39%) with hopes to have closer to 40 (53%).

In order to ensure that my potential respondents will not be violating any workplace policies, I intend to contact the heads of the reference departments with my request for permission to survey their librarians regarding librarian-faculty relationships and collaborations. To prevent any chance of bias or coercion in completing the survey, it will be voluntary on the parts of the individual librarians. Even if the head of their department approves the survey, the individual librarians can still refuse to take it.

Part B:

The subjects for Part B are going to be reference and instruction librarians outside the CSUS libraries that have had experience collaborating with faculty or other agencies at their institution. Since my survey request is going to go out over a wide net, it is difficult to estimate the number of possible respondents. Although, since I am looking for mainly anecdotal information from this subject pool, the number of responses does not need to be large if I can receive a wide variety of responses.

In order to find subjects for Part B, I intend to send requests to complete the Part B survey through the social media platforms of Twitter and Google+. The advantage of using these mediums is that anyone that receives my request has already opted into receiving messages from me. Currently I use both Twitter and Google+ as a professional social networking, connecting with hundreds of librarians around the country. Responding to the survey will be voluntary and there will be no penalties for any failures to respond or complete the survey.

Research Instruments

Both research instruments are available in the appendices of this document with their cover letters.

Part A:

The survey for Part A will contain 28 questions and will be hosted on my website at <http://www.frankskornia.com> using a Drupal module called WebForms. Using WebForms only allows authorized users of my site to have access to the data while the survey is open, reducing any likelihood of tampering or identity theft. The questions are mostly multiple choice with a few short answer questions if the respondent wishes to include additional information.

Part B:

The survey for Part B will contain 9 questions and will also be hosted on my website as well. Since the respondents for this survey are going to be self-selected based on their willingness to share their collaboration experiences, the survey is made mostly with short answer questions to give the respondents place to relate their experiences. There will be a few multiple choice questions, similar to the ones at the start of Part A to determine background information. The respondents will be given the choice to identify their institution if they desire. There will be no penalties in the analysis of their information if they choose not to share this information.

Procedure and Timeline

Part A:

Because I intend to introduce the survey to the potential respondents through the heads of the reference departments, I will give respondents a period of two weeks following the initial contact to complete the survey. This allows sufficient time for the request to be passed to the potential respondents. The cover letter that I will send to the heads of the departments with information regarding the purpose of the survey, the measures for privacy protection, and my identification information will be presented as the front page of the survey. The results of the survey will be aggregated by the WebForms module and exported into an Microsoft Excel file for analysis.

Part B:

As the survey for Part B will be disseminated through the social media networks Twitter and Google+, it will be necessary to rebroadcast the request for respondents. To match the period for Part A, respondents will have two weeks from the initial announcement to complete the survey. Since these communication mediums are limited in the information they can convey, it will be improbable to try and include the cover letter information in the broadcasted request.

Therefore, like with Part A, the front page of the survey will be the cover letter providing information about the purpose of the survey, the measures for privacy protection, and my identification and contact information. In addition, since I will be asking for voluntary information identifying their institution, the respondents will be alerted that not supplying the information will not diminish the validity of their results. These results will be aggregated into a Microsoft Excel document for analysis.

Ethics Governing the Project

The Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU) Human Research Protection Program (HRPP) is committed to protecting the rights and welfare of human participants involved in research which is conducted on the campus or in cooperation with other research agencies, regardless of whether the project is funded externally, internally or receives no funding support.

The SCSU HRPP subscribes to the basic ethical principles for the protection of human participants in research that underlie *The Nuremberg Codes*, *The Helsinki Declaration*, and *The Belmont Report*. Copies of these documents may be found on reserve in the Buley Library (under HRPP) and in the School of Graduate Studies Office.

Author's Qualifications

The author is currently a graduate student in the Masters of Library and Information Science department at Southern Connecticut State University. He has completed 30 of the 36 required credits for the master's degree. He is on the Academic Library track with an emphasis on technology and instruction. He is currently working part-time as the Digital Archival Specialist for Voices of September 11th. He is currently enrolled in ILS 580: Research in Information and Library Science taught by Dr. Mary Brown of the Graduate Faculty.

Human Subjects (IRB) Protection

The author still needs to submit the proper application to conduct research to the Institutional Review Board at Southern Connecticut State University. Until this application is submitted and approved by the Review Board, the process of data collection cannot begin. The National Institute of Health Web-based training course, “Protecting Human Research Participants”, was completed on May 28, 2011 and the author was granted Certification number 692167.

References

- Agosto, D. E., Rozaklis, L., MacDonald, C., & Abels, E. G. (2011). A model of the reference and information service process: An educator's perspective. *Reference & User Services Quarterly, 50*(3), 235-244.
- Baum, C. D. (2010, Fall). Director's column. *Buley Bulletin, 8*(2), 2. Retrieved from <http://library.southernct.edu/buleybulletin8-2.pdf>
- Becker, B. W. (2010). Embedded librarianship: A point-of-need service. *Behavioral & Social Sciences Librarian, 29*(3), 237-240. doi: 10.1080/01639269.2010.498763
- Bell, S. J., & Shank, J. D. (2007). *Academic librarianship by design: A blended librarian's guide to the tools and techniques*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Bennett, O., & Gilbert, K. (2009). Extending liaison collaboration: Partnering with faculty in support of a student learning community. *Reference Services Review, 37*(2), 131-142. doi: 10.1108/00907320910957170
- Christiansen, L., Stompler, M., & Thaxton, L. (2004). A report on librarian-faculty relations from a sociological perspective. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship, 30*(2), 116-121.
- Hunter, G., & Ward, D. (2011, May). Students research the library: Using student-led ethnographic research to examine the changing roles of campus libraries. *College & Research Libraries News, 72*(5), 264-268.
- Kesselman, M. A., & Watstein, S. B. (2009). Creating opportunities: Embedded librarians. *Journal of Library Administration, 49*(4), 383-400. doi: 10.1080/01930820902832538

Kho, N. D. (2011, March). Embedded librarianship: Building relational roles. *Information Today*, 28(3), 1, 35-36.

Kobzina, N. G. (2010). A faculty-librarian partnership: A unique opportunity for course integration. *Journal of Library Administration*, 50(4), 293-314. doi: 10.1080/01930821003666965

Little, J. J., Fallon, M., Dauenhauer, J., Balzano, B, & Halquist, D. (2010). Interdisciplinary collaboration: A faculty learning community creates a comprehensive LibGuide. *Reference Services Review*, 38(3), 431-444. doi: 10.1108/00907321011070919

Lougee, W. (2009). The diffuse library revisited: Aligning the library as strategic asset. *Library Hi Tech*, 27(4), 610-623. doi: 10.1108/07378830911007718

Markgraf, J. (2004). Librarian participation in the online classroom. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, 9(1), 5-19. doi: 10.1300/J136v09n01_2

Owens, R. (2008, Spring). Where the students are: The embedded librarian project at Daytona Beach College. *Florida Libraries*, 51(1), 8-10.

Phaneuf, K. M., & Emma, C. (2011, July 15). Full impact of higher education cuts remains uncertain. *The CT Mirror*. Retrieved from <http://www.ctmirror.org/story/12605/higher-education-shakeup-approaches-higher-education-experts-share-rocky-roads-other-sta>

Reference and User Services Association. (2001, June). Guidelines for liaison work in managing collections and services. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/rusa/resources/guidelines/guidelinesliaison.cfm>

- Shepley, S. E. (2009). Building a virtual campus: Librarians as collaborators in online course development and learning. *Journal of Library Administration*, 49(1), 89-95. doi: 10.1080/01930820802312821
- Shumaker, D. (2009). Who let the librarians out? Embedded librarianship and the library manager. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 48(3), 239-242, 257.
- Shumaker, D., & Talley, M. (2009, June 30). *Models of embedded librarianship: Final Report*. Retrieved from <http://www.sla.org/pdfs/EmbeddedLibrarianshipFinalRptRev.pdf>
- Sterngold, A. H. (2008). Rhetoric versus reality: A faculty perspective on information literacy instruction. In J. M. Hurlbert (Ed.), *Defining relevancy: Managing the new academic library* (pp. 85-95), Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- Walstrum, M. Garcia, L., & Morisson, R. (2011). From embedded to integrated: Digital information literacy and new teaching models for academic librarians. Proceedings of the Association of College & Research Libraries 2011 (pp. 174-179). Philadelphia, PA: http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/events/national/2011/papers/from_embedded.pdf
- Yu, T. (2009). A new model of faculty-librarian collaboration: The faculty member as library specialist. *New Library World*, 110(9/10), 441-448. doi: 10.1108/03074800910997454

Appendix A – Cover Letter for Survey A

Dear Reference Department Head,

My name is Frank Skornia and I am currently a graduate student at Southern Connecticut State University in the Information and Library Department. I am performing a research study in the collaborations between librarians and faculty at the Connecticut State Universities and the Connecticut Community Colleges as part of my graduation requirements.

The information collected in this study will be used to examine how librarians in the Connecticut universities and colleges collaborate with faculty and other agencies on the campus. All information collected will remain confidential. The data collected will only be used for statistical analysis and there will be no identification of individuals. I am intending to share the results of this research with the Connecticut State Universities and Connecticut Community College.

I am asking that if you are willing to forward this letter and the link to the survey the reference and instruction librarians at your library, so that they could choose to participate.

If you choose to participate in this study, you will need to complete the questionnaire at the URL provided below. Completion of the questionnaire will confirm your consent. The questions are not mandatory, and you are welcome to skip any that do not apply with no risk or penalty. Your participation is voluntary and there is no penalty if you do not participate.

If you have any concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Southern Connecticut State University Institutional Review Board at (203) 392-5243. Otherwise you may contact me by email at skorniaf1@owls.southernct.edu if you have any additional questions regarding this study.

I hope that you will decide to participate in my study and complete the survey. If you choose to participate, please follow this link to the questionnaire: [insert link after IRB approval].

Thank you for your consideration and participation.

Frank J. Skornia
Information & Library Science Department
Southern Connecticut State University

Appendix B – Survey A**Librarian-Faculty Collaborations in the Connecticut State University System: An Examination of Current Practices****Survey A**

Instructions: None of the questions are mandatory. If you do not want to answer a question or it does not apply to you, just skip to the next.

Part 1: Background

1. Which of the following best describes your work status?

- Full time (35+ hours)
- Part time (under 35 hours)
- Not employed

2. Which of the following best describes your institution?

- 2-year college
- 4-year university

3. Do you serve as a departmental liaison in your library?

- Yes
- No

4. Do you have an additional graduate degree aside from your MLS?

- Yes, Ph.D.
- Yes, Master's
- Yes, Other graduate degree
- No

Part 2: Library Instruction

1. Do you participate in information literacy education at your institution?

- Yes

No

2. Which of the following library instruction activities have you performed?

(check all that apply)

Designed a printed information literacy resource

Designed a library tutorial website, video, or other electronic resource

Instructed one-shot library instruction sessions

Held individual research sessions with a student or faculty member

3. If you have taught one-shot library instruction sessions, approximately how many have you instructed in a semester?

1-5

6-10

11-15

15-20

20+

4. Does your institution have a method to assess the success of your library instruction sessions?

Yes

No

5. In your opinion, how effective do you find one-shot library instruction sessions for educating research skills and information literacy?

Very
Ineffective

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Very
Effective

10

Part III: Embedded Librarianship

1. Have you ever participated as an embedded librarian in an online Course Management System (like Blackboard/Vista or Moodle)?

Yes

No

2. What activities did you perform while acting as an embedded librarian?

(Check all that apply)

- Included library resource links in the course content
- Broadcast library tutorial documents to the course
- Responded to questions posed in the discussion forums
- Responded to questions sent to you via e-mail
- Provided library instruction through the online CMS
- Participated in a live class online
- Other (please specify)

3. What challenges did you face while you were acting as an embedded librarian?

(Check all that apply)

- Difficult to balance online duties with normal duties
- The technology was difficult to master
- Encountered resistance from the professor
- Did not feel engaged with the students
- Felt pressured to be always available
- Other (please specify)

4. Would you participate as an embedded librarian again?

- Yes
- No

5. In your opinion, how effective did you find the embedded librarian experience for educating research skills and information literacy?

Very Ineffective											Very Effective
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		

6. If you answered no to question 2, would you participate as an embedded librarian if given the opportunity?

Yes

No

7. If you answered no to question 2, what has prevented you from participating as an embedded librarian?

Normal library activities do not give you enough time

Lack of interest from faculty

Not enough familiarity with online CMS

Library does not have enough staff to spare

Other (please specify)

Part IV: Campus Partnerships

1. Does your library work closely with other educational services at your institution (writing center, tutoring center)?

Yes

No

2. Do you provide library services outside of the library while collaborating with the other educational services?

Yes

No

3. Do other educational services at your institution possess permanent workspace within your library?

Yes

No

4. Have you collaborated with any other faculty or staff member, such as an instructional designer or information technologist, to design a course at your institution?

Yes

No

5. In your opinion, how effective do you find your collaboration outside the library in providing library services to your community?

Very Ineffective											Very Effective
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		

Part V: Integrating Information Literacy into the Curriculum

1. Have you taught a full course (credit or non-credit) on information literacy and research skills?

Yes

No

2. Have you collaborated with a faculty member to improve the training of students in information literacy and research skills in a course?

Yes

No

3. In your opinion, how effective do you find a full-scale information literacy course for educating research skills and information literacy?

Very Ineffective											Very Effective
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10		

Part VI: Obstacles and Challenges

1. Do you feel that time would be a limiting factor in properly implementing a program that involves collaboration outside the library at your institution?

Yes

No

2. Do you feel that staffing would be a limiting factor in implementing a program that involves collaboration outside the library at your institution?

Yes

No

3. Do you feel that learning new technology would be a limiting factor in implementing a program that involves collaboration outside the library at your institution?

Yes

No

4. Have you tried implementing a collaborative program and had problems with a lack of participation from either students or faculty?

Yes

No

Appendix C – Cover Letter for Survey B

Dear Respondent,

My name is Frank Skornia and I am currently a graduate student at Southern Connecticut State University in the Information and Library Department. I am performing a research study in the collaborations between librarians and faculty at the Connecticut State Universities and the Connecticut Community Colleges as part of my graduation requirements.

The information collected in this study will be used to examine how librarians in the Connecticut universities and colleges collaborate with faculty and other agencies on the campus and ways in which they may improve their collaboration. This is the second of two questionnaires. I sent the first to librarians in the Connecticut universities and colleges to determine the current state of librarian-faculty collaboration. The purpose of this survey is to collect information regarding successful and unsuccessful attempts at collaboration at other institutions to provide recommendations for the future.

All information collected will remain confidential. The data collected will only be used for statistical analysis and there will be no identification of institutions unless you consent. I am intending to share the results of this research with the Connecticut State Universities and Connecticut Community College.

If you choose to participate in this study, you will need to complete the questionnaire on the next screen. Completion of the questionnaire will confirm your consent. The questions are not mandatory, and you are welcome to skip any that do not apply with no risk or penalty. Your participation is voluntary and there is no penalty if you do not participate.

If you have any concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Southern Connecticut State University Institutional Review Board at (203) 392-5243. Otherwise you may contact me by email at skorniaf1@owls.southernct.edu if you have any additional questions regarding this study.

I hope that you will decide to participate in my study and complete the survey. If you choose to participate, please follow this link to the questionnaire: [insert link after IRB approval].

Thank you for your consideration and participation.

Frank J. Skornia
Information & Library Science Department
Southern Connecticut State University

Appendix D – Survey B**Librarian-Faculty Collaborations in the Connecticut State University System: An Examination of Current Practices****Survey B**

Instructions: None of the questions are mandatory. If you do not want to answer a question or it does not apply to you, just skip to the next.

Part 1: Background

1. Which of the following best describes your work status?

- Full time (35+ hours)
- Part time (under 35 hours)
- Not employed

2. Which of the following best describes your institution?

- 2-year college
- 4-year university

3. What is the name of your institution? (Optional)

4. Do you serve as a departmental liaison in your library?

- Yes
- No

5. Do you have an additional graduate degree aside from your MLS?

- Yes, Ph.D.
- Yes, Master's
- Yes, Other graduate degree
- No

Part 2: Collaborative Experience

1. What type of librarian-faculty collaboration have you participated in successfully?

Embedded in an Online Course Management System

Partnership with another educational service (writing or tutoring center)

Collaboration with an instructional designer or information technologist to design a course or learning tool at your institution

Worked with a professor to increase the amount of library resources or research training in a standard course

Taught a full course (credit or non-credit) on information literacy and research skills

Other (please specify)

2. Please describe your collaboration experience below.

3. In your opinion, do you feel that your collaboration was successful?

Yes

No

4. What challenges or obstacles did you encounter during your collaboration?

Appendix E – NIH Certificate of Completion

