

Academic Assembly
October 5, 2006
Minutes

65 people attended

Karen Calhoun convened the meeting.

Congratulations to Stuart Basefsky who has an article published, as the August 2006 cover story, of **Information Outlook**. The article, which is now available to all via Proquest, is entitled *Mis-Information at the Heart of the University: Why Administrators Should Take Libraries More Seriously*.

Congratulations also to Peter Hirtle. His article, *Research, Libraries, and Fair Use :The Gentlemen's Agreement of 1935* has been published in the **Journal of the Copyright Society**, Spring-Summer 2006.

Today's meeting is co-sponsored by the Cornell University Library's Priority Implementation Team on Information Fluency and the Academic Assembly Steering Committee:

FROM DIALOGUE TO IMPACT:

Enhancing Campus Collaboration in the Service of Student Learning & Engagement

Elizabeth Dupuis & Patricia Maughan
Project Director and Project Manager of the Mellon Library/Faculty Fellowship for Undergraduate Research, University of California, Berkeley

This presentation will focus on UC Berkeley's Mellon Library/Faculty Fellowship for Undergraduate Research (<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/MellonInstitute/institute.html>), a four-year, grant supported initiative spearheaded by the University Library which focuses on large enrollment and high impact undergraduate courses. The Mellon Program is aimed at encouraging and facilitating faculty collaboration with a range of campus academic support units and personnel to strengthen the connections between undergraduate research, information literacy, and library collections. The presentation will provide an overview of the grant, explore the campus partnerships formed through the project, describe the annual Faculty Institute, detail Library-Faculty collaborations on courses and assignments, and review the evaluation and assessment components of the project. The 30-minute presentation will be followed by a period for questions and discussion.

Please join me in welcoming Beth and Pat.

To listen to an audio recording of this presentation, click [here](#). For a transcript, see below:

Beth: The Berkeley project is a 4-year project. We have one year remaining so our last cohort of faculty have been introduced into the project. After talking to some of the people from the Information Literacy Team, and reading their reports, I think there is a great deal of similarity between Berkeley and Cornell in terms of the campus culture and structure. Both campuses serve a diverse student body of both undergraduate and graduate students, and cover a wide-range of disciplines.

Our program is a little different from some of the other undergraduate research or literacy programs/projects that have been done at other institutions primarily because it allows people to "opt-in" by creating opportunities for people to participate, utilizing many resources that we already have on campus, and pulling them together in different ways, for outcomes we determine together, as a group, as opposed to just the library coming in and setting the agenda.

Our grant is funded by the Mellon Foundation. The grant gave us an opportunity to look at how we might change the nature of large-enrollment, lower-division undergraduate classes. At Berkeley, we were also just about to launch into our accreditation review so this was also a time for us to look at some of the accreditation themes or goals we wanted to set for ourselves. Undergraduate research was identified as one of the top issues.

A new library AUL and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate education came together to develop a proposal to look at what the campus could do to improve undergraduate research, in large enrollment classes (normally comprised of first-year, but sometimes second-year and even third-year students), in all disciplines. We wanted to change the nature of learning in those classes. An important goal was to make connections between undergraduate research, library collections, information-seeking skills and critical-thinking skills. We didn't simply want the students to be active in the classroom in a different way, we also wanted to develop the kinds of skills they could use throughout their careers, skills they could build on to become excellent scholars.

Our project was originally funded in January 2003. One of the key components of the project was the selection of faculty fellows. Each year, there is an open call for faculty to apply to be the fellows for that year. We usually selected up to 15. Some years we selected a slightly smaller group based on the applications and the kinds of courses we would be dealing with. These could be new courses that were being developed or courses that were already on the books that faculty wanted to reshape.

Important criteria for participation:

- Large-enrollment courses, about 100 plus students
- The course met one of the campus requirements. This might be a requirement for the major or a course for "American Cultures", a required class at Berkeley.
- Best if faculty could come together with another person that they taught the course with, or who maybe taught that same course in subsequent semesters, to create a kind of cohort in those departments.

We always had more applications than we could handle. One approach we have taken over the past couple of years was to talk to Department Chairs to ask them to help us identify one or two of the stars within their department they thought could really help inform this approach. We were also looking for people who were very committed to undergraduate education.

We wanted to develop a cohort of faculty across a number of disciplines committed to changing the ways they teach and open to partnering with other groups on campus. Within this particular grant, the three principal investigators are the University Librarian, the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, and the Dean of Undergraduate Division of Letters and Science (that particular college has about 85% of the undergraduate population). So, we had three very prominent people on our campus, all committed to the same goal, helping with the overall direction of the grant; however, many of the decisions about the grant and how we have implemented things, have happened through the Steering Committee.

There are about eight people on the Steering Committee. This is not just a library initiative, although there are a number of us from the library involved. The Steering Committee includes representatives from the Graduate Student Instructor Teaching Resource Center, the Office of Educational Development (which deals with faculty training and support), Education Technology Services (ETS), which is the unit that deals with the learning management systems (like Blackboard), the Student Learning Center and also the Center for American Cultures.

We select faculty to attend what used to be a 9-day, and is now a 6-day Institute. The sessions are organized and led by the faculty themselves and other campus experts who come and talk about different issues. The Institute is the kick-off for a one-year experience. The rest of the year, the faculty members work with an Implementation Team, a collaborative group consisting of a librarian, someone from ETS, and someone from the Graduate Student Instructor Teaching Resource Center. This group works together throughout the semester developing the course and helping to implement it. There are also surveys that faculty can use to assess the course and at the end there are meetings to discuss how it went.

Collaboration between the various groups on campus is a very important part of the project. It is not only the library that is setting our goals. The campus groups come together and decide what we're going to focus on and how we will evaluate our progress. We're also looking for ways to have some of the Implementation Teams be available to faculty beyond that particular semester in case the faculty member decides to redesign some of their other courses.

[As an outgrowth of this project], we have hosted a number of collaborative events on campus. For example, there is an every two-year campus symposium on some sort of teaching and learning topic open to all faculty and staff and students on campus. Two years ago, we chose the theme of undergraduate research, and how to support it in large-enrollment courses. This symposium gave us an opportunity to hear from the faculty and

other attendees about the challenges they were facing and to share some of the models designed by faculty that have already gone through the program to discuss what they've tried that worked, and what obstacles we needed to address to make the program more available in more classes. Those types of events, as well as just smaller-scale partnerships, have been one outgrowth of this grant.

Pat: The goals for our Institute in some ways mirror the goals of the program. We want to create an environment that would enable faculty to get together and discuss a range of topics related to developing effective research assignments for students that would challenge them to engage with the library's collections, be they print or digital. We do this through that consultative model that Beth mentioned – the Implementation Teams. Actually, the members of the Implementation Teams also now attend the Institute.

The second goal of the Institute is to build on and continue to develop the partnership between the academic partners – the Office of Education Development, Graduate Student Instructor Training Center, the Educational Technologies Services and others.

A third goal of the Institute is to widen the implementation and impact of research-based activities on the undergraduate's learning experience while they're with us in the undergraduate curriculum. We do this by focusing on courses that we think will have the greatest impact, the large enrollment-courses, the course-requirements, the core courses, things of that nature.

Our faculty participants are made up of ladder-rung faculty and lecturers all of whom have to be scheduled to teach the course they intend to redesign in either the subsequent fall or subsequent spring following their attendance at the Institute. The selection of the fellows is done by the principle investigators but the selection committee also does a review of the applications and makes recommendations and comments for their consideration. Preference is also given to certain course profiles – large-enrollment courses, American Cultures, and courses that are rotated among more than one faculty.

Expectations of the faculty fellows include a strong commitment from their department heads to try to institutionalize whatever changes took place in the individual course, to try to widen those changes to other courses taught in the department. The fellows are expected to attend all sessions of the Institute. They're also expected to do additional work, outside of the Institute. By the end of the Institute they should have a revised research assignment for their course. This is done in consultation with their Implementation Teams and that relationship is first introduced in the context of the Institute.

The format for the Institute has evolved quite a bit over time and it has been informed by the post-Institute evaluations that are administered on the last day as well as by comments that are submitted through the Course Management System, or given individually to either Beth or me. Some of the changes we have made, based on these comments, were to reduce the number of readings and the amount of work outside of the Institute. We dropped some of the content and re-focused the emphasis on the research assignment

itself. Originally, we wanted a revised syllabus and an assessment plan, but, we realized this was too ambitious, and we decided that it made more sense to focus on the research assignment that will be given to the students.

We've tried to set up the Institute as a peer-to-peer model for learning. Our role – the people that participate in the Institute apart from the fellows – is to facilitate the discussion on certain targeted topics. The Institute has its own course web site so that faculty have an opportunity to experience what it's like to use a course management system from the student perspective. We've tried wherever possible to model good instructional practices and active learning approaches.

The Institute content follows a certain progression. In the beginning, faculty members are asked to reflect upon their own initial research experiences as undergraduates. We then compare those experiences with the experiences of today's undergraduate learner. Lastly, we ask them to consider how they might redesign their research assignment, or their syllabus, given this reflective exercise and their observations about the changes in today's learners.

On the website of the Institute , you can scroll down and find links to pull up the program, the curriculum, for each year, and the evaluations for each year, as well as the staff facilitators. <http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/MellonInstitute/institute.html>

After the Institute, we have built in a series of supports. We've mentioned the Implementation Teams. We also have a semi-annual program of salons in which we pull together all of the cohorts for a late-afternoon event. One of the things we ask them to do towards the end of the Institute is to identify topics they would like to continue to discuss or pursue to use as guideposts for determining what the next topic of the salon is going to be. I contact one or two of the fellows and ask them to work with me to organize this late-afternoon session. The sessions are informal, hosted in a very nice location, we provide the best food and beverages that we can, and create an environment where they can just feel comfortable coming together, meeting each other, and talking about a topic that we know is going to be of interest to them.

We also have a program of post-Institute funding. Any fellow automatically qualifies for \$1,000 of educational technology funds or services and \$2,000 in library collections money for either the purchase of collections to support their course or for the digitization of materials to support it. In the last two years, we initiated an "innovation funding" program that's earmarked for proposals that address institutionalizing the changes faculty participants may have made in their individual courses, the assessment of the research assignment experience on student learning overall, the development of shareable teaching tools and products, or the building of similar cohorts within their own departments. There are certain things that we particularly hope to support but I think that they have been able to pretty much propose whatever they like and we will consider it.

In terms of the accomplishments, to date (in four years) we have had 45 faculty attend the Institute, 52 courses have been redesigned, about half of them have enrollment of over a 100 students, and we calculate that we have reached about 7800 students, one way

or another, through the Mellon assignments and experiences. We've received very high ratings from our faculty on the Institute, both in terms of its overall value and their satisfaction with the quality of the programming. We've also developed pedagogical assessment expertise among the library staff which is a major bonus of this project. We've created shareable and adaptable products and approaches, and made them available to anyone who is interested.

One important outcome of the Institute is that it has altered faculty perceptions of the library and what librarians can bring to the educational enterprise and to the challenge of engaging students. The project partners have developed a better understanding of what each one of us brings to the table, what our roles are, what are strengths are, and how we can work together and this has led to other campus-wide collaborations, such as the bi-annual symposium. We have also become active contributors to the development of the campus course management system, called "eBerkeley", and a new project that's just getting underway on learning spaces within the libraries.

Beth: Faculty-Librarian collaboration is central to the whole project. The Institute sets up the initial experience in which faculty are brought together with librarians and representatives from other services on campus as well as with faculty from other departments. Often, they have never met each other before. Most of the faculty report that one of the greatest things about the program is to the opportunity to talk with faculty from other departments about the things they would like to do in their courses. Having librarians, instructional technology people, and other experts together with faculty helps inform the design of a particular course.

In the past, faculty might have had to go to maybe five different buildings to get some input about their course. The support teams idea was one of the biggest lessons we learned from our pilot year. The first year we didn't have these teams together and so faculty were still running between different departments trying to pull together all the expertise. We'd raised the awareness for them about what all of these different units could bring to the table but we hadn't yet made it easy for them to get that support. Bringing everyone together to plan desired changes ahead of time is also an important component of the Institute.

The program focuses on research-based learning, emphasizing the research process. On our website, under a section on publicity, we have some video-taped interviews with various faculty and students to measure satisfaction and impact.

[Beth played video clips from two Berkeley students, Molly and Joseph, available on the website.] (<http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/MellonInstitute/institute.html>)

The project really isn't just about library collections but about how we connect users with information, or about how to evaluate information in a way that contextualizes it with other events. There isn't just one right answer and they're not going to find that answer simply by typing their question into Google. We encourage faculty to look not just at the final paper, but also at the research process, by having students write a reflective essay or

an interim report on their progress. Reflective essays can provide more information about the student's research process than bibliographies. Most faculty come to appreciate the idea of requesting an interim reflective essay on the research process by the time they leave the Institute.

We are often asked, "can you really do research in a large-enrollment class?" We have a very liberal interpretation of the term research. It doesn't have to be a mini-thesis. Sometimes it's a short research assignment. One class put together a research prospectus defining the research questions that might be pursued, determining what was worth researching and what hasn't already been addressed, and how the research would proceed.

There's a huge shift on the library side, as well. Within our libraries, there is only a small number of staff members who have instruction as the primary component of their job, however, many library staff have instruction as *some* component of their positions. We are looking at ways of collaborating together, and working together with the disparate groups on campus concerned with instructional technologies, and assessment and instructional design, and the subject matter, and on to how to pull all of those things together with a relatively small number of people, to make good decisions, as well as how to organizationally find the time to do all of this and work with the classes and the departments.

Pat: The evaluation and assessment is guided by the goals of the grant which are to create a sustainable model for introducing changes into courses and curricula and to create a community of fellows that demonstrate a commitment to student learning around a group of activities, to compile student performance data, strengthen collaboration among the partners, and enhance the awareness of and use of campus collections. In those five broad areas, you can imagine how many questions we might want to answer. I think when we really tried to do that we came up with this enormous laundry list of 65 or 75 questions. We quickly realized that we didn't have the capacity to truly process all of this, so we tried to group our questions around three primary focuses:

[The first focus area concerned] the impacts of our program on individual faculty at Berkeley. How has the program influenced teaching? What are the professional and personal benefits they have derived from their participation and what obstacles have they encountered on campus trying to implement the changes they have planned?

The second area of focus concerned the impacts of the program on the campus culture of learning, such as the effects on interdepartmental cooperation and interactions in terms of faculty development and support and what elements are required to effectively redesign a course.

The third area of interest is the impact of the program on student learning. We measure that in a number of different ways: through student perceptions of their learning, faculty perceptions of their learning. There are all sorts of subcategories, but I think that will give

you an idea of the three themes that we think are most important and that will really put an imprint of meaning on what we do and the data we collect surrounding it.

Questions:

Stuart Basefsky: The question concerns what your Mellon Grant was designed to do, which was to create something that was sustainable. Without the Mellon money, without the incentive package you had to start this thing up, is it sustainable and how are you envisioning its sustainability?

Beth: I think that the primary benefit of the original grant was the prestige that came from the Mellon Foundation and the focus it brought to this issue. Many of the ideas we came up with can be imbedded in current practices. Certainly it was helpful to have money, but the money primarily went towards faculty stipends, all-told, approximately 30,000 dollars. We also realized that we have other sources of faculty grants for redesigning their courses, such as instructional technology grants, graduate student instructor grants, and some money from our Chancellor that went to a Presidential Chair teaching fellows grant.

It's hard to say, at this point, what aspects of the program will be sustainable. We are eager to review our evaluations. The first cohort of faculty have now had three years to process and boil down what they think. Some of them have become more enthusiastic and committed over time. So, we'd like to take a step back and look at the evaluations to see what worked and what didn't work. Interestingly, the Steering Committee thought that once the grant ran out, the Institute would probably go because it takes a great deal of coordination and time, but, as it turns out, most of the faculty who have attended have told us that the Institute is very important to them because it forces all of us to make the time in our schedules to come together to develop our plans collaboratively. Many of the applicants for this final cohort came to us by word-of-mouth and there was a sharp increase in the number of full faculty who applied this year, our last year. In the beginning, it was the early-adopters, some of them new to campus, but we are now reaching into a different level of faculty who are ready to experiment.

I think the program has changed the nature of the discussions we have about undergraduate research on our campus. In preparation for the e-Berekeley Symposium, three people went out and interviewed representative faculty on campus. The interviews provided some very important insights about what does and doesn't work on our campus, and about problems in the curriculum from their own perspective on what students do and don't know.

Our curriculum is pretty flexible. There are few prerequisites. Freshmen can and do sign up for upper-level courses, so we can't really design a plan that says that all Freshmen will learn "package A", and sophomores will learn "package B". We're very accepting of any of the faculty who wish to come forward and redesign courses that students might encounter along the way. We also realize that the institution has some responsibility to

create certain moments in time so that students, if they're interested, can improve their skills or increase their awareness.

We're looking at creating a new experience for incoming students in the summer before they arrive on campus to help them understand what being at a research institution really means and how they can engage in that. We're trying to find a way to have it available online, or on DVD, in a way that's collaborative, so that students can start talking to each other. We're telling them that how you learn in college is very different than coming to class, listening to a lecture, and turning in your homework, although of course some classes might be a little bit like that, but that's what we're shooting for.

I think there are some outcomes, some collaborations, [that are sustainable]. We're all committed to our units still working together. We've talked about how to reach out to new faculty to tell them about all of the services on campus available to them from each of these units.

Pat: I don't think it's necessarily all on us to sustain it. The theme that I've heard from the students, and the faculty, is that they never want to go back to doing things they way they used to and I think that is equally true of our academic partners. I really believe, for example, that the Graduate Student Instructor Training Center won't be training their instructors they way they used to before they had the experience with Mellon.

Kizer Walker: Can you talk about the question of assessment?

Beth: We spend a lot of time talking about assessment. As Pat mentioned, we wanted to look at the impact on student learning and on improving student learning and we realized, over time, that we couldn't really do that [in the way we originally thought] because we didn't begin the grant by selecting a particular cohort of students to study. Instead, we started off by working with faculty to redesign courses, looking at how well this course, and this approach to teaching, seems to engage students so that they walk away with skills that we think are good skills. We work with each of the faculty differently. One thing we realized is that we couldn't package these skills year-by-year, or state that all freshmen will learn a certain group of skills, and then test on those.

We try to honor that these skills are probably best demonstrated in the products the students create. We've been looking at the assignments that students turn in to try to analyze the skill levels. We've looked at some of the projects that are purportedly Information Literacy assessment tests and they could be good for certain environments but, in my personal opinion, they are not right for Berkeley. We have this really messy, but rich sort of environment where students can take the courses they are interested in when they feel prepared for them. So, students all progress at very different levels, and with very different skills. We're trying to recognize that, to honor that, by working class-by-class to see how we can best assess what students are doing in that particular course.

.....So, it's important for us to look course-by-course at the products students are creating, based on what the instructor has chosen for their own goals for the course and

their own learning outcomes and helping them determine whether their goals have been achieved in the student's work products.

I think we will increasingly be pushed to try and find some national assessment tool we can use. We should try to articulate for ourselves how we would like to do that as opposed to having it pushed upon us from somewhere else, but at least for me right now, the tests that are available out there don't quite meet what we're looking for.

There is a side-project I haven't mentioned called the "Library Prize for Undergraduate Research", which is separate from the Mellon grant. At Berkeley, about 2-3 years ago, we started a project that gave awards to undergraduates for their research projects. There's a different prize award for lower-division students and upper-division students that recognizes that students develop skills over time and doesn't just reward the senior. The prize isn't just looking at the final papers, but also on the reflective essays about the research process. Students from any discipline can enter. The judges are three faculty and four librarians, or four faculty and three librarians. It's very powerful to look at the projects that students turn in and what they talk about, about how they went about researching the topic, the kinds of sources they consulted, and how they made distinctions between the content, and what kinds of connections they made. It's interesting for the faculty, who may be teaching in other disciplines, to judge the research process in a field they are unfamiliar with. For example, a professor of English may find herself judging a Physics paper and it is actually liberating.

We also create exhibits from the student research projects and these exhibits have inspired other students to tackle something like that themselves. One of the things we look at is where they hit obstacles and how they overcame those obstacles. That's the part that students say is most revealing to them. We think it's important to look at the products the students create as opposed to taking an Information Literacy test.

Karen Calhoun thanked Pat and Beth and adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm.