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Introduction
Centers for teaching and learning in higher education are a growing force for improving student learning through educational development and changing the culture of teaching and learning. Librarians can transform their role as educators, expand their capacity for professional development and grow as organizational leaders through joining forces with these Centers as participants, learners, and strategic partners.

This paper presents results from a survey of directors of teaching and learning centers (CTLs) at U.S. higher education institutions about the involvement of librarians in CTLs and perception of their contributions. To date, there has been no systematic data collection and analysis of CTL/library partnerships on a national scale. A major large-scale study of faculty development professionals listed librarians as among CTL partners but provided no further detail, thus inspiring questions about the nature and extent of the participation. This study represents the view from outside the library of how librarians are participating in CTLs.

The first teaching and learning center was opened in 1962 at the University of Michigan and the majority were established during the 1970’s and 1980’s. While librarians have likely worked with CTLs in various ways throughout the years, there are relatively few accounts in the literature of these partnerships, and these are from the perspective of librarians and are largely case studies of individual libraries. These articles outline how the infrastructure and relationship opportunities offered by CTLs can be used to meet the need to expand librarians’ capacity as educators. Jacobson surveyed instruction librarians at ARL libraries to outline their participation with CTLs and provided examples from five institutions. Warner and Seamans presented benefits of such collaborations for librarians as customers, providers, and participants, using case studies from their institutions (Notre Dame and Virginia Tech). A formal partnership with the CTL to create a community of teaching librarians, with a librarian also assigned to work in the CTL, was successfully established at the University of Toronto. Librarians at Colorado State University participated in the Master Teaching Initiative, sponsored by the CTL. At Middle Tennessee State University, librarians heeded the call in the Framework for Information Literacy to create “communities of conversation” by leading a Faculty Learning Community on Information Literacy. Finally, an article from outside the library literature reports on an initiative by the University of Kansas Center for Teaching Excellence to create course design teams which included librarians, faculty, writing center specialists, and graduate student fellows.

Methodology and Results
Participants in the study were directors of centers for teaching and learning and comparable faculty development units at higher education institutions throughout the United States. A total of 388 surveys were sent out via email
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during Fall 2018, and 92 responses were received, for a response rate of 23.7%. In addition, follow-up telephone interviews were conducted with twelve of the forty-two respondents who were willing to be contacted. The distribution list for the directors was developed from the list of Other Teaching Centers developed by the University of Kansas [https://cte.ku.edu/other-teaching-centers] and the list of HBCU schools from NICHE [https://www.niche.com/blog/list-of-hbcu-schools-in-america-2/], with additional institutions added as identified from other sources. It was quite encouraging to have such a positive response from colleagues outside of the library, and their willingness to participate indicated a recognition on their part that exploring this collaboration is worth their time.

The survey consisted of thirteen questions (see appendix 1). The first four questions asked about demographics of the institution and provided the following profile: Responses came from a wide range of geographic locations and types and sizes of institutions. Responses represented 38 states and the District of Columbia. Public and private institutions were almost equally represented (public = 55.43% and private = 44.57%). The size of the institutions ranged from those with under 1,000 FTE’s (3.26%) to those with over 30,000 FTE’s (6.52%). Half of the institutions (55.43%) were in the range 5,000—19,999 FTE’s. Almost half of the respondents were from Research/Doctoral institutions, including Ivy League schools, with the breakdown for the type of institution as follows: Research/doctoral, 46.15%, Comprehensive, 27.47%, Liberal Arts, 16.48%, and Community College, 4.4%.

The rest of the questions asked for details about the center and librarian participation, and results are reported below.

**Question 5: What is the size of your center’s staff (indicate how many are students)?**
The size of the staff for the respondents’ centers range from .1 to 58. Size of staff did not necessarily coincide with the size of the institution (although the method of data collection precluded making a definite comparison).

**Question 6: Is your center housed in the Library?**
Responses to this question were about half and half (45.65% yes, 54.35% no). The breakdown by type of institution with the center in the library is as follows: Comprehensive 56.00%, Liberal Arts 53.33%, Research/Doctoral 40.48%, and Community College 40.00%

While it might be expected that the centers housed in the library would have greater librarian participation, this did not prove to be an overwhelming factor. For those housed in the library, 80.95% said librarians participate in their activities; for those not housed in the library, 84% said librarians participate. Based on the open-ended comments and interview conversations, it appears that other factors, such as the people involved and the nature of the relationships, are greater determining factors.

**Question 7: Do librarians participate in your center’s activities and work?**
It is encouraging that over three-quarters of the respondents said that librarians did participate (82.61%—n=76, with 17.39%—n=16, saying they did not). Of the sixteen who said librarians do not participate, ten still responded to Question 10 that it was beneficial to have librarians participate. It is not clear how to interpret this discrepancy; one of the ten said her CTL was new and she hoped to have librarians participate in the future. Four of these ten have centers that are housed in the library, so it may be that they benefit from what librarians do, since some noted librarians were good at accessing information and providing resources. The remaining six of the sixteen are those who said librarians did not participate and it was not beneficial to have librarians participate.

By type of institution, the ones with the highest participation are liberal arts (100%). The other rates of participation are: Research/Doctoral, 80.95%, and Comprehensive and Community Colleges both 80%.
Question 8: If librarians participate, in what ways?
As might be expected, attending workshops was the most prevalent (and passive) form of participation, with the more traditional role of providing resources as the second most frequent. And delivering workshops was the third, ahead of more involved collaboration and instructional partnership activities:

Responses to the ‘Other’ option provided additional means of participating, including serving on the center’s advisory council and other teaching and learning committees (e.g., first-year curriculum), co-facilitating workshops, co-authoring articles and chapters, working with faculty on LMS and OER projects, as well as other technologies.

Question 9: Do you see librarians as fellow educators or as support staff?
The majority of respondents (84.78%) saw librarians as fellow educators. Responses varied by type of institution, with the following percent seeing librarians as fellow educators: Comprehensive, 92%; Liberal Arts, 86.67%; Research/Doctoral, 83.33%; and Community Colleges, 80%. This perception was not greatly affected by whether or not the center was housed in the library. Of those centers housed in the library, 83.33% of the respondents saw librarians as fellow educators; of those not housed in the library, 86% saw them as fellow educators.

Illuminating responses included that “on my campus, librarians are not regular faculty”, which points to the status of librarians as one of the issues affecting perception and collaboration. One respondent said librarians had a ‘chip on their shoulder and have a hard time with respect and credibility from faculty”.

Question 10: Is it beneficial to have librarian/library involvement in your teaching and learning activities?
The majority of respondents (N=84) said yes (92.31%), with 7.69% no (N=7). Of the seven who said ‘not beneficial’, six (except for one community college) also said librarians did not participate (Question 7). Of the seven, five said they collaborated with the Library ‘infrequently’, one said a ‘moderate amount’, and one said ‘not at all’. So again, there is the correlation between a positive perception and the frequency of interaction. For type of institution, Liberal Arts respondents were the most positive (100% beneficial), with Research/Doctoral at 95.12%, Comprehensive at 92%, and Community Colleges at 60%.
Question 11: What are the benefits of having library/librarian involvement?

Question 11 was an open-ended question and the comments provide the directors’ perspective on what librarians can bring to a partnership and what role(s) they can play. The key ideas reflect in large part realities and assumptions that librarians themselves likely have, but that need reinforcing from outside the library. Here are the themes that appeared most frequently.

1. **Librarians have a complementary role.** CTL’s and libraries can combine their strengths and expertise so that both sides can benefit. “We both serve faculty so can create a holistic approach together.” However, determining the role of each partner will be crucial for facilitating collaboration. “When librarians use their strengths…their expertise is invaluable.” But it has to be clear to librarians and their partners what their strengths are.

2. **Librarians have a unique perspective on student learning.** This is one of the most striking and repeated comments. Librarians need to take note and determine how to capture and convey this knowledge. “Librarians have access to moments of student learning that others don’t.” “Librarians can help faculty see possibilities of new assignments and approaches.” “Librarians have their fingers on the pulse of a set of ideas that might elude faculty…” “Librarians hear feedback from students about research assignments that students would never share with faculty.”

3. **Librarians have the capacity to build bridges and relationships across campus and disciplines, which can further the work of the CTLs.** Librarians themselves are aware that one of their strengths is that they work with faculty and staff in all academic and administrative units across campus and that they touch students in all disciplines. Comments recognizing this advantage include: “Libraries are a hub for faculty so the more we can collaborate, the better.” “They are well-informed, know many people and issues on campus and work extremely well with their fellow faculty members.” “They help more fully connect the work of our Center to the research mission of the university.” Their participation “helps to decrease the silo effect that is prevalent in higher education.”

4. **Librarians bring a unique and valuable set of skills and expertise that others value.** These include information literacy expertise, knowledge of resources and accessing information, technological expertise and assistance, and instructional design and pedagogical experience and expertise. Comments include: “Librarians have been instrumental in helping our faculty better target information literacy and inquiry-based thinking.” “They bring knowledge of resources available that our center staff may not be aware of.” “They have extraordinary resource literacy.” “They are a great resource for our faculty clientele, they bring a different perspective, they are at the forefront of many teaching and learning initiatives, e.g., OER, digital humanities, etc.”

5. **The status of librarians as faculty does have an effect on how they are perceived and what work they can do.** Comments include the following: “Our librarians are tenure-line faculty. Many teaching faculty members see them as colleagues rather than the ‘staff’ perception they may have of CTL professionals.” “The librarians that help facilitate in our Master Teacher program are classified as faculty and participate and lead sessions as peers with other faculty.”

Question 12: What are the challenges of library/librarian involvement?

This was also an open-ended question and the comments may point more clearly to directions for change than the benefits do and sometimes the challenges are in conflict with the benefits.

1. **Time, schedules, location, and staffing present challenges to collaboration and planning.** This was frequently mentioned. “We are all very busy—hard to make time to get together to truly collaborate (vs. each of us
co-sponsoring one another’s separate workshops). “Not housed near each other—both short-staffed.”

2. While librarians bring valuable skills, they have limited experience with pedagogy or with faculty development and do not share the normal teaching experiences of faculty, which makes it more difficult for them to participate fully in faculty development activities or for others to know when to include them. “Limited experience with pedagogy, SoTL, and tend to offer training opportunities rather than deeper program engagements with faculty.” “They don’t have as much of a classroom perspective.” “Their teaching context is often very different and constrained (e.g., 1-time session in a class on how to use a database).”

3. Faculty status of librarians was unclear to a number of respondents or its lack was an obstacle to faculty acceptance. Comments include: “Librarians have a second class citizen status on our campus (as do I who direct the Faculty Center)”. “Their status as not quite faculty is problematic in some settings.” “Faculty not seeing them as peers.” “Position titles that are not comparable with academic titles.”

4. CTL’s and the Library have different goals and missions. “The library has a different mandate and a different audience, so does not always envision programs in the same way.” “They have a more narrow focus than we do, so sometimes the info literacy focus doesn’t align well.”

5. Faculty don’t understand or are not aware of what librarians can offer. “…sometimes faculty don’t see the value of including a librarian.” “…we need to promote awareness of contributions and support faculty-librarian partnerships in course design.”

6. Making collaboration work takes considerable time and effort. “Willingness to work together.” “Buy-in.” “Our failure to be as intentional as we could be in reaching out to them.”

7. Librarians at some institutions have negative attitudes or compete with CTL activities. “The library staff provides their own series of faculty development events, so sometimes there is a friendly competition for faculty attention.” “They are territorial.”

8. Librarians are not always comfortable with a teaching role in relationship to faculty. “Some people are not very out-going and/or comfortable speaking in front of a lot of faculty.”

9. In some places, there is a lack of support from university and library administrations, who may not understand or prioritize the teaching role of the Library. “Our current upper admin, and upper library admin, still tend to see librarians as information managers rather than pedagogy supporters….good teaching-focused librarians don’t stay long-term in our libraries.”

**Question 13: How often do you collaborate with these campus units?**

The top three partners were Technology/IT Center, Office of Academic Deans or Colleges and Library. This parallels the findings of the major survey of faculty developers by Beach, Sorcinelli, Austin, and Rivard. They reported that collaborations were less extensive than expected, but that the educational development work of teaching and learning centers needed to expand to include librarians and other instructional staff. Some CTLs, as well as some libraries, have highlighted these partnerships by listing them, with links, on their websites.

More granular data can be found by looking at the percentages under each frequency variable (All the time, A great deal, A moderate amount, Infrequently, Not at all). The Library still comes up #3 for ‘all the time’ and ‘a great deal,’ but is #1 for the ‘moderate amount’ category. A surprising finding is that the Writing Center is so low on the list. It has the highest percent reported for infrequent collaboration.

Looking at frequency of collaboration and type of institution, Liberal Arts institutions are the ones with the highest percentage of collaboration between centers and the library for the combined categories of ‘all the time’ and ‘a great deal’ (and zero for “Infrequently”).
To provide more depth for the survey data, the investigators conducted phone interviews with twelve CTL directors out of forty-two who indicated on the survey their willingness to be interviewed. The interviews consisted of seven questions (see appendix 2) and were of approximately 30-45 minutes in length. Interviewees are from a variety of institutions: public and private; research universities; comprehensive four-year; and liberal arts colleges.

Using basic thematic coding, the investigators identified the following major themes across the responses from interviewees. These themes reflect the themes that emerged from the survey comments on benefits and challenges of librarian participation in CTLs.

1. **Underdeveloped (but potentially complementary) roles for librarians in teaching and learning roles.** CTL directors commented on the positive, if sometimes attenuated, impact that librarians have on student learning, and attributed this reality to the fact that librarians are usually not instructors of record, and do not see the “whole” of the curriculum that faculty develop and that students experience. Several of the Directors commented on librarians’ increasing role with OERs (Open Educational Resources) as an opportunity for broader involvement in the teaching enterprise. Other directors commented on librarian participation in Faculty Learning Communities and reading groups, workshops, and seminars.

   A very interesting aspect of the underdeveloped role of librarians in teaching and learning is that it appears that librarians are not having conversations about the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* with CTL staff, who could be their logical partners for expanding the understanding of information literacy. Of the twelve directors who were interviewed, all but one (who has been actively involved with librarians and SoTL) were unaware or only vaguely aware of the *Framework*. Two of the directors who hadn’t heard of the *Framework* then asked their librarian colleagues about it and discovered that they were using it with faculty in their IL instruction and in programs such as first-year tutorials, thus on a separate teaching and learning track from the CTL. So, these findings indicate that librarians are using the *Framework* in their own instructional work with faculty but are not bringing it to the larger CTL table.
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2. **Nascent role for librarians as educational developers.** Three Directors observed that librarians could become instructional consultants or educational developers in an analogous way to the role of CTL staff, in partnering with faculty on assignment or course design and infusing information literacy into the curriculum in a more integrated way. One CTL Director noted that librarians need to join “design teams” and focus more broadly on design along with others on campus.

3. **Librarians as interdisciplinary champions for students** as a concomitant and unique role, offering the institution a different perspective on student barriers and challenges in learning—student learning challenges not seen by faculty in the classroom, lab, or studio. One interviewee noted the similarity in roles between that of librarians and staff in Student Life.

4. **Unclear status for librarians.** Even friendly colleagues such as CTL directors were not always certain about what status librarians hold on their own campuses—whether they were tenure-line faculty, non-tenure-line faculty, or some intermediate or special category. This uncertainty creates some difficulty in knowing when or how librarians can be included in campus groups, or what they might “bring to the table” in some cases. One CTL director did observe that at her institution, librarians were in two categories, making it a challenge to be inclusive of all library colleagues in campus committees and initiatives focused on teaching and learning.

5. **Librarians’ lack of assertiveness and strategic positioning.** Although Directors were positive about librarians’ existing contributions, most commented on the need for librarians to become more visible, more assertive, and more strategically thoughtful about offering their expertise. One Director commented on the need for librarians to become much more aware of the power structure on their campuses and how to connect to it.

6. **Need to deepen understanding faculty culture and scholarship.** To become partners with faculty at the course and curriculum level, and to work more effectively with CTL staff, librarians will need to understand faculty behavior, faculty resistance to change, and faculty incentives around their scholarship, and know how teaching fits within the overall faculty set of priorities. One Director spoke of the need for librarians to develop the “language of complexity” used by faculty, and to avoid a kind of mechanistic solutionism about teaching and learning that fails to address the complexity that faculty see in learning the ways of thinking in their disciplines.

7. **A collaborative shift in mindset needed.** To participate fully with faculty in redesigning courses and curricula, librarians need a new “intellectual sophistication,” according to one Director. Librarians need to become “thought partners” with CTL staff and with faculty in order to contribute most deeply to changing the curriculum and deepening student learning. Librarians need to understand faculty as learners themselves—as highly expert ones, but as members of a community of learners who are often uncertain about the complexities of teaching and learning even with their great disciplinary knowledge. Librarians need a new form of professional development involving coaching and guidance about faculty as learners. And they also need to understand themselves as learners.

8. **Centers as hubs and connectors.** Several Directors spoke of their vision for their Centers as “hubs” or “connectors”, places where faculty can engage in pedagogical experimentation, in conversations with colleagues about that experimentation, and where they can showcase their learning about pedagogy. Directors see a multiplier effect that comes from a convergence of interests and expertise in their Centers, and believe that faculty allies and champions are their surest path to success—in addressing large institutional challenges and opportunities around teaching and learning. Several Directors spoke of opportunities for librarians to amplify their influence through partnerships in programming offered.
by their Centers, to reach faculty more adroitly through Center programming, and to join in communities of learning sponsored by Centers to help the Library itself achieve its educational goals. One Director spoke of the need for her Center to use “match-making” in pairing faculty with other faculty around teaching issues or challenges, and suggested that librarians could become part of that “match-making” activity. Another Director spoke of the emerging model for integrative professional development for all faculty need at her Center, with undergraduate research, assessment, writing support, and faculty development all brought together in a “one stop shop” for faculty.

9. Culture change and networks. In speaking of the role of his Center as a “thought partner” with faculty, one Director asserted that he seeks a true partnership or collaborative role, rather than the more traditional service role offered by many Teaching and Learning Centers. A baseline of services supporting instructional development, technology support, and related areas may be necessary, but the full partnership model will require the intellectual engagement of multiple parties through “networks” of influence—informal groups that are the testbeds of pedagogical innovation and experimentation. Such culture change around the teaching and learning mission of the institution requires “small significant networks” of ongoing conversation about teaching and learning, according to one Director. Those networks create the grassroots energy that propels inquiry into teaching and learning across institutions, and builds a collective knowledge base and continuing, open-ended experimentation in creating a richer learning environment for all. Another Director spoke of the need for Centers to think deeply about trends in higher education, the shifting roles of faculty away from content expert to pedagogy expert, the impact of technology, and ubiquity of information itself—and to recast the role of Centers to address these big challenges and to help the institution prove its “value proposition.” Librarians have an opportunity to join these larger conversations through partnerships with Center Directors and their staffs.

Conclusion
It is encouraging that the overwhelming majority of our survey respondents, who are directors of centers for teaching and learning at all types and sizes of institutions across the country, are positive about the participation of librarians in their center’s activities and see them as fellow educators. But what does this mean for either CTLs or Libraries? What do the themes from the survey comments and the interviews tell us about new directions? How can librarians seize upon this partnership opportunity to enhance their impact on teaching and learning?

CTLs and libraries share common challenges. Because of changes in higher education and demands from stakeholders, including a new focus on student learning and assessment, both face the need to define and transform their roles at the institutional level. Both need to come in from the margins to claim a seat at the table. Both have tended to play support roles in service of faculty and institutional priorities, defaulting to a more traditional role without necessarily taking a leadership role in shaping these priorities. Yet both enjoy an institution-wide platform in terms of their role and the connections they have across campus. And with their joint commitment to improving student success through teaching and learning, they can join together for transformative change.

The opportunity for librarian/CTL collaboration can be seen more clearly if viewed through the lens of creating change in higher education, change that can be scaled and sustained. “First-order change involves minor adjustments and improvements in one or a few dimensions of the organization; it does not change the organization’s core...Second-order change is transformational change; the underlying values or mission, culture, functional processes, and the structure of the organization change.”
But no one unit can accomplish this alone. “The advantage of utilizing collective leadership in change processes is that it encourages more individuals to be a part of the process, which in most studies has been shown to facilitate change.”13 Indeed, the term ‘educational development’ is now preferred over ‘faculty development’ as a more inclusive term to reflect the range of constituencies.14 And collective achievements have more impact and visibility.

Collective leadership needs several building blocks, and from the interplay of themes in our survey and interviews, libraries and CTLs are poised to start building. Collaboration takes time and effort. Change agents embarking on strategic and interdisciplinary partnering have to work out shared purpose and goals, engage in a deliberate reflection on the definition of roles and responsibilities, cultivate a sense of trust, play to each partner’s strengths, and level out differences in status.15 All of this takes conscious and committed conversations, shared extended experiences and a tolerance of diverse perspectives, which can be fostered by the CTL.

CTLs, as connector hubs, are being called upon by institutions to lead transformative change and to move from the individual or peer-to-peer to a more intentional structural and systemic approach to large-scale institutional change.16 Schroeder has challenged CTLs to “come in from the margins”, arguing that faculty developers’ organizational role is what is demanded in the current world of higher education.17 Facing this same need for role transformation, libraries could shift their information literacy work from being library-centric to joining in the mission of CTLs, or other offices sponsoring educational development, thus achieving greater impact and visibility as a catalyst for change at the institutional level. The question that CTLs and libraries can face together is “given that this role change is occurring, what changes must we make to proactively prepare and implement this role effectively?”18

Change Agenda #1: Librarians need to redefine their roles, in terms of developing their identity as educators and in terms of being collaborators and change agents.

This role redefinition involves a shift in mindset19 and identity and means moving away from individual and instructional level activities, however compelling those might be, toward a broader conception of educator at the campus level.20 Survey results show that faculty are unclear or unaware of what librarians can do, and librarians need more confidence or assertiveness to change this. Comments from respondents also show that CTL directors value the unique work that librarians already do—providing resources, working with OERs, digital scholarship—but that we need to step beyond a traditional service role.

The CTL can be a stage to show what librarians can do. We have known for years about the need to respond to larger institutional priorities and questions, but we have not always known how to engage in capacity-building with campus partners in order to accomplish those larger goals.21 Just as the survey respondents and interviewees in this study emphasized the need for CTL staff to influence through campus networks and through being “at the table”, librarians need to expand their role beyond occasional participation in teaching-related workshops and faculty reading groups, toward an active change agent role, along with others, as ‘thought leaders’, as one interviewee encouraged.

This change agent role requires deeper thinking about institution-level challenges about teaching and learning, and contributions in advancing collaborative solutions. From the perspective of CTLs (which also applies to libraries), Schroeder states that “these challenges require broad-based collaboration among multiple ‘experts’ and shifts in values, boundaries, and paradigms undergirding the structures and policies that inhibit significant institutional change.”22 Discussions focused on synoptic views of perennially challenging large-enrollment courses; reaccreditation initiatives focused on pedagogy; course transformations; and student success initiatives are examples of institution-level discussions where librarians can fruitfully contribute. Doing so will mean learn-
ing to lead in a collaborative environment, and looking for strategic opportunities to contribute along with CTL colleagues. The campus educator role requires an intentional turn toward the strategic mindset, keenly honed sense-making of dynamic campus environments, and an ability to think, speak, present, and write about student learning with colleagues beyond the library. It involves developing “social capital” and credibility with those colleagues, and learning along with them as the institution addresses its big challenges.

Change Agenda #2: Librarians need to cultivate networks of colleagues and a systems perspective in order to advance the large institutional challenges described.

Learning how to be “at the table”, as described by Schroeder, means knowing what special knowledge, expertise, and skills one can bring to the larger conversation and asserting the right to be there. CTLs themselves, as connector hubs, can be catalysts where these networks of colleagues, including librarians, can form and learn from each other. In the same way, librarians need to join, where possible, those places where grassroots energy occur, the “small significant conversations.” These are those informal conversations that occur in the “backstage” of campus life, among small groups of colleagues, as opposed to the “front stage” or public events where participants present more scripted views. Knowing how to move adroitly across the landscape of conversations about teaching and learning, whether small and private or large and public, is crucial in cultivating relationships. The general conception of “campus networks” of which Kezar writes is crucial to understanding how to initiate, guide, and sustain larger-scale change initiatives, and librarians need to construct maps together of those networks: through written descriptions, visualizations, and other depictions of where mutual influences occur, where new ideas are generated, and where the energies for learning together catalyze further institutional change.

Change agenda #3: Librarians need to create new professional development programs, both internally and externally, that will prepare them for new roles as educators and change agents.

To better position librarians as strategic partners with Centers for Teaching and Learning, new “integrative professional development models”, mirroring the integrative learning we emphasize for students, need to be developed to get beyond silos and departments. Such a program may be two-tiered: one strand, focused within libraries themselves, to best prepare librarians for wider participation on campus, covering such topics as faculty culture, signature pedagogies, Decoding the Disciplines, SoTL, and collaborative leadership strategies. A second strand, designed to develop relationships with a larger community of learners across campus, could focus on broader topics that join librarians’ expertise in information-seeking and the core concepts of the Framework for Information Literacy, with the scholarly approaches to teaching and learning of faculty and other instructional partners.

The survey results show that librarians are participating in CTLs in more traditional ways (attending and delivering workshops, providing resources) and that their lack of regular teaching experience makes it difficult to know where to include them and affects their credibility with faculty. They could change their role and recognition dramatically by engaging in faculty learning communities, where they would both enhance their pedagogical knowledge and become known for their unique perspective and expertise through being actively involved in longer-term relationships with faculty. Faculty have been “neglected learners,” as have librarians, and librarians should realize that faculty bring their disciplinary expertise, but they share librarians’ experience of not having been trained in pedagogy, so everyone will join in learning together. Both librarians and faculty have been impeded by ‘imposter syndrome.’ Here is an opportunity for librarians to propose FLCs that focus on information literacy within the larger context of student learning. At the institutional level, research has shown that “faculty learning communities are valuable mechanisms for sustaining and scaling change.”
Another proactive way librarians can participate both as contributors and learners is to join CTL-sponsored assignment or course design teams such as the one organized at the University of Kansas, which included colleagues from the libraries and the writing center, as well as graduate student fellows. One of the authors was interviewed for our study and noted that this course design team project shaped her view of how to work with librarians, since she had not previously understood the role that librarians could play in instruction. Several other respondents agreed with her advice that librarians should be involved on the front end, rather than brought in later when problems emerge, and that librarians have the potential to be educational developers.

Forging a new, shared understanding and experience of professional development that transcends silos, departmental boundaries, and individual preferences is, in a way, counter-cultural to the prevailing ethos of the academy. Lee Shulman’s call of over twenty years ago for a new scholarship, a scholarship of teaching and learning, complements his other call, for a “wisdom of practice” that comes from deep reflection on one’s professional work and on one’s professional identity. At this point, creating shared understandings about scholarly approaches to teaching and learning through communities of learners—including faculty as “expert learners”, educational developers, librarians, instructional designers, and others---is a strategic opportunity for librarians, as partners and as campus leaders.

What we have learned from the perspectives of CTL directors about the current and potential of librarian participation in campus teaching and learning collaborations leads us to directions for change that should be explored by librarians and their campus partners. In this way, new communities of learners can grow on our campuses, with an institutional culture of collaboration for conversation, inquiry, mutual influence, and deeper engagement with the large questions that the academy, at its best, poses to our students and ourselves—as learners together.
Appendix 1. Survey

Survey of Centers for Teaching and Learning

As a faculty or staff member at a center for teaching and learning or comparable faculty/educational development unit at a postsecondary institution, you are invited to participate in this research study. The purpose of this study is to explore the extent and potential benefits of partnerships between librarians/libraries and centers for teaching and learning.

The co-investigators are Dr. Sharon Mader, Professor and Dean Emeritus of the University of New Orleans Library and Craig Gibson, Professor and Professional Development Coordinator at The Ohio State University Library. This project has been determined exempt from IRB review at The Ohio State University and the University of New Orleans.

The survey will take approximately 5 minutes to complete. You will be asked to click through a short series of questions with options for response, either multiple choice or open-ended. You may skip any questions you do not feel comfortable answering. Participation in the study is voluntary, and responses will be completely confidential. Participants may withdraw at any time without penalty.

We will work to make sure that no one sees your survey responses without approval. But, because we are using the Internet, there is a chance that someone could access your online responses without permission. In some cases, this information could be used to identify you. Following coding and analysis, de-identified survey data will be kept in secure electronic storage for five years. Results of the study will be disseminated through conference papers and professional publications.

If you have any questions at any time about this study, please contact Co-Investigators Dr. Sharon Mader at smader@uno.edu/504-280-6556 or Craig Gibson at Gibson.721@osu.edu/614-292-5466.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant in this study, you may contact Dr. Ann O’Hanlon of the University of New Orleans Institutional Review Board at 504-280-3990, or Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Ohio State University Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251.

Return of the questionnaire will be considered your consent to participate. Print a copy of this page for your records if desired.

1. In what state is your institution located?
2. Is your institution public or private?
   - Public
   - Private
3. Indicate your type of institution
   - Research/doctoral
   - Liberal Arts
   - Comprehensive
   - Community College
   - Other (please specify)
4. What is the size of your institution?
   - <1,000 FTE  
   - 1,000-4,999 FTE  
   - 5,000-9,999 FTE  
   - 10,000-19,999 FTE  
   - 20,000-29,999 FTE  
   - >30,000 FTE

5. What is the size of your center’s staff (indicate how many are students)?
   - Staff _________  
   - Students _________

6. Is your center housed in the Library?
   - Yes  
   - No

7. Do librarians participate in your center’s activities and work?
   - Yes  
   - No

8. If so, in what ways? Check all that apply.
   - Attend workshops and other professional development offerings  
   - Deliver workshops and other professional development offerings  
   - Belong to faculty learning communities  
   - Identify and provide information and research resources  
   - Offer an institutional repository to archive faculty pedagogical work  
   - Collaborate with faculty to design/redesign courses and curricula  
   - Other (please specify)

9. Do you see librarians as fellow educators or as support staff?
   - Fellow educators  
   - Support staff

10. Is it beneficial to have librarian/library involvement in your teaching and learning activities?
    - Yes  
    - No

11. If so, what are the benefits of having library/librarian involvement?

12. How often do you collaborate with these campus units?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Unit</th>
<th>All the time</th>
<th>A great deal</th>
<th>A moderate amount</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology/IT Center</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of academic deans or colleges</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Center</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs/Residence Life</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning Office</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate College</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Are you willing to be contacted for a follow-up interview? If so, please provide contact information.
   - Name _______________________________________________________
   - Company ____________________________________________________
   - Address ____________________________________________________
   - Address 2 __________________________________________________
   - City/Town State/Province____________________________________
   - ZIP/Postal Code____________________________________________
   - Country ____________________________________________________
   - Email Address _____________________________________________
   - Phone Number _____________________________________________
Appendix 2. Interview Questions

1. Increasingly, librarians see an emerging role for themselves as educators (as classroom instructors and instructional designers). Do you see this as the primary role for librarians as educators or are there other roles that are equally or more important for supporting teaching and learning? How are your roles complementary?

2. How do librarians participate in your faculty learning communities?

3. What do librarians need to learn or do to become more effective partners? With CTL staff? With faculty?

4. Have librarians at your institution promoted the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education with your staff? With faculty in general? (See http://sandbox.acrl.org/library-collection/framework-elevator-speech-handout for further information.)

5. How would you describe the culture of teaching and learning at your institution? Is it an institutional priority?

6. In what ways do you think CTLs can act as change agents to improve the culture of teaching and learning on campus? How can librarians help?

7. Anything else you’d like to add?

Notes

1. Beach et al., Faculty Development in the Age of Evidence.

2. Jacobson, “Partnerships between Library Instruction Units and Campus Teaching Centers.” In addition to survey results, examples are provided from five institutions: SUNY-Albany, Queen’s University, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Iowa State University, and Virginia Tech.

3. An unexpected but important benefit of the relationship between the CTL and the Virginia Tech Library was “a subtle shift in the way the librarians are viewed by their colleagues around the university. There is an increased sense of librarians as peers… in the teaching and learning mission of the university and who contribute in ways beyond the traditional role of providing information resources and document delivery services.” Warner and Seamans, “Teaching Centers, Libraries, and Benefits to Both,” 39.

4. Benefits of the partnership between the CTL and the University of Toronto Libraries accrued to both sides: “The effect of shared leadership, boundary spanning and an eagerness to experiment with new models of intentional partnerships can be a lasting change in the culture of both teaching centres and libraries.” Bolan et al., “Realizing Partnership Potential,” 197.

5. Beyond just attending or presenting workshops, librarians at Colorado State University are participating as students and learners. “By participating in programs offered by CTLs, rather than simply contributing to such programs, librarians can elevate their own teaching profile and hone the teaching skills that are increasingly important to professional development, promotion, and personal growth.” Hoseth, “Library Participation in a Campus-Wide Teaching Program,” 381.


7. At Middle Tennessee State University, “by using the infrastructure of the Learning, Teaching, & Innovation Technology Center’s Faculty Learning Community program, the library was able to bring together a group of interdisciplinary faculty to engage in a year-long program in which they discussed how information literacy fit within the context of the larger academic community.” Vance, Lanfear, and Richey, “Info Lit Squad Goals,” 346.

8. From the non-librarian perspective, one lesson learned from the collaboration was that it was better to involve librarians and other instructional experts on the front end in “collaborative proactive instructional design instead of calling on [them] for assistance only after specific skill deficits emerged.” Bernstein and Greenhoot, “Team-Designed Improvement of Writing and Critical Thinking,” 40.

9. Beach et al., Faculty Development in the Age of Evidence.

10. See, for example, the list of campus partners at the Endeavor Center for Faculty Development at Rollins College, https://www.rollins.edu/endeavor/our-team/index.html.


12. Kezar, Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change, 16


15. Brown et al, “Creating a Supportive Teaching Culture.”
16. Beach et al., *Faculty Development in the Age of Evidence*; Felten and Chick, “Is SoTL a Signature Pedagogy”; Kelley, Cruz, and Fire, “Moving Toward the Center”.
17. Schroeder, *Coming in from the Margins*.
20. Schroeder, *Coming in from the Margins*; Kelley, Cruz, and Fire, “Moving Toward the Center”.
21. Iannuzzi, “Faculty Development and Information Literacy”.
23. Schroeder, *Coming in from the Margins*.
31. Bernstein and Greenhoot, “Team-Designed Improvement of Writing and Critical Thinking.”
32. Shulman, *The Wisdom of Practice*.
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