Reaching the Faculty of the Future…
Now: Marketing Instructional Services to Graduate Students

Liz Cooper, Chris Palazzolo, and Anna Van Scoyoc

Abstract
It has been common among academic libraries to place disproportionate focus on their undergraduate, rather than graduate populations. The evidence for this is not only anecdotal, but is pervasive throughout the library literature. Librarians are slowly starting to acknowledge this lopsided focus and conceptualize new practices to emphasize graduate student training and support. We believe that Emory has a unique program in the way that librarians’ have become involved with various existing programs across campus that train graduate students in their future roles as instructors. This paper contains approaches the librarians at Emory used to take advantage of existing programs on campus and will inform readers of the various means by which they can educate graduate student instructors about instructional services and effective research project development at their respective institutions.

Introduction
Librarians at Emory University have begun an initiative to promote research-based learning and to market library instructional services to an underserved academic population—namely, graduate students—by partnering with the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS) as well as with individual graduate departments. The GSAS has a unique teacher training program, TATTO, (or Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity), which is designed to prepare graduate students to enter the professoriate as competent and confident teachers. Participation in TATTO is required of all students pursuing the Emory Ph.D. and consists not only of “training” but also of actual hands-on experience in the classroom through teaching assistantships and co-teaching.1 For the past few years, a number of reference and instructional services librarians took the opportunity to work with the GSAS and organized several TATTO workshops to assist in teaching graduate students. These interactive sessions served as an excellent means of promoting research-based inquiry and demonstrating to these teachers-in-training the role(s) that the librarians can play in instruction and research particularly in terms of instruction and assignment development.

Liz Cooper is the Anthropology Librarian at Emory University, email: ecoope2@emory.edu; Chris Palazzolo is the Political Science and International Documents Librarian at Emory University, email: cpalazz@emory.edu; and Anna Van Scoyoc is the Instructional Services Librarian at Emory University, email: avansco@emory.edu.
Librarians also reached graduate students through partnerships with existing programs through their work with individual departments’ pedagogy courses and collaboration with graduate teachers in instruction for their classes. Individual graduate departments offer a (required) pedagogical course designed to meet the needs of instructors unique to their respective disciplines, and many librarians have become involved in teaching these classes and using them as another opportunity to educate the future professoriate.

Review of the Literature
The review of literature was done in three parts. The first search targeted finding publications about services libraries offer graduate and teaching assistants. A review revealed citations to case studies, empirical reports, and qualitative papers that focused on graduate students. There are a number of articles focusing on the incorporation of information literacy into the graduate curriculum. Additionally, there is an abundance of literature regarding the research services offered to graduate level students. Aside from Samson and Millet, there appears to be a dearth of literature regarding librarians educating and marketing their instructional services, as well as collaborating in the assignment design and teaching research skills, to teaching assistants.

The second literature search focused on locating publications about librarian-instructor collaborations. The current literature regarding libraries’ instructional services to instructors focuses on efforts librarians have taken to collaborate specifically with tenure-track or adjunct faculty, especially in developing effective assignments that successfully develop students’ information literacy and research skills.

The third literature review targeted publications discussing the importance of programs undertaking the proper training of future teachers. Interestingly, at the grade school teacher education level, librarians and faculty were working together to teach their future teachers (at the undergraduate level) the skills, resources, and tools needed to successfully incorporate research-based learning in their future classrooms. Asselin and Lee discussed the benefits of reaching out to teacher education students in order to develop their knowledge of the ways and means a teacher-librarian can assist in co-designing courses and creating strong assignments that effectively develop grade school students’ information literacy skills. Witt and Dickinson described a collaboration between an education studies undergraduate program and the university library that developed an undergraduate curriculum “to improve librarian–teacher cooperation through instruction in the information literacy skills outlined in the Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education, and to mentor pre-service teachers in practical methods of integrating information literacy instruction in both their student teaching and their future professional lives.”

At the university and college level, faculty have recognized the need to formally train graduate students (i.e., future faculty) in the theories and applications of teaching methods. Knotts and Main specifically outlined Emory’s own TATTO program and its benefit to political science graduate students in training to teach semester-long political science courses. Houston, speaking from a departmental chair perspective, outlined the ideal teaching training for Ph.D. programs using a formal teacher-training course, while Ritter, after recently securing a tenure track position, outlined the need for proper teacher training for future faculty during their Ph.D. coursework. Once again, however, little was found regarding the library’s marketing to and collaborating efforts with those graduate students during their course planning and teaching of undergraduate courses.

At Emory we have taken these two avenues, a graduate school sponsored program and a department’s formal teacher-training course, to reach this population that has not been tapped into the wealth of instructional services offered by librarians.

Strategy #1: TATTO Workshops
Overview of the TATTO Program at Emory
The Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity (TATTO) program was introduced by Emory University’s Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS) in 1991 as an effort to provide training and preparation for graduate students to enter the professoriate as competent instructors. Participation in the TATTO program is a degree requirement for all of those wishing to receive a Ph.D. from Emory. The rationale behind the TATTO program is that scholarship and teaching are not dueling concepts, but rather complimentary facets of an academic career. Students are required to participate in four separate stages of the program: (1) the graduate school course, (2) the departmental course, (3) the teaching assistantship, and (4) the teaching associateship.

The graduate school course is currently a two-day course in which students attend various sessions dedicated to a number of pedagogical issues and concepts
(e.g., lecturing, diversity, syllabus development, and grading). The final session is devoted to microteaching, in which students are required to present a fifteen-minute lecture (in their area of subject expertise) in front of their peers. After successful completion of the graduate school course, students enroll in departmental TATTO courses which focus upon relevant issues within their chosen area of graduate study. The third and fourth requirements of the program involve working as a teaching assistant and as a co-teacher for a course in one’s field. As would be expected, the co-teacher benefits from more involvement in the course’s planning, instruction, and evaluation.

Graduate students who wish to continue to gain teaching experience during their graduate career are able to teach courses on their own after successful completion of the TATTO course. A prestigious and competitive fellowship—the Dean’s Teaching Fellowship—is also offered for exceptional graduate students who wish to teach their own course for one semester. The fellowship provides funding support for the remaining semester required for completion of the dissertation.

Finally, despite this very positive overview of the TATTO program, there are a few institutional weaknesses. The most important of these relates to departmental autonomy within the GSAS. Some departments require their students to enroll in TATTO their first year (while they are undergoing many other orientations to academic and social life at Emory more generally), whereas others require enrollment during the third year.

**Development of Library’s Role in TATTO**

Traditionally, the library has supported graduate students in various manners with their research needs and requests through departmental orientations, collection requests, and individual research consultations. Additionally, due to the popularity of online reserves, the Circulation and Reserves team has frequently offered sessions as part of TATTO for graduate students to demonstrate use of the electronic reserves software. However, little emphasis has been placed on providing resources or guidance to graduate students as instructors.

Several attempts had been made in the past to integrate library instructional services into the TATTO graduate course, with varying levels of success. The first major inroads were made in Fall 2004 when instructional services teamed up with the Emory Center for Interactive Teaching (http://ecit.emory.edu)—which assists Emory students and faculty with various multimedia projects, including web design, image scanning and production, and audiovisual needs—for a combined session for graduate students (repeated six times for six different sets of students). The majority of the session was devoted to ECIT and its services, with approximately fifteen minutes allocated to library instructional services. The session was marketed to the students more as technology in the classroom than as a “library” session. Our short component primarily focused on library services (e.g., research guides, workshops, etc. to assist instructors), but spent little time actually connecting these services to issues of pedagogy and instruction. The general assessment and consensus was that a full session would have been much more effective and worthwhile for librarians and graduate students alike.

One of the librarians, who was coincidentally a doctoral candidate in the Graduate Student of Arts and Sciences and had experienced the TATTO program himself, decided to pursue the concept of a full session for library instructional services for Fall 2005. He opened a discussion with the one of the assistant deans of the graduate school, who oversees the TATTO program, as to how to incorporate instructional resources and services into the two-day graduate course. The GSAS was extremely open to the session and a group of reference and instruction librarians began to meet to construct and structure the content of the session. The session would be led by two librarians and repeated with different sets of students six times over the next two days. Each session was (and still is) fifty minutes in length. The second year of the initiative was further divided between Woodruff Library, which serves as the main library on Emory’s campus, and the Health Sciences Library, which assists graduate students in the medical sciences (e.g., Nursing and Allied Health). The students in each session were from a variety of disciplines within the social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities.

**Instructional Design**

Our primary goals for the sessions were to promote research-based inquiry and demonstrate to these teachers-in-training the role(s) that librarians can play in instruction and research, particularly in terms of instruction and assignment development. We hoped the students would leave the session having thought about the fact that how they craft assignments could affect the learning experience of their students and the quality of work they receive.
We emphasized from the outset of the graduate school session that the goals of librarians are the same as those of teachers, i.e., that the ability to locate, evaluate, and effectively use information is common to all disciplines and learning environments. The introduction to the session demonstrates this confluence of teacher-librarian objectives:

Our goal today is to demonstrate how the library can collaborate with you (the instructor) in helping your students to effectively and ethically use, evaluate, and access information resources so as to strengthen the quality of their research projects and assignments. In addition, we would like to offer guidance in how we can help you create effective research assignments for students that help them to “research to learn.”

In both years of the library’s involvement with TATTO, our sessions followed the same basic outline:

• familiarizing the students with the literature and research surrounding the effectiveness of research-based learning (e.g. the Boyer Report11, the UGA <emma> Project12, and the Cornell citation study13),
• sharing information about the role of the librarian and what we can do to help, and
• encouraging the students to reflect upon their own experiences/situations.

We also compiled a substantial number of handouts and guides for students, which we collected in a folder for them to keep. The collection of documents included (in no particular order):

• plagiarism guides,
• Creating Effective Library Research Assignments (from UCLA),
• sampling of library assignments from a number of academic institutions,
• Subject Liaison Directory,
• Library Workshops and Tours,
• Information Literacy Guidelines/Standards from ACRL, and
• Bibliography of Library Instructional Resources (entitled “Improving Research Skills for Undergraduates: Recommended Resources”).

We designed the sessions to be interactive and not just presentation-oriented. For the 2005 TATTO workshops, we tried to stimulate discussion by asking students about any previous teaching experience they had and any problems they had encountered with student papers they had received. We also asked them to share any interesting and/or enlightening research assignments they experienced as undergraduates. The dynamics of each group tended to determine how lively the responses were. In general, the sessions were not as interactive as we had wanted them to be and, unfortunately, we ended up spending the majority of the session talking at the students.

When we began planning for the 2006 TATTO workshops, we focused on how to make the session more interactive and how to encourage greater participation. We decided to follow a modified Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach, where leaders act as guides and participants are given an actual problem to solve that will lead them to discover the information the leaders want to impart. This time, we gave the TATTO participants a hands-on exercise which consisted of creating a research assignment. Participants were asked to break into groups and discuss what sort of guidance and instructions they would provide to ensure that students use credible, authoritative sources in a correct manner. The formal assignment was as follows:

You are a professor at Emory and you wish to include a research component in your course on American history. The departmental expectation is that the curriculum is research/inquiry based. You certainly do not want the students citing from Wikipedia or from random web sites. How might you structure or design the assignment so that students correctly use and evaluate the information resources at their disposal?

Each group of students elected a spokesperson to share their thoughts on effective research assignment development. For the most part, participants were extremely willing and excited to speak about and explain the research projects and their guidelines for successful completion of said projects. As students were sharing their thoughts, leaders of the session asked questions and probed further about concepts and approaches. Many of the concepts and approaches emphasized and underscored by participants echoed the following tips we often provide instructors—based on experiences with students and instructors in both the classroom and in the library—in crafting assignments:

• clarity of the assignment,
• unambiguous terminology (e.g., clear definitions of scholarly versus popular materials, internet versus free web, databases vs. search engines),
• resources (does the library have what your students will need?),
• research process (different stages of the paper, rough drafts, annotated bibliographies, etc.),
• library research skills (library instruction, consultation, etc.),
• ethical use of information (plagiarism, citation issues), and
• integration of the librarian into the class (have library sessions, put the librarians name on the syllabus, work with the librarian to craft assignments).

The students’ comments and ideas served as the perfect segue for the librarian leaders to mention the various services the library offers (classes, research guides, one-on-one consultations, help crafting assignments, etc.) that could help both the graduate student teachers and their students. While the 2005 TATTO sessions included a specific presentation on library services; the 2006 sessions, being more interactive, allowed us integrate this information into discussions with the students, which we found to be much more effective.

Evaluation of the Library’s TATTO Program
Evaluation and assessment of the TATTO initiative has proven to be somewhat challenging. During the first year, the library asked to be included in the graduate school’s evaluation of the graduate course. However, the evaluation survey never materialized. The following year, the GSAS proposed another assessment, but again the evaluation never came to fruition. The library, therefore, composed its own evaluation survey using the rudimentary tool of Survey Monkey. However, the survey was sent out too late after the final sessions to elicit a significant response for analysis. Additionally, a substantial number of respondents conflated the session on Course Reserves with the library’s instructional services session.

Strategy #2: Departmental Pedagogy Courses
Integration into Departmental Pedagogy Courses
In addition to the TATTO program, librarians have targeted graduate students as teachers by working with established departmental pedagogy courses. These courses are required by the college and are tailored to the needs of each discipline/department. They vary greatly in rigor, content and structure. Some meet weekly, have a syllabus, readings and assignments; others meet sporadically and informally. Since 2001, and prior to involvement in TATTO, librarians have worked with departmental pedagogy courses. Although this work has been done primarily by those librarians who have also led TATTO sessions, the two efforts have not been coordinated.

The Anthropology Department has one of the more informal approaches to the pedagogy classes at Emory. The Department sponsors two one-hour teaching roundtables each semester that first- through third-year graduate students are required to attend. The roundtables are also open to all anthropology graduate students and faculty. Guest speakers are often invited to lead the roundtables and in the spring of 2005, the Anthropology Department invited the anthropology librarian to lead a roundtable on a topic of her choice. At the time, the librarian was new and had not yet approached the department about integrating information literacy skills into the graduate curriculum, so the department’s invitation had more to do with their attempt to fill out a roundtable schedule than trying to accommodate a request from the librarian. However, the invitation was seen by the Library as a great opportunity to bring issues related to integrating information literacy skills into the curriculum to graduate students and faculty. The roundtable consisted primarily of a lecture by the librarian explaining the importance of crafting research assignments to integrate information literacy skills and the benefits of this for the students and professors. The Cornell Study and UGA Project were highlighted as examples of these benefits. The librarian also shared current services offered by the library to assist professors with their teaching and explained that similar services should be available wherever the students end up teaching. The librarian also provided the students with a packet of handouts including information about how to craft assignments as well as examples of assignments from actual anthropology classes in the department that incorporated these skills. There was also a short discussion at the end of the session. In hindsight, the librarian believes that a more interactive session with less formal lecturing would have been a more effective format.

At the other end of the spectrum is the English Department with a more structured pedagogy course design for their graduate students. Graduate students in the English Ph.D. program are required to take a two semester-long course. The first semester takes place in the spring, and the second semester is held in the fall, which coincides with the first class they teach—either an English 101 (Expository Writing) or an English 181 (Writing about Literature) class for freshmen. In the following spring semester (after completion of the two semester-long course), they teach the opposite course
In 2001, collaboration with the English pedagogy course began with the instructional services librarian creating a course guide of resources for the graduate students to use when thinking about their course’s structure, as well as when designing their research assignments. From there, the collaboration has evolved into the instructional services librarian attending the English pedagogy course numerous times during the two semester-long course to discuss ways and means to create effective research based assignments for first-year students. Furthermore, when the graduate students teach their freshmen courses, the instructional services librarian assigns librarian liaisons (subject specialists) to the courses that match to the content of individual ENG 101 or ENG 181 courses. This allows the subject specialist to be the main contact for the graduate student. The liaisons offer help in 1) conceptualizing research assignments, 2) designing library instruction sessions for the freshmen English classes, 3) creating web-based tools with relevant research tips, links and locations for resources, 4) providing “virtual” assistance with research via the class’ module in a course management system (e.g., First Class or BlackBoard), and 5) offering one-on-one research consultations for students enrolled in the ENG 101 or ENG 181 class. Sometimes the content of an ENG 101 or ENG 181 course does not fit exactly within a certain subject liaison’s area. Regardless, each graduate student that teaches an ENG 101 or ENG 181 course has a librarian assigned to them to help in the above mentioned ways.

In the past, no formal evaluation was done to examine the impact of incorporating a librarian into the graduate students’ ENG 101 and ENG 181 classes. In an effort to begin an informal evaluation, a survey was sent to the six graduate students that were part of the English pedagogy course and taught a first-year English class during the fall semester of 2006. The survey simply attempted to gauge the graduate students’ reactions and experiences with the library instruction services that they took advantage of for their ENG 101/181 courses, as well as to gauge any impact they saw on the students’ research processes and papers.

Respondents answered each item on a 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) scale. Out of the six students, the four students that responded regarding their students’ final papers were positive overall. For example, respondents rated their students’ selections of appropriate materials at an average of 4.25 and the thoroughness of their students’ papers at an average of 4.0. The ratings of the effectiveness of the library sessions were also positive. For example, the average rating that the library session received in regards to furthering the discussion of research was a 4.50, and the average rating that the library session scored in relation to enhancing the overall course was a 4.25.

**Conclusions and Future Steps**

Since 2000, the Emory Library has progressively addressed graduate pedagogical needs and concerns through various methods, such as the cross-discipline TATTO course and departmental pedagogy courses. In the future, to ensure continued growth and refinement of the library’s role in preparing graduate students for the professoriate, there are two areas that we would like to focus on for improvement: 1) development of a more systematic and structured integration of graduate student instructor outreach, and 2) greater assessment and evaluation of our efforts.

Although initial reactions to the more active-learning approach, especially during the 2006 sessions, to the TATTO workshops have been encouraging, greater assessment is needed. Such assessment efforts could take on the following forms:

- More formal debriefing among librarians who lead the TATTO sessions.
- More follow-up with TATTO participants as a means to reinforce concepts from the workshops as well as to determine if/when they employed methods and approaches introduced in TATTO.
- Development of explicit learning outcomes and expectations to serve as a baseline or foundation for evaluation and assessment of our efforts.

Additionally, while there has been positive feedback regarding the librarians involvement in the informal (e.g., Anthropology) and formal (e.g., English) graduate level pedagogy classes, there should be continued refinement of objectives to advance our outreach efforts. For example, one future step includes identifying other departments’ pedagogy classes and their course structure in order to determine additional opportunities for librarians to work with graduate instructors, as well as to continue to market instructional services beyond the TATTO workshop. Additionally, next steps will include creating more formal evaluation techniques to assess the level of efficiency and efficacy of students’ research skills and incorporation of research into their final projects. Moreover, in a more orderly approach, we would like
to continue to gauge graduate instructors’ reactions and experiences with the library instruction services they took advantage of, as well as any impact they saw on the students’ research processes and papers.

The librarians at Emory University have found that making a concerted effort to market instructional services to graduate students as they learn how to teach, has been greeted with an overwhelmingly positive response. By taking the steps that we have, we continue to develop our program into a systematic effort to help prepare future teaching faculty, who may be coming to an institution near you.

Notes
1. Please see Emory’s GSAS web pages devoted to the Teaching Assistant Training and Teaching Opportunity program at http://www.emory.edu/GSOAS/current/teachers_assistants/.