Journal of Information Literacy

ISSN 1750-5968

Volume 4 Issue 2

December 2010

Article

Fielden, N and Foster, M. 2010. Crossing the Rubricon: Evaluating the Information Literacy Instructor. *Journal of information literacy,* 4(2), pp 78-90 *http://ojs.lboro.ac.uk/ojs/index.php/JIL/article/view/LLC-V4-I2-2010-6*

Crossing the Rubricon: Evaluating the Information Literacy Instructor

Ned Fielden, Librarian, San Francisco State University
Email: fielden@sfsu.edu

Mira Foster, Sr. Asst. Librarian, San Francisco State University
Email: mira@sfsu.edu

Abstract

Sound information literacy (IL) programmes at a university library depend on effective librarian instructors. A robust, systematic evaluation procedure can both assist the development of librarian instructors as well as provide data for summative decisions regarding their retention, promotion or tenure. This case study explores issues in IL instructor evaluation and proposes a rubric instrument for peer review observation. Rubrics are a fast, powerful, standardised mechanism for evaluating performance, and while studied in depth for the purposes of assessing student work, they have not been the focus of research and are relatively underemployed for the purposes of evaluating librarians. This paper discusses different types of rubrics (analytic vs. holistic, simple vs. complex) and how they allow for customisable but standardised application. The process of developing a rubric clarifies instructional values and desired outcomes. Rubrics show promise as a streamlined, equitable means for furthering information literacy goals by focusing on the teaching performance of the librarian instructor.

Keywords

Peer review; rubrics; evaluation; information literacy, academic libraries; tenure and promotion.

---

1. Introduction

Successful information literacy instruction requires an effective teacher. A vast amount of intellectual attention, energy and research in the field of education is devoted to the ongoing, systematic evaluation of teachers in order to increase their effectiveness, and a similar evaluative process on the development of teaching librarians furthers information literacy goals by clarifying and heightening awareness of core IL principles. Even when graduate library programmes offer courses in paedagogy and practical teaching methods, new librarians engaged in instruction require mechanisms both for formative and summative evaluation so that their teaching performance can be as effective as possible. Rubrics are helpful tools used in the formal assessment of both students and teachers. This paper presents a case study of the design process and implementation of a rubric for the evaluation of instructional librarians involved in the delivery of IL programmes.

San Francisco State University, in California USA, enrols twenty-three thousand undergraduate students and almost six thousand graduate students. In the year 2007 when this case study was initiated, the university library had twenty-eight librarians, six of whom were probationary employees and thus on the “tenure-track,” a much higher percentage than usual.

In 2006, in response to a large number of new hires, the library overhauled its retention and tenure policies. In 2007, for the same reasons, the university as a whole also undertook a revision of retention and tenure policies, which brought into focus the importance of appropriate peer review documentation. The Library Education Committee, which included both tenured and untenured librarians, inspected past practices for reviewing librarians who conducted educational sessions, and decided to develop an evaluation mechanism that was efficient, fair and flexible, with improved accountability for both the reviewers and those being reviewed. The Committee formed a subgroup, involving the authors of this paper, who undertook a literature review and ultimately identified and adapted a rubric for assessing librarian instructors. With input from the Library Education committee, the library faculty revised and adopted the draft rubric in spring 2008. A full-scale evaluation of the rubric lies in the future, but the theoretical and practical aspects of its design add to the limited literature on rubric use for the purposes of evaluating IL librarians. The adoption of this instrument has been a valuable exercise for the library faculty, helping to clarify themes and elements of the instructional program and thus furthering the overall goals of information literacy on our campus.

Initially the university library at San Francisco State University needed an improved assessment mechanism for reviewing librarians on the tenure track (6 out of 28, or almost a quarter). Librarian instructors needed evidence of summative evaluation in their tenure files, and also requested formative feedback from their peers to improve their teaching performance. The Library Education Committee sought to provide an opportunity for formative evaluation (advice and feedback on teaching performance) to the new instructional librarians, and to improve the already existing summative review mechanisms for formal tenure as required by university policy. In addition, the pool of reviewers needed a common tool to standardise the observation and feedback process.

In the United States, over half the academic librarians have the same professional status as teaching faculty (Best and Kneip, 2010). In order to achieve tenure and promotion within the university, librarians must be evaluated in the same way as teaching faculty staff. The three broad categories of review for faculty staff are:

- Teaching performance (often measured by student evaluations and peer review by colleagues)
- Professional accomplishments (conference papers, publications, and other scholarly “outputs”)
- Service (membership on university committees, professional societies, or public service to a relevant community, university-affiliated or not).

Tangible achievements must be demonstrated in each of these categories, and these are qualified by the universities who specify what proportion each category should assume, as well as what levels of performance must be attained within each category. Instruments for the evaluation of teachers are fairly numerous, and typically standardised for a given institution. The options tend to be more limited for stand-alone library instructional sessions, which usually cannot allot suitable time for a survey or self-evaluation at the end of a session the way a semester long course can.

Library staff are evaluated by at least four broad mechanisms which assess their teaching performance, some directly reflecting the quality of teaching, others providing more indirect measures, for example by assessing student learning outcomes. Surveys, either completed by students just after an instructional session or later in the term, provide some data on instructional value, but are often necessarily so brief as to limit data to mere “customer satisfaction” type information. For example, surveys at the authors’ institution are administered shortly after an instruction session and include Likert scales measuring the level of the student’s agreement with statements such as:

- "The information presented will be helpful for completing my assignment."
- "After this presentation, I now feel better prepared to use the library and the online library resources."
- "The presentation was clear and understandable."

If the partnering course faculty member is offered an opportunity to complete a survey, this can often provide more useful feedback for a librarian instructor, because it can generate some data that conveys to librarian instructors how their information literacy session improved the quality of student papers or other assignments. Aside from surveys, it is possible to gain an indirect measure of IL librarian effectiveness by using data collected during library instruction sessions (these could be pre- or post-test results that deal with actual student competence for given IL tasks, or other in-class exercises that are collected and analysed). Librarian instructors can also be evaluated by means of direct observation from either a superior or a peer colleague, the method traditionally employed at our campus.

2. Literature Review

The use of rubrics as a means of grading student work dates to the early 1900s, and while originally termed a "scale" for measuring student writing competence, rubrics emerged from an educational philosophy concerned with measurement and quantification for summative purposes (Turley and Gallagher, 2008). These authors discuss the early history of rubric usage in grading student writing, and note how the focus of many educators has turned to using rubrics as learning tools for students themselves. Most of the introductory and more comprehensive works focus on rubric use in the classroom and for evaluating student learning. Stevens and Levi (2005) offer an introductory look at rubrics, covering basic issues such as reasons to use rubrics and overall design principles. Arter and McTighe (2000) provide a detailed guide to rubric usage in their text *Scoring rubrics in the classroom* which outlines broad considerations of rubric criteria and standards. Goodrich in 1996 discussed overall rubric utility for scoring student work, and in a later publication (2005) specifically addresses validity and reliability measures for rubrics, while Mertler (2001) defines rubrics as rating scales rather than checklists, and describes a method to design rubrics for specific tasks. Moskal (2000), on the other hand, outlines the basic types (holistic vs. analytic) and their application, providing good definitions and practical suggestions for use and suggests that rubrics provide a means of offering a judgment of quality.

As a counterpoint to the general enthusiasm for rubrics, Kohn (2006) notes that instructors' tendency to rely on them as an overly versatile tool may blunt their utility, and proposes that rubrics should be employed only when the need for them is clear and their results effective. Similarly, Tierney and Simon (2004) suggest methods of improving rubrics and propose that the use of clear, unambiguous language in their design and implementation is essential for good results, and in particular that consistency across categories and criteria provides the best data.

Library and information science literature focuses almost exclusively on rubrics as tools for evaluating student work. Oakleaf's 2006 dissertation is a case in point as her study covers the application with students in the assessment of ACRL information literacy standards, while a later article (Oakleaf, 2007) outlines the value of using rubrics to generate quantitative data for librarians seeking to employ evidence based decision-making (EBDM) practices. This author also discusses rubric usage to further student learning and improve librarian instructional performance (2009a, Journal of Documentation) and on rubric methodology (2009b, *JASIST*). Knight (2006) examines rubrics in support of librarians teaching information literacy sessions and discusses the use of rubrics in various contexts from K-12 programs to higher education. Knight cautions against the use of rubrics for all

situations requiring evaluation, but claims that scoring student work through a rubric employing ACRL Information Literacy standards produces a useful measure of the IL competences that students at every educational level should possess.

Little rubric literature in the library world focuses on evaluating the teaching performance of librarian instructors, although there are studies dealing with librarian peer review. Samson and McCrea (2008) focus on peer review programs for librarians and propose a three-part peer review model of teaching which includes pre- and post-conference meetings between reviewer and instructor, surrounding a classroom visit. They argue that the librarian instructors who are being reviewed should play a leading role in guiding the process by choosing classes and elements of teaching that they feel require improvement, and that a library's instructional programme can be strengthened when senior librarians review their less-senior colleagues. They also promote Chrism's *Peer review of teaching: a sourcebook* (1999) because it offers a valuable guide for peer review practices, although this book is not specifically focused on librarian instructors, but provides a comprehensive account of the best practices and issues surrounding peer review. Oregon State University developed a "checklist of observation" consisting of a five category (presentation skills, clarity, content, relationship with students, relationship with instructor) and twenty eight item checklist for the purpose of librarian instructor peer review, which lacked only a suitable scale and the name to be considered a rubric (Middleton, 2002).

At their simplest, rubrics are checklists that contain criteria for evaluation. They can require ranking of the performance of tasks, or answers to qualitative questions. In the case of observing instruction, what some call evaluation forms may be rubrics, particularly if they measure performance. Checklists "focus on descriptions (the presence or absence of certain characteristics) and emphasise low inference items" (Chism, 2007, p. 111), while "Rating forms with scales and with or without space for comments focus on higher inference evaluation of specific behaviours" (Chism, 2007, p. 113). Rubrics are often presented as tables with criteria in one axis and level of performance in the other. Because they are essentially announcements and explanations of the criteria by which students will be judged, rubrics are sometimes included in syllabi, assignment instructions, or project evaluations.

Different varieties of rubrics exist based on their level of detail and approach. While a *checklist* is a simple list of criteria, often with a rating scale, an *advanced checklist* includes descriptions of the criteria being reviewed. A *simple model* scoring rubric describes both the criteria and the levels in the rating scale, while a *full model* rubric provides comprehensive descriptions of the criteria and levels of the rating scale. The more detailed a rubric is, the more readily it can be used by various scorers, including peers who apply the criteria during peer review (Bresciani, et al. 2004). The rubric used at San Francisco State University could be considered a simple model.

Literature on rubrics divides them into two general categories: holistic and analytic. Just as academic researchers, particularly those engaged in creating taxonomies, tend to separate into two types, the "lumpers" (which aggregate data and analyse patterns) and the "splitters" (which divide the object of their study into narrow slices of data for detailed examination) so do holistic and analytic rubrics differ in the way they arrive at a final measurement. Analytic rubrics focus on specific data elements, which can be examined individually and serve as better stand-alone instruments (Oakleaf, 2006, p. 191). By contrast, holistic rubrics examine a web of action, and as these allow the whole picture to be addressed in a single instrument they are often considered more useful for summative evaluation (Mertler, 2001).

Evaluation Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Exemplary	Student Learning Outcomes
Articulates Criteria	0 – Student does not address authority issues.	1 – Student addresses authority issues but does not use criteria terminology	2 – Student addresses authority issues and uses criteria terminology such as: author, authority, authorship or sponsorship	LOBO 3.1.1 The Student will articulate established evaluation criteria (ACRL 3.2a)

Figure 1: Example of a Complex, Analytic Rubric from Oakleaf, M.L., 2006. *Assessing information literacy skills,* Dissertation, University of North Carolina, p. 389.

Rubrics can be employed to standardize and equalise any assessment process by employing consistent evaluation criteria, regardless of the target of evaluation. Note in Figure 1 how criteria are explicitly described so as to allow nuanced scoring. Reviewers who use rubrics find that they must address every set of criteria listed, and that the rubrics usage tends to minimize more subjective tendencies that emerge when a grid is not followed. As Goodrich (2005) explains, when rubrics are used consistently for grading students, “Rubrics keep me honest” (p. 29). In designing our own rubric, the full version of which can be found appended to the end of the study, we employ a five point Likert scale, which we felt provided the best balance between recording depth of detail versus ease of capture. Rubric designers will need to consider this balance when creating a rubric for a particular task. The more detailed the criteria and the finer the scale will mean more attention need be given to reviewer training. Oakleaf (2007) concludes that sophisticated rubrics are best employed by “expert” scorers. At the very least, it is advantageous for reviewers to consult and develop a shared understanding of what constitutes a given score for a specific criterion.

The creation of rubrics in a given academic unit can provide an opportunity for defining the outcomes and criteria important to the unit. For us, the process of developing our rubric required librarians to think carefully about instructional goals, identify the values and characteristics we held in highest regard, and ensure that they aligned with our own library’s IL framework and the university’s educational mission. The process of creating a rubric, as outlined by Bresciani (2004), includes articulating the outcomes to be assessed, deciding what they would look like, and in the process, determining the most important assessment criteria. A rubric includes a list of these criteria, which are classified into broader categories. For more complex rubrics each ranking is given a description which distinguishes it from the others (the full rubric is appended).

In librarianship, painting a picture of “good” library instruction is an ongoing discussion and determining criteria that help qualify this type of instruction is an exercise in articulating educational values. An example of this is provided by the University of New Mexico Libraries, where the process of identifying teaching competencies and articulating outcomes forced them to “think about what we expect of our library instructors in the classroom” (Botts and Emmons, 2002, p. 74). They based some of their criteria on those for good reference service and created a series of statements about a “successful instructor” (Botts and Emmons, 2002, p. 71). When Selematsela and du Toit (2007) surveyed instructional librarians on the most important competencies and personality attributes required for good performance in information literacy instruction, they identified mentoring, instructional design, flexibility and communication skills as particularly important.

The items included in a rubric describe instructional values, and the major categories outline the areas of priority. Chism (2007) includes the following categories: teacher organisation; instructional strategies; instruction in laboratories, studios, or field settings; content knowledge; presentation skills; rapport with students; clarity; impact on learning; and overall teaching performance. Shonrock's instruction evaluation form in *Evaluating library instruction: sample questions, forms, and strategies for practical use* (1996), focusing specifically on librarian instructors, ranks the quality of an instructor's skill, clarity of presentation, preparation and organisation, teaching methods, knowledge of classroom assignments, interactions with students/participants, and personal characteristics. We converted this form into a scoring rubric with a five-point Likert scale as used by Shonrock, simplifying and tailoring it to our specific purposes, and incorporating both formative and summative functions. We trimmed and consolidated Shonrock's seven categories into four, combining appropriate facets together for ease of data collection. We utilised concepts elucidated in Chism (2007, pp.54-56) who noted some of the complexity of deciding on a taxonomy of teaching characteristics, citing work done by Seldin (1984, pp 139-140) and Cohen and McKeachie (1980, pp 151-152). Our approach was a balance between breadth and depth vs. ease of data collection.

3. Design Process

When the authors had reviewed the possibilities for instructor evaluation and proposed a rubric tool, the development process involved a number of discussions to clarify the purpose of the instrument and the needs of our faculty. The initial questions we needed to address were:

- How were we to employ these rubrics?
- What were our most important outcomes?
- How were we to address the differing requirements of formative vs. summative assessment?
- What would be the best ways to balance both the needs of the instructors being evaluated with the university's responsibility to rigorously and fairly review the instructional performance of new librarians?
- What were our most important outcomes?

There are different requirements for formative and summative evaluation, as the goals and purposes differ. Formative evaluation can include constructive criticism and feedback intended to focus improvement on specific targeted areas of teaching performance (presentation style, organisation, content etc.). Summative evaluations provide a measure of the cumulative, overall effectiveness of an instructor, and are necessary for retention and tenure decisions. Librarians at San Francisco State University were interested in improving their teaching performance through the peer observation process, but the essential purpose of the exercise was to fulfil the terms of the employment contract and provide objective information from inside the institution to external reviewers. While not mutually exclusive, care is required to address both these aspects of teaching performance. The overall university system within which our campus operates has strict rules about what constitutes legitimate data for summative evaluations. The rubric was created as part of a process that would standardise the collection of this information but also address some of the distinct features of IL instruction, such as the limitations of a "one shot" exposure to a given class.

For annual reviews during their initial six-year probationary cycle, librarians, following the model applied to teaching faculty, assemble a portfolio of documenting letters attesting to their performance at the university. Any librarian engaged in instruction must have at least one annual peer review document. At the time the Library Education Committee was engaged in this project, all the librarians hired in the past ten years had conducted

instructional sessions, and so all the tenure track librarians required annual reviews on their teaching performance. Consequently, the pool of librarians performing the observations became larger and was drawn from members of the Library Education Committee.

Traditionally, the yearly instructional review was conducted by a senior librarian who wrote a report describing the librarian's teaching performance, with commentary on the perceived instructional quality of the session, what paedagogical elements were included, observations about student engagement in the session and the overall effectiveness of the instructional librarian. Past practice had left much of the evaluative framework up to the reviewer, and some of the new librarians had requested a more comprehensive and detailed account of the criteria by which they were being evaluated.

The tenure-track librarians were all fairly recent graduates from library master's programmes, with some variation in their teaching experience. A number were familiar with the growing literature on information literacy assessment of students, and were influenced by the general trend toward programmatic assessment in higher education. This means that with shrinking resources and legislative bodies anxious to cut spending, having concrete data to demonstrate instructional success at the programme level was advantageous, one of the assets for the Evidence Based Research (EBR) theoretical approach. Some of these instructional librarians experimented with teaching techniques such as problem-based learning and learner-centred teaching models. One area of concern for the new librarians then, was that the criteria used for the observation of their teaching might hinder innovation.

The candidates on the tenure track also wanted to know how they would be held accountable for their instruction, and how those who reviewed them would be held accountable for the comments made in the candidates' files as part of the evaluation process. If a rubric was employed, the candidates felt that reviewers' judgments would be more transparent from clearly disclosed criteria and a uniform instrument, that is, the rubric would be applied consistently by the various reviewers. Additionally, tangible evaluation criteria could potentially clarify what theories and practices were encouraged among the librarian instructors. In this specific case, there was a desire to mention the use of more active learning exercise for students, reflecting more current paedagogical theory than was salient for many of the more experienced librarian instructors. As such, the rubric would contribute to IL innovations on campus. The Library Education Committee agreed that input from both sides of the assessment fence be sought, from the reviewers and the candidates who were probationary librarians under review.

As mentioned earlier, our rubric employs a five point Likert scale, which we felt adequately measured the degree to which teaching competencies could be evaluated without going into more nuanced scaling (7 or 10 point scales). The rubric includes the following four broad categories: preparation, teaching method and organisation, communication and classroom management, and content. Each category includes five to seven additional sub-sections with a total of 25 distinct facets altogether. After reviewing the literature, especially the checklist provided by Shonrock (1996) on teaching performance, we developed this framework as a balance between adequate coverage of teaching competencies without developing overly detailed levels of nuance. Certainly in the use of such a rubric a balance must always be struck between the amount of data collected versus the increased time and complexity necessary for more complete or nuanced coverage. The first three elements under the first section of Preparation included facets of communication, knowledge of course assignment(s), and the degree to which the class session was tailored to the specific course. These facets provide evidence to what degree the IL instructor engaged in preparation for a given session.

SECTION I

Rating Scale:

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree, n/a = not applicable

A. Preparation

1. Communicated with course instructor before the session to determine learning objectives and activities	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
2. Learned about course assignment(s) specifically related to library research	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
3. Customised instruction session plan to curriculum, specific course assignments and/or faculty/student requests	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

Figure 2: San Francisco State University Rubric showing Head Category (Preparation) and the first three sub-categories, with Likert scale.

To address the differing requirements of formative and summative evaluation, we appended a second section with seven open-ended questions, which while not formally a part of the rubric, would offer criteria of observation for the reviewer to construct his formal review of the candidate. Additionally these could capture data not explicitly addressed by the rubric grid. The questions addressed broadly the following categories:

- Learning styles
- Resources introduced
- Research techniques mentioned
- Concepts introduced
- Structure of the session
- Strengths of the session
- Weaknesses of the session

These were "open ended" and allowed for more qualitative feedback. While "learning styles" were listed in section II of the Rubric (appended in this article), including this category in the evaluation allowed for a more expanded narrative evaluation. Thus the open ended question (No. 1) probed for more amplified data, asking "how did the instructor address different learning styles during the session?"

4. Implementation

Our rubric sets the terms by which a librarian's teaching performance is reviewed, but it is also used at our institution to inform a more substantive evaluation letter that goes into a librarian's personnel file. In other words the rubric is part of a larger process that includes opportunities for dialogue and negotiation between the librarian instructors and reviewers. Instructors must be observed once a year as mandated by university policy, although candidates can choose to be observed in more than one class. They usually choose different classes each year so that peer review can help in a variety of settings, and so that the formal summative evaluations that go in the instructor's tenure file reflect their competences as instructors in diverse IL related subjects/activities. For example, a librarian instructor may choose an introductory workshop for graduate students from one

department the first year, a lab session lower level undergraduates from another department the next year, and then a seminar for students writing their undergraduate capstone projects in yet another department so that their tenure review portfolio shows the breadth and depth of their responsibilities. A pool of reviewers from the Library Education Committee rotates their observations each year so there can be a variety of opinions, and the rubric is the standardising instrument for all reviewers.

During a pre-observation meeting the reviewer can ask questions about course content, communications with the instructor or record, and pre-planning, while the instructional librarian can identify areas for which they would like specific feedback. After the observation has taken place, a post-review debriefing between reviewer and instructor provides a forum for formative feedback where the instructor raises relevant questions for comments on how or what they taught, and also questions about the summative judgments. The debriefing meeting also gives the instructor an opportunity to discuss any scores from the rubric that seemed unfair or ambiguous. While the instructor is not required to use the rubric, the reviewer employs the information generated by the rubric to produce the formal evaluation of the instructor performance which is then kept as part of the instructor's file.

5. Summary

The creation and implementation of a rubric for instructor observation has accomplished several things for our institution. It has made the review process more transparent, and has articulated the expectations for librarian instructors and their observers. Creating the instrument has encouraged our librarians to reflect on the increasingly important role they play as information literacy instructors, and to identify the most important elements of library instruction. Adopting the rubric has been an opportunity to introduce, or at least heighten, awareness of new paedagogies, and has elicited discussion of the teaching techniques that can best foster information literacy in our programmes. At our library the next steps in the process could involve modifying our rubric, or perhaps developing a more detailed matrix describing the tasks and characteristics of the levels on our Likert scale. This could potentially aid the task of the reviewers, help identify our concepts of good paedagogy and performance, and perhaps bring about further discussion amongst the IL librarians on the most important characteristics of high quality library instruction.

While our rubric is now used during the formal evaluation process, we have yet to determine if it helps elicit important formative information. A flexible tool provides opportunities to consider how an instructor can improve, and how well they have done overall. We do not know if the latter kind of feedback generates a constructive dialogue between the reviewer and the instructor being reviewed, as this type of impact requires further research beyond the scope of this paper. By implementing the rubric we have improved the opportunities for formative feedback and dialogue during the debriefing sessions, where motivated candidates and more seasoned reviewers can communicate specific concerns and discuss IL concepts. In time our reviewers will be able to judge how well the rubric guides their writing of formal, summative evaluations, and many more iterations of the tool will be needed to determine its inter-rater reliability. It is hoped that in the long term we may be able to answer these questions through a review of the evaluation process and with it a renewed discussion of our collective paedagogical values and goals for information literacy education.

Finally, more research is required. Rubrics are just one tool to evaluate teaching performance and it would be useful to compare rubrics utilised by different academic libraries. Libraries that use other formal tools may provide valuable examples for other institutions, as would studies of the application of more holistic rubrics or those used to measure information literacy education outside of the classroom. Use of the standard instruments and processes for observing teachers may help determine if information

literacy instruction is synonymous to classroom teaching or should be viewed differently. Our rubric follows those for general classroom instruction, but more discussion within our field may determine that evaluating information literacy instruction requires unique criteria.

References

Arter, J. and McTighe, J. 2000. *Scoring rubrics in the classroom: using performance criteria for assessing and improving student performance.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Best, R. D., and Kneip, J. 2010. Library school programs and the successful training of academic librarians to meet promotion and tenure requirements in the academy. *College and Research Libraries, 71*(2), pp. 97-114.

Botts, C. and Emmons, M., 2002. Developing teaching competencies for instructors in the academic library: a case study. *Public Services Quarterly,* 1(3)**,** pp. 65-81.

Bresciani, M.L., Zelna, C.L. and Anderson, J.A., 2004. *Assessing Student Learning and Development: A Handbook for Practitioners*, Washington, D.C: NASPA.

Brown, C. A. 2008. Building rubrics: a step-by-step process. *Library Media Connection,* 26(4)**,** pp. 16-18.

Chism, N.V.N., 2007. *Peer Review of Teaching: A Sourcebook* 2nd ed., Bolton, MA: Anker Pub.

Cohen, P., and McKeachie, W. J. 1980. *Improving College and University Teaching*, 28(4), pp. 147-54.

Goodrich, H., 2005. Teaching with Rubrics. *College Teaching*, 53(1), pp. 27-30.

Goodrich, H. 1996. Understanding rubrics. *Educational Leadership,* 54(4)**,** p. 14.

Grassian, E. S. and Kaploowitz, J. R. 2005. *Learning to lead and manage information literacy instruction programs*, New York: Neal-Schuman.

Knight, L. A. 2006. Using rubrics to assess information literacy. *Reference Services Review,* 34(1)**,** pp. 43-55.

Kohn, A. 2006. The trouble with rubrics. *English Journal,* 95(4)**,** pp. 12-15.

Levene. L. and Frank P. 1993. Peer coaching: professional growth and development for instruction librarians, *Reference Services Review*, 21(3) pp. 35-42.

Mertler, C. A. 2001. Designing scoring rubrics for your classroom. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation,* 7(25). [Online] Available at http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7andn=25 [Accessed 29 July, 2010]

Middleton, C. 2002. Evolution of peer evaluation of library instruction at Oregon State University libraries. *portal: Libraries and the Academy,* 2(1)**,** p. 69.

Moskal, B. M. 2000. Scoring rubrics: what, when and how. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation,* 7(3). [Online] Available at http://PAREonline.net/getvn.asp?v=7andn=3 [Accessed 29 July, 2010]

Oakleaf, M. 2009a. The information literacy instruction assessment cycle: a guide for increasing student learning and improving librarian instructional skills. *Journal of Documentation,* 65(4)**,** pp. 539-560.

Oakleaf, M. 2009b. Using rubrics to assess information literacy: an examination of methodology and interrater reliability. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology,* 60(5), pp. 969 - 983.

Oakleaf, M. J. 2006. Assessing information literacy skills: a rubric approach. Ph D. thesis. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Oakleaf, M. J. 2007. Using rubrics to collect evidence for decision-making: what do librarians need to learn? *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice,* 2(3). [Online] Available at http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/EBLIP/article/view/261/524 [Accessed 29 July, 2010]

Samson, S. and McCrea, D. E. 2008. Using peer review to foster good teaching. *Reference Services Review,* 36(1)**,** pp. 61-70.

Selematsela, D. N. S. and Du Toit, A. S. A. 2007. Competency profile for librarians teaching information literacy. *South African Journal of Library and Information Science,* 73(2)**,** pp. 119-129.

Seldin, P. 2006. *Evaluating faculty performance: a practical guide to assessing teaching, research, and service*, Bolton, MA: Anker Pub. Company.

Shonrock, D. D. and Library Instruction Round Table (American Library Association). Research Committee. 1996. *Evaluating library instruction: sample questions, forms, and strategies for practical use,* Chicago, American Library Association.

Stevens, D. D. and Levi, A. 2005. *Introduction to rubrics: an assessment tool to save grading time, convey effective feedback, and promote student learning,* Sterling, Va: Stylus Pub.

Turley, E. D. and Gallagher, C. W. 2008. On the uses of rubrics: reframing the great rubric debate. *English Journal,* 97(4)**,** pp. 87-92.

Appendix: Sample Rubric (Also available at http://online.sfsu.edu/~fielden/ LibEd_ObservationRubric-1.doc)

San Francisco State University Library Education Program

Course Integrated Seminar Teaching Observation Rubric

SECTION I

Rating Scale:

1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree, n/a = not applicable

A. Preparation						
4. Communicated with course instructor before the session to determine learning objectives and activities	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
5. Learned about course assignment(s) specifically related to library research	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
6. Customized instruction session plan to curriculum, specific course assignments and/or faculty/student requests	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
7. Planned to cover an appropriate amount of material during the session	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
8. Assessed the existing needs and understandings of students before or at the beginning of the instruction session	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
B. Teaching Methods and Organization						
9. Stated the agenda, purpose and scope of the session clearly during the introduction	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
10. Addressed different learning styles during the session						
a. Addressed needs of audio learners	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
b. Addressed needs of visual learners	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
c. Addressed needs of kinesthetic learners	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
11. Provided appropriate supporting materials to accompany the session	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
12. Allowed sufficient time for students to finish tasks	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
13. Facilitated student participation	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
14. Assessed students' understanding and progress throughout the session	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
15. Concluded session by summarizing important ideas, techniques etc. covered	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
C. Communication and Classroom Management						
16. Spoke with appropriate clarity, pace, tone of voice, and volume	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
17. Questions and responses						
a. Posed questions to students throughout the session and allowed sufficient time for	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

student answers						
b. Asked questions to students that addressed different levels of understanding	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
c. Solicited questions from students, answered questions, and gave helpful feedback to students	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
18. Maintained good rapport with students	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
19. Respected and encouraged different points of view	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
20. Handled difficult situations effectively	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
21. Informed students of opportunities for, and encouraged use of, research assistance, including personal availability as appropriate	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
22. Describe the notable personal characteristics and mannerisms that helped or hindered the instructor's presentation.						

D. Content

23. Introduced students to subject appropriate resources and tools	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
24. Introduced students to timely and up-to-date library materials	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
25. Used subject specific or topical examples	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
26. Adequately defined unfamiliar terms and concepts	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
27. Covered an appropriate amount of material during the session	1	2	3	4	5	n/a
28. Provided an appropriate orientation to specific JPLL resources and services	1	2	3	4	5	n/a

SECTION II

Open Ended Questions (for observer to develop report/letter)

1. How did the instructor address different learning styles during the session?
2. What resources did the instructor cover?
3. What research techniques did the instructor cover?
4. What concepts did the instructor cover and how were they described?
5. How was the session agenda structured? Describe the agenda/activities, etc.
6. Demonstrated strengths
7. Opportunities for improvement