



WHY DO FACULTY CHOOSE ASYNCHRONOUS LIBRARY INSTRUCTION?

Naomi Binnie, Doreen R. Bradley, Karen A. Reiman-Sendi, & Henny Tasker
University of Michigan Library, Ann Arbor, MI

ABSTRACT

The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated creation and use of asynchronous digital learning objects (DLOs) in academic libraries. At the University of Michigan Library, the most requested DLOs provided library instruction on topics such as Academic Integrity, Finding Books, Searching Databases, Evaluating Sources, and Reading Scholarly Articles.

To understand how and why instructors were integrating Library DIY Toolkit modules (<https://umich.instructure.com/courses/211567>) into their Canvas course sites, we developed a lightweight, sustainable method of assessment to understand this trend, using DLO metadata, surveys, and semi-structured interviews.

Our assessment provided 1) greater understanding of how faculty integrated library-created Canvas modules into their courses, 2) how faculty characterized the broader learning objectives of the modules in context with their discipline, and 3) what motivated faculty to choose this asynchronous method of library instruction even after returning to on campus learning.

"I also think there's value in probably having somebody from the library come into events. Although again, this uses up a lot of valuable time... It would be good to have [more] videos with [showing] librarians."

GOALS AND PURPOSE

Understand how faculty integrated library-created Canvas modules into their courses, how faculty characterized broader learning objectives of the modules in context with their discipline, and what motivated faculty to choose this asynchronous method of library instruction.

METHODOLOGIES

Canvas course data identified which courses inserted/exported the Library DIY Toolkit content. (N=171)

Invited instructors with DIY Toolkit modules in their courses during Fall 2021 and Winter 2022 semesters to do short survey; no instructor received multiple invites to participate. (N=96)

Conducted semi-structured interviews with faculty who submitted survey responses and who volunteered for further conversation. (N=7)

FINDINGS

→ **18 total survey submissions across 2 semesters** (18% return rate)

→ Most instructors required modules

→ ~ Half assigned grades; all assigned points in some way (extra credit, participation, and/or assignment/quiz points)

→ Instructors typically don't modify content

→ **7 structured interviews across 2 semesters**

→ Interview findings supported survey findings/feedback

→ Interviewees asked for discipline-specific examples and more videos

→ Concern over students repeating modules in previous classes

"These are super helpful ... the more popular they are... the less likely I can use them. While students benefit from a refresher on the content, they don't like re-doing the same thing."

PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS

→ Create topical or discipline-related examples needed, specifically humanities examples

→ Address existing module content to prioritize balancing text with videos and opportunities to practice skills.

→ Rotate specific content every year and/or scaffold modules for different course levels

→ Provide instruction on how to modify modules

→ Market partnership with instructors to customize modules

→ Explore building sustainable collaboration with instructors to continue to provide feedback on revised and new modules. It may be beneficial to include library subject specialists in the future creation of modules.

CONTACT US

Naomi Binnie → nbinnie@umich.edu
Doreen R. Bradley → dbradley@umich.edu
Karen A. Reiman-Sendi → karsendi@umich.edu
Henny Tasker → hazita@umich.edu

Survey Data Summary: Why Do Instructors Use Library Modules?

