



Divide and Conquer: A Not-So-Common Approach to Develop Information Literacy Programs

Andrea Wilcox Brooks
Northern Kentucky University

Mary Todd Chesnut
Northern Kentucky University

Abstract

In 2012 the Research and Instruction (RIS) Department at Northern Kentucky University's W. Frank Steely Library divided responsibilities into two areas: research assistance and instruction. The department's reorganization enabled instruction librarians to focus solely on growing the information literacy program. In light of their success and the evolving role of information literacy in higher education, the authors sought to find out how many RIS departments in academic libraries were organized into two departments. Results from a survey suggest the majority of libraries continue to be organized under a traditional model, grouping reference and instructional work together. This article highlights findings from the study and shares the experiences of splitting an RIS department, including what was gained and lost as a result of the new organizational structure.

Keywords: information literacy; library instruction; organizational structure; academic libraries

Introduction

In academic libraries reference and instruction services (RIS) have traditionally functioned as one department with librarians balancing time between desk responsibilities, research consultations, resource creation, and one-shot information literacy (IL) sessions. While not universal, this organizational structure has been the norm for decades in many academic libraries. Johnson and Fountain (2002) found only 10% of academic libraries at mid-sized public universities maintained separate reference and instruction departments, and their study came after the pedagogical shift away from bibliographic instruction to more sophisticated IL programming.

At Northern Kentucky University's W. Frank Steely Library, the Research and Instructional Services Department had been in place for years with RIS librarians providing both one-shot IL sessions and individual reference assistance, among other responsibilities. In 2012, however, the department broke tradition and RIS librarians split responsibilities. One group continued to provide research services, which included online and face-to-face reference assistance; individual consultation appointments for students, faculty, and staff; and a growing embedded librarian program. The second group of librarians focused solely on designing and teaching IL to undergraduate and graduate classes. The division resulted partially from a desire to align IL instruction with the library's growing Continuing Education and Bachelor of Library Informatics programs, which include for-credit IL courses. However, the division was also a result of a growing vision for the IL program that involved more purposeful integration within discipline curricula. Although the department's restructuring was met with some apprehension as librarians grappled with changing job descriptions and new departmental goals, however, instruction librarians soon realized the reorganization created opportunities to teach and integrate information literacy previously not recognized.

The increased potential of the IL program after the RIS department divided led instruction librarians to wonder whether other academic libraries were also creating separate departments for information literacy instruction. On the one hand, the role of information literacy is evolving in an increasingly digital and fast-paced information landscape. As Owusu-Ansah (2004) states, "Information literacy, as a contemporary response to a contemporary problem, implies, therefore, a commitment to a new way of doing things" (p. 5). On the other hand, as higher education has dealt with tight budgets, libraries may be more inclined to consolidate departments rather than split them. A survey of nearly 500 academic library directors found respondents were nearly unanimous in expressing a strong belief that

information literacy education is a function of the library; however, the same survey also found a lack of financial resources and staffing were the leading constraints for library directors interested in making changes (Long and Schonfeld, 2014).

With this in mind, the authors sought to find out whether the evolving role of information literacy in the last decade has had any impact on the traditional organizational structure of reference and instruction departments in academic libraries. The authors present the results of the study and highlight the opportunities and developments NKU instruction librarians experienced after their RIS department split.

Literature Review

At the time of writing, the authors of this paper found that the Association of College and Research Libraries (2015) had just adopted a new framework for information literacy for higher education. The framework places greater emphasis on integrating IL across a student's academic program and introduces a "richer, more complex set of core ideas" (p.1). The framework acknowledges students' struggles to navigate and use information in various contexts but also emphasizes the responsibility of students as they generate new knowledge and ask and answer questions.

The framework's perceptual shift away from information literacy as a set of skills has been prevalent in the literature for the last decade, where we have seen information literacy discussed as a "demanding intellectual activity" (O'Connor, 2009) and "a more ambitious instructional engagement" (Owusu-Ansah, 2004). Several years ago Elmborg (2006) urged librarians to adopt new philosophies concerning literacy education that guide students toward deeper and more critical thinking about their personal lives and the world around them. In addition, one study asked a panel of experts about the future of library instruction services. The majority of participants agreed future librarians should focus on teaching "complex areas of information literacy" and use their skills to integrate information literacy into the curriculum (Saunders, 2009). Librarians are certainly reconsidering their roles as educators and the methods used to teach concepts that extend beyond navigating the library and its resources. A lot of this discussion has centered on current instructional models, primarily the one-shot instruction session and its inability to properly help students understand complex IL concepts (Badke, 2009; Mery, Newby & Peng, 2012; Ward, 2006).

While there seems to be an increased focus on information literacy in academic

libraries, there are few examples in the literature offering reorganization of traditional reference and instruction departments as a solution to develop IL programs. Traditionally, libraries were organized in a bifurcated structure with various librarian functions falling under either “technical” or “public” services (Budd, 2005). It made sense then that reference and instruction services were often organized into one department as both provide services to the public. McCutcheon and Lambert (2001) provide a historical overview of the relationship between reference and instructional work and conclude that definitions of each service have evolved, particularly with the “current emphasis in academic libraries for librarians to be teachers of information literacy” (p. 213). Despite these evolving definitions, there is evidence that academic libraries still maintain a traditional structure, grouping reference and instruction responsibilities together. Detmering and Sproles (2012) found nearly 97% of job advertisements for entry-level academic reference jobs included library instruction responsibilities. While these authors did not specifically study organizational structures, their findings suggest librarians can expect to work in departments with mixed responsibilities, especially reference and instruction work.

There is some evidence that suggests splitting or at least reorganizing reference and instruction duties may lead to more in-depth information literacy instruction. Recognizing the time consuming nature of designing and delivering quality instruction, including the development of IL programs across various disciplines, Sonntag and Palsson (2007) reorganized reference and instruction roles after eliminating the reference desk. Since reorganization, librarians no longer staff a reference desk but rather use that time to focus on instructional initiatives. Sonntag and Palsson explain that “academic librarians surely recognize that the instructional mission of our institutions drives everything we do in the library” (p. 5). Perhaps the most relevant study on organizational structures of reference and instruction departments comes from Johnson and Fountain (2002) who hypothesized an increased visibility of information literacy in higher education would lead to a division of reference and instruction departments in academic libraries. However, survey results showed nearly 80% of these departments still functioned as one, with only 10% organized as two departments. The remaining 10% reported organizational structures of another form. Survey respondents reported limited staffing and a blurred distinction between reference and instruction roles were top reasons for feeling satisfied with a combined reference and instruction department. When asked about potential benefits of separating the traditional RIS department, however, many respondents valued the idea of being able to focus time on instruction purposes and “could see the attraction of a more simplified set of responsibilities” (p. 284). Johnson and Fountain did

not focus their study on the presence of credit-based information literacy courses as a possible factor in dividing reference and instruction departments.

The literature highlighted here shows support for more in-depth information literacy programming across the curriculum in higher education; however, as reference and instruction librarians face a multitude of responsibilities, librarians might begin to explore new organizational structures. The study presented below sought to determine whether the evolving role of information literacy has made a difference in the way libraries organize instructional departments. Specifically, the authors were interested in how many RIS departments use a split reference/instruction model to organize librarian responsibilities and what potential benefits or challenges may result from a split model. The authors analyzed the results in light of the organizational changes at their own institution to determine whether separating instruction and reference duties has provided more opportunities to advance information literacy beyond traditional one-shot sessions.

Survey Results

In June 2014 the authors distributed a survey via the ili-l listserv, ALA's Information Literacy Instruction Discussion List (see Appendix A). A total of 115 surveys were completed. The majority of respondents (72) came from institutions offering masters and/or doctoral programs. Thirty respondents (26%) came from baccalaureate institutions and 12 (11%) from two-year institutions. The student population varied among survey respondents. Six respondents were from schools with fewer than 1,000 students, 48 reported between 1,000-4,999 students, 40 were employed at institutions with 5,000-15,000 students, and 20 reported a 15,000+ student population. One respondent did not answer the demographic questions.

Ninety participants (78%) reported their libraries organized reference and instructional services as one department, and 25 participants (22%) reported reference and instruction were organized as two departments. This finding is somewhat consistent with Johnson and Fountain (2002), but the percentage of institutions reporting a split model is higher in the current study. The current study did not provide an option for respondents to report any "other" organizational structure.

A Traditional Model

The majority of respondents reported their institutions house reference and instruction under one department, but the traditional model is not strictly upheld. While nearly half of these respondents reported reference and instruction responsibilities are divided equally among librarians, 39 of the respondents (43%) explained that, while librarians do provide reference and instruction services, some librarians are more involved in one or both areas. Further, seven respondents reported other models that involved additional duties (i.e., collection development) or indicated that some librarians provide only instruction (see Table 1). This may indicate many academic libraries are placing more emphasis on instruction but are not formally organized as two distinct departments.

Most of the respondents in this group (86%) indicated their institutions had never considered splitting the reference and instruction areas; however, twelve respondents reported their institutions had considered splitting the two RIS areas at some point. When prompted about reasons the split did not occur, most cited a lack of staff or small size of the library as the main barrier. However, a few respondents raised issues concerning the overlapping roles of reference and instruction. As one participant put it, “What is reference but individual teaching sessions?”

Table 1: Institutions Where RIS Departments are Organized as One

Question	Answer	Response
1	All librarians in this area provide both reference and instruction equally	44
2	All librarians in this area provide both reference and instruction, but some librarians are heavier in instruction and/or heavier in reference	39
3	Other	7
	Total	90

A Split Model

Of the 25 respondents who indicated their libraries divided RIS areas into two departments, 11 stated their libraries had been split for less than six years while 13 indicated their libraries had separate departments for six or more years. While many of the two areas had

traditional names (the most common for the reference area was Reference or Public Service and the most common for instruction was Information Literacy or Instructional Services), there were several unique monikers for the instruction area, such as the Department of Instruction & Outreach; Instruction, Assessment & Engagement; Information Fluency; Teaching & Learning; Academic Outreach; and Department of Education & Outreach.

The main justifications for splitting the reference and instruction areas included growth of the instruction program, personnel issues, the opportunity for the instruction librarians to concentrate more on their main mission, alignment with teaching experience/aptitude, more flexibility for scheduling classes, or because “it has always been that way.”

Survey respondents held similar views of the benefits of a split model, including that the split allowed for an increased focus on growing and formalizing the instruction program, gave more time for training and planning, enabled innovative instruction, helped with flexibility in scheduling classes, and increased clarity in specific roles of librarians. The challenges of splitting the reference and instruction areas yielded fewer responses than did the reported benefits. While the list did include chain of command issues, absence of “direct contact” with students beyond the classroom, loss of connection between reference and instruction, communication challenges, and/or a lack of transparency, several respondents indicated no challenges were faced. In addition, there were two unique statements made by librarians who worked in a split department. One respondent simply replied, “The real question is why is reference a department at all,” while another worked under a different reference services model that had been employed at their library: “Our reference department was depleted of librarians, and we moved to a blended service desk where library assistants provide reference service. The benefit is having enough staff to provide reference.”

Organizational Structure and Advancing Information Literacy

Survey participants were asked to select all the instructional duties librarians undertook at their library (see Table 2 and 3). Not surprisingly, nearly 100% of all respondents teach one-shot information literacy sessions in class/person. Despite the push for more in-depth, integrated IL instruction, the one-shot session remains the primary method to teach IL whether RIS departments are organized as one department or split into two areas.

In addition to teaching one-shot sessions, instruction librarians reported various other

duties. The authors sought to find out if instruction librarians from split RIS departments would be more likely to take on responsibilities that advanced information literacy beyond the one-shot session, such as teaching for-credit information literacy courses or designing instruction for subject faculty. Results from the survey show this is not the case. Rather, a higher percentage of librarians working in a combined RIS department teach for-credit IL courses (26% vs. 16%) and design instruction for faculty (40% vs. 28%). Further, a higher percentage of these librarians also create online tutorials (82% vs. 72%). In addition, a higher percentage of instruction librarians from a split RIS department do teach one-shot instruction classes online (48% vs. 32%).

Table 2: Librarian Duties for Those Who Have Split Model

Answer	Response	%
Teaching face-to-face, one-shot information literacy classes	24	96%
Teaching online, one-shot information literacy classes	12	48%
Teaching “for credit” information literacy classes	4	16%
Online tutorial creation and maintenance	18	72%
Marketing instruction program	19	76%
Online embedded librarian	12	48%
Instructional design for faculty in other disciplines	7	28%
Other	9	36%

Table 3: Librarian Duties for Those Who Have Not Split (Traditional Model)

Answer	Response	%
Teaching face-to-face, one-shot information literacy classes	90	100%
Teaching online, one-shot information literacy classes	29	32%
Teaching “for credit” information literacy classes	23	26%
Online tutorial creation and maintenance	74	82%
Marketing instruction program	63	70%
Online embedded librarian	45	50%
Instructional design for faculty in other disciplines	36	40%
Other	20	22%

The Split Model at NKU

Librarians surveyed had various reasons for preferring splitting divisions, but the most common responses seemed to center around the growth of the instruction area (one librarian stated, “our ‘instruction’ department grew to the point that it kind of took on a life of its own, whereas in some institutions it’s just an appendage to the subject librarians”) or a split necessitated by division-wide changes in personnel and/or management. The RIS department split at NKU was associated with both division reorganization and the opportunity for instructional librarians to focus more fully on their main mission of teaching. Interestingly, survey responses did not indicate a split necessarily advanced in-depth information literacy through opportunities such as for-credit IL courses or instructional design for subject faculty. However, a higher percentage of librarians from a split RIS model did indicate spending time teaching one-shot information literacy classes online. This may be a result of decreased staffing, but it also might be an attempt to reach more students in a consistent manner. Instruction librarians at NKU found a split did in fact advance opportunities for more in-depth IL instruction, including the development of online instruction.

Prior to the RIS restructuring, the IL program focused primarily on teaching one-shot information literacy sessions in class/person for various disciplines as requested by individual professors. Six librarians were sharing one-shot instruction responsibilities. Collectively, librarians had begun to create more active, student-centered learning experiences, but instruction sessions still lacked consistency. In addition, assessments varied from class to class, providing random snapshots of student learning rather than a cohesive picture. The IL program had grown through the years, but as additional instruction and reference duties were added, particularly as services expanded online, it was difficult finding time to focus on the program’s future and develop new initiatives.

In mid-2012 the RIS department officially reorganized to form two groups: instructional services and research services. As a result of the division the number of instruction librarians dropped from six to two. The idea of downsizing to a two-person team caused trepidation, but there was also an element of adventure and excitement for the opportunity to expand into uncharted territory. Librarians began to brainstorm a new direction for IL initiatives that would be consistent and better integrated within the disciplines on campus.

It has been more than three years since the department’s restructuring, and librarians have taken several steps toward designing a more dynamic and intentional IL program. It is beyond the scope of this paper to describe all the instruction initiatives that resulted from a

split model; however, it is worth mentioning one innovation that resulted after the department split because it eased scheduling concerns and addressed the issue of having fewer instruction librarians.

Moving Introductory Instruction Online

Under the previous organizational model NKU librarians had developed a strong relationship with general education English instructors. A number of English faculty regularly included a one-shot library instruction session in their introductory writing course (ENG 101) and in the sophomore level advanced writing course (ENG 291). Since the curriculum for ENG 101 does not contain a large research component, the one-shot library instruction focused on a foundational overview of research concepts. Library instruction classes for ENG 101 and ENG 291 varied greatly, depending on the librarian teaching the session, the course instructor, and whether or not the students had a research project in the class. For many NKU students this was their only formal exposure to IL. In addition, despite a strong relationship with the English department, more than half the ENG 101 and 291 sections were not attending library instruction at all. A combination of these factors resulted in a large number of students moving on to high level research in their areas of study without the foundational skills needed to be successful.

As the new organizational model developed, instruction librarians identified the effectiveness of one-shot instruction as a major concern in advancing information literate behavior. There was a strong desire to create a more intentional, consistent IL foundation for NKU students across the disciplines. The instruction librarians made the decision to deliver the instruction for ENG 101 courses solely online. By providing the information in an online package, the material could be covered in the depth and breadth that was needed without having to dilute or eliminate key concepts to accommodate a fifty minute schedule. An assessment component was included to help measure student learning (ENG 101 online videos). Subsequently, ENG 291 instruction model was modified: a flipped classroom approach was used whereby students viewed conceptual videos in an online package prior to class and applied the material during active learning in the classroom (ENG 291 online videos).

Migrating ENG 101 instruction to an online format eventually helped free up time for other classes where research played a heavier role. The ultimate program goal is that all ENG 101 students view the ENG 101 tutorials and complete the assessment prior to entering

their ENG 291 courses. These tutorials provide a more consistent and comprehensive foundation for students as they embark upon more advanced research. This successful model of online instruction has paved the way to integrate IL across NKU's curriculum. Ultimately, the instruction librarians' split from the reference librarians afforded the time to devote to this shifting instructional model as well as other advances in the area that would have been impossible prior to the split. Apparently these types of online initiatives have become increasingly more popular as evidenced in a 2013 report prepared for the Association of Research Libraries, which states, "Librarians at many institutions are now focusing on collaborating with faculty to develop thoughtful assignments and provide online instructional materials that are built into key courses within a curriculum and provide scaffolding to help students develop library research skills over the course of their academic careers" (Jaguszewski & Williams, 2013, p. 6).

Gains and Losses from a Split Model

While the division of responsibilities in the RIS department at NKU afforded positive opportunities for the IL program, there were also some drawbacks that mirrored survey responses. Several of the respondents who worked in a combined RIS department cited lack of staffing as a reason to maintain a traditional organizational structure. This is a noteworthy concern as NKU librarians found a greater need for flexibility in scheduling and for leaner instruction coverage. Moving some instructional materials online helped ease workload, but instruction librarians were individually covering more classes than in past semesters.

Additional speed bumps encountered at NKU seem to be consistent with other libraries that have experienced a split between instruction and reference. One librarian surveyed indicated missing "direct contact" with students (beyond the classroom), one librarian indicated his/her "Information Literacy Dept. is still too small," another mentioned "chain of command issues" associated with the split, while another indicated a "significant challenge to find time to communicate effectively with each other to make sure the right hand knows what the left hand is doing."

Before the reorganization at NKU it was common for one librarian to provide library instruction, serve as the embedded online Librarian, and provide research consultations for students in a course. This provided a consistent connection for students in a class for the duration of their research assignment. As survey respondents indicated, the blurred distinction

between reference and instructional work is a consideration when splitting an RIS department. One survey respondent who worked in a combined RIS department stated, “Even though there is increased attention to instruction, having instruction librarians visible beyond classes is important.” Traditional definitions of reference and instruction do indicate an overlap of services. The second edition of *Reference and Information Services: An Introduction* contains a chapter titled, *Instruction as a Reference Service*. The chapter’s author writes, “to separate instruction from reference is to do a disservice to users” (Wilson, 1995, p. 158). A few years later McCutcheon and Lambert (2001) conclude their study of communication between reference and instruction librarians by advocating the integration of job duties “so there will be better communication about the information covered in the sessions and about the methods used for teaching information literacy” (p. 214). The overlap between reference and instruction services was a consideration when the RIS department split at NKU. Librarians voiced concerns about the potential gap of knowledge between librarians assisting students at the desk and those teaching in the classroom. The instruction librarians continue to believe that reference and instruction do complement one another, but that does not necessarily mean librarians need to take on both sets of responsibilities. However, open communication becomes crucial for each area to advance and develop. NKU librarians from both areas continue to meet regularly and use a Learning Management System (Blackboard) community site to notify others of issues that could potentially impact the other group.

In addition to the new initiatives implemented as a result of the department’s restructuring, there were also some subtle yet meaningful benefits that evolved. The instruction librarians were afforded the freedom to focus more deeply on the concepts of IL in the classroom since the burden of “advertising” all the library’s services during instruction was lifted. Since the IL librarians did not have desk shifts, student consultation appointments, and were no longer embedded in online classes, they had more time for program planning, class planning, and creation of online materials. Additionally, while there were initial concerns of experiencing burnout because of heavier class loads, both instruction librarians found the increased focus on instruction led to more creativity in the classroom and actually served to revive their enthusiasm rather than cause burnout.

In the past a team of RIS librarians investigated and directed the initial planning for all new projects related to instruction and then presented the ideas to others in the RIS department for approval and adoption. The reorganization expedited the process for advancing IL initiatives since there was no longer a bottleneck associated with getting buy-in from the entire department before an idea could move forward. In addition, being able to focus primarily on IL allowed

for deeper class planning, easier resource sharing, and a more focused and intentional path for professional development. The instruction librarians no longer sought professional development opportunities related to desk practices and embedded librarianship but instead were dedicated solely to options related to teaching and tutorial creation. Since the two instruction librarians worked collaboratively to plan the program, more consistency in teaching and assessment efforts was achieved than ever before. A two person team also allowed for a more streamlined scheduling system for IL sessions. In the past an instructor scheduling three sections of library instruction in one day would have likely worked with three different librarians since the instruction slots were divided to accommodate everyone's desk and consultation slots. With the new system each instruction librarian covers a whole day at a time so more continuity occurs when teaching multiple sections.

From an instructional perspective, the pros of dividing responsibilities among the RIS department greatly outweighed the negatives. The new staffing structure allowed for a deeper, more intentional IL program, enhanced assessment practices, a stronger focus on teaching and active learning, more opportunities for focused professional development opportunities, and greater potential for an expanded IL program that will be integrated fully across the disciplines. The benefits that NKU's library experienced were mirrored in a number of the comments made by those librarians surveyed in June. One librarian in particular eloquently captured the intrinsic value of the departmental split saying:

Benefits include more training, growth, and time dedicated to cultivating each area. The public services coordinator responsible for reference is able to devote time to workshops to improve staff skills and has implemented a single service desk since the new division of responsibilities. The instruction coordinator is able to focus on training for teaching, coordinating instruction load, seeking new avenues for instruction outside of face-to-face, and work on formalizing an instruction plan for the institution. These are new endeavors that may not have been sought if a single individual were responsible for both.

Another librarian summed up his/her experience saying, "Instruction was able to start some truly innovative projects," one indicated "more time to focus on outreach and specific instruction related issues and planning," and yet another commented that the division of the two areas "allows time to focus on instruction which includes outreach to first year programs, first generation student success, as well as internal training."

Conclusion

While information literacy education may be advancing across academic libraries and to some extent in higher education, the literature and a recent survey of 115 academic librarians suggest a minority of libraries have split instruction and reference areas into two distinct departments. Further, those libraries that do have a split RIS department may not be using the split model as a method to advance more in-depth information literacy instruction. However, the experiences at NKU's Steely Library indicate a split model could lead to more emphasis on meaningful instruction as the division has provided instruction librarians the time to focus solely on reaching goals associated with the program, including an overarching goal to work with academic departments to integrate IL into various disciplines. Such a goal will not be accomplished overnight, but with a divided approach librarians continue to work toward enhancing information literacy education on campus.

References

- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2015, February 2). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>
- Badke, W. (2009). Ramping up the one-shot. *Online*, 33(2), 47-49.
- Budd, J. M. (2005). *The changing academic library: Operations, culture, environments*. Chicago: ACRL.
- Detmering, R. & Sproles, C. (2012). Forget the desk job: Current roles and responsibilities in entry-level reference job advertisements. *College and Research Libraries*, 73(6), 543-555.
- Elmborg, J. (2006). Critical information literacy: Implications for instructional practice. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(2), 192-199.
- Jaguszewski, J., & Williams, K. (2013). *New roles for new times: Transforming liaison roles in research libraries* (Report Prepared for the Association of Research Libraries). Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.
- Johnson, K. & Fountain, K. C. (2002). Laying a foundation for comparing departmental structures between reference and instructional services: Analysis of a nationwide survey.

- College and Research Libraries*, 63(3), 275-287.
- Long, M. P. & Schonfeld, R. C. (2014, March 11). *Ithaka S+R US library survey 2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.sr.ithaka.org/research-publications/ithaka-sr-us-library-survey-2013>
- McCutcheon, C. & Lambert, N. M. (2001). Tales untold: The connection between instruction and reference services. *Research Strategies*, 18(3), 203-214.
- Mery, Y., Newby, J., & Peng, K. (2012). Why one-shot information literacy sessions are not the future of instruction: A case for online credit courses. *College & Research Libraries*, 73(4), 366-377.
- O'Connor, L. (2009). Information literacy as professional legitimation: A critical analysis. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 50(2), 79-89.
- Owusu-Ansah, E. K. (2004). Information literacy and higher education: Placing the academic library in the center of a comprehensive solution. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 30(1), 3-16.
- Saunders, L. (2009). The future of information literacy in academic libraries: A Delphi study. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 9(1), 99-114.
- Sonntag, G. & Palsson, F. (2007). No longer the sacred cow - no longer a desk: Transforming reference service to meet 21st century needs. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-16.
- Ward, D. (2006). Revisioning information literacy for lifelong meaning. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 32(4), 396-402.
- Wilson, L. A. (1995). Instruction as a reference service. In R. E. Bopp & L.C. Smith (Eds.), *Reference and information services: An introduction* (pp. 152-184). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.

Appendix A—Survey Questions

(Note: Attendees were directed to different questions, depending on whether or not they said their library had split. This survey shows both sets of questions in one document.)

INFORMED CONSENT

Hello! The following survey is being administered to help the researchers better understand the organizational structures of reference/instruction departments at academic libraries. Specifically, we are interested in finding out if your library maintains reference and instruction within one department, or if these two areas function in separate departments.

The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Advance through the questions using the arrow at the bottom of the screen. While there are no major risks to this study, you may experience minimal stress as the topic of splitting reference and instruction may be sensitive. There are no direct benefits to completing the survey.

If you agree to allow your answers to be used for research, we will only use data you complete by answering the questions on the survey. The survey is distributed to librarians across the country and is anonymous; therefore, there will be no way of connecting your answers to you. Data will be kept for three years. Data from this survey may be utilized for a conference presentation and/or a publication in a peer reviewed journal.

Participating in the study is voluntary. Refusing to participate involves no penalty. You may stop participating at any time without penalty. If you have any questions about this research project, contact Andrea Brooks (brooksa2@nku.edu) or Mary Chesnut (chesnut@nku.edu). Questions about your rights as a participant in this research may be directed to Dr. Philip J. Moberg, Chair, Institutional Review Board, Northern Kentucky University at 859-572-1913 or at mobergp1@nku.edu.

Think about the organizational structure of the reference and instruction areas at the academic library where you currently work.

Are the areas of instruction and reference organized into two separate departments?

- Yes
- No

How many years have the instruction and reference areas been divided into two distinct departments at your academic library?

- Less than 1 year
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- More than 10 years

What was the justification for splitting the reference and instruction areas at your library?

Please describe any benefits in splitting the reference and instruction areas at your library.

Please describe any challenges of splitting the reference and instruction areas.

What are the official names of both divided areas (please list both below)?

Please select the statement below that best describes how librarians split the duties of reference/instruction at your library.

- All librarians in this area provide both reference and instruction equally
- All librarians in this area provide both reference and instruction, but some librarians are heavier in instruction and/or heavier in reference
- Other

To the best of your knowledge, have you and/or administrators at your academic library ever considered organizing the reference and instruction areas into two separate departments?

- Yes
- No

What do you think has prevented your academic library from splitting reference and instruction into two separate departments?

At your institution, how many librarians are

- Reference librarians only
- Instructional librarians only
- Both reference and instructional librarians
- Total

Please check ALL duties that librarians undertake at your library when filling the instructional role.

- Teaching face-to-face, one-shot information literacy classes
- Teaching online, one-shot information literacy classes
- Teaching “for credit” information literacy classes
- Online tutorial creation and maintenance
- Marketing instruction program
- Online embedded librarian
- Instructional design for faculty in other disciplines
- Other

Is your institution a

- Two-year institution
- Baccalaureate institution
- Master’s institution
- Doctoral institution

Which of the following describes the student population at your institution?

- Fewer than 1,000 students
- Between 1,000-4,999 students
- Between 5,000-15, 000 students
- More than 15,000 students

What is your professional title?