Title: Transforming Information Literacy Grants Program - a case study of the Course
Enrichment Grants program at University of Virginia Library

= 弗吉尼亚大学图书馆信息素养教育创新实践案例研究

作者姓名： Abigail Karin Flanigan; Wei Wang (王维); Judith Thomas

职位: A.K. Flanigan is *Research Librarian for Music and Performing Arts*

W. Wang is *Research Librarian for East Asian Studies*

J. Thomas is *Director of Faculty Program*

所属机构: University of Virginia Library (Charlottesville, Virginia USA)

联系方式：akf3g@virginia.edu (A. K. *Flanigan*)

ww5y@virginia.edu *(W. Wang)*

Jthomas@virginia.edu (J. Thomas)

摘要：本文介绍弗吉尼亚大学图书馆如何突破传统信息素养的概念，创新扩展信息素养教育，促进图书馆员和教授的合作。弗吉尼亚大学图书馆创建的课程拓展资助计划（Course Enrichment Grant program 简称 CEG），给有兴趣合作的教授提供小额资助，并配备有联络图书馆员带队的专家小组（包括数字技术，数据技术，教育科技专家和教学图书馆员），协助教授拓展丰富现有课程、或新课程。本文将描述该计划的发展历史和成果，以及计划创办三年以来出现的机遇和挑战。我们将分享我们的经验和反思。最后，对有兴趣采纳我们课程拓展资助计划的图书馆提供相应建议。

Abstract:

This article describes the University of Virginia Library's Course Enrichment Grant program, where small grants are awarded to faculty members interested in working with a team of subject liaison librarians, digital technologists, data specialists, and teaching & learning librarians to enhance new or existing courses. This paper will describe the history and development of the program, the logistics and outcomes, as well as opportunities and challenges that have arisen throughout its three years. We will share our reflections as members of both the organizing committee and project teams, as well as recommendations for libraries who are interested in adopting a similar program at their institution.

The Course Enrichment Grants program built on existing information literacy grants programs at similar institutions and expanded to include support for the integration of innovative technology into the classroom and the development of data literacy. It has three tracks: Information Literacy, Data Literacy and Digital Literacy. Each funded project has the dedicated support of a liaison librarian-led team of specialists with expertise in the proposed topic. In addition to enhancing students' ability to critically find, evaluate, manage, and use information both within and beyond their field of study, this paper will show how CEG has inspired faculty to integrate innovative technology into classroom teaching and students' research projects, and to create new types of media-rich class assignments.

We will discuss how our roles as liaison librarians allowed us to leverage our relationships with faculty to promote the program, advise faculty throughout the application process, successfully manage individual projects, and create sustained and meaningful changes within our departments. Notable successful projects will be described and analyzed in depth, including a course enrichment grant awarded to a faculty member in the Drama Department that led to a more sustained effort to incorporate information literacy into the development of a new theater history curriculum.

Our paper will demonstrate how the Course Enrichment Grant program has led to increased campus-wide awareness about library resources and services, information literacy concepts, innovative use of technology in the classroom, and closer relationships among faculty and librarians.

关键词:

信息素养教育；创新实践；信息素养；数字素养；数据素养；团队合作；高校图书馆；学术图书馆；研究型图书馆

Keyword:

Liaison librarian; Information literacy; Innovation; Collaboration; Digital literacy; Data literacy; Library instruction; Teamwork; Research skills; University library; Academic library; Research library

Introduction and Background

This article describes the University of Virginia Library's Course Enrichment Grant program, in which small grants are awarded to faculty members to work with a team of subject liaison librarians, digital technologists, data specialists, and teaching & learning librarians to enhance new or existing courses. We will describe the history, development, logistics, and outcomes of our program, with an emphasis on the ways in which this program has led to deeper engagement between librarians and faculty. From our perspective as members of the steering committee and as liaison librarians on individual projects, we will reflect on the opportunities and challenges that have arisen throughout this program's three years and share our recommendations for libraries who are interested in adopting course enrichment grants at their institutions.

The University of Virginia (UVA) is one of the major public universities in the United States. When Thomas Jefferson designed the campus, he placed the library at its heart - in the Rotunda at the head of the Academical Village (the name given to the University's original campus). Today, the University of Virginia Library remains central to the university's mission to advance human knowledge, educate leaders, and cultivate an informed citizenry. UVA Library's main users are the faculty and students of the College and Graduate School of Arts & Sciences, and the schools of Architecture, Commerce, Education, Engineering & Applied Science, Leadership & Public Policy, and Continuing & Professional Studies. The Schools of Law, Medicine, and the Darden Business School have their own libraries. All the libraries share a common online catalog and work with each other to best support the teaching, learning and research at UVA.

In 2016, UVA Library implemented the liaison model – converting all the selectors to liaison librarians - and hired additional librarians to form the current liaison librarian team, with the goal of deeper engagement with the faculty and students. Each academic school or department has a dedicated liaison librarian. The role of the liaison librarians is to build stronger relationships with their user communities and to support teaching, learning and research. Instead of doing book selection and managing the resource budgets, the liaison librarians actively attend department meetings and research talks, meet with faculty, and have office hours for students. The liaison librarians also teach library workshops and conduct research consultations. Alongside the liaison team, there is a team of Teaching & Learning librarians who focus on providing services to first-year students. The Teaching & Learning team also manages library tours and orientations for new students and develops library workshops, online learning modules, and instructional tools.

With the Liaison Model implemented, the Library was looking for opportunities for librarians to become more embedded in the curriculum and to make real improvements in student learning. The Course Enrichment Grant program (initially called Information Literacy Grant) offers such opportunities. The program draws on and highlights the skillsets of library staff in addressing teaching and learning problems. By working closely with the faculty, successful projects can affect student learning outcomes and change perceptions among faculty about the value of library staff expertise and library services. Through the program, the librarians can learn about faculty's teaching goals, get an in-depth look at their teaching methods and at the students' learning behaviors.

Shortly after the pilot program began, the Library further demonstrated its commitment to faculty engagement with the creation of a new position, the Director of Faculty Programs. The position is tasked with promoting and supporting collaborations between faculty and librarians through the design and implementation of programs dedicated to enhancing research, teaching, and scholarship, and fostering the deep engagement of UVA faculty with library collections and services. Judith Thomas, who has worked in various leadership roles at the Library, took on this assignment. CEG program subsequently became part of her portfolio. With dedicated oversight from Thomas, the program was thoroughly assessed and as a result became better developed and implemented in the following years.

Development of the Program

Awarding mini-grants to faculty to incorporate information literacy into their courses is not a new idea. In fact, the idea to start the Course Enrichment Grant program at the University of Virginia Library came from its dean, John Unsworth, who based the idea on the Information Literacy Grant program at Brandeis University, his previous place of employment. Brandeis is one of many institutions that have implemented similar programs. In developing our local model, we examined Brandeis, Purdue University, Lafayette College, University of Texas at El Paso, University of Southern California, University of Texas at Austin, Siena College, and Indiana University's faculty grant programs. A search of the literature shows that similar programs have been implemented at Arcadia University, [1] Indiana

---

[1] Gordon, Larissa. "Partnering for Success Using Mini Grants to Foster Faculty/Librarian Collaborations." *College & Research Libraries News* 71, no. 3 (March 1, 2010): 152–55.

University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI),[2] and at The Ohio State University,[3] among others. Although these programs all bear slightly different names (information literacy grants; course enhancement grants) and differences in their methods, they align in their aim to increase faculty engagement with information literacy concepts.

Our program at UVA began in 2017, with the goal to incorporate information literacy deeply into the course curriculum in a way that is tailored to the discipline, recognizes students' existing skills, and links course assignments to information literacy concepts. Although many liaisons and teaching & learning librarians were already working closely with faculty members on both course instruction and assignment development, there was no systematic program in place in order to incentivize faculty to work with the library or to publicize the pedagogical and disciplinary expertise of librarians. By facilitating successful collaborations with faculty unfamiliar with the library's potential, this program could therefore change perceptions about the library's capacity to support teaching. A committee composed of volunteers from our Liaison and Teaching & Learning teams assembled in early 2017 to launch the pilot year of this program. The committee reviewed existing programs and collaboratively developed the application and selection criteria for our own local version of what was then known as the Information Literacy Grant. In its first iteration, the

---

[2] Feldhaus, Charles R., Lisa G. Bunu-Ncube, Howard R. Mzumara, Jeffery Xavier Watt, Stephen P. Hundley, Kathleen A. Marrs, and Andrew D. Gavrin. "Using Mini-Grants to Create Sustained Faculty Buy-In for Student-Centered Pedagogy and Assessment in STEM Foundation Courses." *Assessment Update* 27, no. 2 (March 1, 2015): 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1002/au.30014.

[3] Herring, Deidra N. "A Purposeful Collaboration: Using a Library Course Enhancement Grant Program to Enrich ESL Instruction." *Reference Librarian* 55, no. 2 (April 2014): 128–43. https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2014.880317.

application placed emphasis on the faculty who were interested in making changes to their courses related to information literacy. Selection criteria included staff availability, feasibility of the scope and goals of the project, the frequency with which the course was offered, the current Library presence in the program, and whether the course already incorporated information literacy to some degree. Faculty members who received the grant would work with a team of librarians, composed of the subject liaison librarian for that faculty member's discipline and a librarian from the Teaching & Learning department with expertise in pedagogy and instructional design, over the course of the summer to make changes to the course syllabus, learning objectives, and assignments. Six projects were funded in the pilot year from a variety of disciplines: History, English, Drama, Architecture, French, and Public Policy.

In its second year, the steering committee, led by Judith Thomas, made several significant changes to the grant program. UVA Library is home to the Scholars' Lab, a digital humanities center with extensive expertise in supporting digital projects, the Robertson Media Center, focused on providing equipment, services, and spaces to accomplish audiovisual projects, and the Research Data Management group, with expertise in finding, managing, and using data. Seeking to make use of the full scope of our expertise in the Library, the program was reformulated to cover three areas: information literacy, data literacy, and digital literacy. Faculty applicants were asked to identify an area of focus with which their application most aligned. This new, three-pronged approach furthered the library's ability to promote the variety of ways in which we can support student learning and innovation in the classroom. The applications received in the second year of the program again ran the

gamut disciplinarily, and the proposed courses included more advanced projects that made use of the Library's data and digital expertise.

Although this new iteration of the program was largely successful when it came to soliciting more diverse project proposals, implementing some of those projects was a challenge. First, some projects did not fit squarely into the focus area the faculty member indicated, which meant that we did not allocate the appropriate Library staff at the outset of the project. Second, executing some of the advanced projects was challenging, due to the short timeline, availability of staff with high-level digital expertise, and scope creep of ambitious projects. To address these challenges, the steering committee made a few changes in the program's third year. The three tracks were maintained but made less explicit in the application. Although meaningful to librarians, we found that these categories were not well-understood by faculty. To eliminate confusion, we removed the requirement that faculty members specify which track their project fell into, but we continued to include examples of projects that included data literacy and digital technologies on the application instruction page. This effectively promoted the breadth of our expertise without asking faculty to categorize their own application. We also added a section in the application encouraging faculty members to consult with someone in the Library before applying and asked them to indicate the staff member with whom they had consulted. In previous years, we observed that applications where the faculty member had consulted with their liaison librarian prior to applying were much stronger and therefore more likely to be funded. Additionally, these consultations helped set faculty expectations about how much could reasonably be accomplished in the grant period, thereby helping to scope out realistic projects from the outset.

Implementation and Results of the Program

Through these three iterations, we have developed a Course Enrichment Grant program at UVA Library that takes advantage of the breadth of expertise in our library while encouraging and promoting meaningful collaborations between faculty and the library to facilitate greater student learning. One clear winner that came out the first two years of CEG projects for the Library is our Special Collections. The first year we had two projects that made use of the resources and expertise in our Special Collections Library. One was a History course in which students used archival sources to learn about the difference between primary and secondary sources and learned methods for identifying and finding primary sources used in historical research. The second was an English literature course in which students worked with archival texts as part of an in-depth exploration of the history of gothic literature. They learned to form research questions and discovered unexpected ways of finding answers while examining information dynamically along the way.

Two of 2018-2019 projects also had a Special Collections component: *American Natures* and *Studies in Early Modern Music 1500-1700*. *Studies in Early Modern Music* used archival resources to teach students how musicologists investigate the sonic past. The professor wanted the students to think about sound and music in a historical context and to understand the difference between knowledge-making around 1600 and knowledge-making in the twenty-first century. In Special Collections, students found primary sources related to sound and compared them with digital objects, thinking through the material differences in primary sources and how one can use them to ask questions and draw connections about music history. The *American Natures* class had the students pore over the rare textual objects in Special Collections to recover or bring attention to a non-canonical body of environmental

literature. This exercise broadened the students' understanding of what constituted an environmental text. The final class project was a SHANTI (Sciences, Humanities and Arts Network of Technological Initiatives at UVA) blog, where the students contextualized the archival material from Special Collections. These blog entries included analyses of the source, textual histories, and links to relevant online scholarship.

Among the second year's projects, there was a noticeable surge in applying digital and data technologies to class assignment design. *American Natures*, mentioned above, not only took advantage of the rare material at our Special Collections, but also the digital technology expertise from the Scholars' Lab at UVA Library. The students learned to use OMEKA, the digital tool for creating online exhibitions, taught by one of the specialists at the Scholars' Lab. The students used OMEKA to build their "digital plant exhibition", the major part of their final project, a SHANTI blog. Another course, *Statistics and Engineering Practice* from the Science, Technology and Society Program at School of Engineering and Applied Science, utilized the Library's expertise in data literacy to develop students' skills in data manipulation, curation, and visualization and encouraged a critical inquiry into data driven methodologies. Through hands-on activities, the students learned how to combine quantitative and qualitative materials to gain deep understanding of social phenomena. Another awarded project was for a Media Studies course, *The #BlackTwitter Class*. In addition to engaging in a critical analysis of social media data to produce case studies about specific issues related to race and digital culture, the professor wanted the students to learn more sophisticated tools for collecting and mining data from Twitter. Due to the unfortunate departure of the initially assigned technology staff at the Scholar's Lab (an expert on Twitter scraping), the goal of learning advanced tools for Twitter scraping was not fully realized. The

liaison librarian and the teaching & learning librarian on the team rose to the challenge. They taught the students to use Google Sheets to collect Twitter data; however, Google Sheets proved to be an imperfect solution, and the students had to scale down their final project.

This coming academic year 2019-2020, one of the funded proposals has an even more ambitious multi-media project planned for the students. The course, *Global Sustainability*, was jointly developed by the Architecture School and the Global Studies program. The goal is to improve students' ability to employ media-rich technologies and data visualization in their semester-long *Think Global/Act Local* class project. The Library's education technologist will teach students to use video to conduct observation research, and then to create data visualizations and produce a video of their project pitch. The student-produced videos will be featured on both the UVA Sustainability website and the course's website. Because sustainability is an inherently interdisciplinary field, the project seeks to strengthen students' ability to discover data and ethically use and share data from a wide variety of sources both within and beyond their major field of study. This class project will put our Robertson Media Center to test in terms of staff expertise, facilities, and tools. Another technology driven project is for the course *Architecture and Identity in Byzantine Cities*. As part of a new multilayered approach to learning about Byzantine cities, students will balance scholarly reading and writing with hands-on activities using a range of digital technology, such as 3D modeling, virtual reality, and 3D printing.

One of our most successful projects was the *Theater History* course, funded in 2017, the project's first year. It demonstrated the capacity of this program to create meaningful collaboration beyond the scope of the original project. Professor Katelyn Hale Wood,

Assistant Professor of Drama, applied to the grant program to incorporate information literacy concepts into a Theater History course. Abby Flanigan, Research Librarian for Music and Performing Arts, and Paula Archey, a former Teaching & Learning Librarian, worked with Professor Wood over the summer to make changes to the redesign of *DRAM3050: Theater History* with a focus on research methods and processes of historiography. Over the summer, the team redesigned the final assignment to be more research focused, and, to scaffold the final assignment, designed interim assignments that asked students to practice brainstorming connections between course content and other periods in theater history. During the semester, the librarians taught a session on using library resources to pursue research questions, were available during in-class work periods to work through pain points, and asked students to reflect on their research process as part of the final assignment. Changes to the course yielded more original, nuanced, and in-depth research presentations than in years past. In the feedback survey administered by the Library after the end of the semester, 100% of the students reported high confidence in their own research skills after taking the course.

Based on the success of this collaboration, Professor Wood, Flanigan, and Archey applied for joint funding from the Department of Drama and the University Library the following year to continue collaborating. Professor Wood, the sole theater historian in the Department of Drama, is a member of the department's curriculum committee and responsible for redesigning the department's Theater History, Theory, and Criticism Studies program. In order to develop a curriculum that reflects the interdisciplinary nature of performance studies and emphasizes critical inquiry over a set canon of theatrical material, Professor Wood's goal was to develop two new required courses: Theatre Historiography

and Performance Theory. Over the following summer, Wood, Archey, and Flanigan revisited the Theater History class they worked on in the first iteration of the course enrichment grants and amended it in line with these goals. The revised course objectives focus attention on approaches to historiographical methods and navigating various kinds of historical evidence. Two in-class sessions in the Special Collections, complemented by readings from archival theory, give students the opportunity to practice observing and analyzing primary sources related to theater and performance, and further amended class assignments ask students to reflect on and critique the use of evidence in constructing historical narratives and scholarly arguments. The Theater History class they had worked on together the previous summer thus became *Making Theater Histories*, with a renewed emphasis on providing students with the tools they need to study, document, and write performance histories.

This collaboration, made possible through the Course Enrichment Grant program, was notable in that it facilitated connections between the Library and the Drama Department that were previously absent. The Drama Department at UVA has not had a strong history of collaboration with the Library in the past. It is primarily a performance-focused program, which is an area that the Library has struggled to figure out how to support beyond collection development. As a new liaison librarian at UVA Library, Flanigan had reached out to Wood, a new faculty member in the Department, to encourage her to apply to the CEG program given the nature of her course. This program provided a formal opportunity to work together beyond developing a one-shot library instruction session and led Flanigan to become more knowledgeable of and involved in the department's curriculum. In addition, the successful collaboration led to greater involvement in other areas of the department; for example, with

encouragement from Professor Wood, a faculty member in the Dance Program, part of the Department of Drama, applied for and received a grant in the program's second year, leading Flanigan became further enmeshed in the department's curriculum. Developing relationships with faculty members through the program also led to an increase in research consultations from faculty and students, as Flanigan became more a visible resource to the Department.

The program has helped forge new bonds with faculty, whether or not the application is successful. Just the experience of working closely with a faculty member in preparing a proposal can forge stronger bonds with faculty. At UVA, liaison librarians play a crucial role in the proposal process, encouraging faculty to apply and working with them on proposals that demonstrably enhance the student's learning experience and take full advantage of the expertise and resources of the library. This faculty-librarian relationship can even lead to improved faculty recruitment, as we can see in the following case.

Wei Wang, Research Librarian for East Asian Studies encouraged two Chinese language professors to apply the grant in the first year. Both did, but unfortunately neither was awarded. Although the faculty were very gracious, Wang did not simply forget about the failed proposals. One of the professors taught Media Chinese and her proposal included the discussion of fake news. The Library had just published a LibGuide on how to exam the news with a critical eye. Wang connected the professor with two fellow librarians who created the LibGuide and arranged a workshop on fake news for the Media Chinese class. From the conversations with the professor, Wang learned that she was very keen in having China experts giving guest lectures on China, delivered in Chinese, for her upper level Chinese courses. In summer of 2018, through a fortunate stroke of serendipity, Wang

brought a Chinese visiting scholar (a specialist in U.S. China relations) and the language professor together. They planned a guest lecture for Media Chinese in the fall of 2018. By that time, the trade war between U.S and China had started. The visiting scholar gave a timely talk on the very hot topic. The students loved it. Over the last a couple of years, the language professor has changed Media Chinese into theme-based sessions, using documentary films, audio materials and online resources to supplement her lecture; Nevertheless, live expert lectures are not only most thrilling for the students, but also allow students to learn the subjects directly from experts. Furthermore, the students get to apply and practice their Chinese language skill. The students loved having their questions answered by an expert, more excitingly in Chinese.

UVA has been developing interdisciplinary classes co-taught by professors from different departments and schools. However, informal collaboration on teaching among the faulty doesn't happen often. One other factor is that even though teaching in the same university, the faculty members in different departments or schools don't necessarily get to know each other. When the language professor discovered that Wang was a friend of the new Sociology professor (who specialized in China, also a Chinese native), she asked Wang to introduce them. Late fall of 2018, Wang hosted a lunch to connect the two professors. The discussion of guest lectures for the Chinese language class ignited the idea of having the two professors do a joint proposal for 2019-2020 CEG program – incorporating expert lectures (delivered in Chinese) into Chinese language courses and integrating information literacy into it, too.

Encouraging faculty to apply to the program can be tricky, especially the second time around. One doesn't want to give the wrong impression that repeated applicants were guaranteed a spot. Liaison librarians' active involvement in the proposal planning is vital – both to improve the proposal and to make sure that the Library has the expertise and resources (including staff time) to support it. As soon as the 2019-2020 CEG was announced, Wang started working with the two professors. In addition to meeting in person, a WeChat group was set up for the three for easy communication. The final proposal includes the following key elements:

- Lectures covering current topics on China by the Sociology professor, with the Library providing appropriate resources (reading and audio-visual material)
- Short library instruction sessions, coordinated with the lectures and focusing on the resources in Chinese, offered throughout the semester to develop students' information literacy competencies
- An annotated bibliography on a chosen topic as part of the final class project.

The well-thought-out proposal was a winner. At the time of writing, the CEG team were working with the professors to implement the proposal into the syllabus for the class in Fall 2019.

The examples above illustrate the unique opportunities this program creates, but we would be remiss not to discuss some of its challenges, as well. First, successful collaborations required faculty buy-in and compliance that the program was not designed to explicitly enforce. The program requirements specified only that faculty and their assigned library teams should meet at least three times over the course of the summer. The minimal nature of this requirement was intentional - it ensured that the teams would have maximal flexibility in choosing how and when to work together. However, some faculty members

applied for the grant in the spring before their summer plans had been finalized and ended up having difficulty meeting this requirement. Some teams ended up needing to work together much more intensively during the semester than others, which added to the librarians' already packed workload during the semester. Still other faculty members were unwilling to make significant changes to their courses or to implement the changes that library staff recommended. In these cases, where faculty were unwilling or unable to comply with the program requirements, we did not rescind funding or make any other adjustments. This is a challenge and a risk of any program where success depends largely on the specific alchemy a number of factors: the type of course, the faculty member's expectations, the working styles of the librarians, the availability of the team members (as was evident in the #BlackTwitter project, described above). Although we tried to control for these in our applications, there were still instances where unexpected challenges came up.

Another challenge was developing an application that was both flexible and allowed for faculty members who might not yet have a clear picture of how they would incorporate information, data, or digital literacy to apply, while simultaneously encouraging high quality applications. The application itself is fairly minimal and does not require a certain number of words per answer, so we had several applications that were very short and lacked detail, while others were more expansive. To rectify this discrepancy, we added in a recommendation that faculty members consult with a librarian before applying and asked them to indicate which staff member they had consulted with. This challenge ultimately transformed into an opportunity: library staff were able to help faculty put together stronger and more realistic applications. It also meant that whether or not an application was funded, the process of putting it together deepened relationships between library staff and faculty

and led to opportunities for collaboration. We found that amending the application greatly increased the quality of applications we received.

As we increased the scope of the grant, defining people's roles on the project became more of a challenge. In its initial iteration as information literacy grants, the grant project teams were more clearly defined: the subject liaison would serve as project manager and disciplinary expert, and the teaching and learning librarian would serve as pedagogical expert, with the work split evenly among them. As the projects expanded to include technologists and multiple subject librarians, defining these roles became more complicated. Particularly for the digitally focused projects, it was difficult to figure out who was best positioned to be the project manager. As the teaching and learning librarians ended up assigned to more than one project, they transitioned to more advisory roles. In projects where roles were not defined early on, the projects were generally less successful. Clear project management responsibility, in particular, is important.

A final challenge we experienced perhaps reflects the success of our program: unless one has an unlimited budget, it is not possible to fund every good project. The steering committee did its best to establish clear selection criteria and to align the application clearly with an evaluation rubric, but even with those efforts in place, we found that some of the criteria for selecting projects always end up being subjective. This is a powerful program for establishing relationships with departments where there previously were none, helping new liaisons get a foothold in their departments, helping faculty who do not have a full grasp on the capacity of the library achieve things they haven't yet conceived -- all things that are hard to measure or account for in the application process. Our evaluation criteria became more

codified over the course of the three years of the program, but the corresponding increase in quality of the applications we received made it difficult to select from among many outstanding projects. It is always challenging to turn down faculty members who are interested in working closely with the library, and rejection can sometimes even lead to disappointment or anger on the part of the faculty member. However, this challenge again leads to an opportunity: by connecting subject liaisons with faculty members at the point of rejection, liaisons can reach out and offer to help the faculty member achieve their goals, even if it's not as part of the course enrichment grant cohort. Many liaisons found success working with faculty members outside the official parameters of the grant program.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The Course Enrichment Grant program has led to increased campus-wide awareness about library resources and services, information literacy concepts, innovative use of technology in the classroom, and closer relationships among faculty and librarians. We hope this paper demonstrates the value of using mini-grants to collaborate with faculty. By analyzing the development of our local model, successful outcomes of some of our funded projects, and the challenges and opportunities we identified throughout the course of our program, we produced the following recommendations for libraries interested in launching course enrichment grant programs at their institutions.

Maintain flexibility: As we have demonstrated above, the ways in which the teams work together and the outcomes of grant-funded projects vary widely. There are differences among disciplines and personalities that make it difficult to prescribe a one-size-fits-all method of working together. In order to account for these differences and to create the best

possible outcomes, we recommend that administrators and librarians maintain as much flexibility as possible. Our only requirement, that teams meet together at least three times in the summer, ensured that faculty and librarians had adequate time to work together without putting any restraints on exactly when or how they did that work. Although being this flexible has its challenges as described above, we think it is an essential component of successfully launching a program with as many moving pieces as the course enrichment grants.

Cast a wide net: This program can attract a diverse array of projects if structured appropriately. At the outset of developing this program, we did not know how many applications to expect or what types of faculty we would have interest from, so we intentionally designed the application to cast a wide net. This allowed us to attract applications from faculty members from a variety of disciplines. When we wanted to expand the types of projects that were being proposed, we highlighted our data and digital technology expertise but specifically avoided a more restrictive application. We believe this low barrier of entry for faculty members allowed us to garner more diverse and interesting applications and led to more enriching collaborations between faculty and librarians.

Define roles: Through the three years of our program, we have funded both successful and unsuccessful projects. A defining feature of the successful projects was clearly delineated roles among the teams. In particular, one staff member needs to be appointed project manager and take responsibility for setting meetings, agendas, and making sure that all team members are accomplishing their assigned work. It is difficult for the library to control how much time and effort the faculty member devotes to this effort, but clear project management

from the library side will help structure the collaboration in such a way as to encourage their conscientious collaboration.

Make this a learning opportunity for library staff: This program can require a lot of staff time and effort. In order to create buy-in on the library side, it is important that librarians benefit from the collaboration as much as the faculty. We recommend that institutions make their best effort to select projects where library staff have the opportunity learn new project management and technical skills or build relationships with new faculty or hard-to-reach departments. By prioritizing staff development, program leaders ensure that course enrichment grants offer a chance for symbiotic collaboration among faculty members and librarians.