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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to implement an inservice workshop for classroom teachers in the use of resource-based instruction, and to determine the success of the program via an evaluation sheet.

As American society shifts from an industrial society to an information society, a shift in education must also occur. The teacher’s role needs to change from a textbook lecturer to a facilitator of learning. Students will need to become independent learners who are information literate. Critical thinking skills, problem-solving skills, and information literacy skills will be needed in order to become productive citizens. Resource-based learning provides the environment where these skills can be acquired.

Resource-based instruction uses a wide variety of media to achieve curricular objectives. The classroom teacher and the teacher–librarian work cooperatively to design instructional units that foster independent learning.

Inservice workshops need to be job-oriented, of immediate use to the participant, and provide training that will improve job-related skills. Participants need to know the goals and objectives of the training at the onset. For the end goal of the workshop to be improved services to the students, participants need to have follow-up and continuous support by the trainer. When the training
components of theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching are present, the greater the knowledge retention and use of skills learned in training.

The workshop was designed to introduce teachers to the library media center and the teacher/librarian’s role in resource-based instruction. The library research tools, the research process, and the search process were taught to the participants. Also the participants learned the process of developing a resource-based lesson/unit.

An evaluation form using a Likert scale was distributed to participants at the end of the inservice workshop to ascertain the effectiveness of the workshop.

The resource-based inservice workshop that was conducted revealed a great need at the school level for teachers to learn more about the library media center and the role of the teacher-librarian. Teachers are unfamiliar with the current resources found in the media center. Because of this unfamiliarity, there is a reluctance to implement resource-based instruction in the classroom. Through a non-threatening, hands-on workshop the participants became proficient in the use of the media center’s resources.
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CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

One of the national educational goals is for students to become lifelong learners and efficient users of information and technology. As America shifts to an information society, students will need skills to access, evaluate, manage, and use information effectively and ethically. By the year 2000, 60% of all jobs in the United States will require a working knowledge of information technologies (Farmer, 1997); therefore students, in order to become informed citizens, must be independent learners who are information literate, and able to use higher order thinking skills to solve problems.

The Secretary’s Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) Report and Goals 2000 agree that there should be a "greater focus on teaching all students to become independent lifelong learners, to become critical thinkers, to use a variety of technologies proficiently, and to work effectively with others" ("Information Literacy in an Information Society," 1994, p. 3). Information skills can have a direct impact on an individual’s ability to deal effectively with a changing environment by knowing how to learn. “Resource-based teaching and learning is a means by which teachers can greatly assist the development of
knowledge, attitudes, and abilities for independent, lifelong learning” (Saskatchewan Education, 1998a, p. 1).

Resource-based instruction is defined as “the use of multiple resources in a variety of media formats (printed, audiovisual, and/or computer media) and technologies to achieve a curricular objective” (Loertscher, 1988, p. 59). This instruction is the opposite concept of the textbook/lecture method of instruction. In resource-based teaching, instruction shifts from textbook-centered to the use of multiple resources. Instruction is no longer teacher-centered but student-centered. Students are no longer passive learners but active learners who create their own knowledge after interacting with information from various resources. Traditional equipment is replaced with advanced technology and resources. This philosophy of teaching creates new learning environments where the teacher and librarian collaborate in the planning and research process. The classroom teacher and the librarian, as instructional partners, identify the needs of the students, develop teaching units, and guide the students’ progress. Information literacy skills are embedded into the core curriculum, not taught in isolation. “Resource-based learning calls for all members of the educational community to become partners in a shared goal, providing successful learning experiences for all students” (American Association of School Librarians, 1993, p. 2).
Development of the Problem

American society has evolved from an industrial society to a service and information society. Schooling has historically been designed “to produce workers who would advance the economy by following the rules of machine and factory-driven production” (Marshall, 1995, p. 8). As the shift in American society has taken place, so too a corresponding shift in American education must occur. For 75% to 90% of students, textbooks/lectures are the only source of information they will receive on a subject (Young & Reigeluth, 1988, p. 7).

Research on the restructuring of schools calls for the teacher’s role to change from a textbook lecturer to that of a coach. Students become active learners who create their own knowledge after interacting with information from a variety of sources. (American Association of School Librarians, 1993, p. 1)

As America moves to an information society, the need for information literacy increases. Critical thinking skills, problem-solving skills, and competence in information literacy become increasingly important skills for future citizens (Information Literacy in an Information Society, 1994, p. 3).

Resource-based instruction originated in Canada over ten years ago. The Province of Saskatchewan no longer uses the textbook approach to teaching. The Saskatchewan Education, Training and Employment’s policy document states

... in order to meet the needs of individual learners and to develop in students the necessary skills of information processing, resource-based teaching is a recommended method of instruction. Resource-based instruction involves teacher and teacher-librarian cooperating to plan units that integrate resources with classroom assignments, and to teach
students the processes needed to find, analyze, and present information. (Saskatchewan Education, 1998a, p. 1)

In 1988, the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) & Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AECT) outlined four responsibilities of the library media specialist as an instructional consultant:

1. participate in curriculum design and assessment
2. help teachers develop instructional activities
3. provide expertise in materials and technology
4. translate curricular needs into library media program goals (p. 35)

According to Berkowitz and Eisenberg (1989), there is a disparity between the theory and practice of the librarian’s role in curriculum and instruction. Some possible explanations for the disparity are:

1. the curriculum role is undefined
2. resources are limited
3. incentives for greater involvement are lacking
4. teachers and administrators do not frequently use school library media specialists as curriculum consultants (p.1)

**Need for the Study**

Because of the disparity between the theory and practice of the librarian’s role in curriculum and instruction, there is a need for the classroom teacher to understand the role of the teacher-librarian. The classroom teacher must be aware of the qualifications the teacher-librarian brings to the collaboration process and what role the classroom teacher and the teacher-librarian play in
resource-based instruction. Students need to be able to be productive citizens who can solve problems, but can also work cooperatively to solve problems. Resource-based learning provides the environment where these skills can be acquired.

The classroom teacher needs to be shown the advantages of resource-based instruction outweigh the disadvantages. Loertsche (1988) discusses some of the advantages of resource-based instruction to be increased learning, increased variety, and shared teaching responsibilities between the classroom teacher and teacher-librarian.

An inservice workshop might help teachers understand the function of the teacher-librarian in curriculum and instruction and the various curriculum materials that are available. The teacher may also become proficient in the use of print (books and periodicals) and non-print (videotapes, CD-ROMs, audiocassettes) materials, including electronic indexes and online sources. The workshop may demonstrate to the classroom teacher the collaboration and planning process of a resource-based instructional unit.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to implement an inservice workshop for classroom teachers in the use of resource-based instruction, and to determine the success of the program via an evaluation sheet.
Research Question

How is an inservice workshop for classroom teachers that facilitates the use of resource-based instruction implemented and evaluated?
consultant” (p. 26). The access and use of information was broadened as more professionals entered the area of library and media services.

The changes in society and technology since the 1988 publication of Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs, have caused significant changes to the school library programs. With the information explosion, school library programs have more options for accessing and using information and attaining the goal of developing lifelong learners who are information-literate. The 1998 publication of Information Power: Building Partnerships for Learning emphasizes “the active, authentic learning that today’s researchers and practitioners recognize as vital to helping students become independent, information-literate, lifelong learners” (p. ix).

**Resource-based Instruction**

Resource-based instruction is defined as “the use of multiple resources in a variety of media formats and technologies to achieve a curricular objective” (Loertscher, 1988, p. 59). This instruction is the opposite concept of the textbook/lecture method of instruction. In resource-based teaching, instruction shifts from textbook-centered to the use of multiple resources. Instruction is no longer teacher-centered but student-centered. Students are no longer passive learners but active learners who create their own knowledge after interacting with information from various resources.
However, changing from a teacher-centered textbook method of instruction to a cooperatively planned resource-based method is a challenge to most classroom teachers. "Cooperatively planned resource-based learning is a complex change requiring changes in beliefs, materials and teaching methods" (Meyer & Newton, 1992, p. 14). Moving from an autonomous traditional text approach to a cooperatively planned resource-based approach requires a major shift in teaching method. Crandall (cited in Meyer & Newton, 1992, p. 13) "stated that teachers and principals are the crucial link to the successful implementation of a new program and that the classroom teacher plays the most significant role in bringing about the change." Many teachers are not willing to take the risk unless there is a strong commitment from the administration "in terms of expectations, professional development, and monetary support" (Meyer & Newton, 1992, p. 17).

In the study conducted by Meyer & Newton (1992), teachers were interviewed to determine the use of resource-based teaching. The study found that teaching methods changed before changes in beliefs about resource-based teaching. "Teachers' beliefs ranged from feeling that their students would really be missing out if they didn't employ resource-based learning to fearing that their students would not learn anything using this method" (p. 14). Teachers did say that there were benefits to the students by using this method. "Many of the teachers interviewed felt that students benefited from resource-based teaching because a variety of teaching materials could meet the individual needs of their students better than a one textbook approach" (p. 17).
Loertscher (1988) believes there are several advantages to resource-based instruction:

1. Increased learning: when a wide variety of materials and technologies are used, more can be learned in the same amount of time than when the textbook/lecture method is employed.

2. A chance to reach students who are having trouble with regular classroom procedures by the use of different media thus serving a variety of learning styles.

3. An opportunity to share teaching responsibilities.

4. Increased variety in the teacher's school day.

5. An opportunity to be creative and flexible (p. 60).

Both the Saskatchewan (1998) and the Kentucky Department of Education (1997) agree that when resource-based instruction is used students learn to think critically. The students have more opportunity to locate, interpret, analyze, evaluate, and communicate ideas and information.

Loertscher (1988) outlines a four-step planning process for the classroom teacher and librarian. Step one is to begin. The teacher and librarian meet together to determine the unit objectives and the dates the unit is to be taught. Step two is to prepare. This step is the most creative and challenging of the process. Ideas for activities and resources are discussed. Three things need to be done in this step:

1. Selection of the materials to be used.

2. Preparation of the activities to use those materials.

3. A decision on the product to be created by the students as a result of the activities (Loertscher, 1988, p. 65).
A temptation in resource-based teaching is to extend the time period of the project. One thing to remember is that the basic objective of resource-based teaching is to teach more in the same amount of time as the textbook/lecture method. "Meeting the time constraints of the unit and ensuring that every student meets the learning objectives is the creative and the most satisfying aspect of resource-based teaching" (Loertscher, 1988, p. 65).

The third step is to teach the unit as a team. Both the classroom teacher and the librarian share the responsibility of teaching the unit. Some activities are taught jointly while others are taught individually.

The final step is evaluation. "The evaluation component is a combination of measuring student learning, the process itself, and the response of the library media program" (Loertscher, 1988, p. 75). Both the classroom teacher and the teacher/librarian should be involved in the evaluation of student learning and the process. The success of the unit should be evaluated to determine if the unit objectives were met, if the activities were effective, and if the library resources were adequate.

Appendix A shows a detailed guide of Loertscher's four step planning process to help the classroom teacher and teacher/librarian develop the teaching unit. A briefer planning guide might be created after the classroom teacher and the librarian feel comfortable with the process.

Loertscher (1988) states the importance of the evaluation process:

A recent research study showed that only 10 percent of library media specialists spend any time with teachers in reviewing the outcome of a joint unit of instruction. How can resource-based teaching improve if no
evaluation is made? How can the impact of the library media program be assessed if evaluation is neglected? Evaluation of the effect of joint projects should be more important than collecting LMC circulation data and attendance data or doing inventory. (p. 75)

An example of an evaluation sheet for resource-based teaching is located in Appendix B (Loertscher, 1988, p. 76).

Thompson (1991) believes “resource-based learning can transform the educational system” (p. 24). It is the backbone for reform and improvement in schools. Thompson (1991) states

in support of lifelong learning, the ‘three R’s’ of the reformed school are: the ability to manage and use information to solve problems, the skills to communicate effectively, and the capacity to form interrelationships. All these new basics involve the resource-based library media program. (p. 25)

As a superintendent of a K-12 school district, Thompson (1991) promotes resource-based instruction. The teachers and librarian work together to create teaching units that help students identify needed information, locate and organize information, evaluate information, and present information in an organized manner. “Resource-based learning can serve as the force and the source for instructional improvement needed in our schools today” (p. 27).

“School leaders must recognize the power that a library media program integrated with the classroom can provide in improving the quality of learning” (Thompson, 1991, p. 25). The school leader needs to promote the concept. Thompson (1991) states that the most important step in the implementation of resource-based learning is training (p. 27). As in any major change effort, training of faculty is vital.
Inservice Workshops

Vandergrift (1994) discusses the role of the school library media specialist in the staff development process. The school library media specialist needs to offer formal inservice programs to faculty not only in the same building, but also throughout the school district. To be an effective teacher of teachers, the school library media specialist needs to understand the basic principals of adult education.

Adult education activities are usually divided into three types: basic education, career education, and leisure or enrichment education (Vandergrift, 1994). The emphasis of the inservice workshop for teachers would be for career education. Vandergrift (1994) explains what expectations adults have when they participate in an educational activity such as a workshop:

Adult learners ordinarily come to an educational activity with very different expectations from those of elementary or secondary school students. In most instances, adults are choosing to participate and their motivation is very specifically tied to the value they place on the educational experience. Often this is a very pragmatic value; they expect to see the usefulness in their lives and their work. Especially with teachers, whose work is also education, we must be certain that our respect for their prior knowledge is very obviously acknowledged and used in the planning and execution of current learning activities. We must assume self-directed learners who will share both the authority and responsibility for learning in cooperative, peer-group ventures. Teachers as learners demand realistic goals and require challenges and a variety of resources and learning experiences to meet their expectations and various learning styles. In addition, they expect a reasonable learning pace that neither rushes them through content without time for thought or hands-on experiences nor wastes their time. (p. 102)

Malcolm Knowles observed that “an adult brings a great deal of experience to any inservice session….thus, adult learning activities should be
goal-oriented, activity-oriented, and self-directed” (cited in Orlich, 1983, p.199). Teachers participate in inservice workshops for personal growth. An inservice workshop “is one means for continued professional growth which encourages the extension of technical assistance by teacher educators” (Orlich, 1983, p. 197).

In research studies of continuing education for teachers, Gordon Lawrence found that “eighty percent of the studies reported significant changes in teacher behavior” (cited in Orlich, 1983, p. 198). His findings on the effectiveness of inservice education were as followed:

1. School-based programs taught by teachers in specific programs tend to be more successful than those conducted off-site by non-teachers.

2. The most successful programs place participants in active roles, such as developing materials, role-playing, and problem solving, rather than placing them in passive listening roles.

3. Programs that use demonstrations, supervised trials, feedback and application techniques are more successful than projects that expect teachers to “store-up” knowledge. (p. 198)

The inservice workshop is the major vehicle for staff development. When designing a workshop, the needs of the participants and the workshop goals need to be identified. Clear objectives need to be developed and presented at the beginning of the workshop. Handouts need to be made available and given to participants so notes can be taken. It is important to prepare and follow an agenda (Fox, 1990, p. 298).

In the design process a variety in presentation needs to be addressed. Joyce and Showers identified four levels of the learning process which need to be considered when selecting appropriate teaching methods. They are:
1. Awareness: realizing the importance of a topic and beginning to focus on it 

2. Concepts and Organized Knowledge: understanding the concepts inherent in the topic and their relationship to the teaching/learning process 

3. Principles and Skills: acquiring the skills necessary to implement the new concepts in the classroom 

4. Application and Problem Solving: using the acquire skills to teach the concepts, and integrating those skills into one's own teaching repertoire (cited in Cook, 1985, p. 22).

Each level needs a different approach. Lecture, modeling, and demonstration may help teachers gain awareness and understanding, but the development of skills requires practice (simulated as well as real-life settings) and time. “Learning to use, apply, and integrate a skill or concept will take a significant amount of time and a variety of approaches” (Cook, 1985, p. 22). Each participant comes into the workshop with a different skill level and with different levels of concern. The trainer must show a caring attitude as well as an attitude of respect of participants' individuality and experience (Bell, 1986). 

Orlich (1983) discusses the effectiveness of in-service education. Many inservice programs address participants at the awareness and concepts of knowledge stages. “There needs to be greater training and involvement to allow a person to progress through these stages. One-shot inservice programs are not appropriate. Extended inservice projects that allow for application and implementation in the classroom will ultimately cause school improvement” (Orlich, 1983, p. 200).
The climate of the inservice workshop is also important to its success. According to Bell (1986), “sessions need to be relevant, well-designed, offered at an appropriate time, and delivered by someone credible” (p. 1). Teachers prefer their peers as trainers. “Research findings confirm that when their peers are trainers, teachers feel more comfortable exchanging ideas, play a more active role in workshops, and report they receive more practical suggestions” (Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990, p. 14).

Workshop planners need to pay attention to the learning climate. It should be pleasant and conducive to learning. Bell (1986) lists three reasons why climate is vital to inservice learning:

1. Prompting a change in skill, knowledge, or attitude is sometimes difficult. It is hard to let go of comfortable old habits and the attempt to adopt new ones requires a risk.

2. A supportive, encouraging learning climate fosters risk taking. If teachers are among people who care that they succeed, they are more likely to experiment with new behaviors or views.

3. A proper climate does not necessarily generate wild enthusiasm among participants. It does mean most people are in a cooperative frame of mind, are not unduly distracted, and are serious about working. (p.1)

Bell (1986) describes two ways in which such a climate evolves: “through the design and through the trainer’s words and actions” (p. 1). A conducive learning environment evolves through the workshop design by:

1. Climate-setting activities that allow easy participation

2. Providing activities that do not embarrass or put the participant in an awkward situation

3. Providing activities that relate to the content of the workshop
4. Providing activities that fit the culture of the school and the background of the teachers

5. Climate-setting activities that do not plunge participants into the thick of the program content without a chance to get comfortable in the setting (1986, p. 1)

During the training sessions, participants need to have time to process the information presented to them. Time must be given to reflect how to apply these concepts. Participants should be given an opportunity to share with each other their thoughts about the new concepts and the new ideas that have been generated. Training should be ongoing where participants are given time and assistance to master new skills. Hands-on training is important to increase the retention of the new skills. "If teachers can practice what they have learned, they are more likely to use the method or strategy in their own classroom" (Fox, 1990, p. 298). Adequate time should be allowed for questions and discussions. At the end of each session a needs assessment should be taken. Participants should be asked to write down any concerns about implementing the newly acquired skills (Fox, 1989, p. 214-215). The goal of the inservice workshop "should be to increase knowledge retention and on-the-job use of skills learned in training" (Fox, 1989, p. 215).

The trainer must also use language and actions "that support a productive, positive climate – informal but businesslike, concerned about individuals and their reactions but also concerned about accomplishing tasks at hand" (Bell, 1986, p. 1). Participants will feel more comfortable if the trainer or presenter is comfortable and relaxed.
Joyce and Showers have concluded “when all training components are present (theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching) the greater the magnitude of gain” (cited in Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990, p. 14). They also report “that teachers can acquire new knowledge and skill and use it in their instructional practice when provided with adequate opportunities to learn” (cited in Sparks & Loucks-Horsley, 1990, p. 14).

“By (students) knowing how to find, analyze, and use information today, they certify their readiness to become reasoning, thoughtful adults as citizens of the Information Age” (Thompson, 1991, p. 28). Informed citizens who use information and higher order thinking skills to solve problems.

**Summary**

Resource-based instruction uses a wide variety of media to achieve a curricular objective. Students progress from dependent to independent learners. Critical thinking skills increase as students have more opportunities to locate, interpret, analyze, evaluate, and present information.

Classroom teachers and teacher-librarians need to work cooperatively to design instructional units that foster independent learning. Successful instructional units integrate information skills with content area curriculum outcomes.

Inservice workshops need to be job-oriented, of immediate use to the participant, and improve job-related skills. The goals and objectives need to be stated at the onset. There needs to be participant-trainer follow-up and
continued support after the training ends. The end goal of any inservice workshop should be the improvement of services provided to the students.
CHAPTER 2
THE LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The role of the school librarian has evolved from “caretaker of books to information providers, instructional designers, and leaders as well as teachers” (Kreiser & Hortin, 1992, p. 313). As America moves to an information society, the need for information literacy increases. “Learning how to learn has never been as important as it is for students today. Statistics indicate that those soon to assume a place in the work force will need to retrain several times throughout their lifetime” (Saskatchewan Education, 1998a, p. 6). Progressing from dependent to independent learner and from knowledge and comprehension to synthesis and evaluation will aid students in becoming lifelong learners.

One of the purposes of education is to provide children with the skills and knowledge needed to function capably as adults. With the world changing rapidly, the abilities acquired in schools today need to be reassessed, as do the ways in which students are expected to learn...And when the content of the curriculum changes, ways in which the curriculum is delivered must change correspondingly. (Saskatchewan Education, 1998b, p. 1)

Resource-based instruction is a way for teachers to help students develop “knowledge, attitudes, and abilities for independent, lifelong learning” (Saskatchewan, 1998a, p. 1). Resource-based instruction meets the individual
needs of the learner and helps the learner develop the necessary skills of information processing.

Because resource-based instruction depends on the classroom teacher and the teacher-librarian working cooperatively to plan units that integrate the curriculum with library resources, the classroom teacher needs to know how to get started with the process. Loertscher (1988) suggests that an inservice workshop would be helpful to assist teachers in the development of a resource-based instructional unit and the research process.

The areas of the research literature discussed are the historical background of how the librarian’s role has evolved, what resource-based instruction is and why it is beneficial, and the inservice workshop.

**Historical Background**

The American Library Association since 1920 has provided guidelines for school library media programs. (American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1988, p. v) The role of the school librarian “has moved from resources to students to creating a community of lifelong learners. Students and their learning remain at the core of library media programs and services” (American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1998, p. v). “Yesterday’s library provided limited resource services on demand” (Toronto Teacher-Librarians, 1996, p.1). The librarian occasionally
worked with teachers on planning lessons, but for the most part had little involvement in curriculum development.

Between 1945 and 1960 the role of the school librarian changed significantly. "A major emphasis was placed on serving students and teachers. Services offered directly to students were given priority and centered on enriching their personal and instructional activities" (American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1988, p. v). The role of the school librarian as a teacher was emphasized. "The school librarian was jointly responsible with the classroom teacher for teaching library skills as an integrated part of the classroom instruction" (American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1988, p. vi).

The 1975 publication Media Programs: District and School reiterated the role of the library media specialist as a teacher. This publication also "stressed the library media specialist's involvement with classroom teachers in the instructional design process. Through these standards, the role of the media program changed from a support service to an integral part of the total instructional program of the school" (American Association of School Librarians and Association for Educational Communications and Technology, 1988, p. vii).

The American Association of School Librarians' publication of Information Power: Guidelines for School Library Media Programs in 1988, defined the roles of the school librarian as "information specialist, teacher, and instructional
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to implement an inservice workshop for classroom teachers in the use of resource-based instruction, and to determine the success of the program via an evaluation sheet.

Research Design

The research design for this study is descriptive research. Merriam and Simpson (1995) say, "one of the most commonly used methodologies in the study of adult education and training is descriptive research. Its purpose is to systematically describe the facts and characteristics of a given phenomenon, population, or areas of interest" (Merriam & Simpson, 1995, p. 61). Merriam and Simpson (1995) give three advantages or strengths of the descriptive method:

1. Its ease of use. The data produced is accurate and representative. The research design is not as demanding as in experimental studies.

2. It allows the researcher to study relationships or events as they happen in human life situations.

3. It is exploratory in nature. Not only can variables be studied that indicate probable cause, but also additional variables may be discovered that shed new light upon the phenomenon. (p. 71)
One disadvantage of the descriptive research method is the lack of predictive power. “The researcher discovers and describes what is, but is unable to predict what will be” (Merriam & Simpson, 1995, p. 72). In designing a training program for classroom teachers, a study of the literature on adult education and resource-based instruction is important.

**Procedure**

The research design process involved a study of the literature to answer the researcher’s questions on resource-based instruction. First, a definition of resource-based instruction needed to be found. Then the following questions needed to be answered: is resource-based instruction more beneficial to student learning than the textbook/lecture method? If resource-based instruction is implemented, what skills will the classroom teacher need to make this instruction successful? What components make up a well thought-out, organized, and useful training program for teachers?

The workshop was scheduled for three Wednesday afternoons from 3:30 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. and two Saturday mornings from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. All instruction took place in the high school media center. The total instructional and hands-on hours of the workshop were 15.5 hours. The remaining one-half hour consisted of writing up the project/research proposal outside of workshop time.

The instructors for the workshop were the researcher and another high school librarian. The library experience of the presenters were four and six years
respectively. Both instructors shared the responsibility of presenting material and providing help during the hands-on sessions.

At the beginning of each session the instructors explained the agenda for that session. Any questions or concerns from previous sessions were discussed. The agenda for each session can be found in Appendix C.

At the beginning of the first session participants and instructors were introduced. A short orientation to the facility was given and the course objectives and workshop schedule were distributed. Any questions or concerns regarding the objectives or schedule were discussed. The last two hours were spent introducing the library research tools, search strategies and working on the hands-on scavenger hunt activity. A list of each database, along with a description, was given to the participants to use as a reference. The first part of the workshop packet was handed out during the first session.

The remainder of packet of information and handouts was distributed during the second session. This packet was used for the rest of the workshop sessions. Each handout was explained and discussed. The participants asked questions regarding classroom implementation and past experiences of the instructors using resource-based instruction.

The sessions were divided into instruction in the classroom, hands-on activities at the computers, and discussion. The last thirty minutes of each session the participants returned to the classroom for review and questions. This time gave the participants an opportunity to share with each other thoughts about the new concepts and ideas that had been presented. The thirty-minute follow-
up also helped the instructors to monitor and adjust instruction for the next session.

Instruction was given on the various computer databases, the media center's public access catalog, the Internet, and searching strategies. A PowerPoint presentation was given to define resource-based instruction. A sample unit of resource-based instruction, designed by the researcher, was distributed and discussed. Participants and instructors suggested ideas for the development and implementation of resource-based instructional units.

As an Internet activity, the participants were asked to complete the same scavenger hunt worksheet used during the instruction on electronic databases. This time, the participants could only use the Internet to find the answers. The purpose of this exercise was to emphasize the fact that there are many ways to find information, but some sources are quicker and easier than others are.

In addition to the workshop activities, each participant was asked to choose a project or proposal for research. The teachers chose projects to design for upcoming lessons/units to be taught during the current school year. The non-teaching positions chose topics of interests to research. Each participant was asked to complete a Project/Topic Proposal form (Appendix D).

The last day of the workshop was spent completing individual projects. In large group share and tell, the researcher reviewed the basic concepts and benefits of resource-based instruction. The last fifteen minutes of the session an evaluation form was given to each participant to complete. A copy of the evaluation form is found in Appendix E.
Instrumentation

An evaluation assessment was given to participants at the end of the workshop to determine the success of the program. The evaluation instrument was the evaluation form from the district's staff development office. The form covered the areas the researcher wanted to evaluate in the workshop. The evaluation scale used was the Likert technique. There were two parts to the evaluation form (Appendix E). Part one asked the participants two questions regarding the course objectives. The scale was from one to five with one being "no", three "somewhat", and five "absolutely". Part two consisted of questions regarding the learning experience. Participants were asked to indicate responses on a scale from one to seven with one being "got in the way", three "neither helped nor hurt", five "helped" and seven a "major contribution". A comment area was included after each response on the evaluation form.

Assumptions and Limitations

The researcher is a high school librarian who sees the development of lifelong learners as the educational goal of the media center. It was assumed that the principal would be supportive of the workshop and that there would be a positive response from the teachers. Another assumption was that there would be an ample number of computers for the teachers to have hands-on experience with the various computer resources. One limitation was that the project had not been attempted before at this educational facility.
Product/Project Design

The workshop was constructed to include all the resources available in the school media center. The teachers were given instruction on the various traditional and electronic resources as well as an analysis of the research process. Traditional resources were books, periodicals, and videocassettes. Electronic resources were CD-ROMS for fulltext magazine and newspaper articles, CD-ROM magazine and newspaper indexes, an online encyclopedia, and other CD-ROM databases. An Internet unit was included with instruction on how to navigate through the maze of information available on the web and how to evaluate different web sites.

Teachers were provided hands-on training in the development of a resource-based instructional unit in the teachers' main subject area. This involved going through the individual steps of the planning process of the resource-based unit and using the resources that were specific to each teacher's subject area.

This workshop was offered to all teachers in the district through the staff development department. The researcher and one other teacher-librarian conducted the workshop. All instruction was given in the media center. The workshop consisted of sixteen hours of instruction and the participants received one district salary credit for movement on the salary schedule or sixteen recertification hours for the Arizona Department of Education.

The district's staff development evaluation form (Appendix E) was distributed to all participants at the end of the training. Each participant was
asked to complete the form. The two-part form consisted of questions about the course objectives and the participant's learning experience. An area for individual comments was included after each response. The researcher and the district staff development coordinator analyzed the evaluation forms.

By the end of the workshop, participants had worked cooperatively with the teacher-librarians to produce a resource-based instructional unit to be used in the classroom.
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Demographics

The workshop participants consisted of six secondary teachers, one elementary teacher, and three people in support positions at the high school level. Of the seven teachers, two came from social studies, three from foreign language, and two from instruction for the deaf. The support positions were one technology trainer from the district office and two library/media technicians. Of the ten participants, eight were female and two were male. Teaching experience ranged from two years to thirty years.

Findings and Results

Table 1 on page 30 shows the evaluation results. The results indicated the course objectives and the needs of the participants were met. All ten participants indicated that the course objectives “absolutely” met their needs and the workshop “absolutely” met the stated objectives. In the second part of the evaluation, how the workshop impacted participants’ learning, 9 out of 10 participates indicated that their personal expectations of the program and/or content were a major contribution to learning and one participant indicated it helped. All ten participants indicated that the facilitator’s content knowledge was
### Table 1. Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Objectives:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did these objectives meet your needs?</td>
<td>No 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you feel that we meet these objectives?</td>
<td>Somewhat 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How did the following impact your learning?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got in the way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither helped nor hurt</td>
<td>Helped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Contribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own personal expectations of the program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator's content knowledge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator's style.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The material taught.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The audiovisual supports.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The participants manuals and printed materials.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other participants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A major contribution to learning. Eight of the ten participants indicated the facilitator’s style was a major contribution while two indicated it helped. The impact of the material taught, all ten responded that it was a major contribution. Five of the respondents indicated that the audiovisual supports were a major contribution, while four indicated they helped, and one indicated the audiovisuals neither helped nor hurt. Regarding the participants’ manuals and printed materials, eight participants responded the materials were a major contribution while two responded that they helped. Concerning the other participants involvement in the workshop, six participants indicated that other participants were a major contribution, while four said other participants helped. Nine
participants indicated that the facility was a major contribution, while one responded that it helped impact learning.

Table 2 on page 32 indicates the average response to each question. The average response (from 1 – 5) to part one of the evaluation of meeting course objectives was 5. In part two the average responses (from 1 – 7) ranged from a low of 5.8 for audiovisual supports to a high of 7.0 for facilitator’s knowledge and the material taught. Personal expectations of the program and/or content and the facility received an average response of 6.8. The facilitator’s style and participants’ manuals and printed materials received an average response of 6.6, while the involvement of the other participants in the workshop received an average response of 6.2.

Also included on the evaluation form after each response was a comment area. The majority of the participants made comments. A list of the comments is included in Appendix F.

The evaluation forms complete by the participants indicated the workshop was worthwhile and informative. From the individual comments, the researcher concluded that there exists a great need in the schools for teachers to learn how to use the library resources/technology and how to develop lessons/units for students in the use of these resources. The results also indicated that hands-on experience is important in the retention of new skills. Time to practice the skills and to apply the skills learned to the classroom environment were a positive experience for the participants. Comments made during the workshop from participants showed a need to have more hands-on type workshops where the
participants could develop the skills necessary to use the library research tools and to have more independent time to work on individual lessons/units for the classroom.

Table 2. Evaluation Results – Average Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Average Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Objectives:</strong></td>
<td>Scale 1 - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did these objectives meet your needs?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you feel that we meet these objectives?</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How did the following impact your learning?</strong></td>
<td>Scale 1 - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own personal expectations of the program and/or content.</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator’s content knowledge.</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facilitator’s style.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The material taught.</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The audiovisual supports.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The participants manuals and printed materials.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other participants.</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The facility.</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to implement an inservice workshop for classroom teachers in the use of resource-based instruction, and to determine the success of the program via an evaluation sheet.

As American society shifts from an industrial society to an information society, a shift in education must also occur. The teacher’s role needs to change from a textbook lecturer to a facilitator of learning. Students will need to become independent learners who are information literate. Critical thinking skills, problem-solving skills, and information literacy skills will be needed in order to become productive citizens. Resource-based learning provides the environment where these skills can be acquired.

Resource-based instruction uses a wide variety of media to achieve curricular objectives. The classroom teacher and the teacher–librarian work cooperatively to design instructional units that foster independent learning.

Inservice workshops need to be job-oriented, of immediate use to the participant, and provide training that will improve job-related skills. Participants need to know the goals and objectives of the training at the onset. For the end
goal of the workshop to be improved services to the students, participants need to have follow-up and continuous support by the trainer. When the training components of theory, demonstration, practice, feedback, and coaching are present, the greater the knowledge retention and use of skills learned in training.

The workshop was designed to introduce teachers to the library media center and the teacher/librarian’s role in resource-based instruction. The library research tools, the research process, and the search process were taught to the participants. Also the participants learned the process of developing a resource-based lesson/unit.

An evaluation form using a Likert scale was distributed to participants at the end of the inservice workshop to ascertain the effectiveness of the workshop.

Conclusions

The resource-based inservice workshop that was conducted revealed a great need at the school level for teachers to learn more about the library media center and the role of the teacher-librarian. Teachers are unfamiliar with the current resources found in the media center. Because of this unfamiliarity, there is a reluctance to implement resource-based instruction in the classroom. Through a non-threatening, hands-on workshop the participants became more comfortable with the instructors and the content of the workshop. As participants became more comfortable, more interactions between participants and the instructors took place.
The workshop helped teachers understand the function of the teacher-librarian in curriculum and instruction and the various curriculum materials that are available. The teachers became proficient in the use of print and non-print materials, including electronic indexes and online sources. The workshop demonstrated to the classroom teachers the collaboration and planning process of a resource-based instructional unit.

The facilitators were pleased that the participants felt the workshop was relevant and important to the improvement of instruction and the needs of all students could be met using resource-based instruction.

A reoccurring positive comment from the participants was that the information given could be used immediately to create a usable end product for classroom use. From the literature reviewed and the comments made during the workshop to the researcher, participants want and need information that can be used immediately, that is relevant, and will make instruction more meaningful to students.

**Recommendations**

A recommendation for this workshop is to have a follow-up workshop or a part two. Participants needed more time to process the information. The researcher would keep the content the same. All the information presented was important to the understanding of the concept of resource-based instruction. A second workshop would start with a review of the first workshop and the
remainder of the time participants would spend working with the teacher/librarian in the planning and development of lessons/units.

A second recommendation is that participants have more hands-on computer time to develop the necessary information skills for implementing resource-based instruction in the classroom. A requirement for the completion of part two would be to have the participants develop two lessons/units to be taught with the teacher/librarian.

A third recommendation is to teach the workshop to one department at a time. Teachers in the same content area could brainstorm ideas for units and work together in the development of lessons/units.

The workshop was available to all teachers in the district. The participants for the workshop were all from one school. Because of this, the location was changed to the participants’ high school. Recommendation four is to have workshops at one’s home school. It would be advantageous to participants in that there is a comfort level in familiar surroundings and participants would learn what resources are available to them on a daily basis. A participant not having to travel to the workshop is another advantage.

Recommendation five is that the scavenger hunt worksheets for the databases and the Internet be shorter. Having twenty-three items to find was good practice, but took longer than the researcher anticipated. A possible solution would be to divide participants into groups to complete the worksheet.
The sixth recommendation is to start on time. Because some of the sessions were after school, participants had a tendency to arrive late. It is important to start at the designated time. It is unfair to the participants that arrive on time.

Recommendation seven is to provide treats to the participants when they arrive. This was especially important for the workshops presented during the weekday after school. The treats seemed to give the participants a lift, a chance to get to know one another better, and a chance to relax before the instruction began.


APPENDIX A

LOERTSCHER'S FOUR STEP PLANNING PROCESS
LOERTSCHER’S FOUR STEP PLANNING PROCESS

1. Begin

   Classroom Teacher/Librarian Meet

A. Identify what unit of instruction is to be planned and approximate dates to be taught.

B. Briefly discuss the abilities and interests of the students if necessary.

C. Determine the objectives of the unit:
   1. Clarify and simplify.
   2. Are objectives manageable in view of the resources of the library.
   3. Bloom’s taxonomy considerations:
      a. Knowledge (memory).
      b. Comprehension (understanding).
      c. Application.
      d. Analysis.
      e. Synthesis.
      f. Evaluation

D. Decide what each person is expected to do prior to the next meeting.

2. Prepare

   Getting Ready

A. Librarian locates instructional materials remembering:
   1. Levels of difficulty.
   2. Interest levels.
   3. A variety of media.
   4. Materials for special students.
   5. Materials from other sources outside the library.
   6. People resources.

B. Both get creative ideas ready:
   1. Ideas for activities using commercial and locally produced materials.
   2. Ideas for effective use of print, video, and computer media.
   3. Ideas for appropriate library, media, and information skills.
   4. Ideas for building critical reading, viewing, and listening skills.

C. Second meeting of the team:
   1. Discuss unit content changes if necessary.
   2. Discuss materials available and preview if necessary.
   3. Discuss creative ideas.
   4. Decide exactly who will be responsible for presenting each activity in the unit.

D. Prepare and pilot, if necessary, the materials and activities.
3. Teach

Present the Unit to Students

A. Jointly introduce the unit and its objectives and activities.

B. Carry out planned activities. Be open to change as the activities develop.

C. Some activities will be carried out by the teacher alone, some by the librarian, and some jointly. The teacher will generally team on activities based in the library, particularly when students are locating and analyzing information and materials.

D. Share enthusiasm for the unit with students.

E. Expect students to achieve the objectives.

4. Evaluate

Provide Opportunities for Feedback

A. Teacher and librarian evaluate:
   1. Unit objectives and content.
   2. Materials:
      a. Enough materials?
      b. Interest and difficulty okay?
      c. Variety of media okay?
   3. Activities:
      a. Did they motivate?
      b. Lead to unit objectives?
      c. Worth the effort and cost?
      d. Provide for student skill levels?

B. Seek input from students on any of the above topics.

C. Test learning (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor):
   1. Paper and pencil tests.
   2. Other types of tests.
   3. Tests should include learning from library materials – not just lectures and textual materials.
   4. Tests of any library or media skills presented.

D. Postlude:
   1. Plan to teach the unit again?
   2. Materials need replacing?
   3. New materials need to be ordered?
   4. Any issued for administrators to handle?
   5. Report successes and failures to administrator as appropriate.
   6. Any other plans to make?
APPENDIX B

COOPERATIVE EVALUATION OF RESOURCE-BASED TEACHING
COOPERATIVE EVALUATION OF RESOURCE-BASED TEACHING

Teacher/Grade level: ________________________ Class size: ____________

Content area: _____________________________ Unit of study: ____________

What worked well in the unit?

____________________________________________________________________

Suggestions for improvement:

____________________________________________________________________

What media center materials were most helpful?

____________________________________________________________________

What materials were not available?

____________________________________________________________________

How well did the media center collection respond to the unit objectives?

Scale: 5 = excellent
       4 = above average
       3 = average
       2 = below average
       1 = poor

__________ diversity of formats (books, audiovisual)

__________ recency (books, audiovisuels up-to-date?)

__________ relevance of collection to unit needs

__________ duplication (enough materials for number of students taught?)

__________ Reading/viewing/listening levels meet students' needs

Time Allotment:
              Cooperative Planning________

              Actual Teaching Time___________ (Librarian)
APPENDIX C

WORKSHOP AGENDAS
Internet and Resource-Based Instruction Workshop

Agenda

February 3, 1999

3:30 – 3:45  Tour of Mountain Pointe Library

3:45 – 4:00  Introductions
            Course Objectives

4:00 – 5:00  Introduction to Library Research Tools (hands-on)

5:00 – 5:10  Break

5:10 – 6:00  Practice search strategies
            - complete worksheet
            - practice keyword selection
Internet and Resource-Based Instruction Workshop

Agenda

February 6, 1999

8:00 – 8:30  Discuss agenda and individual goals (Classroom)

8:30 – 9:30  Electric Library introduction (Library)
             Scavenger Hunt Worksheet
             Discuss worksheet and searching strategies

9:30 – 9:45  Break

9:45 – 10:30 Overview of Resource-Based Instruction (Computer Lab)
             • Power Point Presentation
             • Sample Unit - “Turn of the Centuries”
             • Sample lessons plans (by subject area)
             • Unit Planner Worksheets
             • Unit Evaluation Sheet

10:30 – 11:30 Review individual goals (Computer Lab)
              Topic Web – Brainstorming Worksheet
              Keyword Searching Worksheet

11:30 – 12:00 Large Group Review and Discussion (Classroom)
Internet and Resource-Based Instruction Workshop

Agenda

February 10, 1999

3:30 – 4:00  Introduction to Internet Searching: (Computer Lab)
- Search engines/Meta search engines vs. subject guides
- A 5 Step Search Strategy
- Discussion: Web Evaluation Criteria

4:00 – 4:15  Web Evaluation Criteria Worksheet (Computer Lab)
Recommended Search Tools Page Exercise
URL:  www.infopeople.org

4:15 - 4:30  PAC (Electronic card catalog) (Library)

4:30 – 4:45  BREAK

4:45 – 5:30  Internet Scavenger Hunt Worksheet (Library)

5:30 – 6:00  Large Group Review and Discussion (Classroom)
Internet and Resource-Based Instruction Workshop

Agenda

February 17, 1999

3:30 – 3:45 Discuss individual project/topic (Classroom)

3:45 – 4:00 PAC (Electronic card catalog) (Library)

4:00 – 4:30 Recommended Search Tools Page Exercise (Computer Lab)
URL: www.infopeople.org

4:30 – 4:45 BREAK

4:45 – 5:45 Work on individual project/topic (Library)

5:45 – 6:00 Large Group Review and Discussion (Classroom)
Internet and Resource-Based Instruction Workshop

Agenda

February 20, 1999

8:00 – 8:15  Review agenda and project/topic proposal (Classroom)
8:15 – 9:30  Work on individual project/topic (Library)
9:30 – 9:45  BREAK
9:45 – 10:45 Work on individual project/topic (Library)
10:45 – 11:45 Large Group Share & Tell (Classroom)
11:45 – 12:00 Evaluation (Classroom)
Project/Topic Proposal

Internet/Resource-Based Instruction Workshop

Identify project/topic you would like to research?

Determine the objectives of your project/topic?

What resources will be used?

Ideas for activities
EVALUATION

INTERNET AND RESOURCE-BASED INSTRUCTION

We believe that individuals gain benefits from our programs to the extent that we are able to communicate principles and processes that increase effectiveness and quality of life. Please help us improve by providing feedback on today’s experience.

Course Objectives The student will learn to develop resource-based instructional lessons using the various library resources. Resources from traditional to electronic will be explored and work sheets for resource evaluation (including internet) will be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did these objectives meet your needs?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you feel that we met these objectives?</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: ____________________________________________

All of the aspects of a program can effect learning. It is important to us that we understand which parts of today’s experience were of help to you and which, if any, got in the way of your learning. We appreciate your responses.

How did the following impact your learning experience?

Your own personal expectations of the program and/or content. (i.e., did you want to be here, were you open to new ideas)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Got in the way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither helped nor hurt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments ____________________________________________

The facilitator’s content knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Got in the way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither helped nor hurt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments ____________________________________________

The facilitator’s style. (i.e., manner of speech, awareness, of audience needs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Got in the way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither helped nor hurt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments ____________________________________________

(more on back)
The material taught. (i.e., were the ideas valid and useful)

Comments

The audio visual supports. (i.e., could you see the overheads, were the videos informative)

Comments

The participant manuals and printed materials. (i.e., were the materials understandable, easy to read, well designed)

Comments

The other participants (i.e., their willingness to participate and learn)

Comments

The facility. (i.e., room comfort and adequate comfortable seating)

Comments

Other

Thank you for your assistance as we strive to continually improve in order to provide more effective, empowering learning situations for you.

5/21/98
Evaluation Comments

Comments to course objectives:

I have seldom taken a class with such immediate relevancy. It was super! Learned the purposes of the various research tools. Good balance between instructor information/presentation/guidance and hands on learning. The instructors had the course beautifully organized. The course was well paced and allowed for interaction between instructors and students. This is exactly what all classroom teachers need. This possibly is the most valuable in-service staff development training I have ever experienced in my 30 years with (the district). This course was outstanding! It really is a must do for all personnel.

Comments to own personal expectations of the program and/or content:

Other classes have helped me with the net, but I felt overwelmed. This limited it to school-appropriate sources. I want to utilize the new technology efficiently and help students learn new ways of learning. It takes time to learn these skills…This is so much out there…How do we learn to wisely choose. It’s exciting that our educational practice is evolving. One day textbooks will be obsolete. I was hoping to learn a little information and became more excited as the class progressed. I wanted hands on and I got it. I needed/expected a lot and I got both! I really wanted to learn new information – and what I learned was so much more than I anticipated.

The facilitator’s content knowledge:

Their library expertise exceeded what I anticipated. I guess I still didn’t realize how up-to-date a “library” is these days. The facilitators were very helpful! Kept a balance between all forms of research sources – not exclusively the net! They practice what they preach. Excellent on the part of both instructors.
I don’t recall any situation where the facilitator wasn’t up to the task, and we had many questions! Wonderful materials that are important resources for planning units and doing interdisciplinary work.

The facilitator’s style:

Both are very user-friendly, are good speakers and their material was well-organized. Respectful of teachers and yet directive where appropriate. Well-paced. Good eye contact and awareness of students’ needs. Both were very helpful and patient with us. Excellent focus on our personal goals. Easy to follow/easy to hear. They even provided refreshments at every session!

The materials taught:

Very relevant. Yes! Ideas really helped me realize the importance of preparing the students before we go to the library! Referenced…current…!!! Practice time was great. It was great that we all had time to choose our own projects & work on it. Totally relevant and invaluable. I feel better now about all the new technology…when is part 2?

The audio visual support:

Good. Wonderful experience with audio visual presentation from computer. No problems.

The participant manuals and printed materials:

The one packet on an American Studies project was hard to assimilate; too much, too long. Handouts were great! Yes, I will use many of the hand-outs. Outstanding!
The other participants:

Good teamwork. Everyone thought the class was very useful. Disappointing that more teachers didn’t take the opportunity to come!! Every seemed engaged. Again we were doing what we expect our students to be doing. Everyone was eager to learn in the beginning and we all got more excited about our learning as the class progressed. Everyone was pleased with being able to work on their individual projects. My only concern is that participants tend to be late for programs such as these, and valuable time is lost while we wait for others to “show”.

The facility:

The facility was great. Great facility...now we can use it!! Our media center is great. At least this time all computers/servers/etc. seemed to be “up and running” (not always the case)

Other comments:

Thank you both so much. This class was extremely beneficial. This would be helpful on a Friday inservice day at school. Great job! M & D knew just what this group needed to know to improve instruction and student productivity. An extremely important and useful class. M & D are excellent instructors as well – patient and well-informed. I think this class would be very beneficial to all the faculty – for personal use and to help their students. I want to do more. M & D really have the right focus because the agenda was based on little fixed, direct instruction and lots of doing. That’s how we retain these concepts! This was an excellent class and the teachers, M & D, did a wonderful job. I believe every teacher should have at least some of this training – particularly veteran teachers who may not know what’s “out there”. Thanks to M & D for a job well done! (The cookies were great! Along with the other goodies) Great food/drink/flow of materials, practicum. I can’t say enough about what a tremendous contribution this class made to my thinking and vision of possibilities via internet use!