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- 7 faculties
- 15,000 students
- 2,600 staff members

Jyväskylä University Library

- staff: 67 persons
- major part of IL teaching: 8 persons
- IL-sessions 2011: 1,307 hours
  6,479 participants

- [http://library.jyu.fi](http://library.jyu.fi) > Information Retrieval > Learning path for IL
As a starter

- Organization based mindset
  - Within the library and within the University
  - Vs. academic process and learning process

- Unclear (unconscious), weakly phased ensemble
  - "Vertical" overlapping
  - Gaps in materials and services

- Isolated, sporadic working approach
  - "Horizontal" overlapping
  - Slow development

=> Development project 2011
The core of the process

- Tridimensionality of IL
  - Academic thinking, argumentation, ethics, community
  - Research and publishing practices
  - Principles and systems of information retrieval

- Tridimensionality of learning
  - Thinking
  - Attitudes; confidence in one’s own abilities
  - Emotions
The goals for the project

- Collaboration as general modus operandi
- Integrated and well phased IL learning path from freshers to postgraduated
- Organized and high-quality learning materials, bank of ideas and materials for teaching personnel
- Pedagogically qualified teaching
- Systematic evaluation of the impact
The commitment

- Management’s call
  - Always a poor decision?
- All teaching personnel
  - But who are they?
  - And where were they when the goals were set?
- Time factor
- Tridimensionality of human behavior
Sharing the expertise

- From goal to strategy and working method
- Within the library, within the Finnish libraries, within the University
- Workgroups and teams
- Seminars and training sessions
- Own Intranet and bank of ideas
- Mutual pedagogical manuscripts and more detailed plans for training sessions with learning goals, contents, pedagogy, evaluation/feedback
Pedagogical manuscripts

- Basic tool of the project
- Description of the learning process, not only learning goals:
  - background,
  - significance,
  - target group,
  - goals, content,
  - carrying out/how-to,
  - marketing, schedule, risks,
  - responsibilities
- Documentation for the next steps
Double strategy

- Who asked the libraries to teach?
- A common understanding of teaching
  - Within the library and within the University
- Link to educational projects and research
- Networking inside and outside
- Use the back door, if the front door stays closed
From bad to worse?

Project evaluation early spring 2012:

- "Projects and hierarchies kill natural creativity, enthusiasm and joy."
- "This project carried me with it in spite of the difficult start."

Best of all:
- The whole thing has cleared up
- Better planning and structure for the training sessions
- More interactive methods
- New updated and structured web pages and training materials
- Better "chemistry" between the teaching personnel
Conclusion / next steps

- More and deeper sharing with one-another
  - From collaboration to co-operation
  - Tridimensionality of human behavior
- More sharing with the faculties
  - Co-training, mutual evaluation systems, educational projects, participation in research
- Better coordination between web pages, e-materials etc.
- More concrete how-to / best practices
- Students role: wildly enthusiastic experimenter
- Teachers role: facilitator