Facility Librarians:

George Aulisio, Kelly Banyas, Frank Conserette, Kevin Norris, and Donna Witek

Semester: Fall 2017

Course Number and Name: INTD 112: EP Foundations (EP)

Course Instructors (Last Name): Mikesell, Fisher, DeSantis, Reavy, and Conlon-Mazzucca

Date(s) of Guest Information Literacy Instruction:

Session 1: Week of 09/11/2017 and Session 2: Week of 09/18/2017*

*14 information literacy class sessions delivered to 7 sections across two weeks

Time(s) of Guest Information Literacy Instruction:

Various; instruction took place in both 50-minute and 75-minute class sessions

Locations: STT 311, LSC 401, and LSC 403

Number of Students Registered in Course: 69 students total across 7 sections

Summary of research assignment or task

In Fall 2017 this information literacy module consisted of the following:

- Librarian visits class on Day 1 of semester to introduce oneself and briefly explain librarian’s role in the course (10 minutes)
- Librarian teaches two information literacy class sessions, 1.5 weeks apart from each other, which involve a shared lesson plan and Library Assignment (i.e., student homework) across all sections
- Between the two information literacy class sessions, librarian grades/assesses student submissions of Library Assignment using a shared rubric, and shares these scores and feedback individually with the students and for the entire class with the course instructor
- Students participate in a “Golden Ticket” research consultation with a librarian in support of their Capstone projects (these meetings are usually 15-30 minutes)
  - In Fall 2017 we had students sign up to visit the Research Services desk using a Doodle Poll
Students then fill out a “Golden Ticket” slip documenting their meeting with the librarian which is handed in to the course instructor.

For shared lesson plans (Sessions 1 and 2), grading rubric, sample “Golden Ticket” slips, and other instructional materials for this module, see attached.

**Student learning outcomes for the guest information literacy instruction (at least one, no more than three)**

Session 1:

1.A: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction and the Library Assignment they will do as homework, students will strategically explore their Capstone topics through the search process.

1.B: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction and the Library Assignment they will do as homework, students will gather complete citation information including article type for three potential sources on their topics.

1.C: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction and the Library Assignment they will do as homework, students will critically evaluate three potential sources on their topics using the “Five Ws” framework for source evaluation.

Session 2:

2.A: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction, students will demonstrate their understanding of database searching for information about their Capstone topics.

2.B: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction, students will articulate their own understanding of the search process.

2.C: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction, students will receive timely feedback on their work of developing search strategies and applying evaluative criteria to information about their topics. [Note: Not technically a learning outcome but more of an instructional outcome.]

**How will you know how students are doing as they work toward meeting these outcomes?**

Session 1:

1.A: Successful completion of Qs 1-8 of Library Assignment completed as homework.

1.B: Successful completion of Q 9, Q 11, and Q 13 of Library Assignment completed as homework.
1.C: Successful completion of Q 10, Q 12, and Q 14 of Library Assignment completed as homework.

Session 2:

2.A: Observation of database teaching activity

2.B: Observation of database teaching activity

2.C: Broad feedback given on homework assignment; feedback provided by librarians in comments of their homework submissions (optional for librarians)

Based on your experience teaching this session and any assessment of student work you were able to do, what can you change next time to improve how you teach it? Or, what was successful that you want to be sure to do again the next time you teach it?

CLOSING THE LOOP — Changes from Spring 2017*:

*Note: There is no Classroom Activity Report for this course in Spring 2017 due to overlapping retirements and leaves in the Research & Scholarly Services department.

There were two factors that went into the decision to make changes to the module between Spring 2017 and Fall 2017. 1) There were seven sections of the course running in Fall 2017, which is exceptionally more than had ever run before; and, 2) Those librarians that delivered the module in Spring 2017 informally discussed the benefits of streamlining the module as a result of the assessment we did in Spring.

In response to these factors the changes the Research & Instruction Librarians made for Fall 2017 were:

- We moved the Library Assignment into the Desire2Learn (D2L) learning management system, using its native Quiz application in order to make facilitating and grading the assignment easier.
- We revised the “Golden Ticket” slips to better structure student reflection on their learning during the research consultation and to eliminate questions that are now obsolete (revision attached).
- We changed how “Golden Ticket” appointments were managed, moving from a model where students signed up individually with the librarian assigned to their section (Spring 2017) to a model where students signed up using a shared Doodle Poll for a date and time to visit the Research Services desk and meet with the librarian on duty (Fall 2017).

What follows is an assessment of these changes and the information literacy module as a whole for Fall 2017.
ASSESSMENT OF FALL 2017 INFORMATION LITERACY MODULE:

Library Assignment

65 students completed the Library Assignment out of 69 students enrolled. Librarians assigned to each section scored their submissions using a shared rubric (attached).

Mean Score: 34.58 / 38
Mean Grade: 91%

Median Score: 35 / 38
Median Grade: 92.11%

The highest grade was 100% (n = 9 students) and the lowest grade was 63.16% (n = 2 students).

53 students out of the 65 who submitted assignments scored 85% or higher.

Based on this assessment, it is clear that a high percentage of the students in this course were successful at accomplishing the information literacy tasks asked of them in the Library Assignment; however, based on observations by the librarians during the grading process, content areas that could be better emphasized in our instruction were identified, and decisions were made to better address them in Spring 2018 the next time we teach the module. See CLOSING THE LOOP section below for details about these planned changes.

Golden Tickets

The Information Literacy Program Master Schedule reflects that Research & Instruction Librarians staffing the Research Services desk met with 69 students for “Golden Ticket” research consultations in Fall 2017.

In the Fall 2017 information literacy module, students handed in their completed “Golden Ticket” slips to their course instructors, after which the instructors were requested to send the completed slips to the Information Literacy Coordinator through campus mail.

The total number of received “Golden Ticket” slips from INTD 112 course instructors in Fall 2017 was 35 Golden Ticket slips.

34 out of 35 of the Golden Ticket slips included answers written by students in response to all three reflective questions (WHAT, WHY, and HOW):

“Reflect on something new you learned about doing research on your topic during your consultation with the librarian. Indicate what new thing you learned, why it is helpful to know when doing research, and how this will change how you do research in the future:”

This is evidence that the revised “Golden Ticket” slip was an impactful revision in that it succeeded at better structuring the students’ reflection on their learning during the research consultations. The three scaffolded questions about their learning resulted in more detailed responses than a single open-ended question about what they learned, as
was asked on the previous version of the slip. This is a revision to the slips we plan to retain into the future.

It is also preliminary evidence that a challenge articulated in the Fall 2016 “WML Assessment Activity Report” for this course (quoted below) has been successfully mediated by this revised “Golden Ticket” slip, thus illustrating a successful cycle of CLOSING THE LOOP through assessment of this component of the information literacy module and taking action to improve how this module is delivered.

From Fall 2016 “WML Assessment Activity Report” for INTD 112:

“Based on the “Golden Ticket” submissions, some students did not document what they learned about finding information. In the future, the librarians should be sure to emphasize to the students what the question is that they are being asked.”

In the future, a possible assessment project will be to transcribe student answers hand-written on their “Golden Ticket” slips and analyze responses for direct evidence of student learning related to our information literacy student learning outcomes for this course and for the program. Given how time-intensive this transcription and analysis will be, this project will need to wait until we are fully staffed in the Research & Scholarly Services department.

Final Exam

The Library has five questions on the final exam in INTD 112 that we use to assess content knowledge related to the research process. In Fall 2017 three out of five course instructors sent student scores for the five information literacy questions to the Information Literacy Coordinator, resulting in final exam assessment data for 31 students:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1: Which of the following is the best place to find scholarly journal articles?</th>
<th>Number of students who got answer correct:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Library Catalog</td>
<td>30 / 31 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Credo Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Library Databases **</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Library Research Guides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2: The more terms you add to your search, the fewer results you'll get.</th>
<th>Number of students who got answer correct:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. True **</td>
<td>25 / 31 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. False</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q3: When searching a database, what filter would you use to limit your results so that you get the most current information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filter</th>
<th>Number of students who got answer correct:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Date**</td>
<td>30 / 31 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Subject Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q4: CQ Researcher is a database that I would use to find newspaper articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Number of students who got answer correct:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. False **</td>
<td>11 / 31 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5: What techniques can you use to capture the citation information for an article you find in a database?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Number of students who got answer correct:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Email the article to yourself</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Copy &amp; paste the citation into a Word document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Print the article from the database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. all of the above**</td>
<td>26 / 31 students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students did very well on Questions 1 and 3, and moderately well on Questions 2 and 5. This informed our decision to retain these questions in future semesters and to continue to find ways to emphasize the knowledge they are measuring in this information literacy module.

Students did not do as well on Question 4, which was about the Library database CQ Researcher Plus Archive. This database contains just one publication, i.e. CQ Researcher, which features expert analysis curated by a scholarly publisher. When teaching the source type in this database, the librarians describe the information accessed through CQ Research Plus Archive as “reports.” Despite this, only about one third of students for whom we have assessment data for this question demonstrated an understanding of the source type this database offers.

As a result of this final exam assessment data as well as librarian observation of student responses to the Library Assignment, the librarians needed to make a decision about whether to redesign the information literacy module to give CQ Researcher Plus Archive a lot more attention or to remove CQ Research Plus Archive from the module entirely. See CLOSING THE LOOP below for the decision we made and the rationale why.

Librarian Feedback Survey

At the end of the Fall 2017 semester, the Information Literacy Coordinator created a one-time survey for the librarians who taught the INTD 112 information literacy module that semester. This survey focused on the librarians’ experience and observations as instructors of the module. The goal of the survey was to gather specific feedback on each part of the module to inform, along with student learning assessment data, revisions to the module for Spring 2018 and beyond.
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Four librarians completed the survey (the Information Literacy Coordinator recused herself), and five questions were connected to specific changes made to the module in Fall 2017.

Question: Would you have any objections to eliminating CQ Researcher as a featured resource in these sessions and in the Library Assignment?
   3 librarians = No
   1 librarian = Not in assignment itself but incorporate another way (see CLOSING THE LOOP for the decision we made about this)

Question: How did you find using the 5 Ws (Who, What, When, Where, Why) as a framework to teach source evaluation? Please comment on both this approach and the handout created for students about the 5 Ws.
   4 librarians = Positive response re: 5 Ws framework
   1 librarian gave feedback on the handout that there seemed to be too many bullet points under each W for students to make good use of the framework (see CLOSING THE LOOP for how we plan to incorporate this feedback in the future)

Question: Please comment on the use of D2L’s quiz feature to administer the Library Assignment. As an instructor how did you find this technology for administering and grading the Library Assignment?
   4 librarians = Positive response re: moving Library Assignment into Desire2Learn, which informed the decision to continue to administer the assignment through this platform

Question: We conducted [the Golden Ticket meetings] at the Research Services desk, where students signed up for a date and time to come for this drop-in consultation. Please comment on how you felt this went. Did you experience any challenges with this set-up? Any successes that were particular to this drop-in approach?
   4 librarians = Positive feedback on Doodle Poll and meetings at Research Services desk
   However, the Information Literacy Coordinator’s experience managing the scheduling with this tool was challenging so a change needed to be made (see CLOSING THE LOOP below for more on this)

Question: Please share any other comments or feedback about this INTD 112 IL module. In what ways can we make this module better and more sustainable for us as Research & Instruction Librarians?
   Positive comment from librarian: “I thought it worked better this semester than previous semesters, despite the fact that there were more sections.”

The responses to these five survey questions informed the changes made to the INTD 112 information literacy module for Spring 2018.
CLOSING THE LOOP — Planned changes for Spring 2018:

Based on the above sources of assessment data and the conclusions drawn from them, the following changes were made to the INTD 112 information literacy module for Spring 2018:

- We removed the database CQ Researcher Plus Archive from the Library Assignment.
  
  Rationale: The information literacy student learning outcomes related to these resources are easily met through use of the other two databases featured in the assignment, i.e., ProQuest Central and Academic Search Elite (EBSCO). To expand the module to give CQ Researcher Plus Archive the time and attention needed to give students a complete understanding of this resource would require time that we do not have available to us. The Research & Instruction Librarians decided that we would promote CQ Researcher Plus Archive in the context of the one-on-one “Golden Ticket” research consultations for those topics for which this resource is a good fit, so it will now be introduced at the point-of-need where appropriate.

- We simplified the “Evaluating Sources with the Five Ws” handout by revising the bulleted questions underneath each W, streamlining and making them fewer in number.
  
  Rationale: This change was in response to a suggestion received through the Librarian Feedback Survey (see above).

- We changed the format of the Library Assignment questions that asked for citation elements for three possible sources on students’ topics, from a long-response question format to separate fields for each citation element.
  
  Rationale: By requiring students to find and submit each citation element separately, it will better ensure students know both what they are looking for and where to find it in each database. The hope is that this change will also make it easier for the librarians to search for each article while grading the assignment since the citation elements are easier to read and copy/paste in this new question format.

- We eliminated the Doodle Poll for scheduling “Golden Ticket” research consultations and instead returned to a model where students reach out to an assigned librarian to make their appointments within the prescribed time frame.
  
  Rationale: We decided to move away from the Doodle Poll for Spring 2018 because even though the four librarians who completed the Librarian Feedback Survey gave positive feedback on the Doodle Poll as a scheduling method, the Information Literacy Coordinator experienced significant challenges both in terms of time required to manage the scheduling with this free tool as well as glitches with the tool itself when the number of users participating was around 70. Students were signing up twice, and still often missed their meetings. The Information Literacy Coordinator decided that a modified version of having students sign up directly with a librarian was a more reliable method for Spring 2018.
The significant change this time was that more Research & Instruction Librarians were involved in this part of the module, with two librarians assigned to each section of the course in Spring 2018. With three sections running in Spring 2018, this meant six librarians were assigned to around 9 students each for the “Golden Ticket” research consultations.

This is an example of CLOSING THE LOOP because a material and logistical concern in past semesters was the time commitment involved in having a single librarian meet with up to 18 students in each section. By sharing the work load among the wider Research & Instruction Librarian team, this concern was mitigated and students would still experience the benefit of meeting one-on-one with a librarian.

WML Information Literacy Program Student Learning Outcomes this information literacy instruction supports

SLO2: Students will gain insight and understanding about diverse sources of information in order to evaluate and use resources appropriately for their information needs.

SLO3: Students will identify the appropriate level of scholarship among publication types (scholarly journals, trade publications, magazines, websites, etc.) in order to critically evaluate the usefulness of the information for their research need.

SLO4: Students will articulate the key elements in their research questions in order to develop and execute a search strategy.

SLO6: Students will properly distinguish between their own ideas and the intellectual property of others in order to ethically use information and demonstrate academic integrity.
Summary of research assignment or task
Include here any background information provided by the course instructor in their request, as well as any resources you want to remember to teach students how to use.

Session 1 of 2; second session is 1.5 weeks later – at the end of Session 1, students are assigned a Library Assignment we (the faculty librarians) designed called Searching as Strategic Exploration; this year the assignment will be delivered and graded/assessed by the librarians as a D2L quiz.

In this Session 1 we are introducing strategically exploring their topics via database searching, in preparation for their Capstone Projects; this year, the bigger presentation for project is an Informative Presentation later in the semester, during which they will need to (verbally) cite published evidence about their topics and create a portfolio of potential sources to use in the presentation.

The most important things we need to cover in Session 1 are:

- Introduce them to three databases including how to find them on the Library’s website, i.e., Databases by Subject → General Topics:
  - Academic Search Elite (EBSCO)
  - ProQuest Central
  - CQ Researcher Plus Archive
- Introduce them to the “Five Ws” framework for evaluating sources (give them HANDOUT with the “Five Ws”, also available on D2L in same Content module as quiz)
- Explain how the homework assignment will work:
  - D2L quiz (under Content) called “Searching as Strategic Exploration Library Assignment”
  - Must submit completed quiz by Sunday, September 17, 2017 at 11:59 pm (late submissions without negotiating in advance with the librarian will have points deducted)
  - Qs 1-8 receive points based on simply completing the questions, whereas Qs 9-14 will be graded according to the rubric HANDOUT we give them in advance (also available on D2L in same Content module as quiz)
  - Important things for them to do are to gather complete citation information including article type (demonstrate “Cite” tool in databases) and use the “Five Ws” to critically evaluate THREE potential sources about their Capstone topics
  - We may also distribute a HANDOUT version of the Library Assignment so they can do some prep work in advance before going into D2L to type up their responses and submit the quiz to be graded
  - If they have questions or problems accessing the quiz they should EMAIL YOU the librarian IMMEDIATELY (so they shouldn’t wait until the last minute to do the assignment)

Note that there will be a second IL Session that takes place 1.5 weeks later, during which we will provide feedback on their submissions (broadly).

In addition, there will be another Library component later in the semester called the Golden Ticket research consultations, which we will share more about with students in Session 2.
Student Learning Outcomes for the IL Session (at least one, no more than three)

These are statements that you write for yourself that describe what students will be able to do, practice, know, understand, or value, as a direct result of your teaching. You can begin each statement with "As a result of this IL session, students will..." and then complete the statement with the outcome you are aiming for. Think of outcomes as your aspirations for your students: What do you hope they will learn through your teaching?

1. As a result of this IL session [and the Library Assignment they will do as homework], students will strategically explore their Capstone topics through the search process.

2. As a result of this IL session [and the Library Assignment they will do as homework], students will gather complete citation information including article type for three potential sources on their topics.

3. As a result of this IL session [and the Library Assignment they will do as homework], students will critically evaluate three potential sources on their topics using the “Five Ws” framework for source evaluation.

How will you know how students are doing as they work toward meeting these outcomes?

Note that often we as librarians don't have access to the evidence of how students are doing as they work toward our information literacy outcomes. Even if you won’t have access to this work, please connect the outcomes you will teach with the work they will be doing for their course instructors during the rest of the course, as potential evidence of information literacy student learning.

SLO 1: Successful completion of Qs 1-8 of Library Assignment completed as homework.

SLO 2: Successful completion of Q 9, Q 11, and Q 13 of Library Assignment completed as homework.

SLO 3: Successful completion of Q 10, Q 12, and Q 14 of Library Assignment completed as homework.
Draft outline of how you will use the time
Here you can sketch your notes for what you plan to do and say as you teach the session. Include here steps for any active learning opportunities you plan to facilitate for the students.

AFTER THE SESSION:
Based on your experience teaching this session and any assessment of student work you were able to do, what can you change next time to improve how you teach it? Or, what was successful that you want to be sure to do again the next time you teach it?

If you do not have access to student work that provides evidence of their information literacy student learning, here you can brainstorm ideas for activities and assignments you could design in the future in collaboration with the course instructor that would provide you with evidence of their learning.
**Summary of research assignment or task**

*Include here any background information provided by the course instructor in their request, as well as any resources you want to remember to teach students how to use.*

Session 2 of 2; first session was ~1.5 weeks ago – at the end of Session 1, students were assigned a Library Assignment we (the faculty librarians) designed called Searching as Strategic Exploration; the assignment was delivered and graded/assessed by the librarians as a D2L quiz before Session 2 meets.

In this Session 2 we are providing broad feedback on their homework submissions, facilitating an activity through which they will solidify what they learned about searching in the databases, and introducing the Golden Ticket Librarian Consultations.

You can cover/facilitate the following items in any order you wish (though I recommend the Golden Ticket introduction be the last thing you do):

**Database teaching activity:**

- Should take the bulk of the class meeting (30-40 minutes total)
- (5 mins) Start by breaking students into groups based on which database they chose to find the three sources from in the assignment.
  - There will hopefully be at least one group per database.
  - If a student found sources from more than one of the databases, assign them to a group with the goal of making the groups evenly distributed.
  - If a group is more than five students, break them into two smaller groups.
  - If no students in your section chose one of the databases, be prepared to go over that database yourself at the end of the activity.
- (5 mins) Instruct students in each group to tell their group-mates the most useful things they encountered about the database. Give them five minutes to discuss this in their groups.
  - Someone should take notes on the various database tools and functions they found useful, and the group should prepare to come to the instructor terminal and teach their classmates what they liked about this database. (The notes are just so they students organize what they want to cover when they come up.)
  - Every student should plan on showing at least one thing, and they can run sample searches using their topics to illustrate what they are teaching.
  - Alleviate the concern that these presentations need to be perfect: they do not, and you (the librarian) aren’t grading them on this. It’s just an opportunity to share about that database with your classmates who didn’t get to explore that database in detail.
  - By the end of the class, everyone in the room will know the most useful things about each database, setting them up to go and continue their research on their topics using all three.
- (20-30 minutes) Each group takes turns coming to the instructor terminal to “teach” their database.
  - Groups should present no longer than 5-7 minutes each.
Information Literacy Instruction Planning Template

Course: INTD 112: EP Foundations  
Date/Time of IL Session: Week of Sep 18, 2017

- Librarian should pay attention to what students are sharing, and take note of any important and useful tools and functionality the students leave out (or get incorrect, if applicable)
- After group finishes presenting, Librarian thanks them, they return to seats, and Librarian fills in any gaps the students missed about that database—if there is more than one group for a database, let all groups for that database go before filling in the gaps
- Then next group is called up
- If there is more than one group doing the same database, then the second group that goes can either focus on the things the first group didn’t share, or, show their own examples of those same things using their own topics
- Be mindful of the time during this part of the activity, so every group has a chance to go and you the Librarian have the chance to share what the groups left out about the databases

Broad feedback on homework submissions:

- As you grade/assess their Library Assignment homework submissions, keep a log for yourself of issues you see in their work that you feel would be useful for you to address with the class as a whole. This feedback should be general and anonymous, not mentioning any specific student or submission by name/topic.
- Also ask the students if they have any questions about the databases or the research process as a result of doing the exercise, then try to address them.

Golden Ticket introduction:

- **HANDOUT Golden Ticket slips** (available in Donna’s office)
- Explain how the Golden Ticket Librarian Consultations will work:
  - Each student will sign up for a date and time between October 11 and November 2 to come to the Research Services Desk on the 2nd floor of the Library to have a 15-30 minute consultation with a Librarian about their research on their Capstone topics.
  - Students should continue their research for the Capstone #2 informative presentations, using their work on the Library Assignment as the jumping off point: they should do some more searching prior to their Golden Ticket consultation.
  - They are to bring the Golden Ticket slip HANDOUT they are receiving today and be prepared to discuss their research with the Librarian; encourage them to bring questions about their research when they come.
  - **On Monday September 27 Librarian Donna Witek will email all students in the INTD 112 course—all seven sections—with the link to the Doodle Poll where they will sign up, along with instructions on how to sign up.** Tell students there will be a deadline for signing up so pay attention to that when you receive the email (likely the end of that week).
  - At the end of the consultation, the Librarian will sign off on the Golden Ticket slip, and students should complete the questions on the slip.
  - The completed Golden Ticket slips are due in to the course instructor after November 2 (ask instructor to share exact date).
Student Learning Outcomes for the IL Session (at least one, no more than three)

These are statements that you write for yourself that describe what students will be able to do, practice, know, understand, or value, as a direct result of your teaching. You can begin each statement with "As a result of this IL session, students will..." and then complete the statement with the outcome you are aiming for. Think of outcomes as your aspirations for your students: What do you hope they will learn through your teaching?

1. As a result of this IL session, students will demonstrate their understanding of database searching for information about their Capstone topics.

2. As a result of this IL session, students will articulate their own understanding of the search process.

3. As a result of this IL session, students will receive timely feedback on their work of developing search strategies and applying evaluative criteria to information about their topics. [Note: Not technically a learning outcome but more of an instructional outcome.]

How will you know how students are doing as they work toward meeting these outcomes?

Note that often we as librarians don’t have access to the evidence of how students are doing as they work toward our information literacy outcomes. Even if you won’t have access to this work, please connect the outcomes you will teach with the work they will be doing for their course instructors during the rest of the course, as potential evidence of information literacy student learning.

SLO 1: Observation of database teaching activity

SLO 2: Observation of database teaching activity

SLO 3: Broad feedback given on homework assignment; feedback provided by Librarians in comments of their homework submissions (optional for Librarians)
Draft outline of how you will use the time

Here you can sketch your notes for what you plan to do and say as you teach the session. Include here steps for any active learning opportunities you plan to facilitate for the students.

See first section of template for details on this. Use space below to adapt the outline to your needs.

AFTER THE SESSION:

Based on your experience teaching this session and any assessment of student work you were able to do, what can you change next time to improve how you teach it? Or, what was successful that you want to be sure to do again the next time you teach it?

If you do not have access to student work that provides evidence of their information literacy student learning, here you can brainstorm ideas for activities and assignments you could design in the future in collaboration with the course instructor that would provide you with evidence of their learning.
Information

The purpose of this Library Assignment is to offer you the opportunity to strategically explore your Capstone research topic through the search process.

DUE: Sunday, September 17, 2017 by 11:59 pm

Background

Question 1 (Mandatory) (1 point)

My Capstone topic is:

Question 2 (Mandatory) (1 point)

Describe what you already know about your Capstone topic.

Question 3 (Mandatory) (1 point)

What interests you about your Capstone topic? What about your topic sparks your curiosity?

Explore the Databases

What is one useful thing you would tell a classmate about each database that was demonstrated to you by the Librarian who visited your class?

Question 4 (Mandatory) (1 point)

Academic Search Elite (EBSCO):

Question 5 (Mandatory) (1 point)

ProQuest Central:

Question 6 (Mandatory) (1 point)
CQ Researcher Plus Archive:

Conduct a Search

Select one of the databases and use it to conduct a search for information about your Capstone topic.

Question 7 (Mandatory) (1 point)

Database name and search terms you used to conduct your initial search:

*Tip: If your first attempted search brings back no results, try broadening your search terms and try again.*

Revise Your Search

Observe and reflect on the results of your search. You will need to click through, read, and examine critically many of the results in order to do this.

What new terms and concepts do you see repeatedly associated with your topic? How can you use this new knowledge to revise your search?

Question 8 (Mandatory) (1 point)

New terms and concepts I encountered and how I could revise my search using this new knowledge about my topic:

Selecting Sources

Repeat the search process again and as many times as needed, revising your search as you go, in order to identify three possible information sources for your Capstone Project.

Using the “Five Ws” approach to source evaluation, critically evaluate and gather the complete citation information for each source.

Submit the following information about each source:
Question 9 *(Mandatory) (5 points)*

**SOURCE 1**

Gather and share the following information about your first source:

- Author(s) name(s)
- Article title
- Publication title
- Date published
- Volume and/or Issue number (if applicable)
- Page range
- Article type (i.e., scholarly, newspaper, magazine, trade publication, report, etc.)

Question 10 *(Mandatory) (5 points)*

**SOURCE 1**

Critically evaluate your first source by asking and answering the following questions about the source:

- WHO created the source?
- WHAT is the purpose of the source?
- WHERE does the information come from?
- WHEN was the source published?
- WHY is this source useful to you?

Question 11 *(Mandatory) (5 points)*

**SOURCE 2**

Gather and share the following information about your second source:

- Author(s) name(s)
- Article title
- Publication title
- Date published
- Volume and/or Issue number (if applicable)
- Page range
- Article type (i.e., scholarly, newspaper, magazine, trade publication, report, etc.)

Question 12 *(Mandatory) (5 points)*
SOURCE 2

Critically evaluate your second source by asking and answering the following questions about the source:

- WHO created the source?
- WHAT is the purpose of the source?
- WHERE does the information come from?
- WHEN was the source published?
- WHY is this source useful to you?

Question 13 (Mandatory) (5 points)

SOURCE 3

Gather and share the following information about your third source:

- Author(s) name(s)
- Article title
- Publication title
- Date published
- Volume and/or issue number (if applicable)
- Page range
- Article type (i.e., scholarly, newspaper, magazine, trade publication, report, etc.)

Question 14 (Mandatory) (5 points)

SOURCE 3

Critically evaluate your third source by asking and answering the following questions about the source:

- WHO created the source?
- WHAT is the purpose of the source?
- WHERE does the information come from?
- WHEN was the source published?
- WHY is this source useful to you?
Searching as Strategic Exploration Library Assignment
Grading Rubric

The purpose of this assignment is for you to **demonstrate that you have strategically explored your topic through the search process.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qs 1-8</th>
<th>1 point per Q for completing each Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Learning Outcome: Gather Citation Information: Q 9, Q 11, Q 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion for Success</th>
<th>Meets Criterion</th>
<th>Room to Grow</th>
<th>Concerning</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gathers complete citation information including article type</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation Elements: •Author(s) name(s) •Article title •Publication title •Date published incl year •Volume and/or Issue # (if applicable) •Page range •Article type (i.e., scholarly, newspaper, magazine, trade publication, report, etc.)</td>
<td>Complete citation information and article type included in student response</td>
<td>One or more citation elements missing from student response; <strong>can</strong> still easily track down source from information provided</td>
<td>One or more citation elements missing from student response; <strong>cannot</strong> easily track down source from information provided</td>
<td>Evidence of little to no engagement with the process of gathering citation information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Learning Outcome: Critically Evaluate Sources: Q 10, Q 12, Q 14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion for Success</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Meets Criterion</th>
<th>Room to Grow</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Critically evaluates source using the five Ws framework</td>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses each of the five Ws in their response, providing a high level of detail in their engagement with each W</td>
<td>Addresses each of the five Ws in their response</td>
<td>Addresses only some of the five Ws in their response</td>
<td>Evidence of little to no engagement with the five Ws in their evaluation of the source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating Sources with the Five Ws

Often finding information is less of a problem than figuring out whether that information will be appropriate for your project.

One way to decide whether a source is “good” for your project or not is to begin by asking some questions about the source. Most of these can be answered pretty quickly by looking at the source itself or doing a web search.

Remember! Evaluation is a holistic process. One of these questions isn’t enough to determine a source’s usefulness. You need to take them all into consideration.

**WHO created the source?**
- What authority does the author/organization have to present on this topic?
- What are their credentials? Are they connected to the field they are writing about?
- Are they affiliated with any specific organizations? Could this impact their reliability?
- Is there contact information for the author or publisher?

**WHAT is the purpose of the source?**
- Does the point of view appear to be objective or does it appear to be strongly biased?
- Is the language emotional, pointing to a personal connection to the topic?
- Are any included images appropriate to the topic and clearly labeled or cited?
- What type of source is it? Scholarly article? Newspaper article? Magazine article? Something else?

**WHERE does the information come from?**
- Does the source use evidence to support its claims?
- Are there any references? If so, are they appropriate to the topic and source?
- Is there a bibliography or references list? If so, what kinds of sources are being cited?
- Can the information be verified with another source?
- Is the source presenting fact or opinion?
- Does the source contain spelling, grammar, or typographical errors?

**WHEN was the source published?**
- Has the information been updated or revised if necessary?
- Does your topic require very recent information, or will older sources be acceptable or even preferred?
- Is a date given for when the information was published?
- Are there important links that are now dead or overall are they kept up to date?

**WHY is this source useful to you?**
- Who is the intended audience?
- Is the information at an appropriate level for your needs (i.e. not too simplistic/not too advanced)?
- Does the information help to answer your research question or develop your argument?
- Does the source add new information or simply repeat or summarize other perspectives?
- How does this information inform your research? How will you use this information in your project?
Reflect on something new that you learned about doing research on your topic during your consultation with the librarian. Indicate what new thing you learned, why it is helpful to know when doing research, and how this will change how you do research in the future:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT:</th>
<th>WHY:</th>
<th>HOW:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions to ask students who come to the Research Desk seeking a “Golden Ticket” research consultation with the Librarian on duty:

What is your topic?

Tell me about your research so far.

What kinds of sources have you already found? What information did you find in those sources? What new things have you learned about your topic through those sources?

What other kinds of sources do you think would be useful for you to find, to fill in gaps in your knowledge about your topic?

[Based on the answer to this question, you can then guide them to the library search tools and resources best suited to what they need.]

Which of the three recommended Databases (ProQuest Central, Academic Search Elite (EBSCO), and CQ Researcher Plus Archive) have you tried so far? How did that go?

[Based on the answer to these questions, either delve further with them into their preferred Database, or guide them to one of the ones they haven’t tried and run some searches with them on their topic.]

What search terms have you tried so far? Have they been successful?

[Based on the answer to this question, help them brainstorm additional search terms and try them together in the Databases.]

Do you have any questions about doing research on your topic that I can help with?

[If they do, try to answer their questions as best as you can.]
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR THESE CONSULTATIONS:

As a result of their “Golden Ticket” research consultations, students will:

1. Know that Library Databases are the best place to find scholarly research articles.
2. Understand that by adding more search terms to a search, they will receive fewer results.
3. Become aware of the different ways to gather citation information for articles found in the Databases:
   - Emailing an article to themselves using the “Email” tool within the Database.
   - Using the “Cite” tool and copying and pasting the citation into a Word document or email to themselves.
   - Printing the article directly from the Database.
4. Know how to get further research help should they need it.

In addition to hitting on the above points during each consultation, another outcome to aim for is:

- To assist each student in finding within the Databases three additional and new-to-them sources about their topic, and modeling for them the above techniques for capturing the article and its citation information for future use. It is encouraging for the student to leave the consultation with new sources in hand about their topic.

Other Tips:

★ Use the “Golden Ticket” research consultation to model for the student how you would go about researching their topic within one of the three recommended Databases.

★ Invite the student behind the desk: pull up to your computer terminal the third stool we keep behind the desk and instruct the student to sit in it during the consultation.

★ Narrate out loud what you are doing in the Databases as you do it. Let them see your thought process as an expert researcher.