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The Questions

Does breaking up one-shot library instruction into two complementary sessions with assignments improve library instruction?

Can two one-shot information literacy lessons teach first year freshmen to locate sources in a variety of formats and evaluate them for credibility and relevance to a topic?

Can one-shot instruction sessions and assignments be designed to tie in with general education course assignments and objectives to increase student engagement?

Do students use what they learn in one-shot instruction sessions to complete later course assignments?

What evidence do we have that the University’s library instruction program has an impact on student learning?

The Process

Spring 2014: Form AA Team
Summer 2014: Plan Sessions/Design Complementary in-class Assignments
Fall 2014: 59 Instruction sessions. Collected 502 artifacts.
Winter 2015: Assess Results; Report Recommendations.
Spring 2015: Assessment/Write-up

Fall 2015: Implement changes
Spring 2015: Assess again

Literature Review (sample)

Broke up the one-shot sessions. We are no longer trying to cover everything in one session/no longer doing the same thing over and over again (even if that wasn’t the perception).

Instruction program is now part of assessment at the program level for the new Core Curriculum’s information literacy learning outcome.

Students “found [the assignments] overly complex, as indicated by the number of incomplete or incorrectly completed artifacts we received.”

Students performed well in the City College of Chase ENGL 101 assignment.

“Faculty have suggested that students are not following through and continuing to use the skills that they learn during their library one-shot instruction. While they may have done well that day, later assignments do not reflect the skills learned during their library visit.”

Students correctly determined which source was the more credible source, even though an adequate explanation was not provided.

Conclusions & Recommendations

Breaking up the one-shot library sessions for 100-level courses allowed the instructors to focus on specific, basic research skills, implement more high-impact practices through the use of an assignment with specific and measurable objectives and outcomes.

Students performed well on the City College of Chase ENGL 101 assignment, but the grading/criteria needs to be improved to measure more than just completion of worksheets. The assignment has been revised to require answers more substantial than yes or no. More work can go into website evaluation.

Students did not meet the standard set for the English Composition (ENGL 101) assignment. The assignment has been revised to distinguish it from the UNIV 101 assignment and require more substantial answers from the students. The instructors of critical thought, which will allow assessors to better score the completed assignments.

The assignments were designed to tie in to larger, core objectives, but this tie needs to be made more explicit to the students, course faculty and librarian instructors.

We cannot claim any long term, or significant impact on student learning from the data we collected. Anecdotal evidence states there was little to no impact. It does not seem the students used what was covered in the sessions on future work, despite the positive faculty survey feedback.