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Research Question
Does the timing, frequency, and teaching methods of information literacy instruction impact the information literacy skills of first term students?

Participants
Control and Pilot participants were students enrolled in one of 14 sections of The Reflective Woman, St. Catherine University’s common experience course taken by all first term undergraduate students, through voluntary participation of the course instructor.

Literature Review

| Information literacy rubric scores/ increased librarian involvement | Low, Booth, Stone, & Tagge, 2011 |
| Information literacy rubric scores/ increased faculty-librarian collaboration | Douglas & Robinson, 2016 |
| Information literacy pre-test post-test/ one shot vs. 5 session | Gearhart, 2005 |
| Information literacy pre-test post-test/ one shot session | Fan, 2011 |

Rubric Evaluation
- A random sample of 64 student papers were selected from eligible participants.
- Each paper evaluated by two librarians.
- Rubric adapted from Carleton College’s Information Literacy in Student Writing Rubric (2012)
  1. Very Poor
  2. Interferes with Goals
  3. Does Not Interfere with Goals
  4. Very Strong

Pre-Test/ Post-Test
- 20 point pre-test/post-test developed by librarians to address each student learning outcome.
- Pre-test delivered before library instruction began, post-test delivered toward the end of the semester after all instruction completed.
- Pre-test and post-tests were matched by student ID.

Rubric Evaluation
Students in Pilot sections scored higher than those in Control sections on both the pre-test and post-test, but had a higher average score increase from pre-test to post-test. However, none of these findings were found to be statistically significant.

Control: n = 69 Pilot: n = 68

Methods and Data

Control: n = 28 Pilot: n = 36

Conclusions and Next Steps
The timing, frequency, and teaching methods of our instruction did not significantly impact the information literacy skills of students. Overall results were lower than expected for Pilot and Control groups in both the rubric evaluation and pre-test/post-test. This may be due in part to several uncontrolled external variables, including different student populations, librarian and faculty teaching styles, and levels of experience.

These results indicate that students are completing their first term with limited information literacy skills, and provides supporting evidence that information literacy will need to be reinforced throughout the college curriculum. Using the results, we will be making adjustments to our information literacy curriculum. These results will also be used as a benchmark for future assessment of library instruction.

This project is part of the program “Assessment in Action: Academic Libraries and Student Success” which is supported by the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) in partnership with the Association for Institutional Research and the Association of Public & Land-grant Universities. The program, a component of ACRL’s Value of Academic Libraries Initiative, is made possible by the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Rubric Evaluation

Students in Pilot sections scored higher than those in Control sections in all three rubric areas, however that difference was not found to be statistically significant.

Pre-Test/Post-Test

Students in Pilot sections scored on average lower than students in Control sections on both the pre-test and post-test, but had a higher average score increase from pre-test to post-test. However, none of these findings were found to be statistically significant.

Results

Student Learning Outcomes
- Control Group Instruction
- Pilot Group Instruction

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrote SLOs</th>
<th>Revised SLOs</th>
<th>Administered Pre-Test &amp; Test</th>
<th>Faculty Survey</th>
<th>Session 2: Search Strategies &amp; Evaluation</th>
<th>Administered Post-Test</th>
<th>Evaluated Student Papers with Rubric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Control and Pilot participants were students enrolled in one of 14 sections of The Reflective Woman, St. Catherine University’s common experience course taken by all first term undergraduate students, through voluntary participation of the course instructor.

Measurement/Intervention

Positive Correlation/Statistically Significant
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