AN EMBEDDED LIBRARIAN

Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How Well?

Heather James
LOEX 2014
Participants (Who)

- Victoria Browne: 2\textsuperscript{nd} Year MA, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Year instructor
- Heather James: RIS Librarian, English liaison
- 20 First-Year, First Semester undergraduate students (embedded section)
- 20 First-Year, First Semester undergraduate students (standard section)
Time and Action (When)

- Two course sections involved: English 1001 (Rhetoric and Composition I), 133 and 128. Both courses held in the afternoon

- Fall 2012

- Research IRB exempt by ORC

Our Aim:
- To pilot an embedded librarian in one of the two English 1001 sections
- To assess the impact of in-depth contact with a librarian on student’ research skills and output.
Purpose (Why)

- Grow Embedded Librarian initiatives at Marquette University
- Deepen integration of library in First Year English (RC1)
- Build support for similar models in other courses (English and beyond)
- Address lack of quantitative and qualitative assessment of embedded librarians
- Improve students’ skills in research
- Improve relationship between student body and the library/library’s resources; diminish “library anxiety”.
Planning

- Flexibility to meet a number of times over the summer and throughout the semester of teaching
- Backward design planning for Librarian discussions and incorporation within the FYE course.
Course Goals

RC1 Course Goals:

a.) Develops students’ reading, writing, speaking, and listening skills for critical literacy. **Critical literacy** is the ability to recognize, analyze, employ and, when necessary, interrupt discourse conventions (i.e., accepted ideas, organization and style) within particular discourse communities (i.e., home, work, church, school).

b.) To foster critical literacy, Rhet/Comp1 focuses on **Academic Literacy**, introducing you to the critical thinking, reading, and writing skills associated with western logic and required of well-rounded university students. These skills include: exposition, analysis, argument, and interpretation.
Ultimate Learning Objective: Regardless of the major, every single student will be prepared to construct a fluid and concise academic essay that adheres to the rhetorical triangle and critically thought-out thesis statement with concrete supporting evidence.
Library Instruction for RC1 (Standard)

- 50 minute “one-shot” instruction during Unit 2 (Academic Exposition)
- LibGuide, scripted database demo with example article, digital worksheet, assessment survey
- 12 librarians, 80 sections, assigned by time slots

ENGL 1001 – Library Research Workshop

Outline for Today:

- Intro to Library website
  - How to find help
  - How to find resources
- Intro to 2 article databases:
  - How to search
- How to evaluate sources
- Time for your own research!
English 1001 Embedded Course Outline

- **Unit One: Rhetorical Analysis**– students read a passage and determine the (in)effective rhetorical strategies of an author
  - Librarian: Introduction, “What is Information Literacy?”
  - contact info available on all class calendars and policy statement
  - D2L content “Information Cycle” “Why Citation Matters”

- **Unit Two: Academic Exposition**– students construct a surprise-reversal strategy with a global health issue/pop culture phenomenon
  - Librarian: English 1001 Library Instruction Session (in library classroom), SW2 Discussion Board, Follow up class, SW3, Research Consults, Class observation
  - Worksheets previewed, No survey
  - Digital Learning Object “Research for Expository Writing”
  - Other D2L content “Scholarly vs. Popular” “What is a Scholarly Article” “Choosing Key Words”
  - Classroom Discussion: Topics from Library Worksheets and Discussion Board – sizeability, angle of vision, beginning approach, “surprise” elements
  - Response via D2L to SW#3 identifying topics
  - Class visit – Model Papers

- **Unit Three: Academic Argument**– students argue a specific proposal for a local social issue in a specific area (gang violence, at-risk youth etc.)
  - Librarian: “Researching for Argument” (in library classroom); SW3, Class observation
  - Dig. Learning Object “The Party”
  - SW#1 Research Narratives
  - Class visits – Proposing a Solution [supporting claims]
  - Response to SW#3 proposing argument and research

- **Unit Four: Academic Interpretation**– students analyze the textual, cultural and ethical elements of a narrative as a form of persuasion/argument.
  - Librarian: Class visit – Analysis and Synthesis in Unit 4 paper [usefulness of outside sources for analytical interp], Final Survey
(What) did we cover…

- Foundational Concepts
  - What is Information Literacy? – How will we handle the huge amount of info available?
  - Information Cycle – How, when, and by whom is information created/recorded?
  - How and Where is Information Stored – What are databases? What are our access points?
  - Research for Expository Writing – How will we approach a topic with which we have little expertise
  - Peer Review Process – Why are scholarly resources different and valuable?
  - Why Citation Matters – What’s the value of doing it at all and why does doing it right matter?
  - Research for Argument Writing – What does it mean to have sources that are “in conversation?”

- Research Skills
  - Finding a starting question/topic, narrowing focus as research progresses
  - Developing key words and locating Subject terms
  - Using databases from multiple vendors, with various interfaces (ProQuest and Ebsco most heavily)
  - Identifying parts of a source record necessary for citation
  - Accessing full text and possibly using ILL
Research for Expository Writing

The Party

When researching for an academic argument, it is important to be sure that your sources are not only credible but that they are relevant to your topic in a specific way.

Academic arguments are like a written conversation where authors acknowledge and respond to the work that’s been done before them and add new information or critique the assumptions and beliefs that have been established.

To practice thinking about what sources have in common, instead of choosing sources, you’ll choose who to invite.

Your goal is to put together a small dinner party where the guests will be able to find enough common ground to have interesting conversations. Click the photo of each guest to read their profile; select one of the four triad combinations and then hit the Submit button at the bottom left.
Assessment Methods (How Well?)

- **Essay Rubrics**
  - Modified “Information Literacy”/ “Integrating Source Material” portion of English 1001 standard rubrics
  - Browne kept separate IL rubric for Units 1-3 papers when grading papers

- **Research Narratives**
  - Unit 3 SW#1: “the process you went through for research Unit 2... how you feel about research... how will you approach the Unit 3 paper?”

- **Survey**
  - Slightly modified standard English 1001 Library Instruction survey given at end of semester

- **Citation Analysis**
  - Unit 3 papers
  - Rubric for coding
  - RIS Librarian volunteer readers
# Essay Rubrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Original] Writing Conventions</th>
<th>3 – Proficient (A, AB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information Literacy – Given the purpose and audience the written text... | - Effectively focuses on 3 well-chosen texts, at least one w/ view fr. outside U.S.  
- Uses clear attributive phrases and effectively credits sources with consistent internal MLA style parenthetical citations  
- Presents accurate MLA Works Cited list |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Modified] Writing Conventions</th>
<th>3 – Proficient (A, AB)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Information Literacy – Given the purpose and audience the written text... | - Includes attributive phrases with MLA style parenthetical citations when referring to any text and a properly formatted MLA Works Cited  
- Uses 3 sources, including one scholarly publication and one international publication, as fundamental content for essay  
- Evidences evaluation of sources for: relevancy, credibility, currency, author’s expertise, publication type, and pertinence to essay |
Results of Instructor’s IL Rubrics

Embedded
- IL Rubrics - .44 improvement overall

Standard
- IL Rubrics - .45 improvement overall
Results of Research Narratives (SW#1 U3)

“After your experience with the Unit 2 paper, you have had...exposure to the kind of academic research you will be doing in your future. Please [describe] the process that you [used] for researching in Unit 2. Also...reflect how you feel about research...and...how will you approach the Unit 3 paper?”

Response and Anecdotes

- 100% responded that they feel more confident/positive/comfortable with one or more aspects of research concepts or tools
- 20% of section sought out further assistance from librarians (Heather or others) during Unit 2 paper research
- Fro-yo as a pop culture phenomenon – confidence in research
Sample Questions

How can you get help at the Libraries?
- IM / text
- Individual appointment
- At the Information Desk
- All of the above

Scholarly journals usually have all the following characteristics EXCEPT:
- Articles have bibliographies and/or footnotes
- Articles are usually peer-reviewed by experts
- General interest ads and photographs
- Articles are often narrowly focused

Do you feel that having a librarian dedicated to the English 1001 class improved your research and evaluation skills?
- Yes, very much
- Maybe, to some degree
- No, not really
- I’m not sure

Results – Embedded vs. All FYE

- 7 standard questions, both content knowledge and affective outcomes
- 3 additional open comment questions for embedded section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>% correct</th>
<th>% all students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[7]</td>
<td>[94.7]</td>
<td>84.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[94.7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Citation Analysis Rubric

- Unit 3 papers coded – Academic Argument Research Paper

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of times used</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 1       | 2       | 3      |                       |         |          |       |           |

### Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Averages</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Embedded</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Embedded</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coding Definitions

Quality
4 – Scholarly, reviewed publication
3 – Subject-specific popular source, Popular credible source, Government/NGO source, Organization/company credible information
[2 – Not an option]
1 – Questionable credibility, Publisher unverified in source, Vanity publication
0 – Erroneous, Not factual information presented as fact

Citation – “form” refers to the font and punctuation and spacing issues of the MLA citation style; “complete information” refers to all necessary and MLA prescribed publication information needed in order to relocate the source. MLA Works cited lists do not need full url’s for web sources.
4 – Source cited with complete information at all uses in-text and in Works Cited with accurate form for both in-text and Works Cited
3 – Source cited with complete information at all uses but inaccurate form in Works Cited OR in-text
2 – Source not cited at all uses or without complete information in-text (e.g. direct quote missing page number or content from source included but not cited parenthetically) BUT complete information included in Works Cited; may have inaccurate form in Works Cited
1 – Incomplete information for source in Works Cited
0 – Source not included in Works Cited or not cited in-text; content has been verified as being from an un-cited source

Usage – for a single source used more than once and in multiple ways record only the highest score applicable
4 – Summary: shows engagement and comprehension of an extended chunk of or an entire text
3 – Paraphrase: shows engagement and comprehension of a small chunk of text (sentence to paragraph in length)
2 – Quote: shows identification and inclusion of a useful piece of information
1 – Patchwriting: Restates ideas or content of source with only minor changes to language or syntax of original
0 – Plagiarism: uses content, ideas, language, or rhetoric of a source without crediting (e.g. direct quote missing quotation marks)

Relevance – “thesis” refers to the student’s individual argument; “topic” refers to the overall subject of the essay but is broader than the student’s individual argument; in determining relevance currency of information, typicality or comparability of population or geography or context, and source’s purpose or focus or bias may bear consideration depending upon the student’s thesis
4 – Specifically relevant to student’s thesis
3 – Generally relevant to student’s topic
[2 – Not an option]
1 – Tangentially relevant to student’s topic
0 – Irrelevant to the student’s topic
Fall 2013

- Reflections
  - English 1001 has a structure that is best served by “just in time” IL instruction, but multiple interactions with students allow for this more effectively
  - Even if quantitative data doesn’t directly show significant difference, the familiarity with a librarian is a valuable outcome of embedded librarian
  - Many TA’s teaching FYE are interested in receiving greater support for their courses from a librarian
  - Even when students “know” how to practice good research skills, if there is no incentive or frequent feedback they will rely on common habits
  - Limits of Citation Analysis Rubric can be addressed in further pilots

- Current Status of Embedded
  - Embedded with multiple sections of RC1 F 2013 & S 2014 – greater opportunity for feedback on research
  - Wider integration of the library across RC1 - Integrated Librarian program
  - Wider use of digital learning objects – flipped instruction & Research 101
  - Embedded partnerships beyond RC1 – RC2 and other courses within and beyond English
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Questions?

Comments, complaints, comforting words...

Heather James
Marquette University
heather.james@mu.edu