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About Berea College

- More than 70% of our students hail from Appalachia
- All of our students have high academic potential but limited financial means
- Many hail from underperforming and underfunded schools, bringing with them information literacy deficiencies among a host of other needs
- Every student receives a free tuition scholarship in exchange for working between 10-15 hours per week for the college
Information Literacy Skills Competency Assessment Pilot: Background

- Pilot focused on GSTR 110, which is REQUIRED of all first-year, first-semester students
- One-shot Library Session REQUIRED component of all GSTR 110 sections; 95% faculty buy-in prior to 2015
- Pilot began in 2015, in response to curriculum shift in General Studies program, specifically GSTR 110
- Librarians observed GSTR 110 change in focus: from documented essay to timed-writing & creative writing
- Some faculty perceived library session as less relevant in absence of research component in their class
- Coupled with our distaste for one-shots and their limitations, we chose to scrap our existing 110 approach

Bottom Line: Curriculum may have changed, student information literacy needs have not

- GSTR 110 is the 1st course in the first-year sequence
- It is followed by GSTR 210, which universally requires a 10-page research paper, and which has a built-in library instruction one-shot
- Historically, we had used GSTR 110 to teach basic skills that would provide the scaffolding for the more involved research skills taught in GSTR 210
- With the move away from the GSTR 110 one-shot, we needed to address student needs somewhere
We had been collecting data from Research Practices Survey since 2008.

We previously used the data to inform the learning objectives of our one-shot.

But what if we used it to tailor instruction recommendations to the needs of individual students instead?

- Prior to the pilot, the HEDS survey had been administered directly by the HEDS group, sent via email to students in the fall and spring
Mapping specific HEDS questions to our SLOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Literacy Student Learning Outcome (IL-SLO)</th>
<th>A: Identify and develop topic-relevant vocabulary</th>
<th>B: Distinguish between popular and scholarly literature</th>
<th>C: Apply CRAAP criteria for evaluation of materials</th>
<th>D: Use citation mining to identify additional resources</th>
<th>E: Refine research question and develop topic relevant vocabulary</th>
<th>F: Use appropriate resources and identify relevant information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>supports General Students Student Learning Outcome (GSTR-SLO)</td>
<td>GSTR110 #5</td>
<td>GSTR110 #5</td>
<td>GSTR110 #5; GSTR110 #6; GSTR 210 #3</td>
<td>GSTR210 #2; GSTR210 #3</td>
<td>GSTR210 #1; GSTR210 #3</td>
<td>GSTR210 #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and is assessed by HEDS Research Practices Survey Question(s)</td>
<td>13, 14, 16</td>
<td>17, 22, 23, 29</td>
<td>28, 29</td>
<td>15, 18, 19</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>21, 28, 29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fall 2014 HEDS results - students answer correctly**

| 13 – 89.9% | 17 - 12.4% | 28 - 62.9% | 15 - 51.5% | 13 - 89.9% | 21 – 58.2% |
| 14 - 63.0% | 22 – 41.6% | 29 – 20.0% | 18 – 50.0% | 14 - 65.0% | 28 – 62.9% |
| 16 - 36.1% | 23 – 50.7% | 19a - 18.8% | 29 – 20.0% | | |
| | 29 - 20.0% | 19b - 44.5% | 19c - 41.2% | | |

**Spring 2015 HEDS targets - students answer correctly**

| 13 – 91% | 17 - 16% | 28 - 64% | 15 - 55% | 13 – 91% | 21 – 42% |
| 14 - 65% | 22 – 45% | 29 – 24% | 18 – 54% | 14 - 65% | 28 – 64% |
| 16 - 40% | 23 - 34% | 19a – 22% | 29 – 24% | | |
| | 29 - 24% | 19b - 48% | | | |

- We did not use every question from the original HEDS survey. We modified it, choosing approx. 5 from each category and then mapping those to our information literacy student learning outcomes as well as specific student learning outcomes stated by the General Studies program.
- Determining which questions mapped to our outcomes helped us determine which questions to use in post-assessment quizzes.
In Summer of 2015, we sent a modified version of the HEDS survey to incoming students:

- Survey sent by Dean’s office
- Didn’t tell students it was voluntary
- Doubtful that survey from library would be as successful

85% initial response rate

Take Away: An Administrative Ally is Essential

- In years past, we had used HEDS to deploy the survey; it was sent directly from the company after school began
- But in summer of 2015, before students even arrived on campus, they were emailed and asked to take survey
- While we didn’t tell them it was required, we didn’t tell them it was voluntary, either
- We had an incredible response rate
- Coming from dean’s office lent a legitimacy/authority; students were used to receiving emails from him that they had to act on
- Also, students were still doing what they were asked at this time; they hadn’t yet experienced email fatigue
What did we learn about our students?

Each had unique information literacy needs:

- 29% passed Finding Resources
- 35% passed Evaluating Resources
- 58% passed Citing Sources
- Only 14% passed all 3 sections!

Solution: workshops, with attendance recommended based on survey performance

- Each of our students was unique in their info lit needs - much like a snowflake
- Workshops would be tailored to the individual needs of the students.
- One of the major obstacles we repeatedly encountered during one-shots was the wide variation in information literacy skills among our incoming students.
- We were forced to teach towards the middle, boring those who were already knowledgeable and losing those who were struggling.
- The workshop model, however, with its’ focus on just one content area at a time, would allow us to see only those students in need of an intervention and even then, only for those areas in when they had demonstrated deficiencies in.
Here is an example of our lesson from our Evaluating Sources workshop, where we begin by discussing the CRAAP criteria.

Using a scholarly article, encyclopedia article, and a webpage (about.com article) about a single topic, students worked together to use the craap criteria to compare and evaluate the sources and then share back their findings.
In our knowing when to cite workshop, we used Plickers polling software to have students weigh anonymously in on whether various scenarios could be considered plagiarism, answering some of the questions above while doing so.
The Finding Sources workshop was the most low-tech.

We used white boards to dissect a question for keywords and then generate synonyms & related terms.

Use boolean logic & keywords to create a search string.

Practices searching in our OPAC & databases, asking students to guess whether a specific query might produce or less results than the one before it.
First Semester Workshop Logistics

- 30 minutes long, including a post-assessment
- Post assessment = questions from HEDS related to that content area
- Each workshop only covered a single content area
- Students would register online using LibCal
- Active-learning techniques
Link added to the hours box on our homepage during the weeks of workshops
Student labor schedules require that students work during the day, in-between classes.

Offered workshops day & nights, Mon. - Fri., and Sundays.

LibCal let us track workshop attendance, create event buttons to push to social media, as well as send reminders to workshop registrants.
Role of Teaching Faculty

GSTR 110 faculty also serve as academic advisors to the students in their section, so we hoped they would encourage students to attend workshops. To facilitate this, we:

- Provided instructors with a class roster during the Fall Faculty Conference
- Which detailed which students had passed the information literacy competency skills assessment & which ones needed to attend 1 (or more) of 3 workshops
- Those who did not attend the Fall Faculty Conference were sent class rosters via e-mail
- 4 weeks into the semester, we provided faculty with an updated class roster listing which students had passed the assessment and which ones still needed to attend a workshop.
- At the end, instructors were provided with a final updated class roster to view their class’ overall performance in the pilot.

During our 1st semester of the pilot, we reached out to GSTR 110 Professors.
Faculty Response Was Mixed...

- Some faculty required their students to attend ONLY specific workshops they needed
- Others required ALL of their students to attend ALL of the workshops, regardless of need
- Some brought entire classes at once for one or more workshops
- Some chose not to participate in the pilot, claiming they already taught these particular information literacy skills in their classes
- Those who did not participate were asked to at least administer post-assessment; they did not

Faculty response varied a lot.
What We Learned/Changed After First Semester

- Our intention was that students would intend workshops voluntarily, not be forced to attend
- To that end, perhaps best not to have faculty monitoring and "encouraging" participation
- Entire classes attend workshops simultaneously = lower student performance on the post-assessment
- Moved away from teaching workshops to entire classes
- Capped registration at 5 students (originally 15); less opportunity for students to disconnect
- Moved to small intimate space (instead of classroom); also less student disconnect because students cannot hide
- Held workshops on nights & Sundays only; attendance was too poor for daytime workshops

Most important: Contact students directly via postcards (and eventually letters); encourages student initiative and overcomes faculty resistance
Here is an example of a letter, recommending specific workshops based on student performance on the survey.

Dear [Student Last Name], [Student First Name],

Greetings from the library.

We noticed you missed parts of the GSTR 110 Information Literacy Competency Assessment during the fall term of 2016. Items labeled “Passed” are items already completed. Items labeled “Attend Workshop” need to be completed:

- Finding Resources: Passed
- Evaluating Resources: Attend Workshop
- Knowing When to Cite: Attend Workshop

The information and lessons from the assessment are crucial components for success in GSTR 110. In order to successfully complete all components of the IL assessment, we are providing you with another opportunity to participate in the assessment and get the information you need to succeed. You can do this by enrolling and completing the workshops for the topics you have not completed at this point (the ones labeled “Attend Workshop” above).

To enroll, simply copy the link below on your browser. You can also visit the library’s homepage directly and click on the link for “Workshops.” From there, you can sign up for a workshop time that is convenient for you. Please make sure you complete this by Friday, February 13, 2016.

URL for library workshops: [http://berea.libcal.com/calendar/workshops](http://berea.libcal.com/calendar/workshops)

URL for the library homepage: [http://libraryguide.berea.edu/](http://libraryguide.berea.edu/)

If you have any additional questions, you may visit the library’s reference desk and ask for one of the librarians, or you can e-mail [ampot.rivera@berea.edu](mailto:ampot.rivera@berea.edu)

Sincerely,

Your Reference Librarian
185 workshops.
12 weeks.
3 librarians.

- Is this workshop model sustainable?
- It depends.
- It is NOT if you schedule a spot for every student who might need to attend.
- This pilot year, we increased the # of workshops we offered to offset the fact that we had decreased the workshop size.
- Many were never filled and many were only attended by a single student. That is not a good use of resources.
- Instead, it would have been wiser to offer half as many, knowing that last year only about half of all students who needed to attend a workshop actually did so.
- Going forward, we will offer half as many.
- Also, it is all much more doable if you have the support of your director or administrator. They will need to understand that for the weeks workshops are happening, many other things are taking a backseat.
Did They Learn Anything?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections Passed</th>
<th>Initial Assessment (Summer 2015)</th>
<th>Final Assessment (April 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finding Resources</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating Resources</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citing Sources</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Student Pass Rates on Survey Sections, Initial Assessment vs. Final Assessment

- At the end of the spring semester of the first pilot year, the Dean sent the survey to these first year students to take a second time.
- The results here are only for those students who completed both the initial assessment and this final assessment.
- This final post-assessment demonstrated notable improvement across all three content areas.
- The number of students passing Finding Resources increased by 32%, those passing Evaluating Resources improved by 24%, and those passing Knowing When to Cite rose by 29%.
We are still waiting to receive the results of the spring assessment for this year from the Dean’s office.

Until we do, we at least have the #s from the workshops to refer to.

As a reminder, at the end of our workshops, students take a post-assessment, comprised of the same questions from the HEDS survey that were used to rate their information literacy skills in that specific area (Citing, Evaluating, or Finding) in the first place.

Upon doing so, 43.8% demonstrated competency in all 3 content areas.

That is an increase of more than 23%.

This # is just for the workshops completed in the fall; it does not reflect any students who may have taken the spring workshops.

We expect, based on trends from last year, the # would have gone up even further.
### Change in Student Participation Rates: Involved Faculty vs. Not Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2015-2016</th>
<th>2016-2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need at least one workshop, as determined by survey</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended at least one workshop, whether on their own or as part of a class</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended at least one workshop on their own</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**: Students Needing Workshops Who Attended At Least One, by Pilot Year

- Would participation decrease significantly when faculty were no longer monitoring or enforcing workshop attendance? When we were just passing out customized letters and not having faculty follow up?
- Yes... but we could live with it
Would We Recommend It?

Yes!

Why?

- Overcome faculty resistance to sharing class time for one-shots
- Establish relationships with students
- Cultivate initiative in students

36-43% of all freshmen students voluntarily attended workshops!

- We conducted 404 reference consultations this year. Anecdotally, many students mentioned that they heard about the consultation service at their workshops.

- This was one of the unintended consequences of the workshops, but one of my favorite

- We wanted students to think of us as THEIR librarian and the small workshop setting allowed us to develop those relationships

- We were blown away that so many students attended workshops on information literacy topics – on nights and weekends -with no extrinsic reward. That is an instruction librarian’s dream come true

- Faculty couldn’t object since it wasn’t commanding any of their classtime