As You Like It: Building, Executing, and Assessing an Adaptable Library Instruction Program for First-Year Experience Courses

Joy I. Hansen
Central Connecticut State University, jhansen@ccsu.edu

As You Like It: Building, Executing, and Assessing an Adaptable Library Instruction Program for First-Year Experience Courses

Joy I. Hansen, Central Connecticut State University

Abstract

Providing targeted experiences for first-year students both inside and outside the classroom is essential for building connections and creating a foundation for skill development necessary for academic success. Many first-year programs include a standalone course for incoming students or specific content weaved into existing course offerings. Information literacy skill-building holds an important place in these efforts; therefore, instruction librarians are provided additional opportunities to collaborate with faculty and reach students. Depending upon the size of the institution, however, the sheer number of first-year courses combined with shrinking library staff pose challenges. This Innovative Practices article is one library's experience with building, executing, and assessing an information literacy program specific to the needs of first-year students in response to these challenges. Offering an array of library resources, collaborating on ideas for instruction delivery, and crafting a more intentional approach to assigning classes are solutions that may be adapted to address scalability and sustainability concerns.

Keywords: first-year students, first-year experience, information literacy instruction

Innovative Practices
edited by Andrea Baer, Carolyn Gamtso, and Merinda McLure

As You Like It: Building, Executing, and Assessing an Adaptable Library Instruction Program for First-Year Experience Courses

Some fifty years ago, in response to student civil unrest, the University of South Carolina introduced University 101, a seminar designed specifically to help students adjust to college life (Roach, 1998). Dr. John N. Gardner served as the program's faculty director, launching the first-year experience movement. Since that time, with the establishment of the National Resource Center for The First-Year Experience and Students in Transition and its popular annual conference, there have been numerous publications written and courses developed to address the needs of first-year students transitioning to college.

By definition, a first-year experience program is designed to "assist students in their academic and social development and in their transition to college," ultimately to improve student retention (Hunter & Linder, 2005, p. 275). The Association of American Colleges & Universities points to first-year seminars, such as University 101, and other experiences that place a strong emphasis on developing skills, such as information literacy, as high-impact practices that improve student retention and engagement rates (Kuh, 2008). As part of this programming, a first-year experience course presents the perfect opportunity to introduce basic concepts needed for academic, professional, and personal success. Specifically, learning outcomes directly related to library instruction, such as evaluating information sources appropriate to the assignment, ethically and legally using information, and connecting with library resources to assist in achieving academic goals, are typically found in first-year experience courses.

Unfortunately, many libraries are not always adequately resourced to respond to new or expanding first-year experience programs, evolving needs of new generations of incoming students, and growing expectations of faculty and administration. Embedding first-year experience courses within introductory courses across academic disciplines poses an additional challenge in the form of varying teaching styles and learning objectives. Academic freedom as to how information literacy will be infused into coursework presents a wild card for library support. This paper documents the experiences of instruction librarians at Central Connecticut State University (CCSU), who collaborated with academic faculty to design, pilot, and fully implement a new first-year experience course. Institutions of any

size, type, or culture might consider aspects of this initiative that may work for their environments.

Designing information literacy instruction for first-year students requires adaptability to accommodate differences in teaching methods (for both librarians and academic faculty), student learning styles, the unique requirements of various academic disciplines, and fluctuating library staffing levels. Not only did CCSU's first-year experience initiative provide opportunities for librarians to participate in cross-campus conversations, but it also required a great deal of internal department collaboration and coordination. Instruction librarians co-designed teaching resources; renewed discourse on effective instruction delivery, classroom management, and best practices for responding to the needs of first-year students; and instituted a more intentional approach to assigning classes to team members.

Following a literature review describing the contributions libraries make to first-year students' success, this case study outlines our library's involvement in planning a first-year course (beginning in fall 2019), launching a pilot program of eight sections, identifying and assessing various measures of success, and preparing for the full course rollout of over 30 sections in fall 2022. There were many lessons learned along the way, as well as considerations for the future so that our library's role in the first-year experience course might continue to evolve.

Background

CCSU, a publicly funded regional university located in New Britain, Connecticut, offers undergraduate and graduate programs through the master's and sixth-year levels, as well as the EdD in Educational Leadership. The four academic schools at the university are Business; Education & Professional Studies; Engineering, Science & Technology; and Liberal Arts & Social Sciences. The most popular undergraduate degree programs are computer/information science, business, education, psychology, and social sciences. According to CCSU's website, the student undergraduate population, numbering 7,054 in spring 2022, was comprised as follows: 54% male and 46% female; 77% full-time and 23% part-time; 39% minority students, with the largest group being Hispanic/Latino; and 96% in-state residents. In any given year, our freshmen number about 1,200 (Office of Institutional Research, 2022). In fall 2022, 49% of incoming full-time students identified themselves as first-generation (C. McDavid, personal communication, October 18, 2022).

Addressing the needs of first-year students has long been a priority for our institution. Several task forces and ad-hoc committees with representation from across the university have made recommendations over the years leading to new (or enhanced) initiatives targeting incoming students. More progress has been made in student orientation, academic and emotional support, outreach to high schools, and improving communication with students and their parents than in developing course content specific to first-year students. A designated subcommittee of the first-year experience advisory group decided that our institution's first-year experience course (FYE-C) would be embedded into many existing first-year courses across a wide variety of academic programs rather than stand as its own course. This decision was based upon our review of best practice models, faculty opinions about the benefits of one model over the other, and the fact that many programs, such as engineering and nursing, have no extra room for an additional course. Although our approach is an embedded one, the elements described in this case study as having the potential for the greatest impact can also be applied to institutions with standalone first-year seminars.

The library held a seat at the campus-wide table for all discussions involving the creation, design, and assessment of the FYE-C, which was extremely important in terms of maintaining open communication and cementing our library's role in this initiative.

Literature Review: The Library's Role in First-Year Student Success

Many factors influence student success in their first year at an institution of higher education, including students' prior knowledge, demographics, campus engagement, academic support, and socio-emotional well-being (van der Zanden et al., 2018). Because so many factors are involved in student success, it has been challenging for libraries to isolate their role in advancing the academic success of first-year students and improving retention of this group from semester to semester. Various attempts to measure the impact of libraries on student success and retention, however, have pointed to positive correlations. For example, findings from the Association of College and Research Libraries' (ACRL) Assessment in Action (AiA) program indicate five positively correlated areas of connection: 1) students benefit from library instruction in their initial coursework, 2) library use increases student success, 3) collaborative academic programs and services involving the library enhance student learning, 4) information literacy instruction strengthens general education outcomes, and 5) library research consultations boost learning (Brown &

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

Hansen
As You Like It

Malenfant, 2017, pp. 1-2). As a participant in AiA, Buley Library, located at Southern Connecticut State University in New Haven, Connecticut (a regional comprehensive university like CCSU) found that "FYE students in sections that schedule library sessions had higher self-reported knowledge of library skills and services, and faculty across all disciplines notice certain positive changes in their students after library sessions" (Hardenberg et al., 2014). These findings provide justification for first-year experience courses, as well as for the library's role in these efforts.

Furthermore, a University of Minnesota study found positive relationships between various instances of library use by first-year students and GPA and academic engagement (Soria et al., 2017, p. 20). Using web-based library resources and services (such as reference interactions) and participating in library classes or workshops were cited as examples of library use that were especially influential in improving GPA and engagement. CCSU librarians have questioned the degree to which one-shot library instruction affects student success and retention for first-year students, and whether the initial "skill build" continues in subsequent years to graduation. Unfortunately, there is a paucity of conclusive research to respond to these questions.

Collaboration Between Academic Faculty and Librarians is Key

Research has pointed to the importance of faculty–librarian collaboration in improving first-year students' information literacy, despite the challenges of initiating and sustaining these conversations. In an analysis of the impact of various levels of librarian-faculty collaboration on the incorporation of information literacy skills in student writing, Char Booth et al. (2015) found that "the quantity of librarian engagement was a clear correlate to the quality of student learning" (p. 635). Similarly, in surveys conducted at the Catholic University of America, Kim and Shumaker (2015) found that if librarians and faculty failed to engage with each other, possible negative outcomes might include unnecessary duplication of content or gaps in coverage, as well as a marginalization of the role of librarians.

Not surprisingly, the nature and degree of faculty–librarian collaboration differs across institutions. In a survey conducted by Perez et al. (2020) at two large, research-oriented public universities (Wayne State in Detroit, Michigan and Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo), faculty reported these types of library collaborations: having a librarian teach in a one of their courses (41%), creating an online course guide (24%), and referring students to a specific librarian (19%). In the same survey, faculty with six or more years of experience

Hansen
As You Like It   [INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

reported librarians teaching sessions in their classes at greater rates than their newer colleagues. An analysis by discipline shows the highest collaboration rates in education, humanities, and social sciences, and the lowest in STEM and fine arts disciplines (Perez et al., 2020). While these survey results may not be generalizable to all institutions, the breakdowns by faculty tenure and discipline may be useful in determining campus populations to approach for collaborations.

Tie Information Literacy Instruction to Course Content

Multiple studies, as outlined by Lacy and Hamlett (2021), have indicated that students learn the research process best when needed skills are taught in the context of a course or discipline. These findings support a model of incorporating first-year experience components within academic courses rather than offering a standalone course. As with any model, there may be a caveat or two to consider. Cope and Sanabria (2014) suggested that faculty–librarian collaborations are often difficult to establish, and resources created by librarians may not always be utilized because faculty view information literacy as already firmly embedded in their disciplines.

Supplement In-Person Information Literacy Instruction with Asynchronous Materials

Jam-packed syllabi, differences in student learning styles, and the importance of literacy skills in today's information society call for a multi-modal delivery approach to library instruction. A study at York University in Canada found that 45% of faculty preferred in-class IL instruction, while about 39% thought it should be scheduled outside of class time (Bury, 2011). These results may indicate that while librarians might sometimes count on being invited into the classroom, they should also prepare instructional materials to be used asynchronously. A partially asynchronous approach would also serve to address the issue of scalability by maintaining levels of library support in the face of an increasing number of courses and other requests for librarians' time. Faculty might assign standalone tutorials, online research guides, and targeted activities with assessments at the point in the course that makes sense, and/or use a flipped classroom model before a librarian's visit. Booth et al. (2015) found that "a course-integrated model with multiple diverse pedagogical interventions … consistently achieved greater performance gains" (p. 635). Depending on the number of first-year experience sections in relation to library staffing, in-person library visits—particularly multiple visits—may not be feasible. As a response, Rutledge and LeMire (2017) suggest online and in-person "microteaching" opportunities to supplement more formal teaching events and to offset shrinking staff resources. Microteaching may include

reference desk interactions, teaching moments at campus events and committee meetings, and/or short TikTok-like tutorials.

Our "As You Like It" Approach

As part of an initial pilot in fall 2021, five librarians in the Reference/Instruction Department worked with eight course sections designated as first-year experience (FYE), including American government, astronomy, biomolecular science, criminal justice, honors writing, and psychology. The FYE-C subcommittee, which included about a dozen staff and faculty members from across campus, had previously reviewed and approved a proposal for library support in the FYE courses. Our proposal offered one or more in-person classroom visit(s) and recommended asynchronous materials, such as an online tour, video tutorials, information pathfinders, online quizzes, and a New to the Library informational brochure, accessible through a first-year experience course guide (Elihu Burritt Library, 2022). A screenshot of the guide is found in Appendix A.

We also developed a series of targeted workshops called "Research on the Run" to supplement in-class learning. To broaden appeal and increase attendance at the workshops, we determined topics for the series based on our experiences working with students at all levels. The workshop titles and topics were: Ready-Set-Research (a basic overview of the research process and database searching), Supercharge Your Research (advanced searching techniques), What Does This Meme? (debunking misinformation), In Pursuit of Truth (website evaluation techniques), Mendeley and Zotero Citation Management, and MLA and APA Citation Review.

Instructional design targeted to first-year students, in addition to the creation of classroom and outside opportunities for engagement, skill practice, and assessment, were all key to the initiative's success. The course content and the supplemental materials developed by our team of librarians aligned with research conducted in both 2-year colleges and 4-year universities showing that first-year students lack certain information literacy skills, such as identifying appropriate sources, evaluating sources, understanding library resources, and developing proper citations (Library Journal & Credo, 2017, p.2).

Our ongoing assessment activities in other courses provided additional insight to inform FYE course content design and delivery in the first-year program. For example, in January 2021, our assessment librarian led a virtual retreat where we reviewed artifacts from the first-year writing classes in which librarians were embedded and from the library's one-

credit LSC 150 – Research in the Digital Age course. Our goals were to norm our grading rubrics, identify the information literacy skills requiring additional attention, determine ways our instruction might respond to these needs, and consider possible alternative assessment methods for instruction. All assessment instruments used during the retreat incorporated the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2015) and the *Information Literacy VALUE Rubric* (Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2013).

As with all instruction efforts, it was our intent to work closely with faculty to guide in-class lessons, provide suggestions on how to enhance and clarify information literacy assignments, recommend appropriate video tutorials and other learning aids, and respond to the specific course requirements of each discipline as communicated by the faculty. With the anticipation of a larger rollout of first-year experience classes in future semesters, we felt that offering choices that might easily be adapted and remaining flexible in our responses to the needs of students and faculty, were the most effective strategies for incorporating library instruction into the program.

Each of the five librarians was matched with pilot faculty in terms of their academic background (including advanced degrees in business, English, fine arts, and history), teaching style, and experience working with various departments. At the time, this decision point did not seem particularly noteworthy. In hindsight, however, this step in the process proved crucial to our "as you like it" model, particularly when the number of sections increased drastically after the pilot. Librarians had previously built relationships with academic faculty through their work in one-shot and embedded information literacy instruction. In addition, preferences regarding the degree and nature of librarian involvement in the course, along with the teaching styles of various academic faculty, aligned well with those of certain librarians. For example, some faculty requested a more traditional show-and-tell of library resources, while other faculty sought a higher degree of collaboration with librarians to develop interactive in-class activities and more frequent visits.

The research guide, which served as the main instructional and supplemental learning tool, was designed to address three main information skill areas: find, evaluate, and use. The librarians divided up the work of developing the guide, choosing one area of focus for content creation. One librarian assumed the role of project facilitator. The project facilitator served as the library's main contact with the FYE-C subcommittee, created marketing and

outreach materials (such as the new student brochure and the flyer advertising the supplemental workshops), and assigned incoming requests for class visits to librarians.

To ensure effective communication with students and consistent course management practices, the FYE-C subcommittee advised each faculty member in the first-year program to modify one of the Blackboard course shell templates for use in their section. Our library had previously worked with our Center for Teaching and Innovation to ensure that various library resources were included in these templates, such as links to the library website, subscription databases, and research guides such as the first-year experience and citation assistance guides. We were, therefore, one step ahead of the game.

So ... Did They "Like It"?

From September through December 2021, the customized first-year experience research guide consisting of pathfinders, short tutorials with assessment tools, linked websites, and other learning objects was viewed over 440 times. To put this in perspective, our popular Writing 105/110 course guide, conceivably used by about 40 sections, was viewed about 560 times during this same period.

As mentioned earlier, librarians designed, promoted, and delivered a series of short workshops on various research concepts geared towards first-year students, but open to all students. Nine students attended these Research on the Run workshops, with some participating in multiple workshops. Unfortunately, we do not know how many of the attendees were from the pilot classes (see Lessons Learned section). Each workshop was held simultaneously in-person and online to accommodate all learners, and recordings with supplemental materials were posted online to a special guide. While we received positive remarks from participants during each session, an attempt to formally gather feedback through a short written online feedback survey sent at the end of the semester yielded no results. The Ready-Set-Research and MLA/APA workshops garnered the highest number of attendees. These workshops, in addition to source evaluation, were also requested most frequently by faculty in our informal conversations with them.

The pilot was assessed in a variety of ways to determine the effectiveness of the model in meeting learning outcomes and contributing to student success. A comprehensive assessment report, structured around four assessment measures, was shared with the first-year experience steering committee, faculty senate, and administration. Here are a few of the results:

Hansen
As You Like It   [INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

1. *Comparing the overall GPA and retention of the students in the pilot (P) sections with the non-pilot (NP) sections*

   There were no significant differences between the P and NP groups in terms of the average overall fall 2021 GPA (2.79 vs 2.77) or retention to spring 2022 (90% vs 93%). However, it is noteworthy to consider that the pilot sample was small.

2. *Pre- and post-surveys*

   While there were a number of questions on the surveys intended to obtain a clear picture of the success of the pilot, there were two positive results directly related to librarian involvement: 1) at the end of the semester, pilot respondents were more likely to express strong agreement with being able to evaluate information sources appropriate to an assignment than non-pilot respondents, and 2) when asked to cite resources that can help a student achieve academic goals, respondents from both groups frequently mentioned the library.

3. *Anecdotal assessment by pilot librarians*

   Librarians noted that using real-life examples and allowing time for in-class and hands-on activities seemed to resonate the most with the students. In this way, real connections were made, not only to the topics presented in class, but to the library and librarians as campus resources. Effective timing of the information literacy instruction, use of the supplemental materials, and ongoing collaboration between faculty and librarians were determined to be success indicators.

4. *Self-reflection by pilot faculty*

   Faculty expressed appreciation for the involvement of librarians and their expertise in teaching information literacy skills. A few mentioned that they could have taken greater advantage of the supplemental materials prepared by the librarians, as well as librarians' availability to work with their classes. As first-year experience courses typically include a long list of desired student learning outcomes, and as the pilot was initiated during the first semester of on-ground classes during the pandemic, it is understandable that faculty were juggling many priorities while adjusting to the return to campus.

Within the coursework of these pilot sections, information literacy skill building was assessed in formative ways through activities led by librarians when they visited the classes, written assignments intended to practice IL concepts, and short quizzes that accompanied

videos that were assigned by some faculty as part of the supplemental materials on the research guide (see examples in Appendix B). The assignments and quizzes were tied closely to class and overall course learning objectives. Given the developmental level of information literacy skill building of first-year students, the results of the formative assessments were mixed, with some students doing well and others less so. These formative assessment activities, however, allowed for librarians to immediately address questions and review unclear concepts.

In one instance, the academic faculty member and librarian shared the workload to assess students' annotated bibliographies in two sections, which totaled about 120 items for review (40 students submitting three annotations each). As a formative assessment, students received credit for submitting the work and made further corrections for the final paper. For the most part, students were successful in selecting and summarizing the required number of sources, but they struggled greatly with creating citations. In the future, librarians could encourage student attendance at the citation workshop, recommend an additional library visit (or suggest that concepts presented by the librarian be reinforced by the writing consultant during their visit), and/or suggest other learning activities. It is important to note that first-year experience faculty hold differing expectations as to the level of citation skill attainment required at this point in students' academic programs.

Lessons Learned

Not surprisingly, many of the lessons learned about library support for first-year experience courses mirror our observations about library support in general. To enhance the quality of information literacy instruction design and delivery, academic faculty and librarians should collaborate early and often. As the first-year program rolls out to more sections, we are reminding program facilitators to encourage faculty to work with librarians, as they can be valuable partners in the process.

Effective timing of librarian visits has always been important. Students need to connect the librarian's instruction to course objectives at the point of need. Scheduling a librarian's visit during the first few weeks of classes when adjustment to college is at its most challenging, and the visit is far removed from assignment due dates, is a recipe for students failing to remember the instruction when needed.

A key ingredient for success is aligning the librarians' teaching styles and experiences with that of the faculty members whenever possible. Existing relationships can be expanded

upon, and new alliances forged, broadening the library's reach across the institution. Consideration of different teaching styles, faculty expectations about librarian involvement, and other factors go a long way to maintain healthy collegial working relationships and, ultimately, successful course delivery to the benefit of first-year students.

A main objective for developing the Research on the Run workshop series was to supplement in-class teaching and learning for first-year students. However, workshop attendance was lackluster. We suggest providing extra credit for workshop attendance or mandatory attendance in at least one workshop. These ideas would help us track first-year student participation, as well as broaden the delivery of information literacy fundamentals. Current research conducted by the University of Brunswick on improving student attendance at library workshops found four factors significantly impact workshop success: topic, session location, advertising type, and target audience (Witherspoon & Taber, 2021). We are currently soliciting possible workshop topic ideas from both faculty and students. In response to session location, feedback from participants tells us that virtual offerings are most convenient for our student population (although we will continue to offer workshops both in-person and online). Additional discussion is needed to address effective advertising of these offerings and to target various workshops to specific audiences. We will also ask attendees to fill out the feedback survey at the end of the workshop since distributing the survey at the end of the semester likely led to the lack of responses.

Future Implications

The pilot program was successful because it had a relatively small number of faculty volunteers who were committed to the initiative and were open to following the FYE-C committee's best practice recommendations, such as working with librarians. Now that the program has been rolled out campus-wide, librarians are justifiably concerned about the overall time investment and the effect on staff resources. In the fall 2022, there are over 30 sections of first-year experience (FYE) courses. This growth has raised several questions, the answers to which are crucial to the program's viability in terms of library support:

- *What additional asynchronous materials (video lessons, tutorials, assessment tools, scavenger hunts) are needed?*
  New programs and initiatives often require additional library resources, which tie into budget considerations. Our support for the first-year initiative requires access to an instructional video database (*ProQuest Research Companion*), an online

assessment-building tool (LibWizard), and topic exploration databases (*Credo Reference* and *Issues & Controversies*). As the program grows, we may need to purchase additional resources or devote staff to creating learning objects.

- *How can we plan for sustainable in-class instruction and workshops?*
  We may want to explore other models of embedded librarianship, such as asynchronous library scavenger hunts and/or shorter in-person visits with flipped activities. We also need to determine what workshops are needed to supplement in-class teaching and how to encourage attendance. With the approval of the newly hired coordinator in New Student Programs, the library project facilitator sent a survey to FYE faculty over the summer to help answer some of our planning questions (see Appendix C). Although the response rate was small, it did spur some faculty to contact librarians to discuss what resources were available. Out of these conversations arose suggestions to repeat the Ready-Set-Research workshop, conduct library tours, and create a basic scavenger hunt.

- *How can we better measure the library's impact?*
  While we have conducted various library satisfaction surveys over the years, the most recent ones were conducted during and immediately after the height of the pandemic, so the results reflect the unique circumstances of that period. Perhaps a student focus group might provide more targeted and actionable feedback. A fuller rollout of existing assessment tools created for the pilot to the additional sections will hopefully yield more recommendations for program improvements.

- *Could we take a "train the trainer" approach to build a more sustainable program?*
  Faculty may be reluctant to devote the requisite amount of class time, may have differing opinions on which skills should be taught, or desire to weave aspects of information literacy into their teaching throughout the semester. Many librarians have shifted their outreach from students to faculty (Cowan et al., 2016). Johnson (2017) described how librarians at Appalachian State University implemented an instruction model in their required first-year seminar course, consisting of about 140 sections over the span of an academic year. The model included pre-session tutorials and associated quizzes in a hybrid classroom "meta-course" approach. This approach relies on faculty delivery of—and commitment to—using library-created content. Training trainers, however, does not need to be limited to faculty, as many

Hansen
As You Like It

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

other support departments, such as the writing and learning centers, would also make effective library partners in responding to the needs of new students.

- *How could we re-envision our overall outreach and service to new students?*
  We could consider devoting a library position to supporting this population in particular. We could also reconfigure student study space, participate in special events, craft marketing messages directed to this group, and orient incoming students to the library in new ways.

Although we don't yet have the answers to many of these questions, we look forward to future conversations and collaborations with our faculty to further develop our library instruction program for first-year experience courses.

References

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2013). *Information literacy VALUE rubric.* https://www.aacu.org/initiatives/value-initiative/value-rubrics/value-rubrics-information-literacy

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2015). *Framework for Information literacy for higher education.* https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework

Booth, C., Lowe, M. S., Tagge, N., & Stone, S. M. (2015). Degrees of impact: Analyzing the effects of progressive librarian course collaborations on student performance. *College & Research Libraries, 76*(5), 623–651. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.76.5.623

Brown, K., & Malenfant, K. J. (2017, April). *Academic library impact on student learning and success: Findings from assessment in action team projects.* Association of College and Research Libraries. http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value/findings_y3.pdf

Bury, S. (2011). Faculty attitudes, perceptions and experiences of information literacy: A study across multiple disciplines at York University, Canada. *Journal of Information Literacy, 5*(1), 45–64. https://doi.org/10.11645/5.1.1513

Cope, J., & Sanabria, J. E. (2014). Do we speak the same language?: A study of faculty perceptions of information literacy. *portal: Libraries and the Academy, 14*(4), 475–501. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2014.0032

[INNOVATIVE PRACTICES]

Hansen
As You Like It

Cowan, S., & Eva, N. C. (2016). Changing our aim: Infiltrating faculty with information literacy. *Communications in Information Literacy*, *10*(2), 163–177. https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2016.10.2.31

Elihu Burritt Library. (2022). *First-year experience research guide.* https://libguides.ccsu.edu/firstyear

Hardenberg, W., Ben-Avie, M, & Beals, P. (2014, June 28). *The long and winding road: Connecting library instruction to student persistence* [Poster presentation]. American Library Association Annual Conference, Las Vegas, NV.

Hunter, M. S., & Linder, C. W. (2005). First-year seminars. In M. L. Upcraft, J. N. Gardner, & B. O. Barefoot (Eds.), *Challenging and supporting the first-year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college* (pp. 275–291). Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, M. (2017). Library instruction for first year students using a CMS meta-course: Scalable and customizable! *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, *11*(1–2), 262–268. https://doi.org/10.1080/1533290X.2016.1221612

Kim, S. U., & Shumaker, D. (2015). Student, librarian, and instructor perceptions of information literacy instruction and skills in a first year experience program: A case study. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *41*(4), 449–456. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.04.005

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact education practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter.* Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Lacy, M., & Hamlett, A. (2021). Librarians, step out of the classroom!: How improved faculty-led IL instruction improves student learning. *Reference Services Review*, *49*(2), 163–175. https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-09-2020-0062

Library Journal & Credo Reference. (2017). *First year experience survey: Information literacy in higher education.* https://mediasource.formstack.com/forms/2017_first_year_experience_survey

Office of Institutional Research & Assessment. (2022). *CCSU Fast Facts.* https://www.ccsu.edu/oira/data/fastFacts.html

Perez-Stable, M. A., Arnold, J. M., Guth, L. F., & Vander Meer, P. F. (2020). From service role to partnership: Faculty voices on collaboration with librarians. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *20*(1), 49–72. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2020.0004

Roach, R. (1998, February 19). Freshman-year experience. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, *14*(26), 30.

Rutledge, L., & LeMire, S. (2017). Broadening boundaries: Opportunities for information literacy instruction inside and outside the classroom. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, *17*(2), 347–362. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2017.0021

Soria, K. M., Fransen, J., & Nackerud, S. (2017). Beyond books: The extended academic benefits of library use for first-year college students. *College & Research Libraries*, *78*(1), 8–22. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.78.1.8

van der Zanden, P. J. A. C., Denessen, E., Cillessen, A. H. N., & Meijer, P. C. (2018). Domains and predictors of first-year student success: A systematic review. *Educational Research Review, 23*, 57–77. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.01.001

Witherspoon, R. L., & Taber, P. O. L. (2021). Increasing student attendance at library workshops: What the data tells us. *College & Research Libraries*, *82*(1), 113–128. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.82.1.113

Appendix A: Screenshot of Library Research Guide for First-Year Students

Appendix B: Sample Assessments

Sample Information Literacy Practice Assignment

AST110 The Cosmos —Your Turn in the Pilot's Seat

Your Name:

What is the URL for the Research Guide for this course?

Cite Sources

On what page of the Course Guide would you find resources to help you cite your work?

What is the URL for the Library <u>Citation</u> Guide?

Find Sources

On what page of the Course Guide would you find resources to help you locate information sources for your topic?

What is the URL of the Library's home page?

What types of information sources can you find searching "Central Search"?

Use the example of astronomer Edwin Hubble for these next questions.

Name two databases you could use to find biographical information.

Conduct a search in one of the bio databases and list one thing about him you find particularly interesting.

Name one invention of his.

Choose a non-reference database and search for information on this invention. Which database did you choose?

Did you have any difficulties in your search? Explain.

Wrap Up

We traveled a lot of miles today. What points are still blurry for you?

Sample Information Literacy Tutorial Quiz

Lateral Reading Assessment

We know that lateral reading is an important tool for evaluating sources. Let us know what you learned from the tutorial by answering the questions below!

Name:
Course Name and Number:
Professor's Name:
Semester:

Which statements accurately describe lateral reading? (Check all that apply.)
Lateral reading...

☐   Uses various techniques to determine what others say about a source.
☐   Involves reading various pieces of information on a website to verify accuracy.
☐   Is a method used by many professional fact checkers.
☐   May include searching fact-checking sites such as Politico and Snopes.

True or False: While not a viable information source in and of itself for academic research, Wikipedia can be used to find out information about an organization, publication, or expert to verify authority of a source.

o   True
o   False

True or False: The issue with solely using a checklist of criteria to evaluate an information source is that the information creator may have used the same checklist to publish inaccurate or misleading information.

o   True
o   False

As part of your lateral reading evaluation, how would you do a Google domain search from the American Civil Liberties Union (found www.aclu.org) excluding their site?

o   -site American Civil Liberties Union
o   American Civil Liberties Union site:*.org
o   American Civil Liberties Union -site:www.aclu.org

What are some ways a website might present itself in a deceptive way?
- o Beefing up the "About Us" section
- o Linking to other content from own site
- o Don't present a clear mission or purpose
- o Hard to tell who is behind the site
- o All of the above

Scenario: You are looking at a website that discusses the impacts of second-hand smoke on children. The website mentions a landmark study conducted by a group of pediatricians and cardiologists. Which of the following would you do?
- o Click on the link to the original study to use that for your research.
- o Use the website's discussion of the study as part of your research.

Which domains may require less skepticism because they have more oversight? (Check all that apply.)
- ☐ .gov
- ☐ .org
- ☐ .edu
- ☐ .com
- ☐ .net

Appendix C: First-Year Experience Course/Library Instruction Survey

The library instruction team looks forward to working with you and your students as part of the first-year experience courses (FYE-C) this Fall. The learning outcomes include "developing academic skill" objectives (LO3) as well as "thinking" and "information finding" skills that are directly related to library instruction. The library provides in-person, virtual, and asynchronous information literacy instruction on many different topics including overviews of library resources and the research process, evaluating information and sources critically, using information effectively, and research ethics.

To better understand your needs and help with resource planning, please respond to these questions. Don't worry if your responses are tentative at this time. The questions have been developed based on the positive outcomes from the Fall 2021 pilot in terms of library collaboration.

Name
Email
Course Name

Do you anticipate requesting a librarian visit for your FYE course during the Fall 2022 semester? (Choose one.)
Yes, one visit
Yes, more than one visit
No, because _____

If you selected yes, what topics, activities, assignments, etc. would you like the librarian to cover in the visit(s)?

For the FYE pilot in 2021, the librarians developed an extensive first-year experience research guide found at [guide address]. Many FY instructors used resources from this guide as asynchronous instruction and to supplement librarian visits. Looking at the guide, do you have any recommendations for additional info that might be added?

Considering your course objectives, do you have any suggestions for supplemental library/information literacy instruction materials that we might develop such as how-to guides, videos, a library tour, or other resources and activities?

Librarians offer targeted workshops as part of their Research on the Run series to support student success and retention. Some instructors provided extra credit for attending these workshops. A list of the topics covered previously are found here [link to Research on the Run flyer]. Do you have any suggestions for other workshop topics to support your classroom teaching and learning?

Do you have any questions or comments for the library (or in general) about first-year experience courses?