This report includes five sections: 1) a description of the library instruction plan for FYS; 2) a summary of the librarians’ reflections on FYS, what worked well and what could be improved; 3) a summary of the FYS faculty survey results along with faculty comments; 4) a summary of the students’ feedback. 5) assessment of student work. 6) action steps going forward

**Section 1: Library Instruction Plan**

Librarians teach one in-class session, focusing on the common argumentative research paper in which all students are required to use at least “5 substantial sources.” Our goal is for students to become critical consumers of information. After the session students will be able to evaluate information in order to determine if a source is substantial and appropriate for college level research assignments.

**Student Learning Outcomes**

1. Students understand how the Internet has created a complex information ecosystem in order to appreciate the need to be critical consumers of information/skeptics

2. Students evaluate sources by considering different types of authority, such as professional status, subject expertise, social position, or special experience in order to determine if a source is credible and appropriate for their information need.

3. Students evaluate sources by considering the type of publication, creation process, purpose, and point of view in order to determine if a source is credible and appropriate for their information need.

4. Students utilize basic library database tools in order to search for scholarly books and journal articles.

**Curriculum**: Based on ACRL’s Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education. Focus on two threshold concepts:

- Authority is constructed and contextual
- Information creation as a process

The FYS student guide used for the pre-assignment and for in-class activities is available online: [http://belmont.libguides.com/fys2016](http://belmont.libguides.com/fys2016)

Our goal is to reach 100% of FYS classes. There was a slight decrease in the numbers this year:

- 84% of sections came for library instruction (62 out of 74)
- 85% of instructors requested library instruction (40 out of 47)
Section Two: Librarians’ Reflections

There is consensus among the librarians that after two years of using the same instruction plan it is time for a refresh. Although the overall goal of the class, evaluating information, still seems relevant and appropriate, several librarians feel that the Wikipedia discussion and Powerpoint presentation both seem dated. Several librarians commented that their students struggled to understand the idea of “original, repackaged, or shared information.” One suggested that instead of Wikipedia we start with a popular article that mentions a study and go from there. Another suggested we spend more time evaluating sources found in OneSearch and also include a discussion of why and when to use books. In recent weeks, we have also been discussing the issue of fake news and information bias and are collecting potential articles and ideas to use.

Although we’re ready for a content change, the “flipped” classroom approach still seems to work well, and faculty, for the most part, are receptive to giving their students a pre-assignment. The in-class active learning exercise also still has potential to be useful, depending on the sources used. Most librarians agreed that having a meaningful discussion is challenging with this group because we only get to see them once for 50 or 75 minutes. We should spend more time on active learning and less on discussion.

The recommended follow-up assignment faced some challenges. Very few faculty agreed to use it, and understandably so. There are so many requirements for FYS already, and we understand the difficulty of incorporating yet another assignment into a syllabus that has already been crafted. The librarians still want to work more collaboratively with the faculty to design information literacy assignments that allow students to hone their research skills, but we need to continue to think of ways to make this work for faculty without it seeming like an add-on from the library.

Section Three: Faculty Survey

The survey was sent to 47 instructors at the end of the semester and was completed by 19 instructors for a response rate of 40%.

Almost every question was rated “Agree” or “Strongly Agree” with just a handful rated “Neither Agree or Disagree.” Faculty comments:

- Use articles for the in-class activity that are related to the class topic. Another commented that the use of customized articles makes the session much more useful.
- The session helped students get started on their research and know the expectations for the kinds of sources they should use.
- Students still using “pop” sources
- Students don’t know where to find scholarly sources
- “The latest set of essays was the strongest in my many years of teaching FYS”
- Students said they “already knew most of that” when debriefing about the library session
- The session would be strengthened by a follow up assignment
We asked faculty if they wanted to keep library instruction as part of FYS, and 84% said yes. 16% said maybe.

We also asked faculty if/how they might want to shake up library instruction for FYS, and here are their responses:

- It looks like the faculty are open to changes, especially a move towards more online instruction, but most want to keep some sort of in-class instruction as well.

Comments:

- “The fourth box is a good idea. I feel like online supplements would be good, but there is something about the human dynamic that is essential.”
- “A physical tour of the library would be good.”
- “Information literacy should definitely be expanded for FYS – so much of what we are doing is discussing information/knowledge, where it comes from, perspectives, etc. ...and more involvement from the library would really, really strengthen that.”
- “I like in class instruction and discussion. A module on using the BU library search engine would be helpful. One may exist already – linking it to FYS resources would help.”
Section Four: Student Feedback

At the end of most classes, students were asked to complete a “One Last Thing!” form and answer two questions. Out of the 585 responses collected, a random sample of 100 was evaluated and categorized by topic.

Question One: What is one thing you learned in the session today?

- 52% mentioned how to evaluate sources to determine if something is substantial
- 45% mentioned the library website, databases, or search techniques
- 12% mentioned that they learned more about how Wikipedia is created and when or how to use it for research
- 5% mentioned that they learned how to contact a librarian for help

Question Two: What is one thing that is still unclear?

- 34% said that nothing was unclear
- 31% said they were still unsure about evaluating information. Most mentioned something specific that they still struggled with such as
  - The difference between primary and secondary sources
  - How to determine if something is original or repackaged
  - How to determine how much time and effort went into creating a source
  - The distinction between peer reviewed sources and others that cite other sources
  - How to determine the credibility of authors
  - Several said they just needed more practice
- 26% said they were unclear on how to use the library, both online and the physical collection. Many also mentioned specific things like:
  - How to locate a book on the shelves using LC call numbers
  - How to look for full text
  - Want to know more about the library databases
- 7% said they were unclear on how to cite their sources
- 4% said they were confused about whether or not they could use Wikipedia
- 3% said they were unclear on how to use information sources in their papers
Section Five: Student Work: Source Analysis Follow-Up Assignment

For the first time, we recommended that a specific follow-up assignment be given immediately following instruction. Some faculty already include annotated bibliographies, but we wanted the students to practice evaluating one source more extensively using the specific criteria discussed in class. Very few agreed to include the assignment, although some said that they already assigned something similar. We collected completed student work from two professors, from four sections, for a total of 60 student artifacts. Averages were taken from two librarians who rated the work using the rubric that follows.

Some thoughts on the results:

- Most students were able to summarize their source and describe how it would be useful to them
- Most students were able to identify the author/creator and their credentials, experience, or expertise and why that makes them authoritative on the topic
- Fewer students fully understood what makes a source original, shared, or repackaged and that could have something to do with the terminology we used
- Most students struggled to explain the creation process of a source and the review or editing process

With so many requirements for FYS, and syllabi and course schedules created in advance of library instruction, we understand the difficulty of adding yet another assignment. The follow-up assignment may not be the best option for reinforcing the concepts taught.
## FYS: Source Analysis Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Advanced 2.5-3</th>
<th>Developing 1.75-2.25</th>
<th>Beginning 1-1.5</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary &amp; Usefulness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides in-depth summary of source including purpose and scope and describes how it will be useful for the student’s topic</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides summary of source and partially describes how it will be useful for the student’s topic</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides brief summary of source</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not summarize the source</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the author/creator and their credentials, experience, or expertise and why that makes them authoritative on the topic</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the author/creator and their credentials, experience, or expertise</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the author/creator</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not identify the author/creator</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Originality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the criteria that make the source original, repackaged, or shared. Explains how the format determines the quality and usefulness of the source.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the criteria that make the source original, repackaged, or shared.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply states that the source is original, repackaged, or shared.</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not address originality</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creation Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully explains time and effort by identifying the author’s steps in the creation process and how that affects the quality and usefulness of the source.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains time and effort by identifying the author’s steps in the creation process</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefly addresses time and effort</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not address creation process</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review or Editing Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the specific review or editing process or absence of one and how that affects the quality and usefulness of the source</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies the specific review or editing process</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simply states whether or not the source was reviewed or edited</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not address review or editing process</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6: Action Steps Going Forward

- Share report with FYS coordinator
- Hold a focus group of FYS faculty to hear more candid feedback and needs going forward
- Create an online learning module on evaluating information to share with FYS coordinator and focus group by May, 2017
- Include more basic library information in instruction
- Consider how/if to address “fake news” in FYS instruction