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**Research Question**

“What impact (if any) does librarian intervention in first-year courses have on IL performance in student work?”

**Methodology**

- Course types: 5 Liberal Arts College First-Year Seminar/Experience programs
- Claremont McKenna College, Pomona College, Scripps College, Harvey Mudd College
- Courses have different learning outcomes and assignments
- BUT all require use of outside sources and are able to be scored using IL rubric

**Librarian Collaboration**

- Papers coded by Level of Librarian Collaboration in Course:
  - 1 = None
  - 2 = Low (one-shot)
  - 3 = Moderate (multiple sessions, moderate syllabus/assignment collaboration)
  - 4 = High (multiple sessions, online tutorial & quiz, significant syllabus/assignment collaboration)

**Papers**

- 521 Papers
- 17 interrater pairs
- Jan-July, 2014

**Combining and scoring papers**

- Originally adapted from a rubric at Carleton College (Gould Library Reference and Instruction Department. “Information Literacy in Student Writing Rubric and Codebook.” Northfield, MN: Carleton College, 2012. http://libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/AiA)

**Rubric**

- Rubric evaluation of papers: 3 areas: Attribution, Evaluation of Sources, Communication of Evidence
- Rubric Levels:
  - 1 = initial
  - 2 = emerging
  - 3 = developed
  - 4 = highly developed

**College Specific-Results**

- **College A**
  - Papers from 11 of 31 sections (n=72). Most collaborations are one-shots.
  - Attribution: 2.7 2.5 2.43 2.53 2.32 2.72
  - Evaluation: 2.21 2.61 2.36 2.89 2.35 2.82
  - Communication: 2.13 2.61 2.36 2.89 2.35 2.82

- **College B**
  - Papers from 17 of 17 sections (n=162). All collaborations higher than one-shots (Level 3 or 4).
  - Attribution: 2.61 2.75 2.65 2.84 2.75 2.82
  - Evaluation: 2.61 2.75 2.65 2.84 2.75 2.82
  - Communication: 2.61 2.75 2.65 2.84 2.75 2.82

**Results**

- Students in courses with Level 2 (one-shot) Librarian Collaboration scored lower (statistically significantly lower) in all three Information Literacy rubric skill areas than those in courses with Level 3 and 4 Librarian Collaboration.
- No statistically significant difference overall between students’ IL skills in Level 3 vs. Level 4 courses. Is there a library instruction “sweet spot”?
- Not enough Level 1 collaboration papers received to make any conclusions about students’ IL skills in classes with no Librarian Collaboration.

**Conclusion**

While it has long been suspected that the one-shot is not as effective as more intensive collaborations on students’ Information Literacy skills in the long-term, this project provides evidence that this is the case.

In short, the more collaborative and scaffolded the instruction, the more effective library instruction appears to be. Based on these results, we recommend librarians (and faculty) continue (or increase) their efforts to design assignments and syllabi in collaboration as well as strategically involve librarians in the classroom.