

6-1-2014

# Librarians Matter! Impact on First-Year Information Literacy Skills at 5 Colleges

M. Sara Lowe

*Claremont University Consortium*

Char Booth

*Claremont University Consortium*

Sean M. Stone

*Claremont University Consortium*

Natalie Tagge

*Claremont University Consortium*

Alexandra Chappell

*Claremont University Consortium*

*See next page for additional authors*

---

## Recommended Citation

Lowe, M. Sara; Booth, Char; Stone, Sean M.; Tagge, Natalie; Chappell, Alexandra; and Burrow, Gale, "Librarians Matter! Impact on First-Year Information Literacy Skills at 5 Colleges" (2014). *Library Staff Publications and Research*. Paper 22.  
[http://scholarship.claremont.edu/library\\_staff/22](http://scholarship.claremont.edu/library_staff/22)

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by the Library Publications at Scholarship @ Claremont. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Staff Publications and Research by an authorized administrator of Scholarship @ Claremont. For more information, please contact [scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu](mailto:scholarship@cuc.claremont.edu).

---

**Authors**

M. Sara Lowe, Char Booth, Sean M. Stone, Natalie Tagge, Alexandra Chappell, and Gale Burrow



# Librarians Matter!\* Impact on First-Year Information Literacy Skills at 5 Colleges

Sara Lowe, Assessment Librarian (AiA Team Leader); Char Booth, Instruction Services Manager & E-Learning Librarian; Sean Stone, Science & Asian Studies Librarian; Natalie Tagge, Instruction Librarian; Alexandra Chappell, Embedded Services Coordinator, Art & Gender Studies Librarian; Gale Burrow, Assistant Director Library Educational Services— Claremont Colleges Library, Claremont, CA

FMI: [sara\\_lowe@cuc.claremont.edu](mailto:sara_lowe@cuc.claremont.edu);  
<http://libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/AiA>

## Research Question

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

## Methodology

4 Liberal Arts College First-Year Seminar/ Experience programs

- Claremont McKenna College, Pitzer College, Pomona College, Scripps College
- papers from 5<sup>th</sup> college, Harvey Mudd, still being scored
- Courses have different learning outcomes and assignments
- BUT all require use of outside sources and are able to be scored using IL rubric

First-Year Student 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)

416 papers

- 14 interrater pairs
- Jan-May, 2014

Rubric‡ evaluation of papers : 3 areas - Attribution, Evaluation of Sources, Communication of Evidence


Rubric Levels:

- 1 = initial
- 2 = emerging
- 3 = developed
- 4 = highly developed

## Data

### Overall Results

Total First-Year Paper Rubric Scores by Librarian Collaboration Level




	Attribution	Evaluation	Communication
p-value (one shot v. high)	0.00000523	0.00000329	0.0000078

< .05 is statistically significant

### College Specific-Results

#### College A : by Collaboration Level


Papers from 11 of 31 sections (n=72). Most collaborations are one-shots.



	Attribution	Evaluation	Communication
p-value (one shot v. high)	0.05019	0.286363	0.014926

#### College B : by Collaboration Level


Papers from 17 of 17 sections (n=162). 95% confidence level (5% margin of error). All collaborations higher than one-shots (Level 3 or 4).



	Attribution	Evaluation	Communication
p-value (3 v. 4)	0.130579	0.047787	0.270188

#### College C : by Collaboration Level


Papers from 15 of 19 sections (n=151). 95% confidence level (5% margin of error). Equal balance of one-shot and higher level collaborations.



	Attribution	Evaluation	Communication
p-value (one shot v. high)	0.0115	0.0000229	0.01859765

#### College D : total scores

Papers from 2 (one each Level 2 and Level 3) of 11 sections (n=31). Most courses do not collaborate with librarians.



## 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 student's 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.



This project is part of the program "Assessment in Action: Academic Libraries and Student Success" which is undertaken by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) in partnership with the Association for International Research and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities. The program, a cornerstone of ACRL's Value of Academic Libraries Initiative, is made possible by the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

\* Special thanks to Dani Brecher, Instructional Design and Technology Librarian, Claremont Colleges, for the Librarians Matter! Infographic of pilot study results. See: [http://bit.ly/CCL\\_infographic](http://bit.ly/CCL_infographic).

‡ 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://go.carleton.edu/6a>).