Building Competencies

Using the ACRL Framework to Construct an Information Literacy Lab for Undergraduate Students

JÉRÉMIE LEBLANC AND VICTORIA TSONOS, ST. PAUL UNIVERSITY

*I*N 2000, THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE RESEARCH LIBRARIES (ACRL) introduced the *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education.*[1] After fifteen years, and as scholarship and teaching evolved to meet changing requirements, the *Framework* was developed to meet the new challenges and realities of students' needs. The advent of the *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* in 2015[2] (hereafter the *Framework*) provides academic institutions with renewed mechanisms allowing for a better understanding of fundamental concepts and allowing the information consumer to become an active participant in the creation and use of knowledge. Also in 2015, the library at Saint Paul University (SPU) was asked how it could better support academic student success.

During the summer of 2015, the Chief Librarian (CL) was invited to a planning meeting under the Vice-Rector Academic and Research, during which there was a thorough discussion on how the library could help with student achievement. This discussion focused on librarian instruction for providing students with better research skills and tools to avoid plagiarism. Knowing how information literacy (IL) could play an important role in students' lives during and after their time at university and that the competencies they develop could support them throughout their lives, the Chief Librarian agreed to research ways in which the library could support their students by participating in some way with the core courses offered at SPU.

The arrival of the *Framework* and the request from university administration provided the perfect opportunity to create something new and challenging for the library and something fresh and creative for the students. The HTP courses (Humanities, Theology and Philosophy) were created to provide students with

fundamentals inspired through the programs offered at Saint Paul University. Initially there were four HTP courses: HTP1101: *Trends in Western Thought*; HTP1102: *The Artistic & Literary Imagination*; HTP1103: *People, Politics and the Planet* and HTP1104: *Faith, Justice and the Common Good.* The Library's goal was to find a way to collaborate with these HTP courses and implement the teaching of information literacy (IL) skills within them. The *Framework* offered a starting point to examine the various IL needs of students and provides suggestions on how the library could work alongside the HTP courses. From the *Framework,* various concept thresholds were identified as fitting the courses: Research and Inquiry; Searching as Strategic Exploration; Authority is Constructed and Contextual; Information Has Value; and Information Creation as a Process.

To better understand the challenges of this initiative, this chapter will first look at the university's history and the makeup of its student body. This background will be followed by a literature review on the *Framework* and information literacy and then a discussion and analysis on the set-up of the initial pilot project and its growth from conception to full implementation in the fall 2018 semester.

Saint Paul University (SPU) is a small bilingual (French–English) Catholic university located in the heart of Canada's national capital Ottawa. The university's history dates back to 1848, with the founding of Bytown College by the Oblates of Mary Immaculate, and it sits on the grounds of the former university seminary of the University of Ottawa. After the split with the University of Ottawa in 1965, SPU kept its ecclesiastical faculties, those of Theology, Canon Law and Philosophy as well as a handful of programs. These other programs eventually combined to create a new faculty of Human Sciences and Philosophy, which currently has departments in Conflict Studies; Counselling, Psychotherapy and Spirituality; Ethics, Social Justice and Public Service; Social Communication; Social Innovation; and Transformative Leadership and Spirituality. Since SPU is bilingual, courses in each language are commonly offered and students have the right to submit their assignments in either language, not necessarily in the language of the course being offered.

Currently, the University has approximately 1,100 students split roughly 60/40 between undergraduate and graduate students. When the pilot was initiated in 2015, the university only had approximately 750 students. The makeup of the student body was not typical of most other universities, with less than 21% of its students under the age of 24 and only a handful of students coming directly from high school. Since 2015, the number of students coming directly from high school has continued to increase (38 students enrolled directly from high school in 2018). However, as seen in the table below, the university has a significant number of mature students aged 40 or older. At the time the pilot

started, they represented almost 45% of the student body, which fell to 34% in 2018 while the number of registered students remained approximately the same. The university has also maintained just under 20% of its enrollment from international students stemming from over 100 countries.

Age group	Fall 2016	Fall 2018
18-24	21%	30%
25-29	14%	17%
30-39	29%	19%
40-49	22%	17%
50+	23%	17%

TABLE 1 - Student enrollment at Saint Paul University by age group (undergraduate and graduate)

Such a diverse student body, in terms of age and linguistic culture, presents a variety of challenges. As noted in the table below, in 2018 the age groups were quite varied. All the same, 59% of these students were adult learners as defined by McCall, Padron and Andrews (students over the age of 24).[3] Depending on the experience, knowledge and access to computers as well as methods of teaching and understanding concepts, for adult learners in particular there could be challenges with digital literacy. Having an approach that welcomes everyone and that is adaptive regardless of his or her experience and background is key to a successful training experience.

Age group	Fall 2016	Fall 2018
18-24	35%	41%
25-29	14%	17%
30-39	19%	17%
40-49	15%	14%
50+	17%	11%

TABLE 2 - Student enrollment at Saint Paul University by age group at the undergraduate level

Multiple factors had to be considered as the training was developed, which focused exclusively in the pilot on undergraduates. Split evenly between French and English, the bilingual student body was non-typical in its range of age groups, in having such a large number of adult learners, as well as in having

approximately 16% of the students within the undergraduate group coming from outside of Canada's borders.

Literature Review

With the arrival of the *Framework* in 2015, the interactions and processes around IL instruction have dramatically changed. The *Framework* allowed for "re-envision[ing] … [the] goals of information literacy and fundamentally seeks to help students to understand the knowledge-making process and to strengthen their own facility when it comes to using and creating diverse information or knowledge products."[4] Julia Bauder and Catherine Rod state that the "*Framework* represents a radically different understanding of information literacy" and one premised differently compared with the ACRL *Standards* published more than a decade earlier.[5] Associate Librarian for Information Literacy at Trinity Western University William Badke explains that "librarians and faculty need to work together to determine learning outcomes for various frames and then develop instructional sessions and assignments that will make these genuine threshold concepts … that both create student scholars and enable them to engage in significant research."[6] The *Framework* changes the approach and results, allowing for a more adaptive way of learning and understanding key concepts and research questions. These new concepts were defined in the *Framework* to better address the changing needs of students and to prepare them for the workforce. However, there is no perfect formula and there are varying degrees of success in implementing the *Framework.*

While librarians tend to deliver one-time training sessions or else are invited to courses, on rare occasions librarians can be embedded in courses and play a more significant role in IL. In some cases, librarians are able to work with faculty to conceive plans on how to better integrate the *Framework.*[7] The *Framework* allows for more flexibility when determining outcomes. As Jacobson and Gibson state, the "*Framework* does not enumerate learning outcomes, but offers great freedom for librarians to write their own at their institutions, or to adapt or revise their current IL outcomes."[8] Insua, Lantz and Armstrong at the University of Illinois at Chicago have documented the roadblocks with first-year "students as they struggle with and learn how to conduct research."[9] However, identifying outcomes does not mean success as students face a variety of challenges, and retaining the skills learned without continued practice such as in academic assignments is very important for long-term success. If the concepts are well taught and the students can apply these, there is a chance that they will use these skills throughout their academic and future career(s).

Realizing that there are various challenges that can come from providing embedded undergraduate IL instruction, our institution also had to deal with bilingualism, international students, and adult learners in the mix with regular undergraduate students. In dealing with international students, Susan Avery noted that "adjustments … [including] class pace and language are important… assignment expectations must be clear and directions for completing them must be given in multiple formats."[10] There are a variety of issues that can arise from international students, some are ESL (English as second language) or FSL (French as second language) students and might have a different understanding of what plagiarism means. Beyond that, as mentioned, the student population at SPU is also varied in age and this presents challenges with andragogy or adult learning. In defining students over the age of 25 as adult learners, McCall, Padron and Andrews also explain that:

> [t]he central tenets of andragogy, as developed by Malcolm Knowles (2012) and based on the original theories of Eduard Lindeman, are: "(1) the learner's need to know, (2) self-concept of the learner, (3) prior experience of the learner, (4) readiness to learn, (5) orientation to learning, and (6) motivation to learn" (p. 3). In the classroom, this translates to a "focus on learning rather than on teaching," and on lifelong learning to where students are taught skills and strategies they can apply to their career(s) and throughout their lifespan (Knowles, 1980, p. 18). These concepts are now familiar to most educators since Lindeman and Knowles' original work, and many recent education studies use the principles of andragogy.[11]

As these concepts are not necessarily new, they cannot be forgotten when instructing students who vary in age. Some of these concepts can also be applied to international learners. Ishimura and Bartlett note that "It does not necessarily follow that librarians are equipped to teach effectively in these circumstances."[12] International students pose a challenge but, by using the concept thresholds from the *Framework* and considering the educational theories around adult learners, there are ways to deliver effective and efficient training. Because of a lack of literature on the subject, it is difficult to determine how students from various demographics respond to IL instruction using the *Framework*. Too often these groups are conflated for analysis, but rarely are they segregated or defined in studies as individual pieces to the bigger picture.

The Pilot

Shortly after the meeting that initiated the call for IL skills for all undergraduate students, the Chief Librarian (CL) met with the Dean of Human Sciences and Philosophy as the Humanities, Theology, and Philosophy courses fell under their responsibility. After an initial discussion, the CL discussed with the program coordinator overseeing the HTP courses how an IL component could be added to the HTP courses. The professor in charge presented no challenges as he saw the benefits and supported the Vice-Rector Academic's decision. As indicated ealier, there are four HTP courses, and each one is offered in French and in English, normally two French (e.g., HTP 1 & 2) and two English (e.g., HTP 3 & 4) are offered during the fall session and then two French (e.g., HTP 3 & 4) and two English (e.g., HTP 1 & 2) during the winter session. The library had to plan out how it would teach to all of these groups. Normally there are approximately 120–160 students in total per semester registered in these courses. The French courses tend to have more students, usually 30–60 per course as the English courses tend to have 25–40 students registered.

As this was a pilot, there was initial brainstorming with librarians over the results. Meeting with the program coordinator, the CL specifically discussed the approach, engaging students, what's the added value, among other topics, while also thinking of strategies to encourage the greatest participation. The librarians along with the CL determined that voluntary IL workshops would provide the best service to the students as well as provide a solid starting point. The library proposed to teach elements through two training sessions one and a half hours in length. Each course was taught by different professors, normally two or three professors sharing the twelve-week semester, each of them teaching four or six classes. This arrangment meant, however, that the library was not allowed to use class time for its instruction. We opted to offer our training sessions during the lunch hour, when no classes were scheduled on campus in hopes of drawing in more students. We also offered the option to do individual one-on-ones with students if they had valid reasons they could not attend lunch hour workshops (e.g., job, medical appointments).

In order to draw students in, the CL suggested that bonus points could be offered to students participating in the training sessions. Initially, up to ten bonus points were proposed for students taking part in the training and completing the assignments. These bonus marks could then be applied to their final grade for the course. The professor in charge of the program was on board with this idea, hoping that we would draw in more participants. However, during the fall 2015 semester only fifteen students out of a potential 120 came to the workshops and completed the assignments. In the winter session, 28 students signed up for the

training out of a potential of 130. The class average in the fall was 7.4/10 bonus marks and in the winter session it was 6.7/10.

During the fall 2016 and winter 2017 sessions, students were offered up to 15 bonus points in the hopes of drawing more students to the sessions. During the fall and winter sessions, the number of participants went up to 69 and 51, respectively. Overall, the 2016–17 school year attracted more students, 120 out of a possible 230, drawing over 50% of the students to take part in the IL sessions. The fall average was 9.33/15 and winter average was 7.27/15. We believed that the increase in potential bonus marks attracted more students to participate; however, the overall average is not indicative of the participation. In these calculations, students who just showed up to a training session and never submitted assignments were counted, as we had also allotted points for class participation. The students could have potentially received three points just by going to the two training sessions. The highest mark achieved was 14.4/15.

The pilot project plan was intended to last two years with the goal of implementing these sessions as a mandatory component of the HTP courses for the fall of 2017. However, in 2017 the University's curriculum review came into place and the HTP courses were to be redesigned. This meant that the pilot could continue with the fall session using the current courses or wait for the new courses to be launched in the fall of 2018. The Dean assured the library would not be forgotten in the curriculum review and that an IL component would be fully integrated in the courses. However, with the curriculum review completed, the courses had changed, and the library was offered a new opportunity. The workshops would have to be combined and attached to one HTP course in French and one in English. In order for the library workshops to be integrated into the course, we proposed to teach for ten hours of class time. However, the faculty did not want to release class time. A compromise was achieved by creating a mandatory "library lab" (outside of class hours) to one of the HTP courses that would be divided over ten weeks and last one hour per week. With that, the library would also receive 30% of the final course grade to be attributed through assignments and class participation.

Creating the Course Syllabus

Once the library lab had been approved by the Faculty of Human Sciences, the library began crafting the syllabus (see Appendix 7A). The purpose of the lab was to complement the new HTP critical writing course by introducing basic IL skills to students–an essential component for academic achievement. The *Framework* was then consulted and adapted according to our needs. The *Framework* was

adapted to best fit the unique student demographic, the first-year experience as well as the university's focus on humanities and social science programs. As SPU is a bilingual university, content for the different sections of the course created needed to be available in French and English, which meant each assignment, quiz and presentation had to be designed in both languages.

In addition to consulting the *Framework* in creating the syllabus, course structure and assignments, librarians also wanted to highlight the various library services and tools that are offered to students. For many students, a similar course is offered upon entering Saint Paul, but many of these students never set foot in the library and weren't aware of library services, or even aware where the library was located. Integrating information about the services and resources and giving students access to and regular interaction with a librarian on a weekly basis demystified the library and made it a space that students could feel more comfortable using.

In the pilot, different aspects of the *Framework* were explored, which informed the exercises and assignments that were created. For the HTP library lab, the assignments from the pilot were adapted to better follow the structure of the course. In addition to exploring the *Framework*'s six threshold concepts, we also explored the librarian's first-hand experiences with students in one-on-one appointments and reference interviews. This was accomplished by examining the students' current IL skills and the need to address these skills with a diverse set of students from different countries, backgrounds and ages. Based on student demographics, the *Framework* suggestions and one-on-one experiences, it was determined that presenting library resources, citations and academic integrity, and evaluation of sources needed to be priorities in this lab.

Once the main concepts of IL were taught, practical applications were examined to incorporate the concepts, such as annotated bibliographies and literature reviews. These were taught more specifically to help students directly with future assignments in other courses and to show how to practically apply what had been taught during the semester. Each of the six concept thresholds were consulted in the pilot and further examined when expanding the pilot for the lab. Special attention was given to the concepts of Authority is Constructed and Contextual, Information Has Value, and Searching as Strategic Exploration, as these concepts aligned well with the IL issues we were seeing in students from across each demographic. The lab also touched upon Information Creation as Process, Research as Inquiry, and Scholarship as Conversation, although to a lesser extent than the other concepts. While these concept thresholds were used as guidelines for the creation of the syllabus, the *Framework* was ultimately used as a guideline and needed to be adapted to prioritize certain concepts for the needs of SPU students. Using the *Framework* helped outline the course and

establish a foundation of information tools and strategies to build upon throughout the course and for future in-library workshops.

The Course

The lab was offered over a 10-week period during the fall 2018 semester. This lab was meant to complement and accompany the English and French first-year writing course, also known as HTP1105 and HTP1505. The English course, titled *Critical Analysis, Reading and Writing Academic Works,* focused on establishing critical reading and thinking skills, as well as academic writing. For the library lab, the students were offered the option of choosing one of two one-hour sections. Once organized into two time slots, the first lab enrolled fifteen students with the second having six students. The lab was given in a lecture-style format with various exercises and in-class activities. The lectures were accompanied by presentation slides that were provided to the students on Brightspace (learning management system) after the second lab had finished. In general, students seemed receptive to the course and actively participated in class discussions. While there were no office hours in place for the librarians teaching the labs, students were encouraged to email and make appointments if they ever had any trouble.

The library also integrated the instruction of various tools promoted by the library such as Zotero and Yewno. The library recommends Zotero as a bibliographic management tool, and this was taught alongside citation styles. Yewno is a knowledge mapping tool that we have licensed and that is available through our research guides. This tool was taught alongside mind and concept mapping to help students visualize their research topics and use various tools to aid them with research, making connections between concepts and finding library sources.

Creation of Assignments

The assessment for this lab was divided into four parts (Appendix 7A): attendance and participation, two in-class quizzes, an essay, and an annotated bibliography. Each of these assessed various concepts within the *Framework*. Attendance and participation were considered important given the nature of the subject matter being taught and the value of the in-class exercises. The quizzes were also included to assess students' grasp of basic concepts throughout the course. The first quiz focused on creating a research question and applying search strategies,

as well as identifying the different types of sources, while the second focused on citation styles, plagiarism and academic integrity, as well as evaluating sources.

Each written assignment, the essay and the annotated bibliography, was designed to evaluate students' practical application of the concepts taught. For the essay, students were asked to explain why plagiarism was deemed unacceptable in an academic setting. They were required to use no less than three academic sources to support their arguments. The grading rubric for this assignment focused on the students' abilities to properly search and select academic sources, the use of citation styles and their knowledge of plagiarism and academic integrity (see Appendix 7B). The first assignment introduced students to the components of a research paper. For this assignment, students needed not only to demonstrate that they understood the concept of academic integrity, could discuss copyright, and could properly demonstrate proper attribution, but they also needed to demonstrate their research skills in finding peer-reviewed scholarly articles.

The second assignment was an annotated bibliography, which was designed to assess students' ability to take what was taught and apply it in a common assignment. The rubric for this assignment followed a similar pattern to the first. Emphasis was placed on the students' ability to identify the pertinent parts of their article for their needs and to properly evaluate their sources. Correct use of citation styles was given a heavier weight for this assignment, inasmuch as this seemed to be the biggest obstacle for the students. As preparation for this assignment, extra instruction was given on using citation styles.

Results

In general, this lab was well received by students. Students could now benefit from having continuous IL instruction instead of trying to push as much information as possible into a 50-minute workshop. The added element of it being compulsory meant that all students received this training, which helped reduce the gap in IL levels amongst first-year university students. Because of the particular demographics at Saint Paul, students are coming from various backgrounds, ages and knowledge levels. In general, the students verbally expressed that they felt the course was useful and the concepts were important, regardless of their age or previous university experience.

One thing of note was the similar nature of reasons for the significant gap in IL knowledge, whether first-year students coming directly from high school, mature students, or international students. Due to their years of being outside academia, some mature students indicated that they had forgotten many

concepts, as well as not being familiar with new tools and online resources. Students coming into university directly from high school as well as international students also expressed that they were not all taught basic IL skills, and their knowledge of online resources beyond Google was limited at best. All students, however, expressed their interest in learning new practices but also felt overwhelmed at the amount to learn. Moreover, the students generally expressed their lack of knowledge of citation styles, properly attributing their sources and finding and evaluating academic sources. When these concepts were introduced, citation styles proved the most difficult for the students to grasp. Practice exercises and examples were then given at the beginning of almost every class for the different citation styles (APA, MLA and Chicago, the three most used citation styles at SPU) to address this issue.

This gap in IL knowledge among different student populations provided one of the main reasons for designing the lab and making it compulsory, evidence of this gap in IL knowledge having been seen in various workshops and courses. Typically, the library offers in-library workshops as well as in-class presentations on demand, but as previously mentioned, one 50-minute workshop cannot adequately demonstrate and teach the various aspects of IL that the *Framework* recommends for students. In addition, many students do not take advantage of the library workshops that are offered each semester. By offering a compulsory lab, we were able to benefit from a traditional classroom setting and assess how the students absorbed and learned these skills.

By being able to evaluate the assignments and interact with students on a weekly basis, the librarians were able to better recognize the difficulties students were having that they weren't able to assess through the in-library workshops. Specific terms, expectations and basics that seemed obvious and straightforward to the librarians were either confusing or unknown to students. It helped the librarians better understand how they needed to adjust not only for this course but also for the future in-class and in-library workshops. Overall, both students and librarians benefited from this lab as it helped to give students a stronger IL foundation and to equip them with skills they might not have necessarily retained in a single 50-minute workshop. It also helped librarians identify the areas in which the IL gaps are greatest and how the library can best adapt and implement changes to further help our students.

Limitations

While the lab was generally seen as a success, moving forward there are some limitations that will need to be addressed to improve the lab for next year. Firstly,

the pilot project was put together very quickly. Official approval for the HTP library lab came mid-August; therefore, there was less than a month to prepare a syllabus, assignments and lectures. While elements from the pilot were used to create the lab, the process was still very rushed since it was so close to the beginning of the school year. Along with planning the HTP course, there were also different events and workshops that the library had planned for September, and with a small library staff it was difficult to plan the HTP lab and execute other regular library activities that are done each year.

Another issue caused by the short turnaround period was that the librarians did not have a chance to engage and collaborate with the professors teaching the HTP course. Initial contact was made prior to the course but there was no face-to-face interaction until the course began. There also was no time for collaboration between the course and its curriculum and the lab to ensure that there weren't scheduling conflicts or overlap in content. Librarians were told that the faculty members would base their instruction and class progress on the library lab as indicated in the syllabus. However, librarians teaching the lab did not see the official course syllabus until a week prior to the first class. This not only affected the librarians teaching the lab but also the students as well, as they were asked last minute to add an extra hour of class time to their schedule. This proved especially difficult because each student already had their class schedule finalized, which caused many conflicts when the administration tried scheduling the labs and accounting for student and librarian availabilty. Because at least one of the lab times had to pose no conflict with the students, this was extremely difficult to manage as some students were part-time and were only enrolled in evening classes, while others were full-time and had classes almost every day. Ultimately, the administration was able to find two appropriate time slots for the labs, but this still caused some inconvenience as students found out the first week of class that they needed to incorporate another hour into their weekly schedule. All the same, in their course evaluations students expressed their interest in reading more articles and having more take-home exercises. This was surprising as the lab added an extra hour to their course timetable at the last minute, as well as added extra work. While students did express their displeasure at the last-minute addition to this lab, they also expressed their gratitude and enthusiasm for the lab and understood its importance.

One change to focus on for future labs would be focusing less on the *Framework* and assuring that we meet most of the concepts but instead catering it more to the needs of our students and focusing on teaching lifelong information skills instead of the immediate academic benefits. The focus of this lab was to immediately equip the students with the tools they needed to succeed and complete their future assignments; however it was equally important to focus

on how the different concepts being taught could apply to more than just their academic careers and assignments.

Moving Forward

Moving forward, some possible changes and improvements could be incorporating more digital and media literacy instruction in the labs and using better real-world examples outside of academia. Another area for examination is students' own perceived knowledge of research practises and skills before the lab, followed by developing ways to track and assess the progression of IL skills and the impact of the lab on the students. Having a better understanding of what students already know and don't know and how big a gap there is between the knowledge of first-year students from high school, international students and mature students would better serve the wide range of students at SPU. This lab was created to accompany the HTP course to address a need that librarians and faculty were seeing. Continuing to adapt and improve upon this course as well as to collect more data/information on how this course affects students will help not only to justify this course but will hopefully help librarians to integrate similar labs, accompanying lectures or even full courses dedicated to IL and other library instruction.

This lab is currently only offered to undergraduate students enrolled in the HTP1105 and 1505. When the final syllabus was presented to the faculty council in Human Sciences, they expressed their interest in the possibility of the library developing a similar lab for graduate students in the Conflict Studies and Counselling and Spirituality programs. Further discussion and collaboration with these programs will need to address the unique needs of graduate students and how a similar lab can be created for them.

In conclusion, the implementation of a mandatory IL lab helped the library further support the faculty and students of SPU. Further collaboration with faculty will be essential in creating more strategies for IL instruction to support all students regardless of their demographic. Librarians could also benefit from examining the impact the lab has had on students' IL skills and their academic success in order to better adapt instruction. The *Framework* proved an essential tool in the realizing of the pilot project and will continue to be consulted for future IL teaching opportunities.

Bibliography

Association of College and Research Libraries. *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*. Chicago: American Library Association, 2010.

Association of College and Research Libraries. *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. Chicago: American Library Association, 2016.

Avery, Susan. "Setting Them Up for Success: Assessing a Pre-Research Assignment for First-Year International Students." *Communications in Information Literacy* 11, no. 2 (September 2017): 324–38. *https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2017.11.2.5*.

Badke, William. "DIKTUON: The Framework for Information Literacy and Theological Education: Introduction to the ACRL Framework." *Theological Librarianship* 8, no. 2 (October 2015): 4–7. *https://doi.org/10.31046/tl.v8i2.385*.

Bauder, Julia and Catherine Rod. "Crossing Thresholds: Critical Information Literacy Pedagogy and the ACRL Framework." *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 23, no. 3 (2016): 252–64. *https://doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2015.1025323*.

Fullard, Allison. "Using the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy to Foster Teaching and Learning Partnerships." *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science* 82, no. 2 (2016).

Insua, Glenda M., Catherine Lantz, and Annie Armstrong. "Navigating Roadblocks: First-Year Writing Challenges Through the Lens of the ACRL Framework." *Communications in Information Literacy* 12, no. 2 (January 1, 2018): 86–106.

Ishimura, Yusuke and Joan C. Bartlett. "Are Librarians Equipped to Teach International Students? A Survey of Current Practices and Recommendations for Training." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40, no. 3–4 (2014): 313–21. *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2014.04.009*.

Jacobson, Trudi E. and Craig Gibson. "First Thoughts on Implementing the Framework for Information Literacy." *Communications in Information Literacy* 9, no. 2 (September 2015): 102–10.

McCall, Rebecca Carlson, Kristy Padron, and Carl Andrews. "Evidence-Based Instructional Strategies for Adult Learners: A Review of the Literature." *Codex: The Journal of the Louisiana Chapter of the ACRL* 4, no. 4 (February 1, 2018): 29–47.

Mullins, Kimberly. "IDEA Model from Theory to Practice: Integrating Information Literacy in Academic Courses." *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 42, no. 1 (2016): 55–64. *https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.10.008*.

Wilder Gammons, Rachel and Lindsay Taylor Inge. "Using the ACRL Framework to Develop a Student-Centered Model for Program-Level Assessment."

Notes

1. ACRL, *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2016).
2. ACRL, *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* (Chicago: American Library Association, 2010).
3. Rebecca Carlson McCall, Kristy Padron, and Carl Andrews, "Evidence-Based Instructional Strategies for Adult Learners: A Review of the Literature," *Codex: the Journal of the Louisiana Chapter of the ACRL 4,* no. 4 (2018): 29.
4. Allison Fullard, "Using the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy to Foster Teaching and Learning Partnerships," *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Sciences* 82, no. 2 (2016): 48.
5. Julia Bauder and Catherine Rod, "Crossing Thresholds: Critical Information Literacy Pedagogy and the ACRL Framework," *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 23, no. 3 (2016): 262.
6. William Badke, "DIKTUON: The Framework for Information Literacy and Theological Education: Introduction to the ACRL Framework," *Theological Librarianship* 8, no. 2 (2015): 7.
7. Kimberly Mullins, "IDEA Model from Theory to Practice: Integrating Information Literacy in Academic Courses," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 42, no. 1 (2016): 57. Trudi. E. Jacobson and Craig Gibson, "First Thoughts on Implementing the Framework for Information Literacy," *Communications in Information Literacy* 9, no. 2 (2015): 109.
8. Jacobson and Gibson, 105.
9. Glenda M. Insua, Catherine Lantz, and Annie Armstrong, "Navigating Roadblocks: First-Year Writing Challenges through the Lens of the ACRL Framework," *Communications in Information Literacy* 12, no. 2 (2018): 100.
10. Susan Avery, "Setting Them Up for Success: Assessing a Pre-Research Assignment for First-Year International Students," *Communications in Information Literacy* 11, no. 2 (2017): 334.

511. Rebecca Carlson McCall, Kristy Padron, and Carl Andrews, "Evidence-Based Instructional Strategies for Adult Learners: A Review of the Literature," *Codex: the Journal of the Louisiana Chapter of the ACRL* 4, no. 4 (2018): 29.
12. Yusuke Ishimura and Joan C. Bartlett, "Are Librarians Equipped to Teach International Students? A Survey of Current Practices and Recommendations for Training," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40, no. 3–4 (2014): 313.

Appendix 7A: Library Lab Syllabus

HTP 1105: Library Lab

Course Code: HTP 1105 (library lab)
Schedule:
Wednesday 4:45-5:45.
Thursday 12:15-1:15.
Instructor:
Office Hours: by appointment.
*** HTP library labs will run from the second week of classes until the 11th week.

Description	In this mandatory library lab for the HTP foundational course the students will be introduced to the basic information literacy proficiency skills as outlined in the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education. We will implement several frames of the ACRL Framework by teaching students how to define their information needs, how to use mindmaps to brainstorm and visually outline their ideas, how to employ basic and advanced search strategies in a library catalogue and electronic databases, how to distinguish primary and secondary sources, the importance of academic integrity and citing sources, how to use a bibliographic management tool and the criteria for evaluating different types of sources. Students will sign up for **one** of the two timeslots available for the lab. If the dates above do not fit your schedule, contact your instructor **before the start of the course.**
Schedule	<u>Week 1:</u> Introduction to library resources and search strategies. <u>Week 2:</u> Creating mindmaps with library resources (Yewno). <u>Week 3:</u> Primary vs Secondary sources. <u>Week 4:</u> Citation Styles. (in-class quiz 1). <u>Week 5:</u> Using Zotero: a bibliographic management tool. <u>Week 6:</u> Plagiarism and Academic Integrity. <u>Week 7:</u> Annotated Bibliography (assignment 1 due). <u>Week 8:</u> Literature Review (in-class quiz 2). <u>Week 9:</u> Critical Evaluation of Sources. <u>Week 10:</u> Review + practical applications for courses (assignment 2 due).
Assessment	— Library lab is worth 30% of the final grade. — Assignments will be graded out of 100%. — 20% - Attendance/Participation. — 20% - Two in-class quizzes. — 30% - Essay on academic integrity/plagiarism (500 words). — 30% - Critical evaluation of sources assignment. — Assignments will be submitted through BrightSpace Friday at midnight on week 7 and 10.

Appendix 7B: Evaluation Rubric

Category	Excellent: (80-100)	Very Strong: (70-79)	Developing Skills: (60-69)	Work Needed: >60
Comprehension (9 points)	Clearly demonstrates that the student has understood the concept of plagiarism and academic integrity. The student has properly addressed the research topic.	The essay shows that the student has grasped the concept of plagiarism and academic integrity. The student has somewhat addressed the research topic.	The essay shows that the student has an insufficient grasp of concept of plagiarism and academic integrity. The student has not properly addressed the research topic.	The essay shows that the student has no understanding of the concept of plagiarism and academic integrity. The student has not properly addressed the research topic.
Research (9 points)	Student has performed a significant amount of research of the literature to answer the question (3 academic sources or more).	Student has performed adequate research of the literature to answer the question (at least 3 academic sources).	Student shows little evidence of going beyond a Google search to find internet resources (less than 3 academic sources).	Student shows little or no evidence of any research having been performed (less than 3 academic sources).
Referencing (6 points)	The essay is formatted using the APA style guide and the references are properly cited.	The essay showed a good effort at using the APA style guide and many references are properly cited.	The essay does not show an understanding of APA style and references are properly cited.	The essay does not show any effort to apply the APA style and no references are properly cited.
Organization (3 points)	The essay structure is very clear and enables the student to answer the question effectively.	The essay structure is sufficiently clear to enable the student to answer the question effectively.	The essay structure is insufficiently clear to enable the student to answer the question effectively.	The essay structure is very unclear that it does not indicate that the student answered the question effectively.
Language and Editing (3 points)	The essay demonstrates the correct use of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The use of language is effective and clearly communicates the ideas behind the essay. No errors that interfere with the reader's understanding of the essay.	Most of the essay demonstrates the correct use of grammar, punctuation and spelling. The use of language is good and sufficient to communicate the ideas behind the essay. There are some errors that interfere with the reader's understanding of the essay.	There are several mistakes in grammar, punctuation and spelling. The use of language is insufficient to clearly communicate the ideas behind the essay. There are several errors that interfere with the reader's understanding of the essay.	There are many mistakes in grammar, punctuation and spelling. The student's use of language is insufficient to communicate the ideas behind the essay. There are many errors that interfere with the reader's understanding of the essay.

Total out of 30: