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Project Narrative

The Claremont Colleges are a consortium of seven contiguous liberal arts institutions situated around a common library. Located in Claremont, CA, the campuses comprise a shared enrollment of roughly 7,000 students distributed across five undergraduate colleges (Claremont McKenna College, Harvey Mudd College, Pitzer College, Pomona College, and Scripps College) and two graduate universities (Claremont Graduate University and Keck Graduate Institute).

Within this singular academic context, the Claremont Colleges Library’s mission is to “partner with The Claremont Colleges in learning, teaching, and research. We are committed to fostering intellectual discovery, critical thinking, and life-long learning. Accordingly, the Library ties our academic community to varied cultural and scholarly traditions by offering user-centered services, building collections, developing innovative technologies, and providing an inviting environment for study, collaboration, and reflection” (http://libraries.claremont.edu/about/libraries/).

As a single institution serving a consortium of fiercely independent colleges, opportunities for innovation at the Claremont Colleges Library (CCL) are directly proportional to the complexity of its operations. In recent years, CCL has fostered a nationally recognized culture of practical creativity in the areas of learning, outreach, and user services. The Library has achieved significant programming and community engagement gains by customizing its distinctive programs to multiple campus cultures. Moreover, it has done so by maintaining a clear focus on evidence-based practice and resource scalability. CCL’s unique approach to creative program development and stakeholder engagement across a variety of interconnected projects form the basis for this SPIRL Award nomination.

Program of Innovation

In 2011, a Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) interim accreditation evaluation report indicated that “progress [was] needed in integrating the Library with the Claremont learning experience.” In response to this directive, the CCL Instruction Services (IS) unit was created in 2011 to shape the library’s vision for learning services. CCL has since created a robust program of innovation by meeting demonstrated
campus needs, strengthening intercampus collaboration, and leveraging emerging technologies to develop highly original pedagogical and marketing practices.

CCL’s specific program innovations include:

- **Strategic information literacy (IL) program development,**
- **Creative use of technology to identify instructional priorities and create learning opportunities,**
- **Value-added curricular collaboration with campus departments,**
- **Faculty and librarian instructor development to establish communities of practice,**
- **Holistic assessment efforts focused on ongoing improvement in pedagogy, student learning, and support for the Colleges’ accreditation processes,** and
- **DIY outreach strategies that foster user engagement.**

Each program component is detailed below, including evidence of outcomes and descriptions of clients served. An index of supplementary materials is provided at the conclusion of the narrative, and supplementary materials are indicated throughout the narrative with links and/or roman numerals. Publications and references in support of this nomination are embedded throughout the narrative.

**Strategic IL Program Development** - Since 2011, CCL’s IS Department has guided the Library’s IL instruction efforts using an iterative program planning process. Following a formal “futures planning” effort by IS staff that identified campus outreach around a common IL instruction and assessment framework as a top priority, an Information Literacy Steering Group (ILSG) was established in 2012 to facilitate the development of a coordinated instruction program vision through increased communication with Colleges stakeholders and IL integration into the Colleges’ curricula and accreditation processes. In response to the WASC decision to elevate IL to its five core accreditation competencies for institutions in 2012, the CCL ILSG developed a local information literacy definition in order to foster a common framework for understanding IL across the seven Claremont Colleges. CCL’s IL definition is built around five critical “Habits of Mind” for the 21st century: Inquiry, Evaluation, Communication, Attribution, and Insight (i).¹ Following intensive outreach to the Colleges by campus embedded librarians² and the ILSG chair, including co-participation in accreditation-related professional development events, the IL definition has been formally adopted by six of seven Claremont campuses (Claremont McKenna, Harvey Mudd, Pitzer, Scripps, Claremont Graduate University, and the Keck Graduate Institute) as their IL framework for accreditation and pedagogical purposes; discussions are currently underway for its adoption at Pomona College in the Spring 2014 semester. The Colleges’ adoption of

---

¹ Roman numerals refer to supplementary materials included with this nomination.
² In Fall 2012, a new governance structure created for the library involved the “embedding” of a librarian at each of the seven campuses to better facilitate communication between the campuses and the library. Embedded librarians serve on Colleges’ Curriculum and Teaching & Learning Committees as well as attending Faculty Meetings.
a common Library-created core competency definition is unprecedented in the history of the Consortium, and
represents a significant milestone in IL program development as well as the integration of librarians into
academic planning and assessment efforts. Based on these and other efforts, programmatic coverage of IL
instruction in first-year seminar programs has increased from three to all five of our undergraduate campuses
since 2011, while significant IL integration gains have also been made within capstone and research
methods courses. In addition to expanding its course-integrated instruction, in 2011 CCL IS developed “(Love
Your) Library Workshops”, which has since become a thriving and well-attended drop-in workshop series with
a highly recognizable marketing program (http://claremont.libcal.com/libraryworkshops). Arguably the
greatest contribution CCL has made to library learning innovation on a national scale is its innovative “visual
curriculum mapping” (VCM) program. Funded by a 2013-14 IMLS Sparks! grant (http://bit.ly/CCLSparks), this
visualization project facilitates knowledge management and subject librarian integration into academic
departments, and is discussed in more detail in the following section and in supplementary item ii.

Creative Technology Use - As mentioned above, a key CCL initiative is an IMLS grant-funded Visual
Curriculum Mapping effort. In this process, approximately twenty liaison librarians visually “map” their
respective subject areas among Claremont’s close to 50 academic programs by organizing information about
courses, faculty members, and degree requirements across the seven Colleges (iii, http://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/handle/10919/18710). Using concept mapping software to understand the complex landscape of instruction and outreach in a seven-college consortium with one library, librarians strategically identify the best points of intervention for IL instruction and other course- and program-related collaborations in each discipline (http://scholarship.claremont.edu/library_staff/18/). This innovative use of Mindomo (http://www.mindomo.com), a ‘freemium’ mind mapping software, has been well received by departments across the campuses (http://ea.pomona.edu/ea-5c-program-map/), and is being systematically applied across the Library for the first time this year. Other teaching and learning-related technology advances at CCL include the local adaptation of UC Irvine’s Start Your Research Tutorial (http://bit.ly/ccl-howtoresearch) and in-house creation of a graded quiz that can be integrated into courses via the campus learning management system (Sakai), a first-year faculty research map (http://bit.ly/CCL_1stmap), new digital learning objects (http://bit.ly/iltoolkit), easy-to-interpret infographics to communicate assessment findings (http://bit.ly/CCL_infographic), and a recently updated web presence (http://bit.ly/CCL_IS). Finally, in Fall 2013 CCL IS began offering its drop-in Love Your Library workshops online (http://bit.ly/LYL_online).

Curricular and Colleges Collaboration - To support IL instruction across the Colleges, increase
faculty engagement, and supplement the Visual Curriculum Mapping project, CCL IS developed specific
information literacy outcomes for first-year and capstone courses (iv) as well as created a successful

3 In Fall 2011, librarians taught 82 first-year classes with 1168 students; Fall 2012, 87 classes with 1311 students;
Fall 2013, 106 classes with 1580 students.
graduate-level “IL Labs” (v) instruction pilot with its own learning outcomes to correct a long-term gap in graduate-level IL instruction. All IL outcomes are customized to course level and learner population, and provide jumping-off points for conversations with faculty members about embedding information literacy into the curriculum, creating a frame for progression of IL skills over the college career. Embedded librarians at each of the seven Colleges collaborate with their respective first-year instruction coordinators, assessment officers, and teaching and learning committees to advocate for robust instruction across the curriculum based on the Library’s IL outcomes. To support broad capstone project requirements at the undergraduate Colleges, CCL IS has emphasized a focus on publication of senior theses in the Library’s open access repository, Scholarship@Claremont, and tailored its instruction with capstone groups to the responsibilities of engaging in the “scholarly conversation” (http://scholarship.claremont.edu/eap_ea_theses/). Faculty report that this growing initiative to encourage OA capstone participation has resulted in significant positive effects on student performance (http://scholarship.claremont.edu/pomona_fac_pub/377/). A similar librarian/faculty collaboration has developed assignments wherein students create well-researched and documented Wikipedia articles on topics related to American Politics (http://infomational.wordpress.com/2012/04/26/oaftw/).

**Faculty and Librarian Instructor Development** - Professional development and the creation of intentional communities of practice are keystones of CCL’s programs at both the faculty and librarian level. The Library leads annual “Research Assignment Workshops” for Colleges faculty, which allows for an ongoing discussion of course syllabi informed by IL learning outcomes. Pedagogy-focused professional development series created by IS for teaching librarians and library staff since 2011 include a biennial “Teaching Librarians Retreat” to focus on skills and themes for the coming semester; inclusive “SkillShares” that allow for topical, open discussion and presentation sessions; “Lib&Learn Workshops” that impart practical teaching and technology skills, and a successful Peer Teaching Observation Program open to all Library staff. To further assist teaching librarians IS created a LibGuide-based “Habits of Mind Toolkit” (http://bit.ly/iltoolkit), with suggestions for ways to present IL content within each Habit of Mind in a student-centered and active way as well as lesson planning templates. This dynamic resource is revised each semester in response to new best practice ideas.

**Holistic Assessment** – CCL’s assessment efforts are diverse and thoroughly integrated into its instruction and outreach programs. IS promptly introduced LibAnalytics in 2011 to streamline instruction and research appointment reporting. The development of an innovative Sakai-based Instructor Portfolio system captures teaching materials, syllabi, and common evaluations in all first-year librarian instruction (http://bit.ly/CCL_portfolios). In the 2011-12 academic year, CCL IS created, evaluated, and revised a rubric (vi) to assess IL in student writing. This rubric has been used to conduct “authentic” student work evaluation

---

4 In the 2012-13 academic year, there were 68 (Love Your) Library sessions with 398 attendees.
projects, is frequently integrated by faculty into courses across the Colleges, and has been formally adopted as an accreditation evaluation rubric by Claremont McKenna College and the Keck Graduate Institute (http://scholarship.claremont.edu/library_staff/17). In collaboration with campus assessment officers and first-year seminar program coordinators over 2012-13, CCL conducted multiple formal studies of first-year and capstone student writing to assess current student competencies in IL Habits of Mind. Results have tended to indicate a strong need for additional IL instruction, supporting additional collaboration and integration into first-year seminar programs and beyond. A recent IL rubric evaluation of student first-year seminar papers at Pitzer College indicated significant librarian course interaction in the form of syllabus and assignment design collaboration and multiple workshops resulted in statistically significant improvements in student IL performance in end-of-term research papers (vii). The design of this evaluation project also provides the basis for CCL’s participation in the inaugural 2013-14 ACRL Assessment in Action program (http://www.ala.org/acrl/aia).

**DIY Outreach** – A critical element of sustaining CCL’s teaching and learning initiatives involves engaging our user communities through a series of creative “do it yourself” (DIY) marketing and outreach efforts. These projects help inject humor and personality into CCL’s more academically oriented programs, and create lasting connections with students, faculty, and campuses staff. In 2011 CCL purchased two button makers and created local library-themed button templates for use in outreach, a highly visible marketing strategy that won CCL an honorable mention in the 2012 LLAMA “Best of Show Award” (http://libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/buttonmakers). Claremont students and faculty have been extremely receptive to the buttons and button presses, which, in addition to being used for library marketing purposes, circulate to student groups and campus offices on a weekly basis. Button making as a marketing strategy has since become widely duplicated in academic libraries, thanks in large part to the open access CCL “Love Your Library” and other button templates that are frequently downloaded and duplicated in the field (http://infomational.wordpress.com/2013/08/19/wait-for-it-new-buttonmaker-templates/). Because of the unique consortial nature of the Claremont Colleges and the naturally temperate climate of Southern California, CCL also purchased a food vendor pushcart cart in 2011 and has since converted and used it as a “Mobile Library,” traveling between campuses to engage with users who may not come to the physical building. During the 2012-13 academic year, the cart was deployed 43 times and interacted with 1640 people – a quarter of the Colleges’ population. Beyond regular campus outings it is also used for special events (e.g., Valentine’s Day, Halloween, Back-to-School) and often in conjunction with the button maker, which has proven a popular combination (see http://infomational.wordpress.com/2011/12/19/project-curve-part-five-library-on-wheels/). A final example of CCL’s creative outreach engagement is RE:BOOK, an annual “repurposed book art” contest (http://libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/rebook) that encourages students to think about their use of and interactions with books and critically analyze the book as a physical object. Since its inception RE:BOOK has generated fabulous submissions in its first two years (see http://bit.ly/ccl-rebook2012-fb for

**Conclusion**

Through the creative and evidence-based strategies described above, CCL has created a diverse and integrative learning services and outreach platform that intersects with a wide range of clients across the Colleges. In a few short years, by significantly reimagining its approach to teaching, learning, and user services, CCL has achieving unprecedented gains in community engagement and championed an ethic of holistic assessment throughout the institution. Ongoing evaluation of CCL’s IL curriculum integration efforts continues to show that librarian intervention and closer collaboration with faculty leads to improved student performance, while enthusiastic user engagement with CCL’s creative marketing and outreach programs enriches the Colleges’ relationship to the library. Minimal costs and open documentation of best practices makes CCL’s contributions readily transferable to institutions of differing sizes and configurations, providing a model for engaging an academic community with outcomes-focused Library initiatives while encouraging a collaborative community of practice.

---
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**Principal Players**

- *Char Booth* is CCL’s Head of Instruction Services & E-Learning Librarian and liaison to the five-College Environmental Analysis program. Char is a faculty member of the Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) Information Literacy Immersion Institute, and received the 2012 ACRL Instruction Section Ilene F. Rockman Publication of the Year award for her book, *Reflective Teaching, Effective Learning: Instructional Literacy for Library Educators* (ALA Editions, 2011).
• **Dani Brecher** is CCL’s Instructional Design & Technology Librarian. She supports librarians, faculty, students, and staff to effectively integrate academic technology and design principles, and has presented nationally on technology integration in libraries and information literacy instruction.

• **Sara Lowe** is CCL’s Assessment Officer & Librarian and is a subject specialist for a number of social sciences disciplines, including Political Science. Sara regularly collaborates and provides support for faculty and students in these disciplines. She has published and presented nationally on information literacy and collection development.

• **Sean Stone** is CCL’s Science & Asian Studies Librarian and is a subject specialist for most of the science disciplines, including Chemistry. Sean regularly collaborates and provides support for faculty and students in these disciplines. He has published and presented nationally on the integration of information literacy into science curriculum and outreach to faculty.

• **Natalie Tagge** is CCL’s Instruction Librarian and is a subject specialist for a number of humanities fields, including Spanish Literature. Natalie regularly collaborates and provides support for faculty and students in these disciplines. She has published and presented nationally on technology integration into libraries and information literacy instruction and assessment.

---

**Statement by Nominator - Kevin Mulroy, A.J. McFadden Dean of the Claremont Colleges Library**

I am pleased to request your consideration of the Claremont Colleges Library’s (CCL) application for a Stanford Prize for Innovation in Research Libraries (SPIRL) award for 2014.

I began work as the first A.J. McFadden Dean of the CCL on July 1, 2013. These are my impressions after six months in the position. The Claremont Colleges Consortium is a fascinating yet unusually complex and nuanced organization. The library serves all seven of the Claremont Colleges. Each of the five undergraduate colleges has its own distinct history, culture, and identity, while the Claremont Graduate University (CGU) and the Keck Graduate Institute focus on the postgraduate experience. The library also has an unusual governance model: the dean reports into the lead college (CGU), while the library organization administratively resides beneath the umbrella of the Claremont University Consortium. Given these challenges, the response of our Instruction Services (IS) team to the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) 2011 recommendation to integrate the library more systemically into the teaching and learning profiles of the Claremont Colleges has been remarkable.

Following WASC’s elevation of Information Literacy Instruction (ILI) to one of its five core competencies for undergraduate colleges in 2012, the IS team mobilized quickly and effectively to implement an innovative and sweeping new series of services and programs for the Claremont Colleges. As detailed in the application, the team focused on six key areas: strategic ILI program development; creative use of technology; collaboration with the colleges on curriculum
development; support and advocacy for communities of practice that include faculty and librarian instructors; robust assessment; and DIY outreach.

Key to this effort has been the development of a unique visual curricular mapping (VCM) program, funded by an IMLS Sparks! Innovation Grant. VCM combines integrated ILI and assessment in asserting a positive leadership role for the library in the academic enterprise. It charts interconnectedness between the Claremont Colleges and interdisciplinary scholarship. VCM features an innovative data visualization approach to a highly distributed model; evidence-based decision-making; and targeted services. The program offers a scalable model that can easily be adopted by other organizations, giving it international significance.

The CCL’s ILI assessment program has been bolstered by its engagement in the inaugural Association of College and Research Libraries’ Assessment in Action: Academic Libraries and Student Success program. Our active learning initiative is already producing results that dramatically document the positive impact of the library on student success in the first-year seminar.

I would be remiss were I not to mention the impact that Char Booth has exerted as the leader of our ILI program and IS team. The remarkable Ms. Booth is still relatively early career, yet has already amassed an outstanding list of accomplishments. An earlier ALA Emerging Leader and Library Journal Mover and Shaker, she is currently a faculty member of the ACRL Information Literacy Immersion Institute, and recently gave a keynote address at the Digital Library Federation annual conference. Ms. Booth is widely considered to be one of the most innovative librarians within our profession, and a national thought-leader in ILI. Ms. Booth is a willing and generous partner in sharing her team’s experience and expertise with colleagues. Under her outstanding leadership, Claremont’s IS team always considers how the services and programs it creates can serve as models for others, and best serve the profession as a whole.

I recommend this application to you with pride and passion, and without reservation.

Kevin Mulroy, MLS, Ph.D.
A.J. McFadden Dean of the Library
Claremont Colleges
800 North Dartmouth Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3941
(909) 621-8924
Kevin_mulroy@cuc.claremont.edu
Supplementary Item i.

CCL IL Definition and Sample First-Year and Capstone Learning Outcomes
Proposed Definition: Information Literacy at the Claremont Colleges

Claremont Colleges Library Information Literacy Steering Group - Spring 2013

The Western Association of Schools & Colleges recently adopted information literacy (IL) as one of five redesigned “core competencies” required for institutional accreditation. In order to foster a common framework for understanding IL across the Claremont Colleges, the Information Literacy Steering Group (ILSG) of the Claremont Colleges Library (CCL) presents the following definition of information literacy to be considered for adoption by each College:

Information Literacy at the Claremont Colleges: Engaging Critical Habits of Mind

Information literacy is the ability to use critical thinking to create meaningful knowledge from information. The information literate Claremont Colleges student:

● Engages in a process of inquiry in order to frame intellectual challenges and identify research needs;
● Strategically accesses and evaluates information;
● Communicates information effectively;
● Provides clear attribution of source materials used;
● And develops insight into the social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, access, and durability.

Supplementary/Supporting Documentation

The remainder of this document is not included in the IL definition, but provides elaboration on its five “critical habits of mind” as well as sample learning outcomes that are intended to clarify the role of IL in the Claremont student experience.

Critical Habits of Mind Skill/Competency Areas

1 Inquiry - interpreting assignments; determining information needs; developing a research strategy, question(s), and/or thesis to facilitate strategic information discovery and access; preliminary research tool and source selection
2 Evaluation - resource analysis, inference, and revision of research strategy
3 Communication - synthesis, integration, contextualization, and presentation of evidence in scholarship and creative work
4 Attribution - providing clear documentation of source materials; perceiving and engaging in a scholarly conversation; understanding copyright regulations, fair use, and when to seek permissions
5 Insight - critical understanding of the social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, access, and durability

Sample Information Literacy Learning Outcomes

First-Year Outcomes

At the culmination of their initial year at the Claremont Colleges, the information literate student should be able to:

1 Inquiry
   ● understand and interpret assignment parameters
   ● clearly define a research or information need
   ● conduct basic information search strategies
   ● develop a bibliography using resources beyond web-based or popular media sources

1 WASC’s redesigned core competencies are “written and oral communication, quantitative skills, critical thinking, and information literacy.” See http://wascsenior.org/redesign/revised-draft-2013-handbook.
2 Evaluation
- conduct preliminary research to inform a research question or information need
- engage with, understand, and draw inferences from scholarly work
- select sources that are broadly appropriate to a research topic
- distinguish between categories and types of information (e.g., fact v. opinion, scholarly v. popular, primary v. secondary)

3 Communication
- paraphrase arguments and provide basic summaries of information sources
- clearly distinguish between their own ideas and those of others
- provide a limited original synthesis of information sources

4 Attribution
- convey a preliminary understanding of why, when, and how to give attribution
- understand the criteria of academic honesty and how to avoid intentional and unintentional plagiarism
- cite basic information sources based on a specified style format in-text as well as in bibliography/endnotes/footnotes

5 Insight
- distinguish between institutionally provided and open web resources
- begin to recognize the universe of scholarship related to academic disciplines
- possess an emerging critical understanding of the social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, access, and durability

Capstone/Graduate Outcomes
At the culmination of their capstone undergraduate experience or at the graduate level, the information literate Claremont Colleges student should be able to:

1 Inquiry
- clearly articulate an information need, define appropriate keywords and revise them as necessary
- discover/access specialized information resources and explore multiple contexts of information creation
- identify and articulate the limits of the information that is available to them
- employ source materials in a way that demonstrates sophisticated independent thought

2 Evaluation
- effectively analyze information from multiple advanced sources into a project that represents significant new or novel information in their field of interest
- show an understanding/knowledge of scholarship related to topic
- choose appropriate resources for scope of information need

3 Communication
- organize, synthesize, and articulate a complex array of sources accessible to the intended audience
- integrate and synthesize evidence expertly to support claims

4 Attribution
- develop a thorough bibliography with multiple and diverse sources of information that indicates a clear grasp of the ‘scholarly conversation’ in a discipline or disciplines
- exhibit proper use of paraphrasing, citations, footnotes, etc. in advanced original work.
- demonstrate sophisticated understanding of why, when, and how to give attribution

5 Insight
- demonstrate a grasp of where, why, and how to obtain open access versus institutionally-affiliated research resources and articulate their institutional access privilege beyond open web resources
- understand the various social, political, and cultural factors that affect information creation, use, access, durability, and openness
- perceive how these factors may affect the ability to obtain information post-graduation and form an alternate access strategy based on subsequent information need and context (e.g., interlibrary lending, information in the professions)
- clearly recognize the universe(s) of scholarship related to academic disciplines and interdisciplines
Supplementary Item ii.

IMLS Sparks! Innovation Grant Visual Curriculum Mapping
Abstract and Schedule
The Claremont Colleges Library (CCL) seeks a $23,500 IMLS Sparks! Ignition Grant to support its 2013-2014 efforts to visualize the interconnected learning communities of its seven institutions; Claremont McKenna College, Claremont Graduate University, Harvey Mudd College, Keck Graduate Institute, Pitzer College, Pomona College, and Scripps College (the 7Cs). The Visual Curriculum Mapping (VCM) project will use concept mapping software\textsuperscript{1} to produce and archive web-based interactive maps of approximately fifty academic subjects and their consortial intersections in order to support information literacy (IL) across the curriculum and explore opportunities for Library community and capacity building at the 7Cs.

The VCM project is an innovative approach to confronting a range of information, change, and resource management challenges created by the rapidly shifting landscape of libraries and higher education. At the Claremont Colleges Library, these challenges are intensified by the need to serve seven largely autonomous academic institutions. Charting this landscape through concept mapping, a visual alternative to text-based information representation, is one way to achieve what David Lankes has described as the purpose of 21st-century libraries, “facilitat[ing] knowledge creation in their communities.”\textsuperscript{2} The maps produced by the 2013-14 VCM project will provide a foundation for an annual bird’s-eye snapshot of how the 7Cs coincide academically, highlighting strategic points for Library intervention among students and faculty and providing our diverse academic communities with a value-added means of identifying shared opportunities and challenges.

In 2011-12, the CCL Instruction Services Department and several early-adopter librarians developed a successful VCM pilot to represent the breadth and depth of their academic communities using concept mapping software. The initial cohort of maps produced by this pilot has helped clarify the complex 7Cs context by using a reliable framework to aggregate curricular information into an integrated whole, resulting in several instances of actionable insight into the learner experience and enhanced faculty outreach and collaboration. For example, an ongoing VCM partnership with the Environmental Analysis (EA) program has facilitated meaningful curricular dialogue between 7Cs EA stakeholders and has supported versatile librarian/faculty collaborations, including embedded IL instruction, a rubric-based evaluation of EA senior theses in support of IL curriculum integration, and an emerging “personal taxonomy” project to visualize faculty research. The map is also a featured resource in the EA website.\textsuperscript{3}

Our goal in expanding the VCM pilot is twofold: to scale these deliverables to the Library and 7Cs by institutionalizing a mapping framework, and to explore new leadership opportunities in intercollegiate knowledge exchange and preservation. Project outcomes will include supporting CCL IL instruction integration and assessment; informing a user-focused and systematic approach to collection development, documenting 7Cs interdisciplinarity; aggregating decentralized academic information; providing a versatile and unique knowledgebase to the consortium; and enhancing the Library’s role in cross-colleges communication and partnership building.

If instituted programmatically, VCM at the CCL increases our potential to deliver targeted services, connect distributed academic stakeholders, and provide multiple knowledge management benefits to our consortium. We will also model a significant innovation in Library practice using a popular and accessible visualization method. VCM offers a systematic and flexible approach by which any librarian or library (regardless of scale) can build insight into their learners, faculty, and administrative stakeholders, discover new paths to collaboration, and inform tactical decisions about Library resources and services. To facilitate the adoption of VCM at other institutions, our project will produce and share open, modifiable templates translatable to any mind mapping platform and a case study in scalable best practices.

---
\textsuperscript{1} Mindomo.com. "Concept" is often used interchangeably with "mind" in reference to mapping software, although the approaches differ.
\textsuperscript{3} See http://ea.pomona.edu/ea-5c-program-map/
## Schedule of Completion | Mapping Curriculum and Community: Visualizing the Claremont Colleges

### Phase 1 – Pilot Map Archiving & Template Map Creation

| Activity One: Aug 1-7 2013 | **Export archival versions of approximately twenty 2011-13 VCM pilot maps from central Mindomo account to multiple formats (Freemind, PDF, HTML, JPG and Excel) and upload to corresponding project archive/backup folders in the Sakai VCM project management space.** | ID/T Librarian supervised by Project Lead |
| Activity Two: Aug 8-31 2013 | **Review pilot VCM map template and edit to create 2013-14 master template in Mindomo for 48 academic disciplines and share with corresponding CCL subject liaisons. Create shortlinks for each following convention established in pilot (bit.ly/ccl-**map2013-14) in the CCL Bit.ly account.** | ID/T Librarian supervised by Project Lead |
| Activity Three: Sep 1-7 2013 | **Update each subject liaison branch of the VCM project management map with their ‘published’ and ‘editing’ 2013-14 map template links (see Figure 3 in **Narrative, Project Work Plan** section).** | ID/T Librarian supervised by Project Lead |

### Phase 2 – Map Building & Research-Intensive Course Identification

| Activity Four: Sep 8 2013 - Feb 15 2014 | **Build 2013-14 curriculum maps; organize Library staff training opportunities to support collaborative mapping efforts.** | VCM Project Team, CCL librarians |
| Activity Five: Feb 16 - Mar 15 2014 | **Identify and flag research-intensive required courses in each VCM map degree requirements branch to review as potential areas of information literacy curriculum integration and assessment. Use degree-requirements, course, and faculty branches to identify areas of collection development need.** | VCM Project Team, CCL librarians |

### Phase 3 – Mapping Forums & Librarian Outreach

| Activity Six: Mar 16 2014 - May 15 2014 | **Organize four mapping forums to facilitate Library/7Cs conversations and build awareness of the VCM project. Support Library subject liaison outreach to 7Cs faculty and academic departments to discuss maps, disciplinary connections, collection development needs, and information literacy integration into majors and research-intensive courses in additional campus forums (meetings, teaching and learning committees, etc.).** | VCM Project Team, CCL librarians |

### Phase 4 – Public VCM Archive Creation & Summary Report

| Activity Seven: May 16 2013 - June 30 2014 | **Export multiple format versions of 2013-14 subject maps from Mindomo and upload to corresponding backup/archive folders in the Sakai VCM project management space. Create open VCM template in multiple formats for use by other institutions. Upload/create metadata for 2013-14 subject and template map exports (PDF, HTML) to Scholarship@Claremont in order to establish public-facing VCM archival collection.** | ID/T Librarian supervised by Project Lead |
| Activity Eight: July 1 2014 - July 31 2014 | **Publicize archival map collection in Scholarship@Claremont (7Cs open-access institutional repository) to 7Cs community via Library News blog and other 7Cs channels. Write summary white paper.** | ID/T Librarian, Project Team |
Supplementary Item iii.

Environmental Analysis 2013-14 Visual Curriculum Map
Supplementary Item iv.

First-Year Information Literacy Learning Outcomes
As a result of librarian collaboration in a 1st-year seminar course, Claremont Colleges students should be better equipped to demonstrate the following information literate “habits of mind”:

1 - Inquiry
Clearly define a research or information need based on a correct interpretation of assignment parameters and develop basic strategies (e.g., defining keyword terms, selecting article databases) to begin an effective research process.

2 - Evaluation
Evaluate search results in order to select sources that are broadly appropriate to their topic, distinguishing between basic types of information (e.g., scholarly v. popular, primary v. secondary) and revising keyword terms/source bases as needed to return relevant material.

3 - Communication
Effectively integrate appropriate information sources to support an argument or position and clearly distinguish between their own ideas and the ideas of others in order to demonstrate an awareness of the broader scholarly conversation.

4 - Attribution
Convey a preliminary understanding of when, how, and why to give attribution for sources used in academic work by citing sources consistently and completely.

5 - Insight
Distinguish between institutionally-provided and open web resources and begin to recognize the universe of scholarship related to academic disciplines.

FMI: Char Booth, Library Instruction Services Manager:
char_booth@cuc.claremont.edu
Supplementary Item v.

IL Labs Learning Outcomes
The purpose of the Claremont Colleges Library’s Information Literacy (IL) Labs pilot is to foster more systematic information literacy skill development early in the CGU student experience by building flexible, course-supported, librarian-led learning opportunities in tandem with required/foundational research methods courses. The IL Labs pilot in the 2013-14 academic year will partner with courses in four CGU schools (SBOS, SPPE, SCGH, and SES) in order to support the five learning outcomes listed below.

After participating in an IL Labs section, CGU students will be better equipped to:

1 - Attribution
Perceive the range and functionality of available citation management tools and database export options, and convey a sophisticated understanding of when, how, and why to give attribution for sources used in academic work.

2 - Inquiry
Define an expert research question based on a correct interpretation of information need(s), and develop appropriate strategies to begin an effective primary and/or secondary literature search (e.g., selecting keyword terms, identifying specialized source bases, articulating the limits of information available, and finding alternative access strategies such as Link+ and ILL).

3 - Evaluation
Evaluate preliminary search results in order to refine initial strategies and select sources that are highly appropriate to the scope and application of information or research need(s) and that demonstrate an awareness of the universe(s) of scholarship related to their academic (inter)disciplines.

4 - Communication
Organize and synthesize a complex array of information sources and integrate evidence into academic work expertly to support claims in a way that is accessible to an intended audience.

5 - Insight
Demonstrate a grasp of where, why, and how to obtain different types of information resources based on institutional access privilege (e.g., open access versus subscription-based research), perceive major disciplinary trends in scholarly communications, and understand the scholarship and publishing support services available to them as Claremont Colleges Students (e.g., Scholarship @ Claremont).
Supplementary Item vi.

CCL IL in Student Work Rubric (v2013-14)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Level of Achievement</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution</strong></td>
<td>Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution.</td>
<td>Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation.</td>
<td>Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings.</td>
<td>Use of evidence and citation is poor, making it difficult to evaluate the argument or sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documents sources consistently and completely</td>
<td>• Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies.</td>
<td>• Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations.</td>
<td>• Displays fundamental and consistent errors in source documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently</td>
<td>• Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies</td>
<td>• Frequent errors and inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes</td>
<td>• Does not include or contains significant inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cites non-textual sources consistently</td>
<td>• Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency</td>
<td>• Does not consistently cite non-textual sources</td>
<td>• Does not name, title, or cite non-textual sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely.</td>
<td>• Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely.</td>
<td>• Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently.</td>
<td>• Does not name or label figures and/or graphs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Sources</strong></td>
<td>Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.</td>
<td>Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.</td>
<td>Source materials used are inadequate.</td>
<td>Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship</td>
<td>• Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues</td>
<td>• Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s)</td>
<td>• No evidence of awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources</td>
<td>• Sources are used support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source to make claim</td>
<td>• Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources</td>
<td>• When included, sources are too few or badly inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td>• Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td>• Does not consistently distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td>• No distinction between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates a thorough critical exploration and knowledge of evidence, theories, and sources selected</td>
<td>• Demonstrates a preliminary critical exploration and knowledge of evidence, theories, and sources selected</td>
<td>• Clearly selected sources out of convenience</td>
<td>• Does not explore outside sources or present evidence when called for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistently presents evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)</td>
<td>• Consistently presents evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)</td>
<td>• Demonstrates little critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected</td>
<td>• No evidence of critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication of Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Evidence is integrated and synthesized expertly to support claims.</td>
<td>Proficient synthesis and integration of evidence.</td>
<td>Weak attempts at synthesis or integration.</td>
<td>No evidence of attempt at synthesis or integration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistently presents evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)</td>
<td>• Generally employs evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)</td>
<td>• Sporadically uses evidence to support claim(s) or argument(s)</td>
<td>• Claim(s) or argument(s) lack necessary evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Synthesizes and contextualizes evidence appropriately for audience</td>
<td>• May present some evidence without context</td>
<td>• Frequently fails to put sources into context (e.g. &quot;The World Bank says...&quot;))</td>
<td>• Fails to contextualize quotes and evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>•Uses evidence instrumentally towards rhetorical goals</td>
<td>• Frequently demonstrates using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals</td>
<td>• Usually does not demonstrate using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals</td>
<td>• No demonstration of using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is consistently clear</td>
<td>• Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is usually clear</td>
<td>• Consistently blurs distinction between own ideas and ideas of others</td>
<td>• No distinction between own ideas and ideas of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identifies gaps in the literature and contributes creatively and/or significantly to a scholarly conversation</td>
<td>• Begins to identify gaps in the literature or contribute to a scholarly conversation</td>
<td>• Does not identify gaps in the literature or contribute to a scholarly conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Information Literacy in Student Work Rubric Scoring Sheet - Claremont Colleges Library

Identification
ID Code ____________________ Reader Name ____________________ Term/Year ____________________ Faculty ____________________

Could not evaluate information literacy (IL) in this work? Check the box and you're done. □

Assignment
A. Does the assignment ask students to use evidence outside of assigned course content? (check one)
   □ Required   □ Allowed   □ Discouraged   □ No explicit mention   □ Assignment not available   □ N/A

B. This work is a: ____________________________ (e.g., research paper, thesis, report, summary, argument, analysis, reflection, media project, other)

Quality of attribution, evaluation, and communication of IL (see rubric for details):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highly Developed (4)</th>
<th>Developed (3)</th>
<th>Emerging (2)</th>
<th>Initial (1)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of Evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OPTIONAL
This work is a particularly representative example of the following (check any that apply):

□ Very robust bibliography
□ Clear and consistent citations
□ Chose appropriate sources to support claims
□ Sources are well-integrated and synthesized
□ Shows awareness of depth of scholarship in area
□ Other ____________________________

□ Egregious errors in bibliography, in-text citations, notes
□ Little or no attribution of non-textual elements
□ Inappropriate source(s) used to support claim
□ Sources not integrated or synthesized (e.g., “patch writing” or excessive block quoting)
□ Sources lack breadth or depth
□ Over/Undercited claims

Elaboration (optional):
Information Literacy in Student Work Rubric/Scoring Sheet Codebook - Claremont Colleges Library

Identification
Fill out any available details regarding student work.

Can we evaluate information literacy in this work?
Even if no sources are cited or the assignment does not call for outside sources, student work may exhibit information literacy if the student is placing their ideas in a broader context using ideas or information from other sources.

Assignment
A. Expectations about use of evidence outside of assigned course reading or other materials provided by professor (use N/A in the case of thesis or other work without defined assignment parameters).
B. Assignment type allows us to determine how to evaluate works that fall outside the “standard” research paper (e.g. a report, thesis, summary, argument, analysis, reflection, media project, or other type of work)

Quality of attribution, evaluation, and communication of Information Literacy
For each category, check the appropriate box. (Highly Developed, Developed, Emerging, Initial)

• **Attribution** refers to how well and how consistently the student acknowledges sources of evidence, including non-traditional formats such as lectures, emails, DVD commentaries, and images/figures as well as non-textual, embodied, reflective, and experiential materials.

• **Evaluation** refers to the appropriateness or quality of source materials the student chooses to use to support their rhetorical goals (claims or arguments).
  This includes materials and sources in their bibliography (if available) as well as those used throughout the work. Do the sources, examples, and evidence selected match the purpose of the type of work and argument the student is creating? Is the student aware of the differences between primary and secondary sources, popular and scholarly sources, or fact and opinion? Have they selected the variety and quality of sources appropriate for their argument and work type?

• **Communication** refers to the use and integration of sources as well as the quality of composition, e.g., whether the student has integrated the evidence they’re using and has done so in a way instrumental to their claim(s) and argument(s). Does the student paraphrase, summarize, synthesize, use quotes appropriately? Does the student frame quotations using authoritative sources? How are they using sources to ground their claims? This category also addresses how a student integrates their own ideas with those of others.

**OPTIONAL** - This work is a particularly rich example of the following (check any that apply):
Check an item when the noted characteristics are present and should be flagged as interesting or rich examples for future analysis or conversation. If you see other rich examples, note them as “Other.”

Rubric content adapted for the Claremont Colleges by Char Booth (char_booth@cuc.claremont.edu), Sara Lowe (sara_lowe@cuc.claremont.edu), Natalie Tagge (natalie_tagge@cuc.claremont.edu), and Sean Stone (sean_stone@uc.claremont.edu) from an instrument originally developed at Carleton College - see [http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2011/csil-carleton-forensic-librarians-and-reflective-practices/](http://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2011/csil-carleton-forensic-librarians-and-reflective-practices/). This rubric version (2013/14) was revised Summer-Fall of 2013 and finalized September 2013.
Supplementary Item vii.

Pitzer IL Rubric Evaluation Project Report (2012-13)
Purpose
In order to assess Pitzer College First-Year Seminar (FYS) students’ Information Literacy (IL) “Habits of Mind”1 as well as the impact of library instruction and librarian assignment design collaboration on IL skill performance, Booth, Lowe, Stone, Snyder, and Tagge of the Claremont Colleges Library collaborated with the Pitzer Assistant Dean of Faculty (Barbara Junisbai) to gather approximately 200 FYS culminating papers with corresponding assignment prompts produced in the Fall of 2012. Student names were redacted and librarians conducted IL rubric evaluation on a sample of approximately half of the papers (n=99).

Methods
The evaluation team used the IL in Student Work Rubric to evaluate the FYS first-year student paper sample (Appendix A). This CCL-developed rubric assesses three of five IL “Habits of Mind” (HOMs) in authentic student writing and other work: “Attribution”; “Evaluation of Sources”; and “Communication of Evidence”. The rubric is a widely used evaluation instrument within the 7Cs that has been adopted for accreditation-level student assessment by several of the Colleges2, and was employed by the same reviewer group on a similar Pitzer FYS paper analysis project in the summer of 2012. It features four evaluation levels – 1-initial; 2-emerging; 3-developed; and 4-highly developed, and was designed to facilitate assessment of IL within any type of student output, regardless of discipline, format, or enrollment status.

Prior to grading, evaluators conducted a norming session to calibrate the implementation of the rubric, a practice common to all CCL rubric evaluation efforts. Each librarian read three identical FYS sample papers and scored them separately using the common rubric; they then met to discuss scores and come to a consensus on interpreting and applying rubric criteria consistently. Following the norming exercise, each librarian scored 18-20 Pitzer FYS papers. In total, 99 papers were read and scored (including the three norming papers); the summary of findings in this report reflects those papers identified within the sample that were deemed suitable for IL evaluation by virtue of including some type of external source integration (n=99).

---

1 CCL defines IL as “the ability to use critical thinking to create meaningful knowledge from information. The information literate Claremont Colleges student engages in a process of inquiry in order to frame intellectual challenges and identify research needs; strategically accesses and evaluates information; communicates information effectively; provides clear attribution of source materials used; and develops insight into the social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, access, and durability.” IL Habits of Mind are emphasized in this definition.

2 To date, the CCL IL Rubric has been officially integrated into IL assessment by Claremont McKenna College and the Keck Graduate Institute. Numerous academic departments and writing programs in the other Claremont Colleges (Claremont Graduate Institute, Pitzer College, Scripps College, and Pomona College) have adopted the IL Rubric for assessment and pedagogical purposes since its creation in 2011 and revision in 2012-13.
Summary of Findings
For IL rubric evaluation at the first-year level reviewers did not anticipate consistent student achievement of 4 or highly developed; this expectation was confirmed by results. Scores in all three IL HOM areas averaged between the emerging (2) and developed (3) - see Appendix B for descriptive statistics.

“Communication of Evidence” indicates how well the writer integrates and synthesizes evidence to support their claims and/or thesis. This category had the highest mean at 2.64 out of 4. Half of the papers (50%) scored at the developed level. A similar number (43%) scored at the emerging level. Seven percent scored highly developed and none were at the initial level.

“Evaluation of Sources” gauges the quality and appropriateness of source materials employed in the paper. “Evaluation” scores were extremely close to “Communication,” with a mean of 2.60. In this category, a majority of papers (52%) scored developed, while 38% were emerging, 4% were initial, and 6% were highly developed.

“Attribution” indicates how well the writer documents communicated source materials and demonstrates understanding of citation formatting standards. This was the lowest scoring category with a mean of 2.32. For “Attribution,” almost half of papers (48%) scored at an emerging level. A similar number (36%) performed at the developed level. Twelve percent scored initial and only 4% were highly developed.

These findings indicate that while significant effort will be required to help students to achieve higher levels of IL performance over the trajectory of their tenure at Pitzer, particular attention should be paid to remediation and development of Attribution and the skillsets it encompasses.

Comparison with Fall 2011-12 FYS Papers
Since its inception in 2011, CCL Instruction Services has increased Library efforts to “programmatically” integrate outcomes-oriented IL instruction into the first-year seminar classes of all five Claremont Colleges, employing methods such as ongoing faculty and librarian professional development, curriculum mapping, the creation of a local IL definition and first-year learning outcomes, and increasingly deep collaboration with first-year seminar program coordinators and writing centers.

The Pitzer FYS/Library collaboration that facilitated the rubric assessment projects in 2011-12 and 2012-13 is particularly representative of this augmented IL instruction effort. Whereas only one third of FYS faculty opted into IL instruction in their FYS sections in 2011-12, increased Library programmatic outreach in the summer of 2012 increased this number to 13 of 17 sections in 2012-13. When comparing the Fall 2012 FYS papers sampled to those from Fall 2011, scores in all three rubric areas improved (see chart below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An important difference between the 2012 and 2011 FYS IL rubric evaluation project is that, unlike 2011-12 evaluation, this year writing assignment prompts were included with student papers. In addition, IL rubric criteria were communicated to faculty before the start of the term and some faculty used the rubric in their courses thus communicating the IL standards to students before they conducted their work. Therefore, evaluation based on acknowledged standards relating to IL Habits of Mind or common performance criteria was possible.

While upward trends in all HOM areas between 2011-12 is indicative of improved performance it must be noted that the aggregate gains are not statistically significant, although “Communication” comes close (p-value .05).³ That said, findings described in the next section of this report clearly demonstrate the positive impact of library instruction and librarian/faculty course collaborations on student IL performance at the first year.

**Librarian Impact**
A central goal of this evaluation project was to determine what effects (if any) cumulative librarian engagement in first-year classes (e.g., IL instruction, course guide creation, student completion of an online IL tutorial/quiz in the campus LMS, collaboration on syllabus/assignment design) had on student IL HOM performance as demonstrated in their end-of-semester research-focused writing assignments.

Impact was measured by characterizing each librarian-faculty collaboration within the paper sample (14 total classes) by **Librarian Course Engagement Level** (1= lowest, 4=highest) and **Syllabus IL Integration/Librarian Assignment Design Collaboration Level** (0 indicating no syllabus was shared; 1= lowest, 4=highest). These levels were self-reported by teaching librarians for each FYS course collaboration at the end of Fall of 2012, then associated with rubric evaluation data (Appendix C lists the specific criteria included in these two measures).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian Course Engagement Level</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Scores</strong></td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis indicates a clear pattern of improved student IL performance across all HOM areas corresponding to increasing librarian course engagement levels (barring one outlier in Communication between 3-4). Total student IL performance increase by librarian engagement level for all three HOM

³ A p-value below 0.05 is generally considered statistically significant, while one at 0.05 or greater indicates no difference between the groups. Declining p-values indicate increasing statistical significance, indicating particularly strong significance in the span between Engagement & Syllabus Levels 4-1.
areas (Attribution, Evaluation, and Communication) is statistically significant between 4-2 (p-value .046) and 4-1 (p-value .015).

When comparing student IL HOM performance across Librarian Course Engagement levels, three areas are statistically significant. In Attribution, the student IL performance decline between librarian engagement level 4 to 2 has a p-value of .046 and 4 to 1 reflects a p-value of .014. In Communication, the student IL performance decline from librarian engagement level 4 to 2 reflects a p-value of .046.

The table below shows librarian syllabus/assignment design collaboration levels (Syl) in addition to the librarian course engagement level (Lib). Syllabi that included direct mentions of IL and/or reflected librarian collaboration to scaffold IL into assignments at higher levels demonstrate similarly significant gains in student IL performance, indicating that syllabus/assignment design collaboration is also an effective means of improving student IL competences in the first year.

Areas of particular significance in this analysis include syllabus collaboration levels of 2 v. 4 in Attribution, which showed a .43 point increase in student performance at a p-value of .008, and at levels 1 v. 4 in Attribution, which showed a 1.16 point performance increase at a p-value of 0.000000778. In Evaluation, syllabus collaboration levels of 1 v. 4 showed an increase of .62 points at a p-value of .014 (Evaluation), and a syllabus collaboration level of 1 v. 4 showed a .52 point performance increase at a p-value of .027 (Communication).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engagement/Collaboration Level</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib n=34</td>
<td>Syl n=28</td>
<td>Lib n=13</td>
<td>Syl n=14</td>
<td>Lib n=42</td>
<td>Syl n=19</td>
<td>Lib n=10</td>
<td>Syl n=10</td>
<td>Syl n=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the librarian Course Engagement Level is combined with Syllabus IL/Librarian Assignment Design Collaboration, the proportional increase in student performance between the highest and lowest engagement levels is even more pronounced. (NOTE: Engagement level 2/ Syllabus level 1 is the lowest combined involvement reported within the sample.)

Combined student performance variation across all three HOM areas between 4/4 librarian engagement (highest) and 2/1 librarian engagement (lowest) is statistically significant (p-value .03).

---

4 Note that level 0 for Syl only indicates no syllabus was shared by the faculty member, not necessarily that there was no discussion of assignments with the course librarian or mention of IL in the syllabus itself - scores at this level are considerably higher than Syl levels 1 and 2.

5 In this sample, all courses with level 4 syllabus collaborations also reported course engagement levels of 4, indicating a clear student learning impact when there is comparable depth of instructional and pedagogical collaboration between librarians and faculty in first-year courses.
Importantly, performance variation in each HOM area are also statistically significant - Attribution p-value .000000778; Evaluation p-value .014; Communication p-value .027.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian Course Engagement combined with Syllabus IL/Librarian Assignment Design Collaboration</th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Scores</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

This study strongly suggests that increased collaboration with CCL librarians and Information Literacy concepts both in the form of course-related instruction and syllabus-level collaboration improved student IL skills in research-oriented FYS writing, in some cases dramatically. The clear pattern of proportional performance increase in both levels of analysis (course engagement and syllabus/assignments collaboration) illustrates that the “one shot” library workshop alone is not sufficient to sustain these results. Rather, it is the combined efforts toward achieving programmatic Library integration in first-year seminars and increased pedagogical communication between faculty and librarians. In the case of FYS, these goals have been achieved by developing greater focus on learning outcomes in instruction, faculty/librarian professional development, collaboration with first-year seminar program coordinators, and a shared understanding of information literacy as an institutional priority to improve student learning in a meaningful fashion. Findings also suggest that faculty willing to integrate external pedagogical resources into their first-year courses produce higher performing students, which likely extends to academic support services such as writing centers and tutors.

**Recommendations**

In regards to first-year student IL performance, there is still room to work toward greater achievement of developed and highly developed standards on the part of librarians and faculty, particularly in the area of “Attribution.” Similar to the 2011-12 paper evaluation cohort, reviewers found that a significant portion of students struggle with when and how to cite a source as well as proper citation style and formatting. Students also tended to have difficulties finding and evaluating appropriate and authoritative sources to support their claims and theses (Evaluation) and often quoted passages, often of excessive length, without contextualization (Communication).

To support the development of Attribution, Evaluation, Communication, and other IL skills in future FYS cohorts, the authors recommend continuing to foster productive faculty-librarian collaborations at the course level as well as exploring programmatic implementation of the CCL IL Rubric and other Library-supported IL Habits of Mind initiatives, such as the Start Your Research Tutorial (see http://bit.ly/ccl-howtoresearch) and corresponding Sakai Quiz, within FYS and other first-year seminar programs across the Claremont Colleges. Findings suggest that sustaining this ongoing focus on scaffolded research assignment design and tailored librarian course collaborations will support continued IL performance gains at the first year.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Level of Achievement</th>
<th>Highly Developed</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attribution</td>
<td>Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution.</td>
<td>Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation.</td>
<td>Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings.</td>
<td>Use of evidence and citation is poor, making it difficult to evaluate the argument or sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Documents sources consistently and completely</td>
<td>• Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies</td>
<td>• Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations.</td>
<td>• Displays fundamental and consistent errors in source documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently</td>
<td>• Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies</td>
<td>• Frequently errors and inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes</td>
<td>• Does not include or contains significant inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cites non-textual sources consistently</td>
<td>• Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency</td>
<td>• Does not consistently cite non-textual sources</td>
<td>• Does not name, title, or cite non-textual sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely</td>
<td>• Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely.</td>
<td>• Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently.</td>
<td>• Does not name or label figures and/or graphs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Sources</td>
<td>Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.</td>
<td>Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.</td>
<td>Source materials used are inadequate.</td>
<td>Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship</td>
<td>• Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues</td>
<td>• Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s)</td>
<td>• No evidence of awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources</td>
<td>• Sources are used support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source to make claim</td>
<td>• Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources</td>
<td>• When included, sources are too few or badly inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td>• Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td>• Does not consistently distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td>• No distinction between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author</td>
<td>• May over- or under-rely on the ideas of others or the work of a single author</td>
<td>• Clearly selected sources out of convenience</td>
<td>• Does not explore outside sources or present evidence when called for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates a thorough critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected</td>
<td>• Demonstrates a preliminary critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected</td>
<td>• Demonstrates little critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected</td>
<td>• No evidence of critical exploration and knowledge of theories and sources selected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of Evidence</td>
<td>Evidence is integrated and synthesized expertly to support claims.</td>
<td>Proficient synthesis and integration of evidence.</td>
<td>Weak attempts at synthesis or integration.</td>
<td>No evidence of attempt at synthesis or integration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistently presents evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)</td>
<td>• Generally employs evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)</td>
<td>• Sporadically uses evidence to support claim(s) or argument(s)</td>
<td>• Claim(s) or argument(s) lack necessary evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Synthesizes and contextualizes evidence appropriately for audience</td>
<td>• May present some evidence without context</td>
<td>• Frequently fails to put sources into context (e.g., “The World Bank says…”</td>
<td>• Fails to contextualize quotes and evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uses evidence instrumentally towards rhetorical goals</td>
<td>• Frequently demonstrates using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals</td>
<td>• Usually does not demonstrate using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals</td>
<td>• No demonstration of using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is consistently clear</td>
<td>• Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is usually clear</td>
<td>• Consistently blurs distinction between own ideas and ideas of others</td>
<td>• No distinction between own ideas and ideas of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B – Descriptive Statistics, 2012 CCL FYS IL Rubric Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attribution</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Attribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>93.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communication

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attribution**

Mean = 2.32  
Std. Dev. = .74  
N = 99
Appendix C - Levels of Librarian Course Engagement and Syllabus IL/ Assignment Design Collaboration

Librarian Course Engagement Level
1. None = no course collaboration or instruction by librarian
2. Low = librarian conducts standard one-shot library session/class visit, creates a course guide, OR students complete the SYR Tutorial and Quiz
3. Moderate = librarian conducts 1-2 sessions AND/OR students complete the SYR Tutorial and Quiz
4. High = librarian conducts 2 or more library session(s)/class visits; students complete SYR Tutorial and Quiz

Syllabus IL and Librarian Assignment Design Collaboration Level
0. Did not receive/see a syllabus
1. None = no mention of IL/IL skills in syllabus and no librarian input into research assignment(s) design
2. Low = brief mention of IL/IL skills on syllabus and/or modest input into research assignment(s) design by librarian
3. Moderate = IL/IL skills are directly integrated into course but not into a graded assignment, and/or significant input into research assignment(s) design by librarian
4. High = IL/IL skills are directly integrated into course and built explicitly into graded assignment(s), and/or major input into research assignment(s) design by librarian
December 19, 2013

Stanford Prize for Innovation in Research Libraries (SPIRL)
University Libraries Advisory Council
557 Escondido Mall
Stanford, CA 94305-6063

Dear Library Council Members,

I was so pleased to learn that the Claremont Colleges Library (CCL) was to be nominated for the esteemed Stanford Prize for Innovation in Research Libraries. As a member of the administrative staff at Claremont McKenna College, I feel the honor is well-deserved.

The librarians at the Claremont Colleges have a difficult job. Claremont is home to five undergraduate colleges and several graduate institutions, all of which rely on CCL for collections and services. The CCL librarians are called upon to meet the needs of faculty across institutions with a broad range of research interests, and to contribute as integral players on the education team for our students. Though I could write pages lauding the effectiveness of these efforts, I would like to focus on a specific innovative initiative that has directly impacted the faculty and students at CMC.

Recently, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges mandated that undergraduate institutions measure students’ proficiency in information literacy (IL). Willing to take this on, but unclear as to how to approach it, I was thrilled to receive a message from the CCL that a group of librarians was ready to assist each of the Claremont Colleges in this process. In October, 2012, delegates from each of the Claremont Colleges were invited to gather with instructional librarians from CCL to participate in the WASC Retreat on Core Competencies: Critical Thinking and Information Literacy. Following the retreat, the librarians worked with our Assessment Committee to design an information literacy rubric that could be applied to the evaluation of students’ writing.

The CCL librarians also hosted numerous meetings of key Claremont Colleges’ personnel including a national information literacy webinar. Through their efforts, we were able to connect with other practitioners in the field across the nation to learn more about best practices for the curricular integration and assessment of information literacy.

Most critically for CMC, the CCL instructional librarians spearheaded an initiative to engage the faculty teaching in our Freshman Humanities Seminar (FHS) in an exploration of ways to incorporate IL instruction in the classroom. Skeptical and fiercely protective of their course designs, the faculty initially had little interest. Patiently, and with great intentionality, the librarians continued to press the issue. Every faculty member teaching FHS this fall was contacted by the library’s Instructional Services Manager, Char Booth in July, 2013. Ms. Booth presented a range of collaboration scenarios and encouraged faculty to meet with their assigned, discipline-specific librarian. These skilled librarians are intensely dedicated to improving student learning, drawing on a range of intervention strategies to assist faculty in their teaching. These flexible collaboration efforts are punctuated with assessment options ranging from the evaluation of written work via the information literacy rubric to the use of online information literacy tutorials with embedded direct-assessment quizzes. CCL produces and then shares detailed reports with meaningful statistical analyses and recommendations to help us better understand the effectiveness of our practices.

Office of the Dean of the Faculty
Bauer Center | 500 E. Ninth Street | Claremont, California 91711-6400
Member of The Claremont Colleges
In one year, the instructional librarians at CCL have facilitated a remarkable shift in mentality at CMC. Whereas information literacy was once a peripheral focus, it has now become one of the institutions’ embedded learning objectives. The willingness of faculty to draw on the rich human resources at the library has increased as well, paving the way for future collaborative endeavors.

On a personal note, I have been consistently impressed by the good humor, professionalism and expertise of our fine CCL librarians. The management of a library that serves faculty, students and staff of no less than seven independent colleges and universities is a monumental task. The CCL librarians not only accomplish this task well, but are also constantly striving to identify practices that push us all to think beyond the confines of our own institution and to explore creative practices that will improve the learning and teaching experiences.

Sincerely,

Dianna Graves  
Director of Academic Planning
January 9, 2014

Dear Colleagues:

I am delighted to write in strong support of the Claremont Colleges Library’s application for Stanford Prize for Innovation in Research Libraries. Because my students, colleagues, and I have been direct beneficiaries of several of the projects that have led to this proposal, I can attest to how valuable their initiatives have been not to the seven institutions that depend on the remarkable staff at the Honnold/Mudd Library, but to academic libraries on a broader scale.

Some background first. Ever since the Environmental Analysis program, for which I serve as the five-college coordinator, received a major grant from the Mellon Foundation in 2009 to build up the number of faculty teaching in the program, and better integrate our curricula and research, the number of majors and classes has exploded. To gain a handle on the rapid growth, and to plan for how we might respond to it, we met with several librarians who pitched the idea of using mapping software to visualize the multifaceted program’s spread across five distinct campuses with upwards of 80 faculty involved in its deliberations. What the librarians produced was nothing short of mind-blowing, a graphic representation of the points of convergence and divergence, only some of which could we have otherwise predicted.

As my colleagues and I scrolled through the visual data we recognized, as if looking at a mirror, the shape and structure of a program that had blossomed in ways we had not foreseen. Since then, we have used this visual representation to revise major requirements and to bring them into closer alignment across the campuses; they have been critical too as we propose additional positions in fields such as landscape architecture, urban geography, and environmental science.

That conversation is ongoing, with librarians presenting updated versions of the map to the program’s annual retreat, a visual feast that routinely has generated non-stop discussion about how our clear need to create a research methodologies class and strengthen our commitment to qualitative and quantitative analysis. The map has proved indispensable, making us better teachers, mentors, and scholars.

These and similar outcomes experienced by my peers across the Claremont Consortium are why I enthusiastically recommend the Claremont Colleges Library for the Stanford Prize for Innovation in Research Libraries.

Cordially yours,

Char Miller, Director
W. M. Keck Professor of Environmental Analysis
char.miller@pomona.edu
909-607-8343
Dear Stanford Prize Judges:

I write in enthusiastic support of the Claremont Colleges Library, which I believe to be a top contender for the Stanford Prize. The work of CCL librarians has transformed library instruction and assessment in significant ways. In particular, over the past two years, the librarians have integrated innovative support programs into my college’s first-year writing course, and in doing so, they have tremendously increased our first-year students’ level of (and respect for) information literacy.

I am the Director of the Writing Program and Assistant Professor at Scripps College, the Women’s College of the five undergraduate Claremont Colleges. The Writing Program at Scripps College is a stand-alone program that reports to the Dean of Faculty, and our primary program responsibility is our first year writing course, Writing 50: Critical Analysis. This course is required of all first-year students, and it is taught by myself along with one full-time and 8 part-time faculty, most of whom have been teaching the course for several years. Our students tend to be academically high-achieving (as measured by test scores and also by the caliber of their senior thesis projects), and about half of them have attended private high schools. All instructors of the course regularly assign three specific kinds of essays, the most significant of those being a researched argument essay. We all scaffold this assignment in various ways, and we all require all of our students to attend a library workshop. In the past, that workshop was run by whichever librarian happened to have free time that day, or by the favorite librarian of a particular instructor. The workshop was a fairly basic introduction to search strategies and library databases. As a faculty, we also noted that our research papers were often disappointing, as students tended to revert to the kind of research report that had worked for them in high school.

In the summer of 2012, I was contacted by the new Instructional Services Manager of the library, Char Booth. Char wondered if I would be interested in expanding the presence of librarians in Writing 50. What Char had in mind was to “embed” librarians in each of the 18 sections so that librarians could more directly address the research paper process. Librarians would be matched with particular courses by course theme according to their academic specialties. Before the semester began, the librarian would meet with the assigned instructor to collaborate on the prompt of the research essay and the types and scheduling of the smaller assignments building to the essay. During the semester, the librarian would come to the course to introduce him or herself and orient the students on the library website’s tools and tutorials. The librarian would subsequently engage in students’ brainstorming process (usually online), respond to drafts of the research paper in whatever ways the instructor needed, and meet with students at least twice to help them
with sources. The entire process would begin by the librarians joining the writing faculty in a pre-semester development workshop, in which the writing instructors could share their concerns about the research papers with the librarians, and the entire group could share their information literacy rubrics.

It may be because Char Booth was the embedded librarian for my course, “Writing for Social Change,” that I felt the pilot program to have been wildly successful in my particular case; either way, I noticed two significant changes in my students’ approach to and practice of information literacy as related to the argumentative essay. The first change I observed in the students was when Char visited my course. She had read a novel I assigned as part of the “literature unit” so that she could use it as a touchstone in examples of research projects. She walked students through the library website’s cool research tools, about which I knew nothing, and showed them the tutorial and quiz they would be taking. I was stunned as I watched the students’ growing excitement. They were bouncing in their chairs as they listened to her explain the ways they could approach their research inquiries, and they even seemed eager to take the online tutorial and quiz. I had never see such excitement about the library. By the time the students next saw Char, at the workshop on research and secondary sources, they had communicated with her through the blog about their topics. These blogs were more specific and the ideas more advanced than in previous years, probably because they had met Char and knew she would be reading their work. At the “secondary source workshop,” she had a worksheet for them that would enable them ultimately to establish and join a critical academic conversation about their particular research topic. Later, I learned that far more of them scheduled a private appointment with her later than had ever done so in past semesters, because they knew and respected her. I will also add that my students loved (and continue to love) the button-maker.

The second change I noticed was that Char was regularly able to prevent the kind of high-school-esque “research reports” we were used to receiving from our students. In one particular case, Char’s intervention helped a student turn her rough draft—a shallow literary analysis of the play *Death of a Salesman*—into a compelling critique of Willy Loman, the play’s protagonist, as the symbol for the Occupy Wall Street movement. Char did so by intervening at the brainstorming phase, asking the student to look for sources outside of the MLA database in order to attach her topic to contemporary issues of social protest. This led the student to sources that mentioned Willy Loman as a symbol used by OWS. Once the student had embraced the new direction of her paper, Char continued to help her find the best sources, both literary critical and also social action theory and journalism on OWS, that would help her interpret the play in the context of contemporary social movements around the class struggle and economic injustice. Her final draft was so well-argued and well-supported that I submitted it for our first-year Essay Award, which it almost won (the paper was the runner-up, and the student was competing against the entire first-year class).

This student’s success helped Char and I understand how the embedded librarian process was working and how it could work even more effectively. The formal assessment of the researched argument essays that the Writing Program undertook in the spring of 2013 contributed further to this understanding by showing us not only whether students were meeting our expectations concerning student learning outcomes, but where our assessment tools themselves could be revised to give us better information. Char and I worked together to close the feedback loop by making changes to our information literacy rubric and to the worksheet we use in the library workshop. In the process, we concluded that the primary purpose of the embedded librarians was to help students discover and represent the academic conversations within
their topics and to take a position in the conversation through the use of secondary sources. This is an extremely important feature of a researched argument essay, and it’s also the only one that we as instructors could rarely facilitate on our own.

The phenomenal success of the pilot led this fall to its improvement and extension; more of the librarians are working with Char to create the same kind of success she facilitated in my section, and my instructors this fall reported a high level of satisfaction with the embedded librarian program. Both in terms of the quality of their research and the level of their engagement, our first-year students are getting the kind of education in information literacy that we on the Writing faculty have always wanted for them but not been able to provide as individual instructors. This program and others like it have transformed the CCL in a very short amount of time, and we fully expect many more years of similarly innovative programs. For these reasons, I believe the Claremont librarians more than deserve the Stanford Prize.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Drake
Director of the Writing Program/Associate Professor of Writing
(909) 607-8372 kdrake@scrippscollge.edu
December 7, 2013

Dear Stanford SPIRL Prize Committee Members:

This letter is written in support of the application of the Claremont Colleges Library (CCL) for your prestigious prize.

I graduated from Pitzer College, one of the colleges in the Claremont Consortium, in the fall of 2012 with a major in Environmental Analysis and a minor in History. During my time as an undergraduate, I frequently utilized the CCL physical collection to aid in the development of my research and final papers. My introductory courses included minimum integration with the library and did not guide me towards online databases that would be useful for my research. It was not until my junior year in college that I was formally taught the importance of online databases and shown what the databases were and how to access them using the library’s catalog. Char Booth, the Head of Instruction Services & E-Learning Librarian at CCL, instructed my class not only in how to use important environmental databases such as EBSCO’s Greenfile, but also taught us how to expand or constrict our research topics to meet the criteria of the research paper as well as properly keep the research within the scope of what could be expected for an end of semester research paper. This process was highly engaging as Char would write each student’s research topic on a whiteboard, suggesting keywords or resources that may be helpful during our research process.

I received this training twice during my junior year and felt much more confident when approaching research papers than I had earlier in my college career. I recalled an environmental history research paper I had written my sophomore year in which most of my references were pulled from basic Google searches using mildly academic works. After receiving the bibliographic search training from Char, I felt that my access to information increased well beyond what was available through Google and my personal collection of PDF articles. After these bibliographic trainings, I felt that the library was a more welcoming and open environment, a place where I was free to ask questions and let others know that I needed help finding appropriate information for an assignment.

I am very encouraged by the programming and services that the librarians at the CCL provide to the students and faculty. I believe that these programs go a long way to encourage collaboration and learning and the library’s efforts to promote academic literacy and research skills within the Claremont College community. Furthermore, I believe that the library’s efforts to promote
reference and citation management techniques in the Love Your Library workshops are excellent programs that provide essential knowledge and training on useful software such that is often assumed to be basic knowledge by college professors. Natalie Tagge, the Instruction Librarian, held a workshop on the proper use and benefits of Google Scholar, which provided an outstanding overview of how to judge scholarly materials and the databases they come from as well as how to perform more complex searches with a resource that is often used for cursory or quick research purposes. The inclusion of such innovative workshops provides useful opportunities for students and faculty to enhance their library literacy and teaches them how to use reference management software such as Zotero, EndNote, and RefWorks. In addition, these workshops are skillfully taught and cover a wide spectrum of user proficiencies in one class period. The instructors make sure that the material they cover provides a starting place for introductory users and new students while also providing value-added information and reference for native users who want to maximize their efficiency and knowledge of software and techniques they currently utilize.

The programming and collaboration efforts that CCL is undertaking is an encouraging step to increase information literacy and critical thinking in academics. Due to the amount of information available and the rapid change of technology over the last twenty years, education has fallen behind in keeping up with training the new generation on how to manage and process the information they come across. We have been given the technology to find information but have been socialized to follow the path of least resistance rather than take an active approach in assessing and processing the information we come across. I believe that the programming and efforts the CCL is undertaking goes a long way to fill in this gap and provide lifelong literacy and research skills that are highly valuable in an information environment that is evolving and becoming more complex every year.

Sincerely,

Peter N. Vanderhooft
Emporia State University
School of Library and Information Management
Utah Cohort IX MLS Program