



# **Building a Librarian/Faculty Partnership to Develop Information Literacy and Assess Short Student Research Presentations (MICA)**

Christian Drolsum (he/him)  
Research Services Librarian

Tannaz Motevalli (she/they)  
Information Literacy and Instructional  
Design Librarian



# How It Started



Interest in embedded library instruction came from conversations with Art History faculty.



**Modernisms** was chosen for the pilot and over the course of the next two years, the workshop was integrated into all sections of the course.



# Faculty Buy-in and Collaboration

Informal conversations between instruction librarian and faculty chair was key to future collaboration.

Additionally:

- Understanding course focus and long-term goals
- Consistent communication with faculty teaching the course
- Accepting ongoing feedback and working iteratively

# Using UbD to Design Measurable Learning



## What is UbD?

Understanding by Design is an educational theory developed by Grant Wiggins, which established the concept of backwards design.

Phases include:

1. Identify desired results.
2. Determine acceptable evidence.
3. Plan learning experiences and instruction.



## Why was UbD used?

Outcomes focused approaches making assessment more likely to actually measure learning.

As a required course with many sections, designing a lesson that could be both consistent and easy for anyone to teach was important.



Students will:

1. quickly evaluate information sources
2. work efficiently in a group dynamic
3. clearly present their research findings to their colleagues



Outcomes were drafted in alignment with 4 of our program learning outcomes and the following ACRL Frames for Information Literacy:

- Information Creation as a Process
- Research as Inquiry
- Searching as Strategic Exploration

# The Workshop: Learning Outcomes



Each Modernisms section has two sessions in the library.

- Session 1 - 60 mins
- Session 2 - 90 mins



Students are grouped together to quickly research an art historical movement or artist collective.

After their research they develop a presentation to share findings with the class.

## The Workshop: Nuts and Bolts

# Week 1

## Background Research and Reading Assignment

### Step One

Guiding Questions

Prescribed Sources

Master Worksheet

### Step Two

Selection of Reading

10-20 Pages

See the workshop  
slides here:



# SCAN ME

See the workshop  
slides here:



SCAN ME

# Week 2

## Google Slides Presentation

### Guidelines

4-6 Slides (including  
bibliography)

Required Elements

Examples Shared



# Assessment

- Presentations are scored using the rubric attached to each group worksheet. Faculty may score presentations as well, though it is not required.
- They are graded on the following criteria:
  - Research & Comprehension
  - Presentation (text and visual)
  - Teamwork
- Since 2021 students have consistently scored between “Accomplished” and “Developing”

# Some Observations

## Librarian observations:



- the workshop reveals gaps in student's ability to discern types of sources
- students need help following directions
- library as a space for research
- librarians need to be encouraging and minimize anxiety

## Faculty feedback:



- more engaged in class discussion and content post workshop
- gained confidence in research
- lesson and learning outcomes could be more rigorous
- students need guidance on slides



Speed of the workshop

Student absences

Diversity of faculty  
engagement



Lack of subject expertise

Lack of accountability

## Some Misgivings



# Thank you!

## Contact Us

Christian Drolsum  
cdrolsum@mica.edu

Tannaz Motevalli  
tmotevalli@mica.edu