Spring 2001

# Teaching Information Literacy in 50 Minutes a Week: The Crush Experience

Judith Faust
*California State University, Hayward*

**JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN ACADEMIC AND SPECIAL LIBRARIANSHIP (2001)**

**ISSN: 1525-321X**

# TEACHING INFORMATION LITERACY IN 50 MINUTES A WEEK: THE CSUH EXPERIENCE

Judith Faust
California State University, Hayward
jfaust@csuhayward.edu

## Abstract

The development of information literacy is central to the academic success of undergraduates, yet few universities require formal, credit-bearing courses taught by librarians to ensure that students develop these lifelong learning skills and abilities. Where such courses do exist, they are often isolated in the curriculum and rarely linked to the General Education experience. This article describes a General Education program begun in 1998-1999 at California State University, Hayward (CSUH), in which a cohort of students and faculty spend the year exploring a common theme in a series of linked courses, which include an information literacy class. Librarians teach a credit-bearing information literacy course to most incoming first-year students as part of this campus learning community. This article will share experiences related to curricular planning and development, course implementation, and assessment and evaluation of the course, in order to offer librarians suggestions and strategies for mounting a similar experience on their campuses.

## Introduction

Though the term "information literacy" has been around since the 1970's, information literacy has recently become something of a *cause célèbre* for librarians (McCrank, 1992). The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) sponsors an annual Institute for Information Literacy Immersion (http://www.ala.org/acrl/nili/immersion01.html), the American Library Association (ALA) defined information literacy in its report by the Presidential Committee on Information Literacy (http://www.ala.org/acrl/nili/ilit1st.html), and ACRL and various state libraries and state library associations have issued guidelines for information competence (http://www.ala.org/acrl/ilcomstan.html, http://cemacolorado.org/l_infolitc.htm, http://www.wlma.org/literacy/eslintro.htm).[1] Librarians at CSUH are fortunate enough to be able to speak about information

literacy with two full years of experience teaching a credit-bearing Fundamentals of Information Literacy course which has, since 1998, fulfilled a General Education requirement for all matriculating CSUH first-year students. The credit-bearing course was the result of two coinciding processes: a California State University system-wide information literacy initiative, and local efforts to improve the General Education program. Two years of teaching this course have given us some insights regarding curricular planning and development, implementation, and assessment and evaluation. Even those librarians who are not - at least not yet - teaching a for-credit information literacy course can benefit from what CSUH learned about (1) getting such a course off the ground, (2) doing curricular planning for information literacy, (3) implementing information literacy instruction, and (4) assessing and evaluating such instruction.

## The Beginnings

Instruction in information literacy can be accomplished in various ways in higher education. It can be via information literacy courses, online tutorials, workbooks or course-integrated instruction - any of which can be either elective or required (Germain, Jacobsen, & Kaczor, 2000; Rice, 1986) . Whatever the vehicle, "information literacy efforts need to be … embraced not only by the staff of academic libraries, but also by the faculty and administration of the academic institution. In recognition of the importance of information literacy, [some] state-wide university systems …[undertake] strategic planning to determine information competencies …." (Spitzer, 1998, p.190)

In 1994, the Council of Library Directors (COLD) of the California State University system identified information competence as an area needing action. An Information Competence Work Group was formed to address the issue of information competence in the California State University system and produce a plan of action. By January 1997, the group, chaired by CSU Northridge University Librarian Susan Curzon, had formulated a set of seven core information competencies that all CSU graduates should demonstrate (http://library.csun.edu/susan.curzon/corecomp.html). Briefly, these competencies included the following abilities:

- formulating a research question and determining the information requirements for it;
- locating, organizing and communicating information effectively;
- understanding "the ethical, legal, and sociopolitical issues regarding information;" and
- understanding "the techniques, points of view, and practices employed in the presentation of information from all sources." (Information competence, 1997)

Also in 1997, California State University, Hayward's General Education subcommittee of the Academic Senate's Committee on Instruction and Curriculum began work on several restructuring issues that were to change CSUH's General Education program radically.[2] The ultimate goals of the subcommittee were to: 1) improve the retention rate of the first-year class; 2) foster a sense of community for students on our urban, commuter campus, where many first-year students have jobs keeping them away from campus, and thereby isolating them; 3) comply with a new CSU mandate that remedial classes be completed in the first year; 4) ensure that most General Education courses be taken in the first two years; and 5) provide more coherence and less confusion in the General Education requirements and their implementation. What emerged was a system of learning communities, cohorts of students and faculty exploring a year-long general theme in a series of linked courses. What came to be known as first-year "clusters" had the following components:

- 3 discipline-based courses in Humanities or Social Sciences or Sciences
- a Composition class
- a Communication class
- a Critical Thinking class
- a General Studies activity/support module
- an Information Literacy class. (http://www.csuhayward.edu/GED/)

Because the Library instruction coordinator, Kris Ramsdell, was on the G.E. subcommittee at the time of the G.E. reorganization, she was perfectly positioned to push for inclusion of an information literacy requirement in the general education components, and she made sure that whatever satisfied the local requirements would correspond to the newly promulgated CSU system information competence standards. She was aided by the G.E. subcommittee chair, Sally Murphy, who felt strongly about the importance of information competency and acknowledged librarians' leadership in information literacy. Ramsdell consulted with library faculty and got our approval and that of the Library Director for a new class, *Fundamentals of Information Literacy* (LIBY 1010), which would satisfy the information literacy requirement. We planned ten Library 1010 class sections, one section coordinated with each of the clusters (http://www.library.csuhayward.edu/staff/Faust/info_lit/Clusterthemes.htm), and Ramsdell shepherded LIBY 1010 through the normal University procedure for new classes, including the necessary approval process for classes satisfying the G.E. requirement. Two other classes were also given credit for satisfying the information literacy requirement – a computer class, *Introduction to Computers* (Computer Science 1020), and a general introductory class, *Summer Bridge* (Psychology 1010), which met in the summer before the Fall 1998 quarter.[3]

## Curricular Planning and Collaboration with Cluster Faculty

By this time, it was Spring quarter, 1998, and we needed to be ready to teach LIBY 1010 in the Fall quarter! Eight out of ten library faculty had taught a two-unit elective, *Information Skills in the Electronic Age* (LIBY 1551), in the past. Like most college and university faculty, many of the librarians had never had formal pedagogic instruction or training, but all had taught numerous "one-shot" research classes to students in discipline-based departments. (Cf. Beaubien, Hogan, & George, 1982). For the comfort of the two who had never taught a quarter-long class and in an attempt to standardize the new course's form, the Library's three-person Instruction Team created a syllabus, a course outline, and sample class sessions for LIBY 1010. The instruction team also chose a textbook, Carla List's *Introduction to Information Research*, (published by Kendall/Hunt, 1998).

Though all readily accepted the team's course description and objectives (http://www.library.csuhayward.edu/staff/Faust/info_lit/liby1010.htm), we found pleasing everyone with sample class sessions somewhat like herding cats. The ten librarians eventually evolved into clusters of our own: one group of three members, one group of four members, and three "lone rangers," with a resulting total of five somewhat different approaches to teaching the class. Some preferred a more traditional, library-research-oriented class, while others chose to follow the LIBY 1551 class outline, with its increased emphasis on electronic resources, rather closely, but the majority explored new paths to achieve the goals set out by the course objectives, giving more emphasis to evaluation of sources and information ethics. Choosing which librarian would teach which cluster also proved interesting, since there were essentially three science-oriented clusters and only one librarian with a science background. Similarly, there were two heavily humanities-oriented clusters and three librarians who felt entitled by their subject specialties to claim them. Since, however, the clusters were at the first-year level, we concluded that our own subject specialties generally were not so important that any of us could not teach almost any of the classes, and worked out cluster choices amicably.

In addition to planning for their own classes, all members of a cluster's teaching faculty were required to meet for a total of thirty hours over the summer to 1) develop linkages between the disciplinary courses; 2) plan activities for the activity/support module for all three quarters; and 3) coordinate with the cluster the Composition, Communication, and Critical Thinking classes. The LIBY 1010 classes were not officially linked because there were two other classes which satisfied the information literacy requirement. Because of the lack of official linkage, librarians were generally not thought of in planning these summer meetings; they therefore had to make special efforts to ensure their inclusion.[4]

After initial contact with other cluster members, a librarian usually tried to remain in contact by phone calls, e-mails, group meetings, or one-on-one meetings. Some library faculty members began the year in contact, but lost contact as the cluster itself did not officially continue to meet. In my own case, the Composition and Critical Thinking instructors and I seemed to make more efforts at keeping meetings and communication going in our cluster than did the faculty teaching the discipline-based science courses. Within a few months of beginning the Fall quarter, we were often the only ones meeting. We eventually ceased meeting regularly.

Some librarians were never able to develop a collaborative relationship with their clusters. Other librarians maintained close contact with cluster faculty all year long, giving them further chances to promote information literacy, and to provide strategies whereby faculty could incorporate it in their other classes (Young & Harmony, 1999). Judy Clarence, the instructor of the LIBY 1010 class that coordinated with "Introduction to Asian Thought," for example, worked very closely with the other members of her cluster for the entire year . Because the discipline-based classes in her cluster required research papers each quarter, she was able to influence several of the assignments given to the students by continuing regular consultations with cluster members, and giving them feedback as to the difficulties students encountered in library research.

## LIBY 1010 Implementation

*Assignments*

Our one-unit classes were fifty minutes long and met only once a week for ten weeks over the quarter, so we were pressed for time to teach the material we thought we should teach. Most library faculty tried to link class examples, in-class activities, and assignments to their cluster's subject matter. Many library faculty required a final project on a topic of the student's choice. (Cf. Joyce & Tallman, 1997.) The final project consisted of an annotated, evaluative bibliography and either 1) a "diary" of, or short essay about, the entire process of topic selection, researching a topic, and then choosing, locating, evaluating and presenting information sources, or 2) a short essay about why each of the items in the bibliography was judged useful for the student's topic. After the first week or two, when assignments were frequently directed toward library orientation and the general organization of information, most instructors created assignments that required the students to find sources on their topics using a different type of information tool each week. These sources were evaluated and cited, and could then be plugged directly into the final project. This worked well for teachers who preferred open rather than closed assignments. That is, the student could work on his or her own research topic ("Find a scholarly article on your topic question"), rather than answer a series of questions that all students would have to answer in the same way

(true/false, fill in the blank). Because open assignments allow students more freedom of choice in fulfilling assignments, they are ideally more relevant to individual students' interests. On the other hand, they are harder and more time-intensive to grade, and some students felt that researching citations for homework assignments and then putting them into the final project was repetitive and pointless.

*In-class activities*

We strove to provide frequent in-class, active-learning exercises or hands-on computer exercises, but with our restricted class time, this was sometimes difficult. (Cf. Drueke, 1992, Bren, Hilleman & Topp, 1998.) One of the active-learning exercises originally created by Judy Clarence for LIBY 1551 involved handing out reference books with slips of paper in each book. On the slips were questions that were not matched to the book but were answerable by another reference book in the room. The students were given 5 minutes to examine their own books and told to pay attention to such features as subject, format, index, table of contents, scope, prefaces and forewords, etc. Then each student read his or her question slip out loud, the students together determined whose book could answer the question, and the student who had that book had to describe the reference book and find the answer (http://www.library.csuhayward.edu/staff/Faust/info_lit/ref_activity.htm).

In my own class, in addition to creating a handout to help students distinguish popular magazines from scholarly journals, I also gave them hints on how to use clues from the citation (http://www.library.csuhayward.edu/staff/Faust/info_lit/clues.htm) - like length of article, number of authors, title of article, title of journal - to make educated "guesses" as to whether a periodical article was scholarly or popular. Students were then given a list where they labeled citations "P" for popular or "S" for scholarly, and then explained their choices in class.

One of Kate Manuel's exercises in 1999-2000 involved handing out colored cards with different web site URLs and asking students with similar colored cards (and URLs) to form groups to evaluate the web sites at these URLs. After approximately 10 minutes, the students were asked their opinions as to the validity of the web sites. Since all the sites were fakes, this proved a challenging and amusing exercise. Some of the sites were: California's Velcro Crop Under Challenge, http://members.unlimited.net/~kumbach/velcro.html, The Taxonomy of Barney, http://www.improbable.com/airchives/paperair/barney.htm and the Mankato, Minnesota "home page," http://www.lme.mankato.msus.edu/mankato/mankato.html.

Since many of the students worked on homework in groups, we also gave quizzes as a way of evaluating each student's individual work. Some instructors gave final exams, as well.

*Library faculty working together*

The Instruction Team put an electronic folder for LIBY 1010 on our internal computer network so that we could share ideas. Each librarian had his or her own folder within the LIBY 1010 folder for class materials, and all other librarians could get access to these materials through the network. We are, in general, a very collegial group and enjoy sharing ideas, so this was an ideal setup for us. There were two librarians who did not put their folders on the network during the first year, but they were generally "solo types" and preferred not to do so. Most librarians, however, used the folders to share with, borrow from, and improve upon others' ideas, assignments, etc. By the end of the first year, with myriad adaptations and embellishments made to assignments, it was sometimes hard to remember whose idea had come first. An additional benefit to offering the class was that some of our class handouts were so useful that they were turned into regular library handouts. As each quarter opens, a new set of network folders is created, so we still have a record of the first classes taught as long as the faculty members choose to keep their folders there.

By the end of the first year, two library faculty members had also mounted most class materials (syllabi, handouts, assignments) on the Web so that students could access materials from home in case they missed a class, were sick, or simply lost their homework assignments.[5] In the following academic year, 1999-2000, all but one faculty member mounted at least a syllabus on the Web.

*Teaching facilities*

During 1998-1999, we primarily used two classrooms. One was our new library teaching lab with an instructor station, a ceiling projector, and sixteen student terminals (Feinman, 1994). We purchased computer control software so that we could project controlled examples of searching to individual students' screens, but in fact, the software never worked to our satisfaction.[6] We found it just as easy to do brief demonstrations via the ceiling-mounted projector and let students do their own hands-on searches at their own terminals. Our other classroom was a more standard classroom with an instructor's workstation and projector. We had used it for several years and still pressed it into service for LIBY 1010, particularly at the beginning of each quarter. Some library faculty used this classroom almost the entire quarter, since they felt that there was not enough class time to teach, engage in active learning exercises, and also allow the students to do their own searches. The final weapon in our first-year classroom arsenal was a laptop and projector on a cart which we used to move to classes in other library venues (another classroom and a large conference room) when both classroom and lab were in use.

Our class size maximum was thirty students (several faculty accepted even more), and some of our in-class and active-learning exercises worked better with smaller class sizes, so adaptation was necessary. With the teaching lab, we doubled students up at the sixteen computers, which made a virtue of necessity, in that they could help each other with problems. Our other classroom was somewhat of a problem for the larger classes, in that thirty students did not fit well into our small room. So before the 1999-2000 school year, a third and larger classroom in the Library was furnished with an instructor's workstation and a projector, allowing the larger classes to use this room more comfortably when hands-on access to computers was not necessary.

## Assessment & Evaluation

We wanted to have some measure of our students' progress beyond formative assessment by instructors in class and summative assessment in graded activities, so our Coordinator of Instruction, Kris Ramsdell, developed a Pre-/Post-Test adapted from one used at Mankato State University for our students to take on the first and last days of the class to measure increasing information competence. We were pleased to note marked increases of correct responses to most questions from the pre-test to the post-test (http://www.library.csuhayward.edu/staff/Faust/info_lit/test.htm).

The following should be taken into account:

- Items with the lowest percentage increase ("Journal articles are listed in the CSUH Library online catalog" and "Anything published on the Internet is considered in public domain and can be used by anyone" in 1998-1999) may suggest areas upon which we need to concentrate teaching efforts further or unclear wording of questions.
- In 1998-1999, 517 students took the pre-test while 419 students took the post-test; a similar pattern prevailed in 1999-2000 when the pre-test numbers were 609 and the post-test numbers were 509.
- Increases of correct responses were less dramatic in some areas during the second year, perhaps because the 1999-2000 class had slightly higher entrance requirements.

At the end of the second year, feeling that some of our questions were confusing, we changed our Pre-/Post-test. We hope we have focused it more directly on what we are teaching of the seven core competencies and that it will test more closely what we actually want the students to know after having taken our class. We feel the need, however for further study of how to create more effective measures of assessment (Barclay, 1993; Geffert & Bruce, 1997; Ramirez, 1999).

To abide by University regulations, and also to get confidential feedback from students as to how they felt we were doing, we also needed evaluation. We had a prior evaluation instrument from LIBY 1551, and we adapted this for use in LIBY 1010 for the Fall and Winter 1998-1999 quarters. It included twenty-eight questions which required numbered ratings and three questions which asked for written comments. By Spring quarter 1999 the sheer numbers of evaluation forms that needed to be read and tabulated made it clear we needed to convert to a Scantron answer form (http://www.library.csuhayward.edu/staff/Faust/info_lit/course_eval.htm) so that machine grading would reduce the time required for feedback to the instructors.

Sample written comments from various teachers' evaluations, arranged by topic:

- Comments about the course content

I know my way around the library and where to find books. I know where to start searching for research topics.
This class was very useful for me. Boolean operators are useful to know about.
The course material was interesting, but the workload of research we did was a little too much.
The course is very useful and I recommend making it a requirement that all must take it in their first quarter.
I think that this class should be a requirement. I never realized how much I didn't know.
I like this course, but it should be worth 4 units!
It was a lot of work for only one unit, but the things we learned to do are very important for a successful college career.
Overall, I think it's a good course, at first I was skeptical but once I started doing the work, I learned things I really didn't know. However, I do believe the class should be 2 units, not 1.

- Comments about the instructor

The teacher was excellent and she was very helpful.
Excellent - makes you feel at ease with all the technology out there that is ever-changing. She is very helpful - an asset to this library
What I experienced was instruction above and beyond what is required of the course. You have an instructor that cares about student learning.
Teacher was good. I felt comfortable talking to her in office hrs., which I did!

- Comments about the teaching process

What wasn't understood in class was made time for in scheduled and unscheduled office hours, and correspondence via email and phone calls.
The teaching process was informative, but the class was so short and there wasn't much time to see many demos.
I loved the teacher, I hated the workload. I loved the fact that I could come to my teacher and ask for assistance anytime, through e-mail, or in class.
The way the class went step by step was really helpful. We always knew what was expected of us, and what the requirements were.

## Lessons Learned

From our experience we have learned the following overall lessons which are relevant to teaching information literacy, whether or not one has a credit-bearing course.

- As the above account of how CSUH established an Information literacy requirement suggests, creating an environment where library faculty are respected players on campus (Rader, 1995) and making external circumstances work to your benefit are key. Since librarians in the California State University system have faculty status, we have served for years on Academic Senate and Senate committees as members and even as chairs. Had Kris Ramsdell not been a long-term, well-respected, and active member of the G.E. subcommittee at a time when a system-wide information literacy project coincided with G.E. re-structuring, and had she not seized the opportunity, we could very easily have missed this chance to insert information literacy into the G.E. curriculum, and to reach students at their entry point to the University.
- Just because you have a structure which mandates the inclusion of information literacy, do not believe it will automatically work. The integration of information literacy into the curriculum requires good relationships with faculty. In this case, those who worked most closely with the clusters had some influence over cluster faculty's awareness of information literacy, and this was to the students' benefit. In Clarence's case, as the library liaison for Philosophy, she already had connections to the faculty in her cluster – those working with clusters outside their liaison or subject specializations generally had fewer prior contacts to draw upon.
- We found we needed to lower expectations about students' verbal proficiency; many of our students are the first in their family to go to college, and many are the children of immigrants. As a result of these factors and the poor state of California's public schools, many of our students needed remediation in both English and math. So when we required students to evaluate and write annotations, some of us, in the spirit of writing across the curriculum, ended up

spending time correcting grammar and spelling (California School Library Association, 1997).

- There is never enough time to teach everything you want students to know. Trying to incorporate hands-on use of technology and active-learning exercises into a fifty-minute class was ambitious and laudable, but not always doable. It takes time to do good teaching, and you are never going to have enough time to teach everything. Pick what you really want and need to teach and teach it well. Similarly, we found that we had trouble adjusting the workload expected of students for a one-unit course. Those of us who had taught our two-unit class did not reduce the load as much as we perhaps should have, while those who had never taught it used the two-unit class as a model and tended to make the same "error." The most frequent statements on the open comments area of the evaluation forms were variations of "This class should be a two(or three or even four)-unit class!" While students' assessments of the workload were often unrealistically low, several of us did agree that we sometimes overloaded them in 1998-1999. As the first year progressed, we hoped we would be able to change our class into a two-unit class the following year, but this would have required increasing the number of overall G.E. units. Given the large numbers of students who need time to take remediation classes in both English and math in their first year, we realized this would be impossible. Most of us tried to adjust the homework to a more reasonable level in the second year.
- Do what you can to make your teaching relevant. We continue to link class examples and assignments to cluster topics, but not rigidly. Ideally, if all our students are truly in the appropriate cluster, cluster-related topics and examples make sense. However, holes in the system have allowed many students from other clusters to take information literacy classes not linked with their cluster. Some library faculty feel that the time spent adapting existing assignments to fit the ostensible cluster theme does not make sense if over half the students are from other clusters. Also, several of the clusters, particularly those related to science, either do not require library research projects in the first year or only require it in the third quarter of the year, so that our final project, and many of the assignments which fed into it, seemed to lack immediate relevance for the students. Judy Clarence negotiated with one of her discipline faculty members who was about to cancel a five-page paper requirement – she convinced him of the need for a project in order to increase relevance of information literacy, in students' minds, at least, and he agreed to simply reduce the paper to a three-page paper. We are also beginning to explore addressing different levels of information competencies, and to work with the discipline-based faculty to integrate information literacy into their curricula.
- On the other hand, some librarians, particularly those teaching the science clusters, feel strongly about the linkage between assignments and cluster theme. They want

to emphasize the scientific method, and address information production and distribution within the sciences, for example, so they are choosing to link their classes more closely to their clusters.

- Like other learning community initiatives (Levine & Tompkins, 1995), ours had disadvantages in the very cohesion we were trying to induce. In the first year, particularly, when the G.E. reorganization was completed late in the spring and rolled out for Fall quarter, incoming students had not known ahead of time that they would be in clusters which largely controlled everything they would take for the entire year. As a result, there was a lot of dissatisfaction with the cluster program. Since the students shared nearly all of their classes, they had a lot of time to talk to each other about those classes, and we found by the second quarter of the first year that we had a lot of very disgruntled students who didn't hesitate to express their dissatisfaction or exhibit it in student behavioral problems.[7]
- The class size maximum was thirty students, large for our classroom and lab, but by the third quarter of each year, several of our classes were so small that we had to cancel them. We felt that if we reduced class size, the smaller classes would distribute students more evenly throughout the year. However, the sizes of the clusters mediated against this, since many of them consisted of ninety students, and we needed three thirty-student classes just to get to all the students in a cluster by the end of three quarters. We do not think thirty students is an optimum class size but we are having to accept the size and create solutions to make it work, such as adding a larger classroom which can accommodate more students comfortably, and utilizing the modular capabilities in our lab. Space is a critical issue, and affects how and what you teach. You need to teach to the number of students you have, and ideally you need to be able to configure the classroom to fit what, and how, you are trying to teach in a particular session. Modular space design helps out here.
- The benefits of information literacy beyond writing papers was often not perceived or communicated, even by librarians. There is a need for promoting information literacy benefits beyond "research" largely because research is very different in different disciplines. In English, research is often something done in the library that results in a paper; this is not so in the sciences (Smalley & Plum, 1982; see also Laherty, 2000; Orians & Sabol, 1999; Sapp, 1992).
- We are beginning to place more emphasis on our pedagogy, on styles of learning and styles of teaching. The first year was "sink or swim" in its immediacy and the second year felt more under control, but new additions to our faculty have brought new focus to the way that today's students learn and have created more visual and kinesthetic components for our class. One new faculty member attended ACRL's Institute for Information Literacy immersion project last summer and brought back valuable insights which we hope to apply directly to our class in this, our third year.

Finally, we are heartened and encouraged to observe in a draft of a second year assessment of the G.E. program that though there were no statistically significant differences in our students' scores and those of a national comparison group of students from comprehensive regional universities in discipline-based subjects, there were definite differences regarding library services after our course. According to second year student responses to the "College Outcome Survey, 75% of CSUH students versus 62% of the comparison group say they were very satisfied or satisfied with library services (Murphy, 2000)."

## Notes

1 Recently, even higher education accreditation bodies are emphasizing information literacy. (Curzon, 2000; Rockman, 2000)

2 California State University, Hayward is a public university, part of the California State University system, located in the San Francisco Bay Area. It has an enrollment of 12,855 students - 36% male and 64% female; 34% White, Non-Hispanic, 26% Asian American, 12 African American, 11% Hispanic, 1% Native American, and 12% Other. Only 500-700 students enter as first-year students; the majority are transfer students.

3 The latter class was a hangover of the prior general education system, and it was fairly apparent from the start that this class was not truly fulfilling the information literacy requirement since there was far too little time devoted to the topic. The time that was devoted to information literacy was taught by the library faculty (one or two classes out of the 10 in the summer quarter), so we were in a position to know just how much time was given to information literacy. Similarly, even though the Computer Science class was a 4-unit class, the librarian who is the liaison to computer sciences was only asked to teach one class session to provide core information literacy skills to the students. True to its department it focused most heavily on computer skills, so that at the end of two years of assessment, it is fairly clear that the computer class does not truly satisfy the information literacy requirement. It is less clear what will be done about it. (Update: The week of 4/23/01 it was announced that two of our library faculty had jointly gotten an information literacy grant with the Computer Science faculty to make their class, Computer Science 1020, more truly fulfill the information literacy requirement.)

4 The fact that the General Education coordinator did not have us on her distribution list or on any official G. E. mailing lists for several months into the Winter quarter may have contributed to "amnesia" regarding the library faculty. As well, several librarians felt that LIBY 1010 alone was a huge addition to their already heavy workload and saw little reason to involve themselves deeply in cluster activities. Our own busy schedules, and sometimes our diffidence, contributed to our disconnection from other cluster faculty.

5 We thought perhaps this would obviate the usual "dog ate my homework" kinds of excuses, and some students did appreciate not having to come in to the instructor's office to pick up copies of homework.

6 Some librarians, however, use the control system just to lock the student terminals temporarily while the library faculty member is giving a demonstration to insure that students will not "play" and miss important teaching points.

7 This attitude was not so evident in the second year, largely because the incoming students already knew about the cluster system. But in the first year, this was enough of a problem to engage a year-end assessment meeting for over an hour. As well, many discipline-based cluster faculty were teaching first-year students for the first time in many years, were unprepared for the "raw material" of first-year students, and had difficulties dealing with students' resentment of the cluster system.

## References


Barclay, D. (1993). Evaluating library instruction: doing the best you can with what you have. RQ, 33 (2), 195-202. Available from: InfoTrac Expanded Academic ASAP Item: A14769922.

Beaubien, A. K., Hogan, S. A. & George, M. W. (1982). Planning courses. In Learning the library: concepts and methods for effective bibliographic instruction (pp. 199-216). New York: R. R. Bowker Company.

Bren, B., Hilleman, B. & Topp, V. (1998). Effectiveness of hands-on instruction of electronic resources. Research Strategies, 16 (1), 41-51.

Breivik, P. S. & Gee, E. G. (1989). Information literacy: revolution in the library. New York: American Council on Education.

California School Library Association. (1997). From library skills to information literacy: a handbook for the 21st century. San Jose, CA: Hi Willow Research and Publishing.

Clarence, J. J., Ginno, E. A., & Ramsdell, K. R. (1999). Info lit[10]: collaborative, clustered, & cool! A presentation at the 29th annual Workshop on Instruction in Library Use, Magill University. Montreal, Quebec.

Cooper, J. L., MacGregor, J., Smith, K. A., & Robinson, P. (2000). Implementing small-group instruction: insights from successful practitioners. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, (81), 63-76.

Curzon, S. C. (2000). Developing a program of information literacy: how California State University did it. College & Research Libraries News, 61 (6), 483-486, 491.

Drueke, J. (1992). Active learning in the university library instruction classroom. Research Strategies, 10 (2), 77-83.

Evenbeck, S. E. & Foster, M. C. (1996). The urban first year experience: building community benefits faculty and other university professionals and serves students well. Paper presented at the 9th International Conference on the First Year Experience. St. Andrews, Scotland.

Faust, J. & Laherty, J. L. (1999). Required! Info lit course integrated with G. E. clusters at CSUH. Poster session presented at the American Library Association Annual Conference. New Orleans, Louisiana.

Feinman, V. J. (1994, February). Library instruction: what is our classroom? Computers in Libraries, 14 (2) 33-36. Available from: InfoTrac Expanded Academic ASAP Item: A14878048.

Geffert, B. & Bruce, R. (1997). Whither BI? Assessing perceptions of research skills over an undergraduate career. RQ, 36 (3), 409-421. Available from: InfoTrac Expanded Academic ASAP Item: A19470464.

Germain, C. A., Jacobsen, T. E., & Kaczor, S. A. (2000). A comparison of the effectiveness of presentation formats for instruction: teaching first-year students. College & Research Libraries, 61 (1), 65-72.

Hensley, R. (1993). Teaching methods. In K. Branch (Ed.), Sourcebook for bibliographic instruction. Chicago: Bibliographic Instruction Section, Association of College and Research Libraries.

Information competence: a set of core competencies. (1997). In Information competence in the CSU: a report submitted to the Commission on Learning Resources and Instructional Technology (CLRIT) by the CLRIT Information Competence Work Group. Available at: http://library.csun.edu/susan.curzon/corecomp.html. Accessed: 15 November 2000.

Information literacy competency standards for higher education. (2000). Chicago: Association of College & Research Libraries. Available at: http://www.ala.org/acrl/nili/immersion01.html. Accessed: 15 November 2000.

Joyce, M. Z. & Tallman, J. I. (1997). Making the writing and research connection with the I-search process : a how-to-do-it manual. New York: Neal-Schuman.

Laherty, J. L. (2000). Promoting information literacy for science education programs: correlating the National Science Education Content Standards with the Association of College and Research Libraries Information Competency Standards for Higher Education. Issues in Science & Technology Librarianship, 28. Available at: http://www.library.ucsb.edu/istl/00-fall/article3.html. Accessed: 15 November 2000.

Levine, J. H. & Tompkins, D. P. (1995). Making learning communities work: seven lessons from Temple University. AAHE Bulletin, 177-180.

McCrank, L. J. (1992). Academic programs for information literacy: theory and structure. [On-line]. RQ, 31 (4), 485-98. Available from: InfoTrac Expanded Academic ASAP Item: A12484901.

Murphy, S. (2000). Personal conversations and emails.

Orgeron, J.-P. (1999). Learning communities: A selective overview of academic library involvement. Journal of Southern Academic and Special Librarianship 1 (2). [On-line]. Available at: http://SouthernLibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v01n02/orgeron_j01.html. Accesse d: 15 November 2000.

Orians, C. & Sabol, L. (1999). Using the web to teach library research skills in introductory biology: a collaboration between faculty and librarians. Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship (23). [On-line]. Available at: http://www.library.ucsb.edu/istl/99-summer/article2.html. Accessed: 15 November 2000.

Rader, H. B. (1995). Information literacy and the undergraduate curriculum. [On-line]. Library Trends, 44, 210-279. Available from: InfoTrac Expanded Academic ASAP Item: A17726336.

Ramirez, A. (1999). Assessment-driven reform: the emperor still has no clothes. Phi Delta Kappan, 81 (3), 204+ Available from: InfoTrac Expanded Academic ASAP Item: A581611391.

Ramsdell, K. R. (1998-2000). Personal conversations and emails.

Rice, J. (1986). How to develop an effective first orientation for library users. In A. S. Clark & K. F. Jones (Eds.), Teaching librarians to teach: on-the-job training for bibliographic instruction librarians. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press.

Rockman, I. F. (2000). New students, new expectations = new information infrastructures. College & Research Libraries News, 61 (6), 493-494.

Sapp, G. (1992). Science literacy through popularization: problems and potential. Science & Technology Libraries, 12 (2), 43-57.

Smalley, T. N. & Plum, S. H. (1982). Teaching library researching in the humanities and the sciences: a contextual approach. In Theories of bibliographic education: designs for teaching. (pp. 135-167). New York: R. R. Bowker.

Spitzer, K. L. (1998). Information literacy: essential skills for the information age. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University, ERIC Clearinghouse on Information & Technology.

Young, R. M. & Harmony, S. (1999). Working with faculty to design undergraduate information literacy programs: a how-to-do-it manual for librarians. New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.

## Acknowledgment

The Author wishes to acknowledge the support of her colleagues at California State University, Hayward Library, especially Jennifer Laherty, Judy Clarence, Elizabeth Ginno, and Kris Ramsdell, all of whom worked with her on presentations about the Library 1010 experience. She is particularly indebted to Kate Manuel for her support, suggestions, and encouragement in preparing this article.

http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v02n03/faust_j01.htm