

2019

Research Clinics: An Alternative Model for Large-Scale Information Literacy Instruction

Glenn Koelling

University of New Mexico, gkoelling@unm.edu

Lori Townsend

University of New Mexico, lt@unm.edu

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/comminfolit>

 Part of the [Information Literacy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Koelling, G., & Townsend, L. (2019). Research Clinics: An Alternative Model for Large-Scale Information Literacy Instruction. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 13 (1), 75-90. <https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2019.13.1.6>

This Innovative Practice is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Communications in Information Literacy* by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Research Clinics: An Alternative Model for Large-Scale Information Literacy Instruction

Glenn Koelling, University of New Mexico
Lori Townsend, University of New Mexico

Abstract

This article describes the pilot year of a new model for information literacy instruction in first-year composition classes at the University of New Mexico. The flipped classroom model, the Association of College and Research Libraries *Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education*, and challenges to library staffing sparked the implementation of *research clinics*, which are a blend of a flipped classroom and a research/reference consultation. These clinics are designed to meet students at their point of need for research projects and allow students to choose what sort of library help will be the most beneficial at that moment. At the end of the pilot year, students and librarians reported high levels of satisfaction with the new model. Both students and librarians enjoyed the one-on-one interaction, and librarians felt sessions were more consistently successful. The research clinic model is a flexible approach with implications beyond the first-year composition classroom.

Keywords: library instruction, information literacy, first-year composition, flipped classroom, tutorials, Association of College and Research Libraries *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*

Innovative Practices edited by Andrea Baer, Carolyn Gamtso, & Merinda McLure

Koelling, G. & Townsend, L. (2019). Research clinics: An alternative model for large-scale information literacy instruction. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 13(1), 75-90.

Copyright for articles published in *Communications in Information Literacy* is retained by the author(s). Author(s) also extend to *Communications in Information Literacy* the right to redistribute this article via other scholarly resources and bibliographic databases. This extension allows the authors' copyrighted content to be included in some databases that are distributed and maintained by for-profit companies. All other rights of redistribution are licensed by *Communications in Information Literacy* under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).

Introduction

Balancing the dual goals of depth (substantive learning experiences for students during their studies) and reach (connecting with as many students as possible) in providing information literacy instruction has historically proven difficult for libraries. Library instruction programs have used curriculum mapping to identify course and other entry points to reach students as well as to avoid content redundancies. Typically, this is done through a customized series of information literacy workshops in a specific disciplinary context, usually consisting of multiple required classes taught by a subject librarian over the course of their degree program. While this programmatic approach may work well at smaller institutions like liberal arts colleges, it is difficult to successfully implement at large research universities, especially given the common challenges of shrinking budgets and staffing, large transfer student populations, and lower division classes taught largely by graduate students. Buchanan, Webb, Houk, and Tingelstad (2015) identified other challenges in curriculum mapping information literacy: “inconsistency in course sequence, varied levels of cooperation and communication with departmental faculty, and librarians’ lack of authority in curriculum development . . .” (p. 107-108). Concurrently, expectations around information literacy instruction have expanded beyond library instruction to include a broad range of conceptual, procedural, and tool-based learning. Online instruction may help increase both reach and depth, but it often lacks the personal touch that can most positively impact students who can benefit from some extra help, like our first-generation students and students who are members of marginalized populations (Bash, 2015; Wood & Turner, 2010). The research clinics model presented in this article is part of our ongoing attempt to provide deep and meaningful learning experiences as well as personal support to our students while enjoying a satisfying and sustainable working life.

Background

Located in Albuquerque, New Mexico, the University of New Mexico (UNM) is the Land of Enchantment’s flagship university. It is a Hispanic-Serving institution with the Carnegie classification Research University with Highest Research Activity. In 2017, UNM enrolled over 26,000 students, including approximately 18,500 full-time and over 3,200 freshman students (“Enrollment,” 2017). The libraries’ instruction program at UNM includes workshops, undergraduate and graduate library instruction, and lower and upper division undergraduate credit-bearing courses.

UNM’s general education requirements include a first-year composition (FYC) course sequence. This series of nine credit hours of writing and speaking courses includes ENGL

120, which is typically taught by graduate assistants (GAs) and uses genre study to explore writing, research, and argument construction. While many 100-level courses incorporate some degree of information literacy, ENGL 120 is the course that has dedicated and well-established library instruction, managed by the libraries' Learning Services team. For the 2017-2018 school year, there were 124 sections of ENGL 120, so it's a good way to reach most first-year students. The team is responsible for managing first-year library instruction, coordinating high school and community library instruction, creating and maintaining digital learning objects, and teaching credit courses in the Organization, Information, and Learnings Sciences department. Over the years, ENGL 120 library instruction has evolved to meet the needs of a changing institution. Hurley and Potter (2017) explained that in 2015 the Learning Services team developed an instruction model based on the Association of College and Research Libraries *Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education* (ACRL *Framework*)—specifically the “Information Creation as a Process” frame or the threshold concept of “format” (Hofer, Lin Hanick, & Townsend, 2018). Teaching broader information skills as represented by the ACRL *Framework* addressed several issues with library instruction for ENGL 120: “repetition of content across multiple classes, timing of the library session in the semester and relevance of the research project assigned in the class to the content of the session” (Hurley & Potter, 2017, p.118). At that time, Learning Services introduced a flipped option where students completed an online tutorial outside of class, and in subsequent, in-class activities students applied and practiced what they had learned. The tutorial was centered on an information literacy concept but also addressed topics such as creating keywords, constructing searches in recommended databases, and citing sources.

While the changes to ENGL 120 library instruction were a step in the right direction, they weren't quite the right fit. Typically, the Learning Services team of three instruction librarians taught these ENGL 120 sessions, resulting in an individual teaching load of approximately eighty one-shots a year (all scheduled and designed according to the needs of each class). These one-shots followed the traditional library instruction model, one similar to that of a guest speaker. Additionally, Learning Services librarians were responsible for more than just ENGL 120 instruction, serving as subject liaisons to at least one department and meeting the research and service requirements of tenure-track positions. Learning Services librarians also co-taught a three-credit introduction to information studies course each semester. UNM libraries, like many other university libraries throughout the country, has suffered from budgetary challenges in recent years. One of the manifestations of this challenge is that the Learning Services team has almost never been fully staffed since its

creation in early 2015. As one of the team members said about previous ENGL 120 instruction, “It felt like I was just running around from class to class, out of breath.”

The potentially unsustainable workload in addition to an ongoing effort to improve the impact of the first-year information literacy program was the impetus for trying something new in ENGL 120 library instruction: the research clinic. Based on a model presented at the 2013 Greater Western Library Alliance Student Learning Outcomes Event by Kansas State University’s Melia Fritch and Joelle Pitts, UNM’s Learning Services team implemented an alternative to the first-year composition one-shot for the 2017-2018 academic year (Fritch & Pitts, 2013).

Research Clinics a.k.a. the Faux-Flip

Research clinics at UNM are a blend of a flipped classroom and a research/reference consultation. They are designed to meet students at their point of need for ENGL 120 research projects while giving them the flexibility to decide what sort of library help would be the most beneficial at that moment. The clinics are seventy-five minute sessions that take place outside of class time. Students register for clinics that work with their schedules and come when they are working on a research project. Each research clinic follows a standard format: introduction/warm-up, work with assistance from librarians, and reflection/exit ticket.

We call our research clinics a “faux-flip” because while they use elements of a flipped class like tutorials and active learning, they are not a traditional flip. Our previous ENGL 120 library instruction followed a classic flipped instruction model. For research clinics, however, pre-work is not mandatory. The faux-flip avoids the challenges Hurley and Potter (2017) identified of classroom tension and reluctance to participate when students didn’t do pre-assigned work. It also avoids some of the other pitfalls identified by Arnold-Garza (2014) such as question clarification lag, ever-changing technology, and dependence on technology access outside of class.

The research clinics are centered in “Information Creation as a Process” as a way to address constantly changing information resources and to avoid repetition of instructional content. By focusing on information formats, students learn to assess information in context, a foundational skill. Seeber (2015) discussed this frame in terms of format, arguing:

The reality is that students no longer need help getting to the sources, but rather critically evaluating the sources that they find. Format, as a process, indicates that this evaluation of information should not be based on

“inconsistent characteristics,” which are unique to each database, but instead grounded in analysis of the underlying processes which led to the creation of that information. (p. 23)

Mapping this frame to ENGL 120 library instruction avoided the risk of repeating instruction in other courses. Additionally, focusing on a core concept rather than technology-specific content extended the tutorial’s shelf life.

Introduction and Warm-up

Each research clinic starts with an introduction that sets expectations for the session and includes a warm-up activity designed to get students interacting with each other. Students learn the purpose of the session, their options to complete it, and that librarians will meet with every student individually. The warm-up activity serves as an ice-breaker and helps students transition to active work.

The warm-up is a brief small-group discussion about some aspect of the libraries or research (see Appendix A). Several prompts add variety to the clinic, which is especially important because there are repeat attendees. A favorite prompt asks students to think back to a previous research project and talk about what they liked and what was challenging. Common student replies concern finding “credible sources,” gathering enough sources, and writing up their research. Occasionally a student will tell us that this was their first research assignment. Another discussion prompt gives students a number that is the libraries’ annual collection budget and asks them to guess what the number represents. This opens a discussion about why the libraries spend that much each year on resources, what those resources can offer students, and why librarians encourage students to use these resources during the clinic.

Individual Work with Assistance from Librarians

Following the warm-up, we hand out snacks (an important part of the research process), and students have two options for working: an interactive tutorial or a research project that they have brought with them.

The tutorial (<https://library.unm.edu/services/instruction/index.php>) was developed by the Learning Services team coordinator and aims to introduce students to the concept of “information format.” It also provides a brief overview of a couple of commonly used library resources and some practice using them. The tutorial takes between forty-five minutes to an hour to complete and is composed of videos, guides, and activities. It begins by introducing the various information formats a student is likely to encounter when doing research and

explains the key components of these formats. The student then takes a quiz on formats and continues on to explore topic and keyword development, authoritative sources, and citations. The tutorial also addresses foundational knowledge about doing research in a university library and incorporates *Framework*-centered instruction. By the end of it, students should have developed topic keywords, found a source, and created a citation for that source. After the tutorial, students should be better prepared to continue their research. The Learning Services team encourages those students who do not bring a project to work on, or who would like a more structured session, to choose this option. Some ENGL 120 instructors assign the tutorial as pre-work for students before the clinic, but the majority do not.

Students in research clinics may also choose to work independently on their research project, with a brief five to ten minute consultation from a librarian. For this option, students simply work on their project—wherever they happen to be. This means that in any given clinic, some students might be starting their research while others may be incorporating their research into a paper and yet others might be working on citations.

For each student, regardless of what option they choose, a librarian will talk with them about their work. Usually we spend more time with those students who are working on a project, and this is the option we prefer. We often discuss their topics, recommend databases, and help with keyword generation in addition to a variety of other research or library questions that arise. As one librarian said: “Asking students to summarize their topic/research was surprisingly challenging for many students to do, but as they worked through their explanation in this low-stakes setting, I felt like it really helped them to focus and feel surer about their project.” Sometimes students say they don’t have a project. In cases like these, we probe further by asking about future assignments and mention students can consult their online class. Many times, students find something to work on as they continue through the tutorial. We want students to apply what they’re learning rather than focusing solely on theoretical concepts.

Reflection

About ten minutes before the clinic finishes, we let students know that if they liked working with a librarian, there are other ways to do that. We hand out exit tickets, and students fill out information about what they did during the clinic and answer a reflective question (see Appendix B). A favorite reflection is “What are your next steps? What can you do now to navigate the road ahead with the most success?” This closing reflection is designed for students to contextualize their work during the clinic within the larger research process. We

also ask them to fill out a survey about their experience. Finally, we stamp the exit ticket (see Appendix C), and students present it to their instructor as proof of attendance.

Challenges and Lessons Learned

The Learning Services team refined many aspects of the research clinic model by trial and error. First, communication with the ENGL 120 instructors was key. Arnold-Garza (2016) also identified instructor buy-in as a common challenge of a flipped classroom (p. 112). Each semester, we presented the research clinic model at the English GA orientation and emailed ENGL 120 instructors regularly throughout the semester. Even then, it took time to communicate the new model with everyone. More importantly, it took a semester for instructors to understand that they should require their students to attend at the start of a research project. For example, one instructor let their class choose which clinic to attend, and the class decided to come after a big paper was due, undoubtedly not realizing the nature of the clinic. This miscommunication meant that by the time the students attended the clinic, they were frustrated at having just turned in a big research paper. By the spring semester, we noticed that most students were bringing projects to clinics. Since GAs rotate out regularly, close communication with the department will be crucial for future semesters. In future communication to instructors, we plan on emphasizing that students benefit most when they come with a project to work on during the clinic. We will also need to work with the Core Writing Coordinators to underscore that students should be required to participate in the clinics.

Second, setting the research clinic schedule was challenging. Since most ENGL 120 sections are not working on research assignments the first three weeks of the semester, clinics started in week four of the semester and continued until week twelve. We gathered information about when to offer clinics in different ways. Students answered a survey about times they would prefer clinics be hosted. We also noticed what clinics filled up and offered more at those days/times or cut back if enrollment was low. Spring semesters have about twice the amount of ENGL 120 classes, so we doubled the amount of clinics in spring. Ultimately, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday clinics were more popular than Thursday/Friday ones, and clinics offered earlier in the semester filled better than those offered in the second half. While attendance was good in week twelve clinics, more students in these clinics did not have projects; they were attending because they had put it off. Clinics held in the late morning and early afternoon usually filled, along with the occasional 5:00 P.M. clinic. In Fall 2017, there were 33 clinics with a total attendance of 333. For Spring 2018, there were 47 clinics with a total attendance of 706 participants. Overall, 80 clinics

reached about 1000 students, although some were repeat attendees. Initially there was a mix of fifty and seventy-five minute sessions, but we soon realized fifty minutes was not long enough. Spring semester only had seventy-five minute clinics. In feedback, students reported that the seventy-five minute clinics were both too long and not long enough, so we feel they are a good length.

In tandem with determining how to schedule clinics, participant registration using Springshare's LibCal was essential for managing attendance. With this software, we saw how many students had registered. If less than ten students registered, we cancelled the clinic. If more than twelve registered, we added a helper librarian. For future clinics, two librarians will be assigned for each clinic since it's easier to drop helpers than to add them.

LibCal has several other beneficial features. First, it sends registrants a reminder email on the morning of the clinic for which they are registered. If the registrant can no longer attend, there's an easy way to cancel, which frees up space. LibCal can also keep track of actual attendance as well, which helped us determine the attendance rate (about 85%). This data is used to set maximum registration numbers and schedule rooms. LibCal can also send a follow-up email. Initially, we used this function to distribute a survey about the clinics but later found that students were more likely to respond at the end of the clinic. For future clinics, we will use this function to send information about how students can meet with a librarian if they liked working one-on-one or if they still have questions about their project. Finally, we used LibCal's waitlist option to see when a time was so popular that we needed to move to a bigger classroom and open up more seats.

The logistics of the research clinics weren't the only aspect that took some trial and error; managing the clinics also needed some finesse. Specifically, we found that the warm-up and how we approached students one-on-one made a sizeable difference as to the clinic's success. The warm-ups got people talking and broke the ice among students as well as with the librarians. It set the tone, helping students settle into the space more comfortably and get to work. As we sat down with each student we did not ask "Do you need help?" since the answer was almost always "No." Instead, we asked "What are you working on?" This opened up conversation possibilities.

A final takeaway from this pilot year of research clinics is that while they were designed for ENGL 120 students, the clinics appealed to a broader population. The libraries' reference department asked if they could refer people to the clinics, and other English classes requested that their students attend. Some ENGL 120 students came to multiple clinics of their own volition. Other students brought friends who also had research projects. We

welcomed all of these requests and additional participants and will remove ENGL 120 branding from future research clinics.

Program Evaluation

At the end of the pilot year of research clinics, student feedback about the clinic model was positive. In a voluntary survey at the end of each clinic, we asked students to rate statements about their experience. To the statement “This was a productive use of my time,” 88% of respondents (n=241) marked “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree.” To the statement “The structure and delivery of the research clinics was a good way for me to learn,” 87% of respondents marked “strongly agree” or “somewhat agree.” One participant wrote: “Awesome clinic. Would do again. Lots of valuable knowledge given. Very friendly instructors.” A theme in the comments was that participants liked the one-on-one aspect as well as simply having time to work although some students wanted more one-on-one time. Gibes and James (2015) found similar results when they flipped a first-year English course and credited “enhanced face-to-face interaction” for their flip’s success (p. 13).

The Learning Services librarians reported feeling much more satisfied with the clinic model. Arnold-Garza (2014) identified several benefits of the flipped model that were true for our faux-flip: time for active learning, increased student autonomy, more instructor-student interaction, and greater flexibility to suit individual students’ learning styles and level of knowledge. Arnold-Garza (2016) also recognized that a flipped model requires fewer librarians to reach similar numbers of students as traditional classroom instruction (p. 111). While we saw significantly fewer students than in previous models, the following reasons likely explain the decline: it was the pilot year and instructor buy-in takes time, and we no longer had a captive audience since students attended outside of class time. Once clinics become established, we expect Arnold-Garza’s observation to be true for us as well. Without a captive audience, however, it’s doubtful that we’ll get the same in-person count, though the number of students completing the entire online tutorial continues to grow. Fortunately, the libraries’ leadership is supportive of experimentation and believes that library instruction is defined by more than the number of students sitting in library classes.

Continuing the Clinics

There are several reasons we are satisfied with the clinics and will continue to develop this model. In this case, numbers don’t give the full story. First, we provide personalized assistance and make connections to each student. This is more satisfying both for the students and for the librarians. One-on-one, students ask more questions than in traditional

one-shots. For students, their attention is captured for the entire interaction because we're focusing only on them and their project or library learning experience. This means that the students who came had a depth of experience that is harder to achieve in a traditional one-shot. While we do not have data about student satisfaction in our previous instruction models, we know students were engaged and reported being happy with research clinics.

Second, library instruction in a one-shot format is not only challenging but also peculiar, and research clinics mitigated some common issues. Librarians sometimes compare the one-shot to guest lectures, and disciplinary faculty and instructors often frame it that way. Unlike guest lectures or field trips, however, a trip to the library is often regarded by students with dread. If librarians try to address conceptual content with active learning during a one-shot, they are more likely to experience resistance from students who don't know whether to trust them and who may resent that they aren't allowed to sit back and listen. Librarians must rely on charisma and energy to overcome reservations students might justifiably feel because librarians don't have enough time to create a substantive relationship with them—the kind of relationship built when teaching semester long courses. Bowles-Terry and Donovan (2016) critiqued the one-shot as an instructional method “born out of necessity and [that has] been maintained in many cases for lack of anything better” and that the one-shot model “offered no sustainability or scalability and, more importantly, very little possibility for the advancement of information literacy as a far-reaching and influential educational movement” (p. 137). This sentiment was echoed in Salisbury and Sheridan (2011) in their article on why curriculum mapping was necessary for their university.

It is not surprising, therefore, that even experienced library teachers who love what they do sometimes have mixed feelings about early undergraduate one-shots. At UNM, the librarians responsible for the bulk of first-year instruction had previously worked hard to make sessions engaging, focused on conceptual learning, and moved database demos and similar library material to the online tutorial (Hurley & Potter, 2017). We encouraged participation and engagement through challenging activities that kept students active and involved. Even given an excellent crew of engaging, fun, and interested librarians, we could never guarantee that a session wouldn't simply fail. This feeling of risk and the constant effort to improve sessions to guarantee a good experience for students was exhausting. There is no magic formula that will work with every ENGL 120 class, given the unique dynamics of both the students and classroom instructors, not to mention the mood and energy level of the librarian. Bowles-Terry and Donovan (2016) described the effect of such dynamics as “the undeniable burnout that can accompany the one-shot instructional model”

(p. 139). Librarians are perhaps placing ourselves in an untenable position if we expect to experience consistent success in this context without a coinciding burnout.

Research clinics don't address all of these challenges, but they mitigate some of the feeling of risk for librarians. For example, one student participant wrote that the clinic was "more helpful than I thought it would be," alluding to that preconceived dread of library instruction. While clinics are still one-and-done for most students, we made personal connections with each student that helped develop trust and broke down some barriers. The Learning Services team also felt that once we had made some adjustments to our initial approach, not many clinics outright failed. In short, the emotional load of uncertainty was lessened. One of the team members said that research clinics did not feel "like the first day every day." Third, the research clinics are removed from a traditional class setting in several ways that also constructively disrupt student expectations for library instruction. Since each clinic may include students from several classes, there is not a classroom dynamic already in place. Each clinic is a fresh start and a new community. The warm-up helps students feel comfortable in this new setting by making connections with their neighbors as they talk about research. Studies have shown that even the smallest sense of community increases motivation (Walton, Cohen, Cwir, & Spencer, 2012). Even the brief time a student spent chatting with their neighbor and the librarians can increase their motivation to work on their projects. This is important because most of students' time in the clinics is spent actively working unlike in the previous one-shot model where students often had periods of inactivity. Even the "clinic" title indicates that these are not traditional instructional sessions. Students have more responsibility for their own work. They must schedule a time that suits them and make it to the library themselves. Unlike traditional one-shots where students often spent more time listening (and zoning out), most students in research clinics work the whole time. Whether going through the tutorial or working on a project, it is the student's responsibility to decide how to use their time.

Another way the traditional classroom setting is disrupted is that ENGL 120 instructors rarely come to clinics, and while they are welcome, their absence reinforces that this is not their class. Librarians, while authority figures, do not represent authority to students the same way that their instructors do (Simmons, 2005). Khailova (2017) pointed out that in flipped classrooms, the librarian's role changed to more of a coach and helper rather than traditional instructor (p. 152), and this is a dynamic we noticed in our clinics. We give out exit tickets, but we do not give out grades. We provide structure and expect that students work, but students are responsible for choosing what that work looks like. Further deconstructing this hierarchy is that there are usually two librarians present for most clinics.

We aim for no more than twelve students per librarian, and most of our clinics had over twelve students registered. During the warm-up, these librarians will often share examples of their own, which may be contradictory. For example, a common warm-up question is “What about research is challenging for you?” One librarian may answer that beginning research is the hardest part while the other might say they struggle with writing. The students see that the librarians have different answers, which disrupts the hierarchy of one authority figure with the “right” answer. In short, the traditional one-shot model of instruction represents a large power and agency gap between instructor and students. The research clinics model tries to narrow that gap.

Conclusion

The next step for the research clinics is to encourage instructors to require students to complete the tutorial, ideally before they attend a clinic. Initially, many students defaulted to completing the tutorial during the clinic because they did not bring a project to actively work on. With better instructor communication, more of the students attending clinics will bring research projects. Early on we realized that we prefer students to be actively working on a project during their time at the research clinic in order to make individual connections with students by providing one-on-one instruction. The tutorial, however, presents a different, more structured way of learning. As one participant wrote: “Honestly the online tutorial was the most helpful and I would strongly consider making it mandatory.” Both clinic and tutorial are valuable since information literacy instruction is not a one-and-done process. This way, students will get library instruction in two different formats. If they take the tutorial before the clinic, they’ll be able to apply again what they learned in the tutorial with librarians present to provide a personalized experience. If students take the tutorial after the clinic, they’ll get the big ideas of information as format as well as reinforcing information learned at the clinic or gaining new knowledge. While requiring students to complete the tutorial before attending a clinic would move the clinics toward a more traditional flipped-classroom format, students would still not need to have completed the tutorial for clinics to be successful. We would also like to update the tutorial, which is several years old.

The clinic model has been so popular in the libraries that we’re starting to flip other large-scale library instruction. Some of UNM’s early undergraduate biology library instruction will now follow the clinic model as will the first-year public speaking course although only ENGL 120 will use “Information Creation as a Process” as a focus. We also plan to implement something similar for K-12 instruction for area schools.

Finally, the research clinic model is flexible enough to be employed in many different settings. The time and effort spent creating a tutorial is well worth it. Once a tutorial is in place, the clinics rely less on instruction and more on individual research consultations. This dynamic has the potential to appeal to librarians who are more comfortable one-on-one with students rather than in front of a whole class. This model may also be good for programs with heavy teaching loads or librarians who feel burnt out on instruction.

The Learning Services team feels optimistic about the future of the first-year library instruction program. Research clinics are an adaptable model that capitalizes on relationships between librarians and students rather than on databases and websites. This is not to say that every clinic held during the pilot year was a dream—some had challenges. But more clinics felt more rewarding than in our previous models, and that’s something to look forward to.

References

- Arnold-Garza, S. (2014). The flipped classroom teaching model and its use for information literacy instruction. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 8(1), 7-22.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/comminfolit.2014.8.1.161>
- Arnold-Garza, S. (2016). The role of the flipped classroom in information literacy programs. In P. Ragains & M.S. Wood (Eds.), *The new information literacy instruction: Best practices* (pp. 103-118). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2015). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>
- Bash, C. (2015). One-on-one versus one-shot: A comparison of a general psychology class - Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. *Catholic Library World*, 85(3), 167-171.
- Bowles-Terry, M., & Donovan, C. (2016). Serving notice on the one-shot: Changing roles for instruction librarians. *International Information & Library Review*, 48(2), 137-142.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572317.2016.1176457>
- Buchanan, H., Webb, K. K., Houk, A. H., & Tingelstad, C. (2015). Curriculum mapping in academic libraries. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 21(1), 94-111.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2014.1001413>
- Fritch, M. & Pitts, J. (2013, November). Research rescue: Flipping instruction for scalability, learning, assessment, and sanity. Presented at the Greater Western Library Alliance, Student Learning Outcomes Task Force Event, Las Vegas, NV.

- Gibes, E.A., & James, H. (2015). Is flipping enough? A mixed approach to introductory information literacy instruction. *College & Research Library News*, 76(1), 10-13. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.76.1.9240>
- Hofer, A. R., Lin Hanick, S., & Townsend, L. (2018). *Transforming information literacy instruction: Threshold concepts in theory and practice*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO.
- Hurley, D. A. & Potter, R. (2017). Teaching with the Framework: A Cephalonian method. *Reference Services Review*, 45(1), 117-130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-07-2016-0044>
- Khailova, L. (2017). Flipping library information literacy sessions to maximize active learning: Toward articulating effective design and implementation principles. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 56(3), 150-155. <https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.56n3.150>
- Salisbury, F., & Sheridan, L. (2011). Mapping the journey: Developing an information literacy strategy as part of curriculum reform. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 43(3), 185-193. <https://doi.org/0.1177/0961000611411961>
- Seeber, K. P. (2015). Teaching “format as a process” in an era of web-scale discovery. *Reference Services Review*, 43(1), 19-30. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-07-2014-0023>
- Simmons, M. H. (2005). Librarians as disciplinary discourse mediators: Using genre theory to move toward critical information literacy. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 5(3), 297-311. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2005.0041>
- University of New Mexico, Office of Institutional Analytics. (n.d.). Enrollment. Retrieved March 15, 2017, from <https://oia.unm.edu/facts-and-figures/data-visualizations/Enrollment.html>
- Walton, G. M., Cohen, G. L., Cwir, D., & Spencer, S. J. (2012). Mere belonging: The power of social connections. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(3), 513-532. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0025731>
- Wood, J. L., & Turner, C. S. (2010). Black males and the community college: Student perspectives on faculty and academic success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 35(1-2), 135-151. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2010.526052>

Appendix A: Warm-Up Activities

Groups of two or three students have about five minutes to discuss a prompt. Responses are shared out as a group, and the librarians also share their responses.

1. Small Group:
 - a. What is your topic?
 - i. Why did you choose it?
 - ii. What do you already know about your topic?
2. Pair-Share:
 - a. What was the last research project you did?
 - i. What went well?
 - ii. What was challenging?
3. Small Group:
 - a. Where do you start your research & why?
4. Pair-Share:
 - a. 5,107,858 [our annual collection budget]
 - b. What is this number? [Sometimes the librarians tell them that it is library related. Sometimes students are told that they can Google the number. Sophisticated Googling will bring it up, but most students don't find it. Once students discuss their guesses, librarians tell them it is a dollar amount and give them an extra minute to guess.]
 - c. Why do we spend this? [Once librarians reveal what the number represents, the small groups spend another couple of minutes talking about why the libraries spend this much money. Then, the larger group comes back together to discuss.]

Appendix B: Reflection Prompts

There is space on the exit tickets for a sentence or two reflection.

1. Summarize the most important things you will take with you from this experience.
2. Reflect on your thinking, learning, and efforts today. In what ways do those efforts support your research assignment?
3. What are your next steps? What can you do now to navigate the road ahead with the most success?

Appendix C: Exit Ticket

Figure 1 - Exit ticket front, stamped with coyote

	
RESEARCH CLINIC 	
TO BE COMPLETED BY RESEARCHER	
Last Name	First Name
Date	_ _ / _ _ / _ _ _ _
RESEARCH ACTIVITY: check all that apply.	
Assignment <input type="checkbox"/>	
Online Tutorials <input type="checkbox"/>	
Consult w/ Librarian <input type="checkbox"/>	

Figure 2 - Exit ticket back

Reflection: _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ _____
Questions? Ask a Librarian library.unm.edu