

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS, PRIMARY RESOURCES, AND INFORMATION LITERACY PEDAGOGY

Melissa A. Hubbard
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Megan Lotts
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

ABSTRACT

This article reports on collaboration between an information literacy (IL) instructor and a special collections librarian to create a hands-on special collections experience for entry-level IL students within the context of a credit-bearing class. Data collected during this experience found that exposing students to these materials can increase their enthusiasm for and engagement with the library and improve their IL and research skills. This article explains the methods for designing such class sessions and reports the results with students.

INTRODUCTION

In 2008, Assistant Professor and Fine Arts Librarian began teaching an 8-week, credit-bearing information literacy course (CI 199) at Southern Illinois University Carbondale (SIUC). She structured the course to cover a wide selection of topics and to offer a range of activities to provide the best learning outcomes. She wanted her students to walk away from CI 199 knowing the library's resources as well how to use them for both their scholarly and everyday needs. The Fine Arts Librarian chose activities that would build on each other, and she encouraged her students to continually apply and strengthen the information literacy skills they were learning throughout the semester.

Most CI 199 instructors at SIUC focus on the online tools students can use to search for and evaluate information sources. But the Fine Arts Librarian also wanted to showcase the great variety of materials available in the library's physical collections. While not all materials are necessarily relevant to the research interests of all students, learning to find, evaluate, and understand such materials provides students with opportunities to practice information literacy skills that can be broadly applied.

The Fine Arts Librarian invited the library's Rare Book Librarian to offer a presentation to the class on the materials available in the library's Special Collections Research Center (SCRC). The Rare Book Librarian's initial presentations for the class were delivered in lecture format. She gave a brief descriptive overview of the collections, a tutorial on how to find SCRC materials in the library catalog and finding aid database, and then showed the students one or two interesting items from the collection.

After offering this presentation for several semesters, the authors discussed how to make the special collections class sessions more engaging for the students. These conversations resulted in a complete change in the format of the sessions. Instead of describing the SCRC materials and showing students how to search for them, the authors brought the students into the SCRC reading room, allowed them to handle a variety of materials, and then discussed the nature of those materials in the context of information literacy concepts. After some initial evaluation and tweaking, these sessions successfully engaged students and facilitated productive discussions about the nature of primary sources and the evaluation of information sources. This case study presents an overview of the methods for designing and running such sessions, some relevant data from the Fine Art Librarian's assignments and course pre/post tests, and qualitative descriptions of the responses from students to these sessions.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This review will examine two areas of library literature: 1) some of the challenges associated with teaching information literacy as a conceptual framework rather than a set of technological skills, and 2) the unique value of using special collections materials in undergraduate instruction.

The Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards define information literacy (IL) as an "intellectual framework for understanding, finding, evaluating, and using information" (2000, p. 3). However, in "Information Literacy and Technology: An Examination of Some Issues," Ann Grafstein (2007) noted that IL is often taught as a set of concrete technology-based skills, such as selecting a database and

searching it. This approach to teaching IL does not necessarily foster the development of the framework needed to make active use of such skills in the understanding of information.

In an article that appeared in *portal* alongside Grafstein's, Rebecca S. Albitz (2007) conducted a review of literature in the education and library fields, finding that writers in education tend to have similar definitions for the term *critical thinking* as do writers in library science for the term *information literacy*. She concluded that the two concepts are mutually supportive and cannot be isolated from one another, arguing that a critical thinker must be information literate, while an information literate person must use critical thinking skills to successfully evaluate information. In 2011, John M. Weiner expanded this work through a text analysis study of a large body of literature on critical thinking and information literacy in the education, health science, and library fields. He concluded that information literacy-related ideas are included in "the full range of cognitive functions of [Bloom's *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*]" when described in the literature, but that "current practices appear to be focused on identification and retrieval of relevant documents" (p. 89).

Authors identify several potential reasons for this disconnect between definitions of IL as an intellectual framework and cognitive process, and practical teaching of IL as a set of skills. Grafstein (2007) observed that the information explosion precipitated by Internet technologies placed information technology skills at the forefront of IL teaching. Also, library instruction is often delivered in the form of one-shot sessions or asynchronous online tutorials, neither of which allows enough time or student-librarian interaction for the development of

information literacy, as noted by Robert Detmering and Anne Marie Johnson (2011). However, even standalone IL courses may fall short of fostering the development of the necessary intellectual framework. In "An Assessment of the Lasting Effects of a Stand-Alone Information Literacy Course: The Students' Perspective," Alice L. Daugherty and Michael F. Russo (2011) reported on their survey of students who had taken such a course at Louisiana State University that measured whether students were using skills learned in their other coursework as well as in their lives outside of school. The authors found that respondents were using many of the skills they learned in the course. However, they noted that none of their respondents mentioned "'evaluation' of information sources" (p. 325) as a skill used after taking the course.

In response to the difficulty of teaching IL as defined by the ACRL standards, several librarians have designed successful programs described in case studies. Detmering and Johnson (2011) described an online module for introductory business students using "fundamental and powerful concepts" to demonstrate "the nature of research in subject-specific settings" (p. 104). The concepts chosen were evaluation of information, organization of information, and diversity of information. Information technology skills were demonstrated in the context of these organizational concepts. In "Facilitating Students' Intellectual Growth in Information Literacy Teaching," Gabrielle K.W. Wong (2010) wrote about an information literacy course focused specifically on socioeconomic data and designed to shift the focus of IL to "conceptual understanding and critical thinking." In her American Culture Studies course, Jeanne Armstrong (2010) embedded multiple writing assignments intended to

facilitate the development of information literacy and critical thinking and to clarify the relationship between the two. Anne-Marie Deitering and Sara Jameson (2008) described a collaboration between writing faculty and instruction librarians to embed information literacy and critical thinking processes into writing assignments through the metaphor of a “scholarly conversation.”(p. 63)

Information literacy in undergraduate instruction has been the subject of scholarly literature for decades, but it is only recently that researchers have found many articles discussing the use of special collections materials in undergraduate classes. In her 2005 master’s thesis, Anna Elise Allison noted a “dearth of literature on instruction in archives, manuscripts, and special collections departments” (p. 6). However, that is changing rapidly as more special collections librarians and archivists report on successful uses of their materials in undergraduate instruction. Several such articles note the connection between offering undergraduates hands-on interaction with physical primary sources in special collections and the development of critical thinking skills. In a two-day workshop for historical research methods students, Marcus C. Robyns (2001) actively incorporated critical thinking instruction as he introduced the original documents the students would use for research. He argued that primary sources are uniquely valuable for fostering critical thinking because they are subjective by nature. Students must interpret them using their own cognitive process rather than relying on “someone else’s interpretation of past events” (p. 365) as with secondary sources. Julia Gardner and David Pavelich (2008) reinforced Robyns’ assertions about primary sources and critical thinking in “Teaching with Ephemera,” noting that student cannot sort

primary sources into simple categories such as peer-reviewed or not, but instead students must question the face value of sources. Michelle McCoy (2010) described a project in which history students were asked first to generate research questions by looking at primary source documents and then to answer their questions using secondary sources. This approach helped students to develop their critical thinking skills as they came to understand that historical research is not a linear or “black and white” (p. 58) process, as one student noted.

Despite increasing evidence of the benefits of exposing undergraduates to primary sources, almost all of this exposure seems to occur in discipline-specific classes rather than in introductory freshman courses or IL courses. Allison’s 2005 survey about undergraduate instruction offered by special collections librarians and archivists found only four instances of such instruction offered in “interdisciplinary freshman courses,” (p. 30) compared to 68 instances in English classes and three in engineering classes. In another 2005 survey about outreach methods used by special collections librarians conducted by Brian J. Dietz, one respondent noted that younger college students are “too close to high school” (p. 38) to fully appreciate special collections materials. In a qualitative survey interviewing leaders in the field of archival instruction, Magia G. Krause (2010) found that many of the leaders were involved in information literacy efforts at their libraries, usually collaborating with instruction librarians on sessions about primary sources. However, she also noted that some were uncomfortable with the broadness of the term *information literacy*. David Mazella and Julia Grob (2011) documented a relationship between special collections instruction and IL in “Collaborations between Faculty and Special Collections

Librarians in Inquiry-Driven Classes.” They asserted that cognitive skills associated with IL can be learned through working with primary sources. When using such sources, students must learn how to locate items through catalogs, databases, and finding aids; they must evaluate the sources and make decisions about their potential usefulness; and they must contextualize new primary sources within the framework of their current knowledge of a subject. However, rather than focusing on entry-level information literacy, the paper describes a semester-long collaboration between a special collections librarian and an English professor to develop discipline-specific IL in an upper level class.

A common theme throughout much of the literature on teaching with special collections materials is that having a hands-on experience with older or original materials is an exciting experience for many students, which stimulates curiosity and engagement.¹

PROGRAM HISTORY

The authors first collaborated on offering a hands-on special collections presentation to students in The Fine Arts Librarian’s University College 101 (UCOL 101) class, a required semester-length class designed to ease the transition between high school and SIUC for first-semester freshmen. While UCOL 101 has standard curriculum guidelines, each instructor can provide a unique focus or theme for the semester. The Fine Arts Librarian’s section focused on IL and library skills. As with CI 199, the Fine Arts Librarian asked the Rare Book Librarian to conduct a presentation on SCRC materials, but she also wanted the presentation to have minimal lecture component and to engage the students actively with the material. The authors

decided that a hands-on session in the SCRC reading room would be the best way to accomplish this.

The Rare Book Librarian had given hands-on presentations for many one-shot classes in the past, but they were usually discipline-specific courses that focused on a particular topic. Choosing items for a general, introductory-level information literacy class posed an initial challenge. She wanted to select items that would capture the students’ attention while also demonstrating the nature of primary sources and the variety of materials available in the SCRC. After consulting other SCRC faculty, she selected the following five items:

1. A 1925 pamphlet describing a local event in which the Ku Klux Klan temporarily seized control of a mining town in the southern Illinois region. This was intended to demonstrate that local history collections can provide a fascinating and unique glimpse into events that are not well-documented in textbooks.
2. A letter from Susan B. Anthony to Victoria Woodhull-Martin dated February 28, 1871, discussing recent activity in the women’s rights movement. Hubbard assumed that the students would be aware of Susan B. Anthony and, therefore, interested in this contemporary account of the progress of the women’s rights movement.
3. A letter from Charlie Chaplin to John Howard Lawson dated September 9, 1955, praising Lawson’s bravery when testifying before the House Committee on

Un-American Activities during the McCarthy era. Again, Hubbard assumed that the students would recognize Charlie Chaplin's name and would have some knowledge of the events surrounding the 1950s Red Scare. With this letter and the Anthony letter, she hoped to help the students understand the concept of provenance and to realize that letters by very famous people might be found in the collections of papers of lesser known figures with whom they corresponded.

4. A University Archives scrapbook from the years 1897 to 1900, documenting the activities of two student literary societies at Southern Illinois University Carbondale, then known as Southern Illinois Normal University (SINU). The scrapbook contains photographs, programs from events, and handwritten notes. This was intended to introduce the students to University Archives as they considered what life was like for students more than 100 years ago.
5. An 1838 pamphlet related to the murder of Elijah Lovejoy, an abolitionist printer killed while defending his printing press from a pro-slavery mob in Alton, Illinois. This was intended to introduce students to SCRC's extensive holdings related to the freedom of the press.

Following a brief presentation about the nature of special collections materials, which included handling instructions, The Rare Book Librarian led the UCOL 101

students to the SCRC reading room, split them into small groups, and gave each group one of the items to investigate. Students were given a few minutes to look at their respective items, discuss with their group members, and ask questions of the Rare Book Librarian as she walked around the room. After that, she asked each group to describe their object to the class. Many of them seemed reluctant to do so, in part because they lacked the contextual knowledge she expected of them. None of the students knew who Charlie Chaplin was, nor had they heard of McCarthyism. Very few knew who Susan B. Anthony was. Generally, the letters seemed to fall flat, which was an excellent lesson about how special collections librarians' perceptions of their own collections can be quite different from freshmen-level student perceptions. While the Rare Book Librarian thought that the students would be excited to handle letters written by famous people, the students didn't recognize their significance, and seemed to think that the single letter format was a bit dull.

However, the group of students with the pamphlet related to Elijah Lovejoy seemed more interested, as slavery in the United States was certainly a topic with which they were familiar. The students with the university scrapbook seemed the most excited by the material, and genuinely enjoyed looking at the old photographs of their predecessors. The Rare Book Librarian asked students what questions the materials generated and how they might go about answering those questions. One of the students with the Elijah Lovejoy pamphlet wondered whether his murderers were prosecuted and convicted, a question that led to a productive discussion about why Google might not be the best source for uncovering such information. The students with the scrapbook wanted to learn more

about what life was like for SINU students in the 19th century but concluded that there would probably not be any relevant sources. That conclusion gave the Rare Book Librarian the opportunity to show them some theses related to that very topic and to talk about how they could find items such as theses in the online catalog. Although there were some very successful elements of the class, it was clear that future sessions would require a different set of objects to increase student engagement.

In the fall of 2011, the Fine Arts Librarian visited the ACRL Immersion Intentional Teaching Track and decided it was time to overhaul her syllabus for the CI 199 course, increasing the focus on cognitive learning and critical thinking skills, and to include many hands-on elements to engage the students with library materials. She also changed her assessment methods for the course to include a pre/post test on basic information literacy skills and library awareness (Appendix A) and an extra credit assignment given near the end of the course that asked students about their attitudes regarding the library and the learning experience offered in CI 199 (Appendix B). The pre/post test was reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee and administered through the Blackboard course management system on the first and last days of class. The pre/post test was not designed specifically to assess the special collections sessions described later in this article, but she hoped that the information provided by these assessment methods would help her further refine her teaching by understanding what aspects of the library are most interesting and engaging to students.

In the spring of 2012, the Fine Arts Librarian taught two sections of CI 199, using the assessment methods previously

described. She decided to incorporate a hands-on session with special collections materials in each of these sections, similar to the one offered in UCOL 101, but selected different materials to increase student engagement. Instead of items with great historical or cultural significance, she chose the following materials as aesthetically compelling. The hope was that students would find these items interesting even if they could not immediately understand their cultural value or significance.

1. A box of costume designs from a 1954 production of George Bernard Shaw's *Saint Joan*. The box included sketches, fabric swatches, and production notes.
2. A cardboard model created for students of R. Buckminster Fuller to demonstrate the concept of *tensegrity*. The model resembles Fuller's Spaceship Earth dome at Disney World's Epcot Center in some respects.
3. An artist's book called *Nella Notte Buia*, designed by Bruno Munari. It is in the mode of a children's book and contains papers of varying textures and colors. (The second time we offered this presentation, *Nella Notte Buia* was replaced by *Fairytales*, an 11-volume set of books with plain white bindings, each containing a unique artist's interpretation of the concept of fairy tales. These books are meant to be fun. One has scratch and sniff elements; one plays a song when opened.
4. A first edition of Phyllis

Wheatley's *Poems on Various Subjects, Religious and Moral*, published in 1773. Although this may have been less visually interesting than the other objects at first glance, the leather binding and handmade paper captured the students' attention very quickly.

5. A wax cylinder used to record Haitian Voodoo music in the 1930s. A digitized recording of the cylinder was also played for the students.

As before, the students were divided into small groups in the SCRC reading room, and each group was given an item with handling instructions and a set of questions to answer and return to the Fine Arts Librarian following the presentation and trip to SCRC (see Appendix C).

In these sessions, instead of asking students to inspect the items and ask questions, the Rare Book Librarian started the session by describing each item to the class, highlighting certain elements. For the costume designs, she pointed out that the collection also holds set designs and photographs from the same production. She asked students to think about how they would document a live performance. She briefly explained *tensegrity* using the Fuller model and showing how important concepts can be better understood through small visual examples. The artists' books were used to demonstrate that visual aspects of books can be just as important as textual aspects. When showing the first edition of Wheatley's poems, the Rare Book Librarian pointed out a page in which 18 prominent White men of Boston certified that Wheatley had written the poems herself. The publishers feared that otherwise no one would believe that a young female slave

could be literate enough to write poetry. This item served as an example of information that can be learned from first editions that could be lost in later editions. When discussing the wax cylinder and its digital surrogate, the Rare Book Librarian pointed out that information comes in a huge variety of formats, many of which are ephemeral in nature.

These two sessions were much more successful than the one offered in UCOL 101. The students were immediately drawn to the objects because of their visual and tactile elements and were able to appreciate the information given about the nature of primary sources through the examples.

OUTCOMES

In-class observations

Even though the authors deliberately selected items that required no prior cultural or historical knowledge for engagement, the students came to appreciate their significance when it was explained to them. This realization was particularly apparent with the book of Phyllis Wheatley poems. The students who handled the book immediately reacted to its age, but their focus changed when the Rare Book Librarian explained that it was the first book published by an African-American woman and showed them the page on which the men of Boston certified that Wheatley herself had written the poems. The students were previously aware of the history of slavery in the United States but may never have seen such a poignant example of the endemic racism of the time. Many were clearly moved by this. As one student wrote in comments on her SCRC student assignment, "It makes me appreciate so much more the freedom that I am blessed with today." Creating opportunities for students to understand how evidence of the

past can help them more deeply appreciate or understand their own lives was clearly one of the successful elements of the class.

In another instance from one of the sessions, a student at the table with the cardboard model from Buckminster Fuller's classes immediately asked why such a thing would be in special collections. He noted that although it was an interesting model, it was just cardboard, something that people throw away every day after the significance of the item was explained, the students discussed that it is often context that provides relevance to any piece of information, which is why the research process often involves both primary and secondary sources.

Two students in one of the CI 199 sections became so interested in the costume designs used in the class that they chose to write part of their final project, an article for Wikipedia, on the designs. In doing so, they researched the designer, the playwright, and the play itself, bringing together multiple secondary sources in order to create an article about this one collection of primary source materials.

At the end of the presentations, the Fine Arts Librarian encouraged the students to think further about the objects and ephemera found in SCRC and asked how items of this nature play a role in their own everyday lives. This led to a discussion about the role of one-of-a-kind or rare objects in the students' lives. The connections that the instructors hoped to make between resources and their historical context were underscored on a personal level in this discussion. Students talked about why they value certain items, which was often because they were passed down from a relative or friend. Students were also asked to consider these items in the context of the

digital world and to think about what they personally create, both physically and digitally, and how it might be preserved for future generations. The students discussed social media websites and how such information might be archived. Finally, the Fine Arts Librarian asked the students to think about what special collection of materials they would most like to see, and why. These discussions were very productive and interesting, and the students participated actively. Relating the special collections sessions to students' own thoughts and feelings on these issues seemed to help them better appreciate and understand the nature of unique information resources, and to view themselves not only as consumers of information, but also as interpreters and creators.

Assessment data

Based on interactions with the students during class, the authors felt that these sessions were very successful in both capturing the students' interest and in facilitating their understanding of primary sources. These assumptions were reinforced by data collected in the pre/post test (Appendix A) and in the extra credit assignment (Appendix B) regarding the students' attitudes toward the library and the class.

In one section of the class (hereafter called section one), 18 students submitted the extra credit assignment, and six of them (33%) described SCRC as one of the most positive aspects of Morris Library. In the other section (section two), 6 out of 17 respondents (35%) had the same opinion. Considering that the SCRC session was only 1 of the 16 class sessions offered during the course, these findings clearly reflect the enthusiasm observed in the classroom during those sessions.

The authors also consider some of the data collected in the pre/post tests for the class to be relevant to evaluating the SCRC sessions. One of the questions asked in the pre/post test was whether students had ever visited Special Collections. In section one, only two students answered *yes* in the pre-test. In section two, zero students answered *yes*. One of the obvious outcomes of the SCRC sessions was that all students who attended the class that day would be able to answer *yes* to that question. Considering how much the students seemed to enjoy SCRC, the instructors saw the students' firsthand familiarity with the SCRC as a very positive outcome.

Because the authors used the SCRC sessions as a way to explain the nature of primary sources, the data regarding the students' understanding of primary and secondary sources from the pre/post test is also relevant to evaluating these sessions. In section 1, 5 out of 18 students (27.8%) correctly answered the question "What is a primary resource?" in the pre-test. In the post-test for the same section, 11 out of 20 respondents (55%) answered the question correctly. In section 2, 3 out of 14 (21.4%) of students answered the same question correctly on the pre-test, while 11 out of 15 (73.3%) answered correctly in the post-test.

In response to the question "What is a secondary resource?" 4 out of 18 (22.2%) section 1 students answered correctly in the pre-test, and 10 out of 20 (50%) answered correctly on the post-test. In section 2, 3 out of 14 students (21.4%) answered the question correctly in the pre-test, while 7 out of 14 (50%) answered correctly on the post-test.

One of the limitations of the pre/post test is that the response rate was based on attendance for the first and last days of class

during which the tests were administered. So, it was not necessarily the exact same group of students taking the test at the beginning and end of the course. Also, because the data was collected anonymously, there was no way of knowing exactly how many students who responded to the pre/post test questions were actually in attendance during the sessions on the Special Collections. The students' understanding of primary and secondary resources might also have developed in other ways throughout the course. Nevertheless, the authors believe this data is relevant to evaluation of the SCRC sessions. Although the students' ability to answer these questions correctly clearly improved during the course, the numbers were still disappointing, particularly for the *secondary resource* question. However, based on the in-class discussion with the students during the SCRC sessions, the lower than expected scores may have more to do with a lack of clarity regarding the terms *primary resource* and *secondary resource* than with a lack of understanding of the concepts. This possibility points to potential limitations in the assessment method but also suggests an area for improvement in future teaching of these concepts.

The pre/post test also asked the question, "What do you like best about Morris Library?" In section 1, none of the student responses were about SCRC. However, in section 2, 4 out of 15 respondents (26.7%) described SCRC as the element of Morris Library they liked best. Speculation is that the response difference between the two sections may be because the session for section 2 was delivered weeks after the session offered to section 1, which provided the chance to evaluate and improve upon the teaching approach. Of course, it may also simply have to do with the inherent attitudes of a different group of students.

Some of the most gratifying data collected using the assessment tools was the enthusiasm evident in some of the student comments about SCRC, both in their assignments and in their pre/post test comments. The following are a few examples:

I appreciated our trip to Special Collection Center. I had no idea SIU contained so much history and so many resources for us students to use. It is unfortunate that this section of the library is under-utilized, but I think that every student should be informed about this location at some point during their college careers.

I thought that special collections was a great place to visit and have in our school because you can learn so much from all the different things they have there. I also like the fact that they have actual objects from the past which is something that always fascinated me. I was really intrigued with the book of poems because it was so old and actually come from the 1700's.

The most valuable skill that I learned would probably be in special collections downstairs. I never knew it was there and it will help me with a lot of research that I will have to do there in the future.

Overall, the authors were very pleased with the outcomes of these sessions, both in the class and in the assessment data. Clearly, there is still room for improvement in some areas, but providing the students with this kind of unique experience engendered enthusiasm for the library and its collections and a deeper overall understanding of the

nature and evaluation of information resources.

CONCLUSION

For those interested in teaching an information literacy course that focuses more on conceptual framework and less on research tools, the authors strongly recommend using special collections or other unique materials. The aesthetic qualities of the items, the hands-on experience, and the act of leaving the classroom to visit a new space all seemed to generate excitement and enthusiasm in the students, which encouraged them to engage in the class investigation of the items and the discussion that followed. The authors found that it was important that the students look not just at objects through locked glass cases, but also learned how to handle, evaluate, and use rare materials to gain a greater perspective of the past, present, and future of library collections and materials. The Fine Arts Librarian believed that her students became better evaluators of online databases and potentially unreliable web resources after their experience in SCRC.

The Fine Arts Librarian recently left SIUC for a new position at Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; but continued collaboration would include developing more focused assessment methods to measure the value of these hands-on sessions. Experience in the classroom indicated that this was a very valuable teaching tool. Students made new connections about the nature of information and how to use and evaluate it, even if that outcome wasn't quite captured in the project's assessment. This is an area for potential future research.

Finally, while special collections resources are usually reserved for upper-level undergraduates and more advanced

researchers who already have some contextual information when approaching the materials, the authors found that it is possible and valuable to connect entry-level undergraduates to these kinds of materials. That two students chose to use some of the items in their own final project for the course was especially exciting, as was one student's indication in his or her evaluation that he or she intended to use special collections resources for future research projects. Connecting students with these materials early in their academic careers cannot only improve their information literacy skills, but also can enrich their learning experience in other courses, as they will be confident in their ability to access and evaluate these materials for future research projects.

NOTE

1. There is an extensive body of literature on the importance of undergraduate engagement. A good place to begin to explore this literature is the National Survey of Student Engagement website, hosted by Indiana University at <<http://www.nsse.iub.edu/>>.

REFERENCES

- Albitz, R. S. (2007). The what and who of information literacy and critical thinking in higher education. *portal: Libraries & the Academy*, 7(1), 97–109. doi:[10.1353/pla.2007.0000](https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2007.0000)
- Allison, A. E. (2005). *Connecting undergraduates with primary sources: A study of undergraduate instruction in archives, manuscripts, and special Collections*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Armstrong, J. (2010). Designing a writing intensive course with information literacy and critical thinking learning outcomes. *Reference Services Review*, 38(3), 445–457. doi:[10.1108/00907321011070928](https://doi.org/10.1108/00907321011070928)
- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2000). *Information literacy competency standards for higher education*. Retrieved September 23, 2012, from <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>
- Daugherty, A. L., & Russo, M. F. (2011). An assessment of the lasting effects of a stand-alone information literacy course: The students' perspective. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 37(4), 319–326. doi:[10.1016/j.acalib.2011.04.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2011.04.006)
- Deitering, A. M., & Jameson, S. (2008). Step by step through the scholarly conversation: A collaborative library/writing faculty project to embed information literacy and promote critical thinking in first year composition at Oregon State University. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 15(1/2), 57–79. doi:[10.1080/10691310802176830](https://doi.org/10.1080/10691310802176830)
- Detmering, R., & Johnson, A. M. (2011). Focusing on the thinking, not the tools: incorporating critical thinking into an information literacy module for an Introduction to business course. *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship*, 16(2), 101–107. doi:[10.1080/08963568.2011.554771](https://doi.org/10.1080/08963568.2011.554771)
- Dietz, B. J. (2005). *Getting undergrads into archives: Educational outreach efforts of university archives, manuscript departments, and special collections*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Gardner, J., & Pavelich, D. (2008).

Teaching with ephemera. *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts and Cultural Heritage*, 9(1), 86–92.

Grafstein, A. (2007). Information literacy and technology: An examination of some issues. *portal: Libraries and the Academy*, 7(1), 51–64. [doi:10.1353/pla.2007.0006](https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2007.0006)

Krause, M. G. (2010). It makes history Alive for them: The role of archivists and special collections librarians in instructing undergraduates. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(5), 401–411. [doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2010.06.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2010.06.004)

Mazella, D., & Grob, J. (2011). Collaborations between Faculty and Special Collections Librarians in Inquiry-Driven classes. *portal: Libraries & the Academy*, 11(1), 467–487. [doi:10.1353/pla.2011.0012](https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2011.0012)

Robyns, M. (2001). The archivist as educator: Integrating critical thinking skills into historical research methods instruction. *American Archivist*, 64(2), 363–384.

Weiner, J. M. (2011). Is there a difference between critical thinking and information literacy? A systematic review 2000-2009. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 5(2), 81–92.

Wong, G. K. W. (2010). Facilitating students' intellectual growth in information literacy teaching. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 50(2), 114–118.

APPENDIX A — PRE/POST TEST

Pre/Post TEST for CI 199- section 204 & 209
<p>Completion and return of this survey indicates voluntary consent to participate in this study and under no circumstances will this pre-test or post-test survey be considered in your grade for this course. All answers to this survey will be stored anonymously in the SIUC Blackboard learning management system and only Assistant Professor Megan Lotts will have access to this anonymous information.</p> <p>If you have any questions about this study please contact Megan Lotts, Assistant Professor- Fine Arts Librarian at mlotts@lib.siu.edu or (618)453-2663 or my office in Morris Library 260D.</p> <p>“This project has been reviewed and approved by the SIUC Human Subjects Committee. Questions concerning your rights as a participant in this research may be addressed to the Committee Chairperson, Office of Research Development and Administration, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901-4709. Phone (618) 453-4533. E-mail siuhsc@siu.edu”</p>
Have you been to Morris Library before today? (Yes or No)
Have you ever visited Special Collections in Morris Library? (Yes or No)
How would you rate your information literacy skills? (Excellent, Good, Average, Below average, or What are information literacy skills)
Do you know who your library liaison is? (Yes, No, or What’s a library liaison)
If you needed Library help where would you go? (Circulation Desk, Information Desk, Administrative Offices, or I would not ask for help I would figure it out on my own)
Where would you go to check out a book? (Circulation Desk, Information Desk, Administrative Offices, or I generally do not check out library materials)
If you had to check out a book on reserve for one of your courses where would you go? (Circulation Desk, Information Desk, Administrative Offices, or I don’t know)
Have you ever used Wikipedia? (Yes or No)
Have you ever used Wikipedia as a resource in a paper you wrote? (Yes or No)
Have you ever created a Wikipedia page? (Yes or No)
Do you think it’s appropriate to use Wikipedia as a resource in a paper for a college course? (Yes or No)
Is Wikipedia something you consider a credible resource? (Yes or No)
Do you know how to properly cite a book or journal article? (yes or No)
What is a primary resource?
What is a secondary resource?
Please define plagiarism?
Have you ever used the EBSCO database? (Yes, No, or What is the EBSCO database)
What databases have you used for library research?
Over-all please choose the statement you think fits best answers the question I think the library is...? (A place to get help with my homework, A place to study, A place to help get research materials for my courses, A place to meet people, All of the above, None of the above)
What do you like best about Morris Library?

APPENDIX B — EXTRA CREDIT ASSIGNMENT

<p>CI 199- section 209 EXTRA CREDIT Due May 1st 11am</p> <p>Name: _____</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What is the most valuable skill you learned from CI 199?2. If you were teaching this course how would you improve the course?3. Would you recommend this course to others? Why or why not?4. What do you think are some of the positive aspects of Morris Library?5. What are some of the negative aspects of Morris Library?6. Any additional comments or thoughts are welcome?
--

APPENDIX C — SCRC SESSION ASSIGNMENT

<p>CI 199 section 204 Special Collections Research Center Project</p>
<p>** please email responses to mlotts@lib.siu.edu & post to black board</p>
<p>For this project I would like each of you to examine a piece of material that can be found in the Special Collections Resource Center in Morris Library and answer the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What is the name of the material that you looked at?2. Who is the author of this material?3. What year was this material made or published?4. Why do you find interesting about Special Collections or the object that you looked at?