Section Header	Description
Institution Name	Aurora University
Institution Characteristics	Private university; 6 FTE librarians; 5000 FTE students
CARLI Counts Participant Name + Job Title	Kathy Clark, Director of University Library
Project Name/Title	One-shot Information Literacy Sessions and General Education Outcomes
Single Sentence Abstract	Phillips Library used a critical thinking rubric to investigate the impact a one-shot IL session in a core general education course had on students' ability to evaluate sources and the findings of the study are pending.
Motivation(s) for Project	This project was important to demonstrate the impact of Phillips Library on student learning. Current literature confirms that information literacy instruction strengthens general education outcomes. Ensuring the library has a voice in the campus priority of building intentionally upon the promise of the new general education curriculum to serve the needs of students, specifically that students will demonstrate critical thinking skills of analysis, problem solving and application was paramount.
Partners and Stakeholders	Director of General Education provided support necessary for the librarians to deliver a one-shot in every IDS 1200 course in the fall of 2019. Director of University Analytics provided access to the general education assessment data for 2018 and 2019. IDS 1200 teaching faculty allowed one class period for librarians to deliver the one-shot session.
Inquiry Question	What is the impact of a one-shot information literacy session in a core general education course on critical thinking?
Study Participants/Population	Freshman students enrolled in the mandatory

	IDS 1200 course.
Method(s) of Data Collection and Analysis	Aurora University uses a critical thinking rubric (adapted from the AACU Critical Thinking VALUE rubric) to assess university general education outcomes. Data is collected at the end of fall term by the IDS 1200 instructors. The data from the year before this project and the year of this project will be used in the analysis.
Findings	Findings are still pending as the data is reviewed through university analytics before being released to the library.
Use of Findings	Priorities of future projects are pending the final results.
Next Steps and Other Results	The process of conducting this investigation led to the creation of a toolkit to assist faculty with integrating information literacy instruction into the curriculum. The toolkit will consist of "self-serve" lessons that faculty can use in the classroom. In addition, librarians were invited to present additional complementary instruction into another required general education course. As the university enhances writing instruction, the librarians have been asked to assist with creating information literacy outcomes and assessments.
Additional Reflections	This project was successful due to the institutional support provided by the General Education department to integrate a library lesson to increase students' ability to evaluate sources. Then, librarian support was necessary to build a quality lesson and deliver it to 38 sections of the course. Without this cohort, I wouldn't have had the skills necessary to bring all these pieces together. You can't do it alone.
Timeline	Feb. 2019 - Early discussions with the

	Director of General Education about student performance on general education outcomes. March 2019 – Invitation from the Director of General Education for librarians to present lesson specific to "Evaluating Sources" to required freshman course, IDS 1200 May-August 2019 – Librarians develop, practice and refine a 50 minute one-shot session on "Evaluating Sources." August 2019-December 2019 – Librarians deliver "Evaluating Sources" one-shot to 38 classes reaching 768 students. December 2019-January 2020 – IDS 1200 faculty report data to the Director of General Education and University Analytics via the Critical Thinking rubric. January 2020-February 2020 – Data is provided to the library for analysis.
Bibliography/Works Cited	Association of College and Research Libraries. Academic Library Impact on Student Learning and Success: Findings from Assessment in Action Team Projects. Prepared by Karen Brown with contributions by Kara J. Malenfant. Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2017.
Appendices	AU Undergraduate Assessment Rubric – Critical Thinking (adapted from AACU VALUE rubrics) Category #2: Evaluating Evidence, Context and Assumptions attached below

AU UNDERGRADUATE ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

CRITICAL THINKING

(adapted from AACU VALUE rubrics)

				EXPECTED DEVELOPMENT FOR **FRESHMEN**
EXPECTED DEVELOPMENT FOR **SOPHOMORES**		
EXPECTED DEVELOPMENT FOR **JUNIORS**	
EXPECTED DEVELOPMENT FOR **SENIORS**

Category	6 - Exceptional	5 - Proficient	4 - Competent	3 - Intermediate	2 - Fundamental	1 - Emerging	0 – No evidence
1. **Critical Thinking:** Explanation of Issues	Paper meets all criteria of level 5 and exhibits proficiency beyond college level	• Issue/problem is stated clearly and comprehensively, including conscientious efforts to address context, nuance, and significance	• Issue/problem is stated with sufficient clarification and some efforts to address context, nuance, or significance	• Issue/problem is stated clearly, though with limited context, nuance, or significance	• Issue/problem stated with some attempt to clarify and provide additional information to aid understanding	• Issue/problem is stated without clarification or description	No evidence
2. **Critical Thinking:** Evaluating Evidence, Context and Assumptions	Paper meets all criteria of level 5 and exhibits proficiency beyond college level	• Identifies and questions evidence in text and one's own response • Demonstrates awareness of how assumptions undergird arguments (own and others) • Explores and evaluates several relevant contexts	• Identifies relevant aspects of context • Demonstrates awareness of assertions/assumptions • Demonstrates that viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning • Does not yet question what are held to be basic truths	• Provides context when presenting a position • Identifies and questions assertions and assumptions • May be more aware of others' assumptions than own	• Identifies some aspects of context • Demonstrates awareness that assumptions are made in the support (or rejection) of one's own argument or arguments of others	• Shows limited awareness of context or assumptions (own or others) • Takes statements in text as fact, without question • Does not evaluate quality of one's own evidence	No evidence
3. **Critical Thinking:** Conclusions and Related Outcomes	Paper meets all criteria of level 5 and exhibits proficiency beyond college level	• Conclusions reflect synthesis of a range of information • Includes discussion of potentially opposing viewpoints • Consequences and implications are thoroughly examined	• Conclusions are logically tied to a range of relevant evidence • Consequences of implications are considered, but may not be thoroughly examined	• Conclusions are logically tied to evidence • Evidence may have been selectively chosen to fit the desired conclusion • Consequences or implications are minimally identified	• Conclusions drawn, but are underdeveloped or inconsistently tied to evidence	• Conclusions drawn, but with minimal support	No evidence