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Introduction

Since the 1950s, academic librarians have strived to integrate library instruction and the undergraduate curriculum. As was the case 20 years ago, first-year students at The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill primarily receive library instruction during one class session of English Composition. As other universities explore and implement more innovative programs, it is time to evaluate UNC’s program and determine if the current system is optimal for students, faculty, and librarians.

Because most undergraduates must enroll in at least one of three levels of English Composition at UNC, including a library instruction session with English Composition ensures that each undergraduate receives some basic library instruction. Before arriving at the University, first-year students take an English Composition placement test to determine at which level they should begin. Students who begin in English 10 must enroll in English 11 and 12; students who begin in English 11 must also enroll in English 12. The lowest level, English 10, is a composition workshop course. The course is structured as three units focusing on writing in increasingly broader contexts, culminating in a large written project. Students participate in small writing groups, share their work, and offer criticism and suggestions to other group members. The next level, English 11, is also a composition workshop course divided into three units, giving students an opportunity to learn how to write about pop culture issues, serious public issues, and academic issues. Most first-year students begin in English 11. The highest level, English 12, teaches students how context affects rhetorical choice by allowing them to practice writing and arguing as members of distinct communities. Exceptional students who test out of English 12 must enroll in
Communications 9, a one-credit course in oral communication in which they do not receive traditional library instruction (UNC Writing Program, 2002).

In order to accommodate incoming first-year students every fall, the English department offers multiple sections of each level of English. Since most students test into English 11, the English department offers as many as 104 sections; with 19 students per section, maximum enrollment can approach 1,976 students. Students who wish to take English 12 can choose from 5 sections, for an enrollment of approximately 95 students. Because a small portion of students must begin in English 10, the department offers only three sections of English 10, with a maximum enrollment of approximately 57 students. Fewer sections of each English Composition class are offered during the spring. With a staff of approximately 20 instructional librarians, the library must reach over 2,000 first-year students each fall. Lisa Stimatz, Coordinator of Instructional Services for the Academic Affairs Library at UNC-Chapel Hill, said that the library hosted 184 instructional sessions for first-year English classes during the academic year 2001-2002. Also during that year, the Health Sciences Library hosted 33 instructional sessions for first-year English students. For the entire year, therefore, 217 first-year English classes received library instruction (over 4,000 students reached). Although these numbers seem impressive, it is not possible to estimate how many students are missed by this instruction or how many of these sessions represent return visits by the same English class.

Instructors of English request an instruction session by filling out an online form at least a week in advance at any point in the semester. Within a few days, a librarian will contact the instructor, ask for more details about the information needs of the class, and tailor the session to those needs. Librarians also encourage instructors to have their students take the library’s online tutorial prior to the information session. At UNC-CH, however, the Writing Program does not dictate the number of assignments requiring research or even when library instruction should fall during the semester. The Staff Manual (2002) for the Writing Program notes that “the library program is required” (47).
The manual also details the types of sessions for each level of English Composition. Students in English 10 and English 11 receive a 45-minute orientation to the library’s resources, specifically the online catalog, periodical databases, and the Internet. Instructors are encouraged to connect the session to a specific assignment. Students in English 12 participate in a working research session; instructors are directed to meet with a librarian one week prior to the session so that the librarian can tailor the session to suit student needs (47). Because increasing requests for library instruction can put a strain on library staff, the library has created an online library research tutorial that can serve as an effective alternative to classroom instruction. The tutorial covers basic library skills, including finding reserve materials, finding materials using the online catalog, and finding articles. According to a sampling of online syllabi, some professors require students to complete the tutorial before receiving additional library instruction in class. The manual lists the online tutorial as optional, although instructors are encouraged to tell students about the tutorial and possibly reward students who take the quiz at the end of the tutorial and turn in the completion certificate (47).

To make learning about the library more enjoyable, some instructors at UNC-CH use a “scavenger hunt” assignment, in which groups of students must locate all the items or answer all the questions on a list. Again, such assignments are at the instructor’s discretion, and while instructors need freedom to structure their syllabi according to their own teaching styles, English departments and students can benefit from definite information literacy requirements.

In February 1999, the Academic Affairs Library Task Force on Information Literacy rejected the following types of program models successfully implemented at other universities on the basis that they did not meet one or more of the “desired characteristics of an information literacy program at UNC-CH”: library for credit course, library non-credit course, library workbook, computer assisted instruction (22). Instead, the Task Force suggested implementing a program that is integrated with “individuals and groups at many levels,” based on faculty
partnerships and support as well as cooperation with other campus programs (26). Such a program would have the following characteristics:

- Reach large numbers of students
- Enhance library instructional services while preserving existing successful approaches
- Emphasize human interaction
- Respond to changing needs (1).

In November 2002, the Information and Technology Committee of the Executive Branch of Student Government at UNC-CH also saw the need to examine undergraduate information literacy. The report summed up the current program as follows:

Already, undergraduate students are subjected to cyclic class lectures that inform them of the electronic resources that are available through the university libraries. Because there exists a need to educate the student, this topic has been incorporated into most foundation English classes at UNC-Chapel Hill. As well, many other classes at the University have their students tour the libraries or have a guest lecture given by a librarian for the purpose of educating the [students]…. Because there currently exists no standard level of education that students can be expected to have, resources and time are wasted as students, faculty, and librarians endlessly cycle through this jury-rigged system (p. 4).

Unlike the Task Force, the Committee recommended a required online course for credit that would cover basic approaches to computing (databases, presentation tools, networking), information retrieval and resources, and ethics. This kind of course would be easy to implement since students are required to have a laptop. Superior students would have an opportunity to demonstrate their skills and place out of this course.

The English department, working with librarians, could create criteria for the information literacy program, and while instructors would have freedom and flexibility in designing their syllabi, they would have to meet these minimum requirements. The initial step in evaluating UNC-CH’s current program is to ask the groups involved in the system—students, English instructors, and librarians—for their feedback. Literature reveals that distributing surveys is the most common method for evaluating an academic program because of the possibility of sampling
a large population at low cost.
Literature Review

In 1999, The Academic Affairs Library Task Force on Information Literacy defined the information literate student as an individual who recognizes that a need for information exists and formulates an appropriate research question; understands how to make effective use of library resources; finds the required information; evaluates the information; organizes the worthwhile information; and communicates and presents the resulting knowledge effectively (22). In order to create more information literate students, universities have implemented various types of programs. In considering UNC-CH’s current program, it is useful to examine successful programs at other institutions.

English instructors at UNC-CH are required to enroll their classes in only one library instruction session. Lilith Kunkel (1996) stresses that just having an instruction session is not enough. She believes that English instructors should also monitor the students’ progress and hold them responsible for the quality of their research. Kunkel’s study also indicated that greater frequency of assignments requiring library research was strongly correlated with strong library skills. Ideally then, English instructors should give more than just one assignment that requires use of the library.

In a study comparing computer-based bibliographic instruction to classroom-based bibliographic instruction at The University of North Carolina, Lucy Holman (2000) discovered that students actually preferred the pace of the tutorial to that of the classroom. More importantly, students in the tutorial group did not score significantly higher or lower than students in the classroom groups, making these methods of instruction comparable. Including the tutorial in the unit on library instruction can only enhance students’ knowledge and understanding, yet
not all instructors utilize or encourage this tool. Surveys at other universities have mirrored Holman’s findings that students prefer the convenience and self-regulated learning of a library tutorial (Tricarico, 220).

Another option for UNC-CH’s consideration is integration of library instruction into general education courses. In a critical study of an information literacy course at Illinois State, Carroll Varner (1996) notes that the most effective program is one in which interaction with the library’s resources increases in intensity and complexity. In this light, one instruction session seems inadequate. Librarians at the Library Research Lab at California State University provide five 80-minute library instruction sessions, which occur over five weeks beginning three weeks into the semester (Yi, 2001). The final grade of the Lab counts as 10% of the total grade for the course, which entices students to take the lab work seriously.

While UNC-CH has instituted a writing-across-the-curriculum program, some schools have extended this model to information literacy. Loanne Snively and Natasha Cooper (1997) note that this model would require librarians to offer workshops for faculty who want to develop courses that meet the information literacy requirement. This kind of program might not garner great support because it seems to demand more of librarians’ and instructors’ time; however, in his discussion of an across-the-curriculum model at Berea College, Steve Gowler (1995) points out that students would return to use library resources in a variety of situations, so librarians can make brief and focused presentations based on specific assignments.

Because Composition classes often involve writing workshops and peer-evaluation, Indiana University has extended this collaborative approach to library instruction to its first-year English classes. Anthony Stamatoplos (2000) writes that in his first-year seminars, students work in groups on specific topics and learn research skills together through the process. His students give him positive feedback about the interactive nature of the class.

The growth of electronic resources presents library instruction with new opportunities as well as new challenges. UNC-CH moved toward incorporating technology into English classes
by developing the Wireless English program in 1999, allowing students to use their laptops during class to research paper topics (http://sites.unc.edu/wireless/). Librarians at UNC-CH can take advantage of this enthusiasm for electronic resources and show students how to use the library’s powerful databases either in the library or on their laptops through the library’s proxy server. One of the challenges that electronic resources present for library instruction is the common, erroneous notion that one can find anything with an Internet search. In an increasingly Web-dependent world, Judith Arnold (1998) points out that librarians must not discount the Web in instruction but include it as a unique and sometimes unreliable source of information. Including Web instruction can provide students with valuable insight into evaluating resources. The most recent focus is to discourage students from using Google as their main—and sometimes only—research tool. Ronald Granieri, a professor at Furman University, uses Blackboard software to post assignments and materials for his courses. He makes an effort to include links to the library to encourage students to use the many resources available to them at the click of the mouse. Another professor of women’s studies at the State University of New York at Stony Brook goes even further. Realizing that students prefer more and more to work electronically, she includes dozens of links to library databases on her course Web site, including journal indexes and databases that specialize in women’s studies (Carlson, A33).

A recent study (1998) indicates that 50% of four-year institutions offer library research courses that count as credit (Charters, 148). In 1995, Illinois State University (ISU) implemented a course similar to the one proposed by the Student Government. The course, “Foundations of Inquiry,” provides students with an introduction to critical thinking and writing while integrating technology and basic library instruction, such as formulating a search strategy, using background sources, and using the online system (Varner, 2). UNC-CH can learn from ISU’s mistakes in implementing the “Foundations of Inquiry” class. Since the class was new, advisors, students, and instructors did not have a clear understanding of the course’s purpose, and so all parties suffered great confusion and frustration. Instructors needed to reach an agreement about the
focus and goals of the course, communicate this to students, and stick to it throughout the semester (Varner, 3).

A survey of students, faculty, and librarians will reveal the strengths and weaknesses of the UNC-CH’s current program to promote information literacy. Other universities have implemented the following types of programs: multiple assignments requiring library research of increasing depth or quality; library tutorials in conjunction with first-year English class; a series of library instruction sessions given near the beginning of the semester; multiple, brief information sessions tailored to specific topics or assignments; and student workshops to learn research skills together. Ultimately, the English department and perhaps other departments must work with librarians to develop an information literacy mission, complete with certain activities that all instructors must include in their first-year English classes. That way, first-year students will not only receive library instruction but will also receive the same level of instruction.
Methodology

The initial step in evaluating the current program’s effectiveness was to receive feedback from the groups involved. Because each of these groups—students, English instructors, and librarians—had different insights to offer, they each received a different survey. A few of the same questions appeared on two or more surveys.

After reviewing surveys sent out by similar institutions, the three surveys for this study were developed over the course of 9 months in consultation with several first-year English instructors and fellow library science graduate students. When surveys were near their final version, Lisa Stimatz, Coordinator of Instructional Services for the Academic Affairs Library at UNC-Chapel Hill, reviewed them and made additional suggestions and revisions. Each survey was pretested by graduate students, and final revisions were made.

In January 2003, 2,800 email addresses for all current, listed sophomores were retrieved from the online campus directory. The Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 schedule of classes, available on UNC’s Web site, contained a total of 90 instructors of first-year English; all of these individuals received a survey. Stimatz provided email addresses for the 20 instructional librarians.

On February 21, 2003, the researcher created a listserv for each survey group containing a direct link to the appropriate survey on SurveyMonkey.com, a Web site that enables users to create professional online surveys, including tools to gather, analyze, and export data. Each version of the survey was brief, consisting of less than 20 questions, and simple in format, with an estimated completion time of 5-10 minutes. The first page of the survey included a brief description of the project and its purpose and assured respondents that their answers would
remain anonymous. All respondents had to agree to these terms before beginning the survey. The survey remained active until March 7, 2003, giving respondents two weeks to provide feedback.

This study was not without limitations. While testing the information skills of students might be useful, this paper is more of a preliminary step in evaluating the program and determining where weaknesses may lie. By getting feedback from students, instructors, and librarians, the researcher hoped to get a clear picture of how the program can be improved. The current rate of satisfaction among these groups was not known prior to the distribution of the survey.

The greatest potential problem for this method was a poor response rate. In an effort to combat this problem, the body of the survey email included the survey’s purpose, expected posting date for results, the brief amount of time for completion, the deadline for completion, and a thank-you in advance for participation. Since a low student response rate was anticipated, the researcher sent out surveys to every sophomore listed in the online campus directory to ensure an adequate number of responses.

The other major limitation was the potential for technical problems. If the server went down or the browser froze, respondents could lose patience and choose not resume the survey at another time. To help reduce the risk of technical difficulties, the surveys were as brief as possible, consisting of only two pages: the agreement to the terms of the survey and the actual survey content.

Although 2,800 students received an email containing a link to the survey, only 202 sophomores responded over the course of two weeks, for a poor response rate of 7%. Since many classes now use email for communication, a survey via an email link was expected to be the most convenient method for students to provide feedback. Twenty-six students accessed the survey, agreed to the terms, but abandoned the survey without completing it, and they are not included in the response total. This disappointing response rate might indicate the level of interest most
sophomores have in this topic or perhaps the fact that they do not realize the topic’s importance. This lack of interest certainly does not reflect the suggestion for an information technology course from the Undergraduate Student Government. The response rates of English instructors and librarians were much more acceptable. Ninety English instructors received a link to the survey, and 23 instructors responded, for a response rate of 25%. Librarians, who undoubtedly have the greatest interest in promoting information literacy, had a response rate of 55% (11 of 20 surveys completed).
Results

Question 1 on each survey was an agreement to the terms of the survey. Results will begin with Question 2.

RESULTS FROM STUDENTS

Question 2. Students indicated how many times per week they go to the library. Forty-four percent of students indicated that they go the library only 1-2 times per week. Twenty percent of students indicated that they go to the library three times or more per week. Nineteen percent of students go to the library 2-3 times per week. Seventeen percent of students typically do not go to the library at all during the week.

Question 3. Students chose a primary reason for going to the library. Fifty percent of students indicated that they use the library primarily to study. Nine percent of students revealed that they go to the library to check out or return books. Seven percent of students do not use the library at all. Seven percent of students use the library to check email, and 6% of students use the library computers for other activities. Five percent of students meet at the library for group work. Four percent of students indicated that their primary reason for going to the library is to use e-databases. Four percent of students go to the library to use course reserve material. The remaining small percentage of students indicated that their reasons for going to the library are to read for fun (1%), attend class (1%), photocopy (1%), use the printers (2%), kill time between classes (2%), or sleep (1%).

Question 4. Students rated their various library skills on a scale from 1 (“poor”) to 5 (“excellent”). Thirty-three percent of students rated themselves 5 in using the library’s catalog,
with 41% of students rating themselves 4. Fourteen percent of students indicated that they need improvement (3), while 3% of students rated themselves 2. The remaining 3% of students gave themselves the lowest rating (1). When asked to rate their ability to find scholarly articles, 10% of students rated themselves 5. The largest percentage, 42%, rated themselves 4. Twenty-three percent of students admitted that they need improvement (3), 8% of students rated themselves 2, and 5% of students rated themselves 1 in finding scholarly articles. When asked to rate their ability to find statistics, only 4% of students rated themselves 5. Sixteen percent of students rated themselves 4, while the greatest percentage of students, 30%, admitted that they need improvement (3) in this area. Fourteen percent of students rated themselves 2, and another 14% of students rated themselves 1. When asked to rate their ability to find historical newspaper articles, 9% of students rated themselves 5. The largest percentage, 25%, rated themselves 4. Twenty-two percent of students felt that they need improvement (3), while 13% of students rated themselves 2, and 11% of students rated themselves 1. Fifty-seven percent of students gave themselves the highest rating (5) in asking for help from librarians. Twenty-eight percent of students gave themselves the second highest rating (4), and 8% of students admitted that they need improvement (3). Only 2% of students rated themselves 2 or 1.

**Question 5.** Students indicated how often they use the library’s electronic databases per week. Forty-three percent of students revealed that they typically do not use electronic databases during the week, but the same amount of students indicated that they use the databases 1-2 times per week. Ten percent of students use the databases 2-3 times per week, only 2% of students use the databases 3-4 times per week, and the remaining 2% of students reported using the databases 5 or more times per week.

**Question 6.** Students indicated whether or not their first-year English classes attended an instruction session at the library. Eighty percent of students said that they received library instruction through this program. Ten percent of students said that they did not receive library instruction, and the remaining 10% of students did not take first-year English.
**Question 7.** Students specified the type of instruction they received. Eighty-six percent of students said that they received catalog/bibliographic instruction. Forty percent of students indicated that they received instruction on evaluating information on the Internet. Sixty-five percent of students said that a librarian helped with a specific assignment. Seventy percent of students indicated that they received instruction about finding information on the Internet. Twelve percent of students said that they had an individual consultation with a librarian.

**Question 8.** Students specified the type of activities their first-year English classes included. Eighty-three percent of students said that their instructors expected them to use Web/Internet resources, and the same amount indicated that instructors also expected them to use library resources. Eighty percent of students said that their classes used email for communication. Sixty-five percent of students said that a librarian provided an instruction session. Forty-one percent of students indicated that their class syllabus was available on the Web. Thirty-one percent of students said that course materials were placed on e-reserves. Seventeen percent of students said that their instructors used a scavenger hunt exercise to teach about library resources.

**Question 9.** Students indicated whether or not they have taken the library’s online tutorial. Seventy-seven percent of students indicated that they have not taken it. The remaining 23% of students said that they have taken the tutorial.

**Question 10.** Students who have taken the tutorial rated its degree of helpfulness/usefulness on a scale from 1 (“not at all”) to 5 (“excellent”). Seven percent of students gave the tutorial a 5. Twelve percent of students rated the tutorial 4. Twenty-two percent of students said the tutorial was “somewhat helpful” (3). Only 4% of students gave the tutorial the lowest ratings.

**Question 11.** Students designated their preferred method for learning to use library resources. Forty percent of students said that they prefer to learn about library resources through single-session instruction in conjunction with first-year English classes. Twenty-three percent of
students expressed a preference for Web-based instruction. Fourteen percent of students prefer written guide or assignments. Seven percent of students would rather attend voluntary workshops, while 6% of students prefer to learn on their own. Six percent of students claimed that they do not wish to learn how to use library resources. Two percent of students said that they prefer to learn from librarians as needed. The remaining 2% of students expressed interest in taking a credit course.

**Question 12.** Students rated a variety of resources for their importance to schoolwork on a scale from 1 (“not important”) to 5 (“important”). Forty-four percent of students rated the library 5. Twenty-one percent of students rated the library 4, 25% of students rated it 3, with only 7% of students rating the library 2 and 3% of students claiming that the library was not important at all (1) for their schoolwork. Only 5% of students rated other libraries 5. Eight percent of students rated other libraries 4. Twenty-six percent of students rated other libraries 3. The two lowest ratings contained the greatest percentage of responses: 20% of students rated other libraries 2 and 37% of students rated other libraries 1. When rating the World Wide Web, 78% of students rated it 5. The next greatest percentage, 10%, rated the Web 4. Only 7% of students rated the Web 3, while even less (2%) rated the Web 2. Only 3% of students rated the Web 1. Sixty-seven percent of students rated the course text 5 and 20% of students rated the course text 4. Only 7% of students rated the course text 3, with the remaining students rating the course text 2 (2%) and 1 (3%). Twenty-three percent of students rated e-journals 5, 25% of students rated e-journals 4, 26% of students rated e-journals 3, 12% of students rated e-journals 2, and 10% of students rated e-journals 1. The responses were similar when students rated e-databases: 21% of students rated them 5, 22% of students rated them 4, 26% of students rated them 3, 16% of students rated them 2, and 10% of students rated them 1. Students saw e-reserves as more important than e-databases or e-journals: 33% of students rated them 5, 28% of students rated them 4, 22% of students rated them 3, 11% of students rated them 2, and only 5% of students rated them 1. When considering personal books, 13% of students rated them 5, 19% of students
rated them 4, 27% of students rated them 3, 26% of students rated them 2, and 13% of students rated them 1. Finally, students indicated how important faculty or other students are for their schoolwork: 41% of students rated them 5, 23% of students rated them 4, 18% of students rated them 3, 11% of students rated them 2, and 5% of students rated them 1.

**Question 13.** Students indicated ways the library could improve to help with assignments. When asked how the library could improve, 56% of students asked for better instruction. Oddly enough, 55% of students requested more computers, even though laptops are now required. Twenty-seven percent of students would appreciate interactive study guides or tutorials. Thirty-nine percent of students would like to see more links to other library and research sites. Thirty-eight percent of students want Davis Library to extend hours. Twenty-seven percent of students think that the library needs better noise control. Students added the following suggestions to the list: keep people from sleeping in the study rooms (1%), have more private study rooms available (2%), add better lighting (especially on corner desks) (1%), add more printers (1%), and add more group areas (1%).

**Question 14.** Students indicated their primary source for research assistance. Fifty-nine percent of students said that they would ask a librarian in person, while less than 2% of students said they would email or call a librarian or use chat reference. Twenty-six percent of students would seek help from a friend, while 13% of students would rely on a professor.

**Question 15.** Students specified which English Composition classes they have completed. Six percent of students have completed English 10, 65% of students have completed English 11, and 88% of students have taken English 12. The remaining 11% of students placed out of English Composition.

**Question 16.** Students who placed out of English Composition indicated whether or not they have received library instruction. Forty-two percent of students have not received any library instruction. Of those who did receive instruction through UNC, 11% of students have received instruction through a first-year seminar class, 5% of students have received instruction
through another class, 4% of students have received instruction through the Duke and Robertson Scholars Program, and 4% of students have received instruction through a summer program. The remaining 33% of students said that they have received instruction on their own, as needed.

**Question 17.** Additional comments. Only 4 respondents included additional comments. One student noted the need to reach students who place out of English Composition. Another respondent praised the librarians for their help. The third student said that the word “library” has a negative connotation because it is correlated with stress. The fourth student said that hours should be extended at Davis Library and that cell phone rules should be enforced more often.

**RESULTS FROM INSTRUCTORS**

**Question 2.** Instructors indicated which English Composition classes they have taught. Only 9% of instructors have taught English 10. Ninety-six percent of instructors have taught English 11. Eighty-three percent of instructors have taught English 12.

**Question 3.** Instructors indicated whether or not they included a library instruction class during the semester. Ninety percent of instructors indicated that they scheduled a library instruction session, while 10% of instructors did not.

**Question 4.** Instructors who said they did not have a library instruction session indicated why. One instructor claimed that there simply was not enough time. Another instructor complained, “In each of the past two semesters I have requested library instruction, providing 2 possible dates as requested on the forms. Both times, I received no confirmation from the libraries, and both times on the first of the two dates I received emails from library staff suggesting that I had ‘forgotten’ to bring my class. After two semesters of such experiences, I have opted instead to take advantage of a wireless classroom setting and do the library instruction myself.”

**Question 5.** Instructors specified during which unit the library instruction session fell. Only 10% of instructors indicated that they scheduled a library instruction session for each unit,
which arguably is the most effective means for incorporating library instruction. Thirty-two percent of instructors scheduled the session during the first unit. Over 50% of instructors indicated that they scheduled a library instruction session for the second unit only. Only 7% of instructors said they scheduled the session for third unit.

**Question 6.** Instructors indicated the type of instruction their classes have received. Eighty-three percent of instructors said that they have received catalog/bibliographic instruction. Forty-eight percent of instructors indicated that librarians have discussed finding information on the Internet. Twenty-two percent of instructors said that librarians have instructed students on evaluating Internet information. Seventy-nine percent of instructors said that students have received guidance for specific assignments. Twenty-two percent of instructors said that their students have had individual consultations with a librarian. One instructor complained that librarians have focused almost entirely on Internet resources and urges librarians to incorporate more basics into their presentations, such as how the LC system works and where journals are shelved. The same instructor also suggested that librarians cover more than just InfoTrac and LexisNexis, databases frequently used by undergraduates.

**Question 7.** Instructors indicated whether or not they were satisfied with the quality of library instruction. Fifty-two percent of instructors said that they were satisfied. Thirty-nine percent of instructors were somewhat satisfied. Only 4% of instructors said that they were not satisfied. The quality of the presentation seems to depend greatly on the presenter, as more than one instructor complained that the instruction sessions are always boring and vague, even when specific instruction is requested. Another instructor said that librarians “simply need to give more effective presentations.”

**Question 8.** Instructors specified the type of activities their first-year English classes included. One hundred percent of instructors required students to use library resources for papers, while 96% of instructors expected students to use Internet resources for papers. Eighty-seven percent of instructors said they had an information session with a librarian. Eighty-seven
percent of instructors communicated with the class via email. Fifty-two percent of instructors included a class syllabus on the Web. Twenty-six percent of instructors put course materials on electronic reserves. Only 13% of instructors used a scavenger hunt exercise to teach about library resources.

**Question 9.** Instructors specified the number of assignments that required students to document resources. Seventy percent of instructors indicated that students were required to document resources for 5 or more assignments. Seventeen percent of instructors indicated that they required students to document resources for 4 assignments. Nine percent of instructors required students to document resources for 3 assignments. Only 4% of instructors required students to document resources for only 2 assignments.

**Question 10.** Instructors designated the penalty for using poor resources. Only 57% of instructors said that students received a lower grade if they use poor resources for their assignments. Thirty-five percent of instructors indicate that students were penalized only a few points (not enough to lower the grade).

**Question 11.** Instructors indicated whether or not they required students to take the library’s online tutorial. Sixty-nine percent of instructors said yes. Thirteen percent of instructors said no. Thirteen percent of instructors wondered “What tutorial?” Five percent of instructors will require students to take the tutorial if the librarian makes a special request prior to the information session.

**Question 12.** Instructors indicated whether or not they believe an information literacy course should be required for first-year students. Over 60% of instructors believe that all first-year students should take an information literacy course. Twenty-six percent of instructors do not think an information literacy course should be mandatory for first-year students. Six percent of instructors think the course should be worked into the composition classes. Seven percent of instructors were not sure.
**Question 13.** Instructors indicated whether or not they would attend a library instruction session for English instructors only. Seventy-nine percent of instructors said they would be willing to attend such sessions. Thirteen percent of instructors would not attend. Only 8% of instructors said that they might consider attending an instruction session for only English instructors.

**Question 14.** Instructors designated ways to improve the partnership between the English department and the library. One instructor said, “I have had a lot of success with the existing partnership and plan to take advantage of it as much as possible. I do think plagiarism on campus is a bigger problem than acknowledged—the library could assist in that kind of education. I also like the idea of students taking an information literacy course.” A second instructor pointed out, “A librarian comes to address the English staff at a staff meeting early in the semester, and I think that serves well to apprise the instructors of available resources.” A third instructor requested less advanced notice for scheduling sessions. A fourth instructor offered the following advice: “English instructors and the library personnel need to work better in helping students find materials and know what they are looking at—my students report that library personnel give them different instructions from the ones I give them and that they are only marginally helpful in giving them actual practical assistance in finding sources.” A final instructor offered extensive criticism: “I have given the following feedback on both departmental and library surveys: Library sessions, when run by the right people, can be useful. However, the library staff members, while well informed, often do not seem trained in giving effective presentations—they are long-winded, boring, don't cover all the bases, and students retain little information. (I should know, I've sat through nearly twenty such sessions.) This means that the English instructors end up doing the reference librarians' job; students come to us, in our offices, for research help, and we cover the exact same information that students were supposed to get from the tutorial and information sessions. I believe that the partnership could be improved in two different ways. First, the librarians simply need to give more effective presentations. Secondly, I believe that an
alternative to librarians giving information sessions should be developed. This alternative would be for librarians to work one-on-one with individual instructors, then let the instructors give the presentations based on their specific needs. The librarians could attend those sessions to correct misinformation, fill in gaps, and provide additional support.”

Question 15. Instructors described their position at UNC. Ninety-six percent of instructors said that they were graduate students. Only 4% of instructors were full-time faculty.

Question 16. Additional comments. One instructor complained, “The English classes are being asked to do too much…we put the burden of information skills on the library, but given our time constraints, expect the librarians to do more in, say, one class period than is reasonable.” The respondent continued to suggest that instead of an information literacy course as proposed by this research, first-year students should be required to take a “technology literacy course: a low-homework course that teaches students word processing, Excel, PowerPoint, and Web skills. It's this technology that often poses the research problems for students, not the idea of research itself. If such a ‘technology literacy’ course were in place, I believe that the library and English instructors, working together, could do a better job on the ‘information literacy’ front, because we could both go into more subtle skills.”

RESULTS FROM LIBRARIANS

Question 2. Librarians specified the number of instruction sessions they teach per year. All librarians indicated that they teach at least 4 sessions per year. Thirty-six percent of librarians teach 14 sessions or more, and the same percent of respondents teach between 7-13 sessions. Eighteen percent of librarians teach between 4-6 sessions. Nine percent of librarians teach 25 or more sessions per year.

Question 3. Librarians indicated whether or not they receive adequate notice for teaching sessions. One hundred percent of librarians said that they receive adequate notice.
**Question 4.** Librarians designated the type of instruction they provided. All librarians said that they provided catalog and bibliographic databases instruction and instruction for specific assignments. Ninety-one percent of librarians provided instruction on Internet searching, while 82% of librarians provided instruction on evaluation of information on the Internet. Eighty percent of librarians said that they instructed students on evaluating the quality of information. Nine percent of librarians provided online/print course guides.

**Question 5.** Librarians indicated whether or not they believe an information literacy course should be mandatory for first-year students. Fifty-four percent of librarians believe that such a course should be mandatory, while 46% of librarians believe that it should not be mandatory.

**Question 6.** Librarians rated various aspects of their information sessions, on a scale from 1 (“poor”) to 5 (“excellent”). In considering the quality of interaction with students, no librarians gave the highest (5) or lowest (1) rating. Sixty-four percent of librarians rated the interaction 4, 27% of librarians rated the interaction 3, and 9% of librarians rated it 2. When rating student response and enthusiasm, again no librarians chose the highest (5) or lowest (1) ratings. Thirty-six percent of librarians rated response and enthusiasm 4, 46% of librarians rated it 3, and 18% of librarians rated it 2. When it came to English instructor enthusiasm, no librarians gave the two lowest ratings (2 and 1). Eighteen percent of librarians rated English instructor enthusiasm 5, 55% of librarians rated it 4, and 27% of librarians rated it 3. When rating their own enthusiasm, again librarians did not choose the two lowest ratings (2 and 1). This time, however, more librarians (36%) gave a 5 rating, while 55% of librarians gave a 4 rating, and 9% of librarians gave a 3 rating. When given a chance to rate the amount of time they have to cover material, only 9% of librarians rated that aspect 5. Twenty-seven percent of librarians rated it 4, 46% of librarians rated it 3, 9% of librarians rated it 2, and 9% of librarians rated it 1. When rating communication with the English department, no librarians gave a 5 rating. Fifty-five percent of librarians rated it 4, 18% of librarians rated it 3, 18% of librarians rated it 2, and 9% of
librarians rated it 1. The ratings for the amount of feedback from the English department were
the lowest of all the categories. Only 9% of librarians rated it 5 and only 18% of librarians rated
it 4. Forty-six percent of librarians rated it 3, while 18% of librarians rated it 2, and the remaining
9% of librarians rated it 1.

Question 7. Librarians indicated students’ weakest information-seeking skills. Thirty-six
percent of librarians felt that students are weakest in searching library databases. Twenty-seven
percent of librarians feel that students lack strong skills in locating items on the shelf. Eighteen
percent of librarians believe that students need the most help in learning to evaluate resources.
Ten percent of librarians think that students need to learn how to identify resources better. Only
4% of librarians believe that students lack the ability to develop a good search strategy, and
another 4% of librarians think that students often fail to understand the goals of the assignment.
No librarians felt that students are weakest in searching online.

Question 8. Librarians designated ways to improve the partnership between the English
department and the library. One librarian suggested that English instructors must help to
“promote the importance of librarians in education,” noting that librarians are “often seen as an
extra in instruction, not as an important part of learning.” Another librarian suggested that the
English department improve the partnership by having pre-semester meetings between TAs and
librarians and encouraging TAs to work with librarians on developing assignments. The same
librarian added, “If librarians attend department meetings, they must have a clear agenda and
articulate what skills they believe are necessary for students to possess.” A third librarian offered
these comments: “It may be a platitude, but keeping open the lines of communication is key. For
example, written contact with English instructors prior to the library session is always helpful.
We can learn what the instructors are looking for and what assignment the class is working on. In
this way, we can tailor the class to the instructors' and students' needs. When this process works
as it should, instructors and students alike realize what a great resource librarians are. Library
instruction workshops in which librarians and English instructors can meet, trade issues and
concerns, etc., are also useful in my opinion. Finally, it's important to get student input in order to learn what's working and what's not.”

**Question 9.** Additional comments. One librarian offered this criticism of teaching assistants: “TAs need to have help with assignments in advance when they are dealing with topics they know little about. They set unreal expectations of the students. Just because a topic is interesting to them does not mean it is a good teaching assignment. And the emphasis on locating items on the shelf is not really preparing students for lifelong learning. Overall, I think the approach is good but feel the communication between TAs and librarians needs to be improved.”
Discussion

The survey results revealed several weaknesses of the library’s current collaboration with the English department. Although the library does reach a majority of first-year students, responses from students and English instructors indicated that not all instructors make time for library instruction during the semester, despite the requirement. Since most first-year English instructors are teaching assistants (TAs), the turnover rate is high, and perhaps most of these graduate students are not completely apprised of the information literacy requirement. With new instructors continually entering the department, it is a constant effort to communicate the need to promote information literacy. Most librarians suggested that librarians and instructors meet for a few sessions at the beginning of the semester, and 79% of instructors said they would be willing to attend such sessions. With such a high approval rating, implementing such a program should be relatively easy.

Although most students enrolled in first-year English said they received library instruction, such was not the case with students who tested out of English Composition and enrolled instead in Communications 9. In fact, 42% of students said that they received no instruction through this course. Instructors of Communications 9 must work with the English department to ensure that these students are receiving the same library instruction as students who take first-year English.

The Staff Manual for the Writing Program states that the library program is required, and it even illustrates the types of library sessions each level of English Composition should receive; however, no consistency exists among instructors for the scheduling of library instruction sessions. Only 10% of instructors indicated that they schedule a library instruction session for
each unit, which arguably is the most effective means for incorporating library instruction. Research shows that students retain more information when library sessions address them at a point of need; instructors, therefore, must work with librarians to make the information covered in each session relevant and immediately applicable. Over 50% of instructors indicated that they scheduled a library instruction session for the second unit only. This means that students must rely on their own research skills or seek help independently for assignments in the first unit, or they are not required to use library resources until the second unit. Since 70% of instructors indicated that students must document resources for 5 or more assignments, it’s unlikely that students are not required to use any library resources during the entire first unit.

In order to provide more incentive for using reputable resources, instructors must impose stricter penalties for using poor or questionable information. Only 57% of instructors said that students receive a lower grade if they use poor resources for their assignments. Thirty-five percent of instructors indicated that students are penalized only a few points (not enough to lower the grade). In order to ensure that students are using the highest quality resources, they must receive research instruction at the beginning, and not in the middle, of the semester. The English department needs to reexamine its requirements for information literacy and set more specific guidelines.

Little agreement was reached when each group was asked about implementing a mandatory information literacy program for first-year students. Librarians were almost split (54% yes to 46% no), only 2% of students indicated that they would prefer taking a credit course, and over 60% of English instructors thought that all freshmen should take an information literacy course. Perhaps this high percentage on the part of instructors reflects the sentiments of one respondent, who commented, “The English classes are being asked to do too much. We put the burden of information skills on the library, but given our time constraints, expect the librarians to do more in, say, one class period than is reasonable.” The respondent continued to suggest that instead of an information literacy course as proposed by this research, first-year students should
be required to take a “technology literacy course: a low-homework course that teaches students word processing, Excel, PowerPoint, and Web skills.” This suggestion is more in line with the recommendation of the Undergraduate Student Government.

![Figure 1: Preferred Learning Method](image)

Although most students indicated that they prefer to learn about information literacy through single-session instructions in conjunction with first-year English classes, another significant portion (30%) expressed a preference for Web-based instruction (see Figure 1). For these students, the library has created a helpful online tutorial, yet 77% of students indicated that they have not taken it; however, when asked if they require students to take the tutorial, 61% of instructors said yes. Perhaps more students would take the tutorial if it were featured prominently on the library’s homepage. The few who did take the tutorial predominantly rated it as “somewhat helpful,” with only 7% of students giving it a high rating. With the growing number of instructors using Blackboard for their courses, a link to the library’s tutorial could easily be provided with other course information. Instructors must also follow up with students and make sure they have actually taken the tutorial. Other pages on UNC’s Web site could feature a link to the tutorial, such as the English Composition homepage, the “For Students” page, the library’s homepage, and any online syllabi for English Composition classes. Granieri’s innovative use of
Blackboard to introduce students to library databases might not be feasible at this time since only 52% of instructors use the Web to accompany and enhance their courses. Perhaps if instructors took a course with librarians before the semester began, they would better understand the benefits of having their course materials available online. This is another area for further exploration and feedback.

The quality of instruction during library sessions seems to depend greatly on the presenter, as more than one instructor complained that the instruction sessions are “always terribly boring and vague.” This feedback indicates a need for quality control in the library instruction program. Perhaps librarians could attend some teaching/training sessions at the beginning of the year and periodically undergo observation and evaluation. One instructor suggested that English instructors lead the library information sessions with librarians attending only to correct misinformation, fill in gaps, and provide supplementary information. While this suggestion is worthwhile for consideration, not all instructors will feel comfortable with this alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rating of Resources (mean)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNC libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other libraries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5=important, 1=not important

When asked about their library usage, 44% of students indicated that they go the library only 1-2 times per week, with 50% of students indicating that they use the library primarily to study. When asked how many times they use the library’s electronic databases per week, 43% of students said not at all, and only 4% of students indicated that their primary reason for going to
the library is to use e-databases. E-databases and e-journals received a low rating compared to other resources, such as the course text or the World Wide Web, which received the highest rating (see Table 1). These results indicate that students are not taking advantage of the many resources in the library. For students, the library seems to have a general importance as a place to study and is not viewed as an active resource. One librarian suggested that English instructors must help to “promote the importance of librarians in education,” noting that librarians are “often seen as an extra in instruction, not as an important part of learning.” This same comment applies to how students perceive the library.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Rating of Skills (mean)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use catalog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find historical news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When given the opportunity to evaluate their library skills, students rated themselves highly (see Table 2). One-third of students rated themselves as excellent in using the library’s catalog, with 41% giving themselves the second highest rating. When asked to rate more specific skills, such as finding statistic or finding historical newspaper articles, students were not as confident. While students expressed high confidence in their own skills, instructors and librarians were more critical. Several English instructors remarked that students cannot discern the differences between types of sources, such as professional and popular, and also are unable to assess the quality of sources. Librarians believe that students are weakest in searching library databases, locating items on shelf, and evaluating resources (see Figure 2). A rather surprising response was librarians’ belief that fewer students have trouble evaluating resources than locating items on the shelf.
If the English department and the library hope to improve their future collaboration, they must take an equal interest and active role in strengthening this partnership. While great change cannot happen overnight, a few changes can be implemented easily: the library’s homepage, as well as several UNC pages frequented by undergraduates, should feature a prominent link to library tutorial. The Writing Program’s home page should include links to the tutorial as well as to general and English-related library e-databases and e-journals. The Writing Program must also work with instructors of Communications 9 and the library to ensure that students who place out of English Composition and take this course instead are receiving library instruction. English instructors should also seriously consider attending pre-semester meetings with librarians and incorporating multiple library instruction sessions (one per unit) into their courses. Librarians, especially new graduate assistants, must undergo periodic evaluation to make ensure that they are giving the highest quality presentations possible.

The surveys revealed several areas for improvement in the English department’s collaboration with the library. In order to strengthen the program, the English department must work with librarians to develop an information literacy mission, complete with certain activities
that all instructors must incorporate into their first-year English classes. As improvements are considered, English instructors and librarians must be sure to preserve the current program’s strengths while remaining flexible and welcoming to the changes the future brings.
Appendix A: Student Survey

This survey of UNC-CH sophomores will be used to evaluate how well the first-year English Program works with the University library to promote information literacy. The survey is featured in its entirety on the following page and should take about 5 minutes to complete. Your responses are anonymous and will not be traced to your email address.

1. Check the following if you agree to these terms and wish to begin the survey.
   __ I agree

2. How often do you go to the library in a week?
   __ 0 times
   __ 1-2 times
   __ 2-3 times
   __ 3-4 times
   __ 5 times or more

3. What is your primary reason for going to the library? (please mark just one)
   __ Check email
   __ Study
   __ Do group work
   __ Browse the shelves
   __ Check out/return materials
   __ Use electronic databases for research
   __ Use library computers for other activities
   __ Socialize
   __ Use course reserve material
   __ Attend class
   __ Read for fun
   __ Photocopy
   __ Consult with library staff
   __ I don't go to the library
   __ Other
4. Rate how well you can perform the following tasks in the library:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>needs improvement</th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use the catalog to find a book and then locate that book on the shelf</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find scholarly articles</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find statistics</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find historical newspaper articles</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask for help from a librarian</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How often do you use the library’s electronic databases per week?
___ 0 times
___ 1-2 times
___ 2-3 times
___ 3-4 times
___ 5 times or more

6. Did your English class (English 10, 11, or 12) have a day of library instruction?
___ Yes
___ No
___ N/A

7. If yes, what type of instruction did you receive? (please mark all that apply)
___ Catalog and bibliographic databases
___ Finding information on the Web/Internet
___ Evaluating information on the Web/Internet
___ Instruction for specific assignments
___ Individual consultation with a librarian at the Reference Desk
___ Other

8. Did your first-year English class do any of the following? (please mark all that apply)
___ Have a course syllabus on the Web
___ Place course materials on electronic reserves
___ Use email for class communication
___ Expect you to use library resources
___ Use a scavenger hunt exercise to teach about library resources
___ Expect you to use Web resources
___ Have a librarian provide an information session
___ N/A

9. Have you taken the library’s online tutorial?
___ Yes
___ No
10. If yes, please rate it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>degree of helpfulness</th>
<th>not at all</th>
<th>somewhat</th>
<th>excellent</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What is your preferred method for learning to use library resources? (please mark just one)
   __ Single-session instruction through the first-year English program
   __ Web-based instruction
   __ Written guides or assignments
   __ Credit classes
   __ Voluntary workshops
   __ I don’t want to learn to use library resources
   __ Other

12. How important are the following information sources for your schoolwork:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information Sources</th>
<th>not important</th>
<th>somewhat important</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNC libraries (including remote use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Wide Web resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-reserves or reserve readings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal books, journals, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty or other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How could the library improve to help you with your assignments? (please mark all that apply)
   __ Make it easier to use and access library materials (through better instruction)
   __ Have more materials available
   __ Offer interactive study guides or tutorials
   __ Provide links to other library and research sites
   __ Extend hours
   __ Have more computers available
   __ Control noise better (including cell phones)
   __ Other
14. If you needed help with research, how would you most likely go about receiving it? (please mark just one)
   ___ Ask a librarian in person
   ___ Email a librarian
   ___ Go on chat reference with a librarian
   ___ Call a librarian
   ___ Ask a friend
   ___ Ask a professor
   ___ Ask a family member
   ___ Other

15. Which English composition classes have you completed? (please mark all that apply)
   ___ English 10
   ___ English 11
   ___ English 12
   ___ I placed out of English Composition

16. If you placed out of English Composition, have you received any library instruction?
   ___ Yes, through a first-year Seminar
   ___ Yes, through another class
   ___ Yes, through a volunteer workshop
   ___ Yes, on my own, as needed
   ___ No
   ___ Other

17. Additional comments:
Appendix B: Survey for English instructors

This survey of UNC-CH English instructors will be used to evaluate how well the first-year English Program works with the University library to promote information literacy. The survey is featured in its entirety on the following page and should take about 5 minutes to complete. Your responses are anonymous and will not be traced to your email address.

1. Check the following if you agree to these terms and wish to begin the survey.
   __ I agree

2. Which English composition classes have you taught? (please mark all that apply)
   __ English 10
   __ English 11
   __ English 12

3. Did you schedule a class trip to the library during the semester?
   __ Yes
   __ No

4. If no, why not?

5. During which unit does the library trip usually get worked into your schedule? (if you have multiple sessions, please mark all that apply)
   __ First unit
   __ Second unit
   __ Third unit
   __ All units
   __ N/A

6. What kind of instruction have you received? (please mark all that apply)
   __ Catalog and bibliographic databases
   __ Finding information on the Web/Internet
   __ Evaluating information on the Web/Internet
   __ Instruction for specific assignments
   __ Individual consultation with a librarian
   __ N/A

7. Have you been satisfied with the quality of library instruction?
   __ Yes
   __ Somewhat
   __ No
   __ N/A
8. My English composition class included: (please mark all that apply)
__ A course syllabus on the Web
__ Course materials on electronic reserves
__ Email for class communication
__ Using library resources for papers
__ A scavenger hunt exercise to teach about library resources
__ Using Web resources for papers
__ An information session with a librarian
__ Other

9. How many assignments require students to document resources?
__ 0
__ 1
__ 2
__ 3
__ 4
__ 5 or more

10. Do you deduct points from the students’ grades if they use poor resources for research?
__ Yes, enough to lower the grade
__ Yes, just a few points
__ No
__ N/A

11. Do you require students to take the library's online tutorial?
__ Yes
__ No
__ What tutorial?
__ Other

12. Do you think an information literacy course should be required for first-year students?
__ Yes
__ No
__ Other

13. Would you take the time to attend a library instruction session for English instructors?
__ Yes
__ No
__ Other

14. How can the partnership between English instructors and librarians be improved?

15. Describe your position at UNC:
__ Graduate student/graduate assistant
__ Adjunct faculty
__ Full-time faculty
__ Other

16. Additional comments:
Appendix C: Survey for Librarians

This survey of UNC-CH librarians will be used to evaluate how well the first-year English Program works with the University library to promote information literacy. The survey is featured in its entirety on the following page and should take about 5 minutes to complete. Your responses are anonymous and will not be traced to your email address.

1. Check the following if you agree to these terms and wish to begin the survey.
   __ I agree

2. How many classes do you teach on library instruction per year?
   __ 0
   __ 1-3
   __ 4-6
   __ 7-9
   __ 10-13
   __ 14 or more
   __ Other

3. Do you receive adequate notice for teaching sessions?
   __ Yes
   __ No

4. What kind of instruction did you provide? (please mark all that apply)
   __ Catalog and bibliographic databases
   __ Finding information on the Web/Internet
   __ Evaluating information on the Web/Internet
   __ Instruction for specific assignments
   __ Individual consultation
   __ Other

5. Do you think an information literacy course should be mandatory for all first-year students?
   __ Yes
   __ No
6. Rate the following about your information sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>poor</th>
<th>ok</th>
<th>excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of interaction</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with students</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student response/enthusiasm</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English instructor</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiasm</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your enthusiasm</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to cover material</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English department</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of feedback from</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English department</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. In your experience with students, in which area are their skills the weakest? (please mark just one)
   - Searching online
   - Searching library databases
   - Evaluating resources
   - Locating items on shelf
   - Identifying resources
   - Other

8. How can the partnership between librarians and English instructors be improved?

9. Additional comments:
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