Student Learning: An Assessment of Information Literacy Learning in Nursing Research One-Shots

Stephanie Wiegand

*University of Northern Colorado*, stephanie.wiegand@unco.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digscholarship.unco.edu/libfacpub

Part of the Health Sciences and Medical Librarianship Commons, and the Information Literacy Commons

**Recommended Citation**


This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Libraries Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Scholarship & Creative Works @ Digital UNC. For more information, please contact Jane.Monson@unco.edu.
Student Learning: An Assessment of Information Literacy Learning in Nursing Research One-Shots

Presented at the 2019 Annual Meeting of the Midcontinental Chapter of the Medical Library Association
October 15, 2019 | Omaha, Nebraska | Magnolia Omaha

Background
As part of on-going assessment within the libraries of the University of Northern Colorado, librarians collect formative assessment data in select one-shot sessions. Although assessment is valuable for students to understand their own learning process, it is also important for librarians to use data to evaluate their teaching. In the spring, summer, and fall semesters, the Health Sciences Librarian is invited to speak to the nursing program’s research and evidence-based course that meets in three-hour sessions. Data was collected from three sessions in 2018. Nursing cohorts include 36 students each; only two of 108 students were absent on the days of the sessions and nine students either did not complete the assessment or declined to be included in this study. Ninety-seven students agreed to participate and fully completed the form, answering all questions. The assessment included feedback on what students perceived to be the most valuable knowledge they learned in the session and the likelihood students would contact a librarian for future research projects.

Methods
Each session is broken into three parts (see NURS 380 Lesson Plan for a more detailed breakdown):
- Part 1 – Lecture and discussion
- Part 2 – Hands-on exercises
- Part 3 – Facilitated searching

During a portion of Part 1, students breakdown the structure of a research article. Once each section of the research article is defined, tips for quickly identifying research articles and discriminating from non-research articles are offered. The difference between primary and secondary research is discussed including the contrasting of subject type. In an activity students practice discriminating between article types (see NURS 380 Activity). Before facilitated searching, students complete a short online assessment that is not graded nor shared with the instructor (see NURS 380 Assessment). Data was collected from three sessions in 2018. Nursing cohorts include 36 students each; only two of 108 students were absent on the days of the sessions and nine students either did not complete the assessment or declined to be included in this study. Ninety-seven students agreed to participate and fully completed the form, answering all questions. The assessment included feedback on what students perceived to be the most valuable knowledge they learned in the session and the likelihood students would contact a librarian for future research projects.

Results
93/97 Students Correctly Differentiated between Three Article Types

96%

Figure 1

Most Valuable Service/Research Tip/Tool Learned Today

- Advanced Search Techniques
- RefWorks
- Other
- Citation Tracing
- ILL
- Finding Full Text

Figure 2

Likelihood to Contact Librarian in Future

Students were able to differentiate between research/non-research and primary/secondary. Less than 4% of students misidentified one or more abstracts (Figure 1). A majority of students (50%) indicated that advanced search techniques for PubMed and CINAHL was the most valuable knowledge gained during the session (Figure 2). Only two students (2.06%, included in the ‘Other’ category) stated that discriminating between research/non-research and primary/secondary was the most valuable knowledge gained. Figure 3 demonstrates the students’ perception of the likelihood they will contact a librarian during future research projects, with zero students indicating definitely not.

Discussion
Data from the formative assessment demonstrate students are able to differentiate between types of articles by the end of the session. Yet it is clear that students do not find this material to be the most valuable in the session. The majority indicated they would ‘probably’ or ‘definitely’ contact a librarian in the future. Given the time devoted to breaking down research article structure, differentiating between types of articles, and practicing, this content may need to be reduced and more time devoted to other topics or spent in facilitated research.