ABSTRACT
A faculty member and librarian collaborated to adapt a new programmatic IUPUI Bridge/FYS information literacy curriculum to a highly disciplinary, pre-professional course (Dental Hygiene). Development of information literacy instruction that met all the needs of students in the first year experience was only allowable through the close collaboration and multiple levels of library intervention during curriculum scaffolding.

INTRODUCTION
Introductory courses are challenged with filling the needs of diverse subject matter and focus while maintaining consistent content and experiences. Programmatic curricula maximizes efficiency for instruction and assessment. In the fall of 2015, the University Library instituted a unified curriculum for the teaching and assessment of information literacy (IL). The Dental Hygiene Bridge/FYS classes make excellent test cases. Some students will continue as dental hygiene majors and should benefit from early specialized instruction while the majority of students (~90%) will change majors, in some cases to non-STEM disciplines. The goal for all students, however, remains the same and these courses must teach adequate skills for success that are transferrable to any discipline. This project focuses on determining the best way to use this new, normalized curriculum.

LEARNING OUTCOMES
FYS
• Understand and begin to practice basic communication skills appropriate for the academic setting
• Begin the process of understanding critical thinking in the university context
• Understand the role and make full use of IUPUI resources and services that support their learning and campus connections

DH FYS
• Design searches strategically
• Evaluate sources (i.e., popular v. scholarly)
• Cite sources
• Know what services the library offers

In-Class

Instruction

Explain learning objectives
Introduce the course research guide: http://libguides.iupui.edu/bridgeminclass

Discuss the "Research Process"

A volunteer reports their question to the group

Break down the volunteer’s or other question onto keywords and synonyms

Worksheet #1

Introduction

Strategy 1

Worksheet #2

Strategy 2

Worksheet #3

Strategy 3

Worksheet #4

Assignment

Define Your Question or Topic

Comprehension Check

Find Scholarly Articles

Comprehension Check

Cite Your Article in the Required Style

In-class worksheets were assessed using a rubric developed specifically for this assignment. Both the Bridge and FYS classes had n=19 assessable student worksheets which were scored by both faculty members for a total sample size of n=38. The rubric measured student performance based on the described goals for the course: Production of Keywords & Synonyms, Article Quality, and Citation. Each of these areas was scored on a scale of one to three.

Overall, scores are average to good. Students did best at keyword and synonym selection for searching with a mean of 2.42, and means of 2.09 and 1.93 for article quality and citation, respectively. This is not unexpected given that most students would have extensive experience searching databases in their regular lives but less experience determining scholarlyness of publications or creating formal citations manually. What is particularly interesting is the difference between the Bridge and FYS results. There was a statistically significant difference in scores for keyword selection and article quality and a non-significant but observable difference in citation scores with Bridge student scoring better than FYS students in all areas.

MEAN SCORES

RESULTS

• Student driven topic choice is superior
• Provides a baseline for student IL skills

CLASSES

• Expand IL instruction with an annotated bibliography and additional assessment
• A model for sequencing of IL into advanced DH courses

FUTURE

• Integrate IL into a new dental hygiene BS curriculum
• Keep librarians integrated into classes at all levels for IL

ASSIGNMENT RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Level of Achievement</th>
<th>Student Name:</th>
<th>Class:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keywords &amp; Synonyms</td>
<td>Developed 1</td>
<td>Emerging 2</td>
<td>Initial 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Source materials are appropriate or non-scholarly</td>
<td>Article is only tangentially related to the proposed question/due to lack in quality</td>
<td>Article is only tangentially related to the proposed question/due to lack in quality or from a scholarly journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citation</td>
<td>Citation is complete and in the assigned style</td>
<td>Citation is incomplete or not in the assigned style</td>
<td>Citation is incomplete or not in the assigned style</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While both classes did the same work and had the same goals, there were differences that likely turned out to be significant. Bridge students were allowed to choose research topics while FYS students all researched a specific topic. Interestingly, this change was made in attempt to improve the FYS class over the earlier Bridge class which was perceived as being chaotic. Given the student assignments, this inadvertently removed much of the burden of actual thought from students. Not surprisingly, students given the same topic and sample keywords came up with the same keywords and synonyms, often not going beyond those suggested in class during discussion.