**Question**

What does information literacy look like in introductory writing (Writing 1)?

**Goals**

**Writing faculty**

More clearly articulate information literacy priorities for Writing 1.

**Librarians**

Understand how to better support information literacy in Writing 1.

**Collaboration Begins**

- UC Merced Librarians and Merritt Writing Program (MWP) faculty received a faculty fellowship grant from our Center for Engaged Teaching & Learning (CETL).
- This grant funded a 2017 project called Promoting Academic Thinking and Habits (PATH).

**Project Overview**

- A PATH planning team designed a curriculum framework and a learning community implemented the framework in fall 2017.
- Librarians provided resources and lessons for use with Writing 1.
- PATH participants and librarians met three times during the semester to discuss experiences with the curriculum.
- Librarians and two planning team members conducted end-of-semester assessment interviews with participants.

**Participants**

14 MWP faculty and two librarians.

---

**Curriculum Framework**

Three cover letters each with an overview, assignment goals, information literacy outcomes, and reading and writing assignment samples.

1. Expository Writing, Practicing Summary & Analysis
2. Writing in a Mode: Choosing and Integrating Sources
3. Writing an Argument and Ethically Using Sources

**Library Contributions**

Provided four resources for MWP faculty use, including three lesson plans and an online tutorial.

---

**WHAT WE LEARNED**

MWP faculty had high levels of agreement around three areas of information literacy that should be a strong focus of Writing 1. However, three other areas did not have the same level of consensus.

**High Level of Agreement**

- Critical Reading & Synthesis
  - Students will be able to read critically and closely to successfully synthesize source materials.
- Source Integration & Analysis
  - Students will be able to effectively and ethically integrate sources through summarizing, paraphrasing, and quoting.
- Information Sources
  - Faculty primarily used popular sources rather than scholarly sources with their students.

**Mixed Level of Agreement**

- MLA Style Expectations
  - Faculty expected students to use MLA properly but not perfectly. Yet, they did not necessarily expect students to use MLA with the same level of independence.
- Source Evaluation
  - Most faculty focused on working with students to evaluate sources by considering rhetorical context and purpose while some also asked students to consider basic indicators of authority to evaluate information.

**Low Level of Agreement**

- Information Finding
  - Some faculty wanted students to find limited information independently; for others this was not feasible due to the time and attention needed for critical reading, synthesis, source integration and analysis.

---

**What Comes Next?**

Partner with MWP to follow through on recommendations and fully accomplish original goals.

**Recommendations**

- Identify and create the highest priority resources to support information literacy in Writing 1.
- Revisit and renew the information literacy course learning outcome for Writing 1.
- Update curricular framework to clearly articulate and formalize Writing 1 guidelines.

**Future Challenge**

Determine sustainable and effective library support for information literacy areas that accommodates diverse faculty approaches to Writing 1.

**Future Opportunity**

Work with colleagues to continue refining information literacy priorities and support for basic writers.

**Thanks to the rest of the PATH Team**

Matt Snyder, Kris Van Bebber, Michael Elkins, Justin Gautreau, Pam Gingold, Edward Kennedy, Heather Lanser, Tessa McIntire, DeEtte Silbaugh, Jane Wilson, Angela Winek, and Anne Zanuzzchi.