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Table 1. Strategic Collaboration Matrix

1. Librarian and faculty met to develop collaboration framework standards and academic and library information literacy modules.

2. Students registered for the required academic course.

3. Students received the academic assignment from faculty member during class.

4. Students reported to the library to receive information literacy instruction.

5. Student used information obtained during the library information literacy instruction to complete the academic module.

6. Student transferred knowledge obtained from the strategic collaboration modules to subsequent program courses.
### Strategic Engagement Collaboration Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Librarian and Faculty</th>
<th>Librarian and Students</th>
<th>Faculty and Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Person-centered education</strong></td>
<td>Librarian and faculty member shared their respective knowledge and expertise in order to achieve a high level of inter-professional collaboration</td>
<td>The librarian provided one to one; and one to small group instruction on library resources and information literacy skills.</td>
<td>Students enrolled in a course where one-to-one teaching could occur when necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Respect and value different roles</td>
<td><strong>Librarian and Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>Librarian and Students</strong></td>
<td><strong>Faculty and Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian and faculty member possessed field specific expertise that when combined generated new ideas and processes that led to an increase in student use of library resources and information literacy skills.</td>
<td>The role of the student as learner was respected during the activity. The librarian encouraged the student to explore the resources. The student respected the librarian’s role as guide.</td>
<td>The Faculty member respected the students’ right to explore their intellectual capacities. The role of the student is to make useful meaning of the information, specifically, they get to explore ways they can use the information in their day-to-day life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Engagement Collaboration Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian and Faculty</th>
<th>Librarian and Students</th>
<th>Faculty and Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Build and preserve dignity and respect</strong></td>
<td>Librarian and faculty member mutually decided the format of the intervention and both utilized their strengths to build a curriculum that would assist students in acquiring lifelong information literacy skills.</td>
<td>Librarian provided an atmosphere that allowed the student to feel a sense of belonging. The librarian's decorum demonstrated a true sense of compassion for the student. The student remained responsive and open to the instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Share accountability in a just and equitable culture</strong></td>
<td><strong>Librarian and Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>Librarian and Students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Librarian and faculty shared the responsibility of delivering the instruction to students. Faculty was responsible for getting the students to the library and the Librarian was responsible for introducing the students to the information literacy resources. Both parties engaged in on-going communication to assure information literacy acquisition.</td>
<td>The librarian and student worked together to achieve an increase of student information literacy skills. Each student received consistent service in regard to quality, attention, and care. The student was accountable for their responsiveness to the information literacy training and transferring the newly learned skills to address other information needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Make joint decisions and trust and communicate information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian and Faculty</th>
<th>Librarian and Students</th>
<th>Faculty and Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Librarian and faculty decided how to expand student accountability to experiencing information literacy. Both concluded that an attendance sheet and a certificate of completion would be beneficial to the student's motivation.</td>
<td>Librarian and student jointly explored the information literacy resources to determine the best resources together. The student trusted that the librarian possessed current and accurate expertise. The Librarian must acquire and apply information literacy skills across the current activity and future activities.</td>
<td>Although most to the curriculum is developed without the current student, much of the curriculum was reimagined as a result of student feedback and reflections. Also, students decided when they would complete the information literacy tutorial as well as the assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Strategic Engagement Collaboration Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Librarian and Faculty</th>
<th>Librarian and Students</th>
<th>Faculty and Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Trust and communicate information openly</td>
<td>Librarian and faculty established open lines of communication as the students matriculated through the experience. The faculty often sought the opinions of the librarian regarding student performance, attendance, and maintenance of information literacy, as well as acquisition trends, directions and/or changes.</td>
<td>Librarian provided an environment that allowed for open dialog as students explored the available resources. Students expressed their thoughts and ideas during the research process allowing the librarian to better guide and inform the student of information literacy practices.</td>
<td>Faculty communicated information openly with students regarding the process, including the academic activity, the interaction with the library, and the collaboration process. If students had questions, those were openly addressed to assist students in achieving the learning outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Academic and information literacy modules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Instruction</th>
<th>Information Literacy Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The seminal work in the field of autism began with the publication of two scientific papers published only one year apart. In 1943, Leo Kanner reported on cases of children, whom he labeled as autistic, who had major problems in communication and social interactions, as well as bizarre repetitive movements and an obsessive dislike of change. In 1944, Hans Asperger reported on cases of children, whom he referred to as having autistic psychopathy, who displayed normal intelligence and language but who were socially isolated and had obsessive interests in extraordinarily narrow areas. Your task is to locate copies of the original works, compare and contrast and discuss the major characteristics of autism and Asperger syndrome as outlined in Kanner’s and Asperger’s papers. Point out similarities, as well as differences between the two sets of characteristics. I would encourage you to create a matrix that details the compare and contrast the two findings prior to creating your narrative, which explains your findings. | • Determination of information need  
• Development of adequate keyword list  
• Identification of descriptive elements of papers (e.g. Author name, paper title, publication title etc.)  
• Identification of elements of paper (e.g. abstract, methodology, reference list etc.)  
• Understanding of different uses for resources such as library databases, online search engines, and Google Scholar or Google Books  
• Acquisition of materials (e.g. Catalog, interlibrary loan etc.)  
• Proper citation of found material. |
Context of the Problem

1. Virtual library built under the concept of the “digital natives”.
2. Lack of funding and space, but an abundance of electronic resources drove the concept.
3. Students relied solely of open source resources to gain information.
4. Students are naïve to the amount of information literacy needed and resources that are available to them.
Study

1. Procedures
   a. Beginning of collaboration
   b. Designed information literacy training
   c. “Sandwich” approach
      i. Students received assignment from faculty (sub-purposeful module)
      ii. Students were trained on IL (purposeful learning)
      iii. Students used IL training to complete assignment (student product)
      iv. Students gain cognitive strategies to access IL (acquisition)

2. Methods
   a. Qualitative methods with a phenomenology design
   b. Collaboration

3. Data Sources
   a. Student Survey
   b. Researchers Collaboration Reflections

4. Scholarly Significance
   a. One isolated event that demonstrates how faculty and library collaboration improves the information literacy of students
Participants

- Undergraduate Education students
- EC-6, SPED, or 4-8 (Math)
- Taking Intro to Exceptional Learners class
- Class Mandatory for all Education students
- Survey distributed 4 semesters after taking the Exceptional Learners class
- Students were either beginning or concluding their student teaching experience.
Findings

Question #1 Which of the following best describes you?

Student Survey Responses

- I learned 80% or more: 16
- I learned 50%-79%: 11
- I already knew most of this information: 0
## Findings

**Question #2** - Which resource will you most likely use during this semester to complete your academic assignments?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Learned 80%+</th>
<th>Learned 50%+</th>
<th>Knew Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Library Databases</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
<td>0.8182</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Internet Search</td>
<td>0.6875</td>
<td>0.5455</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Google Scholar</td>
<td>0.6250</td>
<td>0.4545</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Library Catalog</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.2727</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Refworks</td>
<td>0.2500</td>
<td>0.0909</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Wikipedia</td>
<td>0.0625</td>
<td>0.0909</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0909</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Worldcat</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Question #3- Can you describe one or more differences between Find Online Articles (Library Database) and Google (Internet Search Engine)?

Student Responses

• “In Google, it is simple to search different topics, but while using "Find Online Articles (library database)" you are able to focus your research and topics to more professional/peer-reviewed material.”
• “The articles could be filtered and allowed you the opportunity to search for exactly what you need.”
• “Library database have been reviewed + peer reviewed Google are not 100% accurate
• It narrows it down.”
• “Internet search engine is good for Google scholar, which library database helps find research articles and books.”
• “Using the library database made it easier for me to be sure that the articles would be peer-reviewed & what I needed.”
Analysis

- Purposeful learning with a sub-purposeful module improved student’s long-term learning and utilization of information literacy knowledge and skills.
- Students continued utilizing proprietary resources after the control was removed.
- Students data indicated a preference for proprietary (cost) resources over open source (no-cost) resources; with focus as their leading indicator.
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