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The Rise of Active Learning & Flipped Instruction

Evolution of Bibliographic Instruction

- New instruction methods of the 1990s
- Opportunities created by evolving technologies
- Updated literature and research available for applying these new techniques
Enhancement of Instruction Program

A New Atmosphere at USF

- Improved departmental instruction efforts through new staff and faculty hires
- Emphasis on in-class activities and active learning
- Internal training opportunities and departmental workshops
- Increased focus on assessment
- University-wide switch to Canvas
  - Enhanced ability to develop modules, embed course guides, etc.
History of Marketing Management Instruction

Course targeted due to:

- Size of class (50+)
- Stability of instructor
- Frequency of course offering (required for several programs)
- Solid information literacy component
- Change in library faculty
- Opportunity for new instruction experimentation
- “Measureable deliverables”
Negotiating with Faculty

How do you do it?

- Determine what actually needs to be covered in class through discussions with faculty
- Emphasize the importance of covering ONLY agreed-upon content during the in-class session
- Reiterate the importance of activities (previously cut due to time constraints)
- Be patient!
Selecting Flipped Elements

The Assignment: Marketing Plan
- Semester-long project
- Multiple components

Resources
- Industry (IBISWorld, ReferenceUSA)
- Marketing (MarketResearch.com Academic, Marketline Advantage, Mintel Oxygen)
- Census Data (American FactFinder)
- Company and News (ABI/INFORM, Business Source Premier)
- Consumer Confidence Index

Flipped Elements
- What can be effectively described via video/tutorial?
- Where should the emphasis lie?
Development of Rubric

First Draft
- Based on the CRAAP Test
- 10-point scale (Poor, 1-3; Average, 4-7; Good, 8-10)

Revisions
- Re-purposing the CRAAP Test (Currency versus Timeliness)
- Reconsidering the point scale

Group Rubric Re-design
- Inclusion of all interested librarians
- Re-defined parameters (e.g., cross-discipline applicability, reduced point scale)
## The Finished Product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Source Required (e.g., Journal, Book, etc.)</th>
<th>Authority - Defined by the parameters of the assignment (e.g., primary, peer-reviewed, trade, etc.)</th>
<th>Relevance to Topic</th>
<th>Clarity of Documentation</th>
<th>Accuracy of Citation</th>
<th>Quality of Annotation/Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = all are incorrect; 1 = few are correct; 2 = half are correct; 3 = most/all sources are correct</td>
<td>0 = no sources; 1 = few sources are relevant; 2 = half are relevant; 3 = most/all sources are relevant</td>
<td>0 = none of the sources are easy to locate; 1 = few sources are easy to locate; 2 = half of the sources are easy to locate; 3 = most/all sources are easy to locate</td>
<td>0 = no citations are accurately cited; 1 = few citations are accurate; 2 = half are accurate; 3 = most/all are accurate</td>
<td>0 = none of the annotations/test meet assignment requirements; 1 = a small portion meet the requirements; 2 = half meet the requirements; 3 = most/all meet the requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5. Type of Source Required (e.g., Journal, Book, etc.)
  - All sources are incorrect
  - Few of the sources are correct
  - Most/all sources are correct

* 6. Authority - Defined by the parameters of the assignment (e.g., primary, peer-reviewed, trade, etc.)
  - No source is appropriate
  - Few sources are appropriate
  - Most/all sources are appropriate

* 7. Relevance to Topic
  - No source is relevant
  - Few sources are relevant
  - Most/all sources are relevant

* 8. Clarity of Documentation
  - No source is easy to locate
  - Few sources are easy to locate
  - Most/all sources are easy to locate

* 9. Accuracy of Citation
  - No sources are accurate
  - Few sources are accurate
  - Most/all sources are accurate

* 10. Quality of Annotation/Text
  - No annotations/test meet assignment requirements
  - A small portion meet the requirements
  - Most/all meet the requirements
Outcomes and Assessment

What we were looking for:

- Appropriate number of sources for project needs
- Good mix of library and reputable internet sources
- Use of specific resources we demonstrated in the instruction session
- Evidence that sources helped produce a quality product
Outcomes and Assessment

What we found:

- Numerous issues with citation style and consistency
- Heavy reliance on internet resources
- Little use of scholarly journals
- Surprising issues with “findability”
- Heavier use of library resources seemed to correspond with better grades from the instructor
Process and Takeaways

The Pros
- Good feedback so far from faculty partner
- Students used relevant sources

Areas for Improvement
- Need more emphasis on citations and mix of sources
- Focus on evaluating quality of resources

Future Possibilities
- Gauge student feelings on the “flipped process”
- Become further embedded (e.g. quizzes, more flipped elements, video tutorials)
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