

# **Outcomes and Challenges of Offering an Information Literacy Compulsory Undergraduate Credit Course: A Mexican Case**

European Conference on Information Literacy (Fifth ECIL)  
“Workplace Information Literacy”

Department of Information Management of Hacettepe University,  
Department of Information and Communication Sciences of Zagreb University  
Information Literacy Association (InLitAs), St. Malo, FRANCE, September 18-21, 2017

## **Jesus Lau**

[jlau@uv.mx](mailto:jlau@uv.mx) / [jesuslau@gmail.com.mx](mailto:jesuslau@gmail.com.mx)

Twitter / LinkedIn, Instagram and other social networks: [jesuslau](#)

[www.jesuslau.com.mx](http://www.jesuslau.com.mx)

Universidad Veracruzana, Veracruz-Boca del Río, Instituto de Ingeniería/DSAE /  
PIMSA- Cátedra Distinguida, CETYS Universidad

## **José Luis Bonilla / Alberto Gárate**

[Joseluisbonilla@cetys.mx](mailto:Joseluisbonilla@cetys.mx) / [alberto.garate@cetys.mx](mailto:alberto.garate@cetys.mx)

Professor / Academic Affairs Vice-Chancellor  
CETYS Universidad, Baja California, México

# Topics

1. CETYS University Information Culture
2. How course content evolved
3. Course implementation
4. Evaluation of course facilitation
5. Learning outcome

# Introduction

- ◉ Information literacy lecturers are scarce in Mexico
- ◉ IL challenges at high school level and at university
- ◉ PISA: Mexican students received 423 points versus OECD 493 points
- ◉ CETYS University Information Culture goal
- ◉ Action: Creation of *Management of information* course

## How course content evolved

- ◉ Undergraduate program: 20% of courses contribute to general skills development
- ◉ Management of information (MI) 8 credit course: 4 hours per week for first year students
- ◉ Course thematic components:

Information  
society and  
culture

IL Mexican  
standards:  
Eight core IL  
competencies

How to  
conduct  
information  
search

Bibliographic  
resources  
management

# Course implementation

- ◉ Academic decision and course implementation was in a short period
- ◉ Administrative challenge: Faculty recruitment
- ◉ All selected lecturers had a Master's Degree and two had Ph.Ds.
- ◉ All attended an introduction to the course and received teaching materials of UV IL course
- ◉ Enrollment, 361 students: 17 groups
- ◉ Lecturers met during the semester to share experiences

## Evaluation of course facilitation

### Three Research Techniques

- ◉ Questionnaire for students. 27 closed questions and 3 open-ended questions
- ◉ Lecturer discussion group: attended by 7 out of 9 lecturers - Tijuana campus
- ◉ Analysis of student papers: End-of-term MI paper; and last high school semester paper

## **Lecturer discussion group: Four kick off questions**

1. How did you feel during the facilitation of the course? What did you feel go right and what did not?
2. How did you feel about training for MI teaching? What would you suggest for other new lecturers?
3. What are the skills required to facilitate the MI course?
4. What syllabus improvements did you identify?

# **Results Lecturer Discussion Group**



- **Welcome the course:** Adoption of the course was a proper decision and was beneficial to students
- **Achievement:** Good learning level
- **Benefits:** Most students improved IL skills
- **Concern:** Skills learned in MI are likely to be lost if they are not practiced
- **Syllabus complexity:** Took more effort than expected to understand syllabus structure

- **Training:** Team work: training was not enough to grasp the scope of the course
- **Discipline:** Difficult to focus on discipline-specific student needs
- **Opportunity to seize:** Capitalize on rich variety of info-resources across USA border
- **Limited knowledge construction:** Students tended to make the least learning effort to reach course objectives

**Student Learning Outcome:  
Information Competencies Evaluation**

Table. High School Versus Undergraduate Papers  
(52 students with both papers)

Paper indicators fulfillment Value 10% Each	High School 52 papers = 100%	Undergraduate 52 papers = 100%
1. Table of contents	37%	40%
2. Structure: Introduction, discussion and conclusion	69%	96%
3. Writing composition (Argument)	54%	81%
4. Citations	46%	98%
5. Paraphrasing	69%	100%
6. Academic information sources	35%	81%
7. Information sources in other languages	29%	67%
8. References – Style	63%	100%
9. Use of advanced word processing	12%	21%
10. Use of graphics and tables	16%	28%
Average	43% papers	71% papers

# Conclusions

- ◉ Overall course outcome was highly positive
- ◉ Course program may need to be adjusted
- ◉ Lecturer profile needs to be more specifically defined
- ◉ Teaching MI team of nine Tijuana lecturers had uneven IL qualifications

- ⊙ Lecturers were unaware of their own IL skills limitations and were generally satisfied with their facilitation performance
- ⊙ Better lecturer training is needed
- ⊙ Further studies are needed to assess factors in regard to library role and lecturers' IL skills impact
- ⊙ Study results will be forwarded to the university authorities for potential IL course improvement

# **Outcomes and Challenges of Offering an Information Literacy Compulsory Undergraduate Credit Course: A Mexican Case**

**Jesus Lau**

jlau@uv.mx

**José Luis Bonilla**

joseluisbonilla@cetys.mx

**Alberto Gárate**

alberto.garate@cetys.mx