

WI+RE:
Writing Instruction &
Research Education

Assessment Findings:
Program Year 2016-17

Instructional Improvement Program Grant #16-11

UCLA Office of Instructional Development | Center for Educational Assessment
June 2017

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 2 |
| Project Description..... | 2 |
| Project Assessment..... | 2 |
| Assessment Reports..... | 2 |
| Summary of Key Findings..... | 3 |
| Cornerstone Workshops (face-to-face) | 3 |
| Mapping Your Research Module (online) | 3 |
| Psychology 188B CCLE Modules (online) | 3 |
| Faculty Engagement Interviews..... | 3 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 1: Pre-Survey Results..... | 4 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 1: Post-Survey Results | 7 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 2: Pre-Survey Results..... | 10 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 2: Post-Survey Results | 12 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 4: Pre-Survey Results..... | 14 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 4: Post-Survey Results | 16 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 5: Pre-Survey Results..... | 18 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 5: Post-Survey Results | 20 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 6: Pre-Survey Results..... | 22 |
| Cornerstone Workshop 6: Post-Survey Results | 24 |
| Mapping Your Research Module: Post-Survey Results..... | 26 |
| Psychology 188B Survey Results | 28 |
| Faculty Engagement Interviews..... | 33 |
| Case Narrative #1..... | 33 |
| Case Narrative #2..... | 34 |
| Case Narrative #3..... | 36 |
| Case Narrative #4..... | 37 |
| Cross-case Summary | 38 |

Introduction

Project Description

The WI+RE team comprises collaborators from the Undergraduate Research Center, Writing Programs, Center for Digital Humanities, the UCLA Library, and students-learners. This cross-campus community focuses on helping learners succeed in their writing and research projects. Utilizing a participatory design approach wherein students-learners are actively engaged in the creation of learning materials, the WI+RE team designs, develops, and implements a suite of research and writing tools that facilitate the teaching and learning of writing, critical thinking, information literacy, and digital methods and analysis skills. The tools are predicated on an active learning model and include mobile instructional modules that can be delivered in a mix of synchronous, asynchronous, face-to-face, and online modes.

Project Assessment

The Center for Educational Assessment (CEA) provided an evaluation of ongoing activities of the WI+RE team which included face-to-face workshops, online tutorials, and course and faculty collaborations. The assessment focus captured both student and faculty perspectives and included review and analysis of existing data provided by the project collaborators and interviews conducted by CEA researchers with select instructors. Existing data included responses to pre- and post-surveys given to students attending the Cornerstone Research Workshops, a post-survey completed by users of an online instructional module, and an active questionnaire integrated through CCLE completed by students of a Psychology course. The surveys assessed the value of the workshops and modules and their function in teaching research and writing skills. The interviews with instructors were guided by a protocol developed by project collaborators. The case narratives from the interviews revealed the faculty uses and perceptions of the WI+RE research and writing tools and assessed how they are being integrated into various courses.

Assessment Reports

The following assessment findings are contained in this final report:

- Cornerstone Workshop Pre- and Post-Surveys: draft report completed 3/11/2017
- Mapping Your Research Module Post-Survey: draft report completed 3/15/2017
- Psychology 188B Survey: draft report completed 5/15/2017
- Faculty Engagement Interviews: draft report completed 6/2/2017

Summary of Key Findings

Cornerstone Workshops (face-to-face)

- **Workshops met student expectations:** Students appreciated the workshops and indicated that the content was good, helpful, and informative; the speakers were great, engaging, and thorough; their questions were answered; and they learned a lot about research opportunities, programs, and how to get involved.
- **Students felt more confident about their research abilities:** Following completion of the workshops, students felt more comfortable with the following: developing research topics and generating research questions, citing sources and creating bibliographies, being aware of tools and strategies for managing the research process, and planning a research project from start to finish. They also cited having developed stronger research and writing strategies.
- **Students discovered valuable resources:** Respondents became aware or more familiar with campus programs and resources such as student-initiated research programs, research opportunities with faculty, library tools, and presentation and publication opportunities.

Mapping Your Research Module (online)

- **Video modules were helpful and provided direction for developing research topics:** Respondents praised the mapping your research video for being concise, straightforward, and easy to follow, as well as providing guidance for focusing topics, creating outlines, and starting research papers. The video also aided students with systematic development and focus of questions.

Psychology 188B CCLE Modules (online)

- **Students found the module to be well designed:** Respondents acknowledged that the components of the module were simple, straightforward, comprehensive, and well made.
- **Students found the activities and strategies to be very helpful:** Respondents appreciated the step-by-step process of developing a research question and seeking out resources, as well as new tips for utilizing familiar research databases.

Faculty Engagement Interviews

- **Faculty across the board had positive experiences:** Faculty found the workshops, modules, and tutorials to be well designed and very helpful for their courses and students. Everyone plans to continue to use the research and writing tools in their courses.
- **Faculty desired efficiency in teaching:** Faculty expressed a preference for teaching students the basics and fundamentals about research writing outside of class time so that class time can be used more productively and for greater depth.
- **Course integration was wide-ranging:** The various research and writing tools were incorporated into the courses in a mix of in-person, online, and hybrid modes via class time, library time, and CCLE.
- **Faculty affirmed student improvement:** While acknowledging lack of control groups or pre- and post-tests, there still appeared to be evidence of improvement, including greater understanding of research writing and higher sophistication of work from students.

Cornerstone Workshop 1: Pre-Survey Results

N=169 respondents

- 82 North campus majors
- 83 South campus majors
- 4 N/A majors

- 114 Third/Fourth years
- 53 First/Second years
- 1 Graduate
- 1 Extension

Q1: Imagine a researcher at UCLA. List 3 things this person might be doing that constitutes "research."

Respondents listed 476 items that varied across 17 categories:

| | |
|--|----|
| Finding/organizing sources, background reading, lit reviews | 55 |
| Data collection (e.g., archives, databases, documents) | 55 |
| Field/lab work | 45 |
| Discovery, exploration, investigation, learning, producing new knowledge, studying topics | 42 |
| Experiments | 40 |
| Analysis (e.g., data, trends, results, models) | 40 |
| Writing (e.g., proposals, essays, papers, reports, books, peer reviews), presenting/publishing work | 33 |
| Developing/testing hypothesis/theories | 32 |
| Surveys | 29 |
| Other | 20 |
| Types of studies (e.g., ethnography, case study, clinical trials, meta-analysis) | 17 |
| Assisting/collaborating with professors/others | 15 |
| Interviews | 13 |
| Asking/answering questions | 14 |
| Observations | 10 |
| Don't know | 9 |
| Drawing conclusions | 7 |

Q2: What are three ways students can get involved in research at UCLA?

Respondents listed 411 items that varied across 20 categories:

| | |
|---|-----|
| Contacting/working with faculty, graduate students, peers, department staff | 126 |
| Courses (e.g., SRP 99/199, Dept 199, classes) | 65 |
| Self/student-Initiated | 37 |
| Join a lab | 23 |
| Research/scholarship programs, research grants (e.g., McNair, Mellon Mays) | 19 |
| Don't know, not sure | 18 |
| URC | 17 |
| Search online | 13 |
| General research assistance (e.g., assist with recruitment, data collection, writing) | 12 |
| As a participant/subject | 11 |
| Internship, volunteer | 11 |
| Honors thesis/198, capstone | 10 |
| Other | 9 |
| Attend workshop, undergrad research week, research fairs | 8 |
| Library resources | 7 |
| Clubs, research organizations, think tanks | 6 |
| Seeking out and applying for research opportunities | 6 |
| University resource centers (e.g., AAP, career center, Murphy Hall) | 5 |
| Write research papers, publish essays/findings, poster presentations | 5 |
| Flyers | 3 |

Q3: What do you hope to learn during this workshop?

Respondents listed 199 items across 15 categories:

| | |
|---|----|
| How/where to start/find topics | 38 |
| How to get involved with research | 32 |
| How/where to find research opportunities | 30 |
| Learn the research process/how to conduct research (effectively) | 18 |
| Learn anything (3), don't know | 14 |
| How to get in touch with faculty about research projects | 12 |
| Available resources | 9 |
| How to apply for research position/program | 8 |
| Better research skills, methods, tools | 8 |
| How to conduct own research | 7 |
| Finding/assessing sources | 7 |
| What is research | 5 |
| Writing skills | 4 |
| Other (e.g., pros/cons, ideas, collaborate with peers, lit reviews) | 4 |
| What credit available for doing research | 3 |

Q4: How did you find out about this workshop?

| | |
|---------------------------------|----|
| Email | 42 |
| MyUCLA | 41 |
| Word of mouth | 24 |
| Professor (9=Shorter, 1=Deckes) | 23 |
| Posted flyer | 17 |
| WAC 51 (also Shorter) | 14 |
| Activities fair | 5 |
| Class | 5 |
| Online, website, search | 5 |
| Facebook | 4 |
| Undergraduate Research Center | 4 |
| Other, N/A, Don't know | 3 |
| AAP | 1 |
| Career Center | 1 |
| Counselor | 1 |

Cornerstone Workshop 1: Post-Survey Results

N=139 respondents

- 60 North campus majors
- 77 South campus majors
- 2 N/A majors

- 93 Third/Fourth years
- 45 First/Second years
- 1 Extension

Q1: Imagine a researcher at UCLA. List 3 things this person might be doing that constitutes "research."

Respondents listed 401 items across 18 categories (bolded items new in post-survey):

| | |
|---|----|
| Field/lab work | 78 |
| Surveys | 47 |
| Analysis (e.g., data, trends, results, models) | 44 |
| Data collection (e.g., archives, databases, documents) | 41 |
| Experiments | 33 |
| Finding/organizing sources, background reading, lit reviews | 25 |
| Developing/testing hypothesis/theories | 23 |
| Discovery, exploration, (methodical) investigation, learning, producing new knowledge, studying topics | 19 |
| Observations | 15 |
| Other | 14 |
| Writing (e.g., proposals, essays, papers, reports, books, peer reviews), presenting/publishing work, conferences | 14 |
| SRP 99/student initiated | 10 |
| Assisting/collaborating with professors/mentor, faculty-initiated | 10 |
| Interviews | 9 |
| Documentary/art project | 8 |
| Don't know/ same as before, n/a | 7 |
| Asking/answering questions | 3 |
| Drawing conclusions | 1 |

Note: The "types of studies" responses from the pre-survey did not emerge in the post-survey.

Q2: What are three ways students can get involved in research at UCLA?

Respondents listed 381 items across 18 categories (bolded items new in post-survey):

| | |
|---|-----|
| Contacting/working with faculty, graduate students, peers, department staff, faculty initiated research | 109 |
| Courses (e.g., SRP 99/199, Dept 199, classes) | 101 |
| Self/student-initiated, independent/individual research | 64 |
| Research/scholarship programs (e.g., McNair, Mellon Mays, USRP, USFP), research grants | 23 |
| Search online | 13 |
| Internship, volunteer | 12 |
| Honors thesis/198 | 10 |
| URC | 9 |
| Other | 7 |
| Attend workshop, undergrad research week | 7 |
| Don't know/ same as before, n/a | 6 |
| Write research papers, publish/submit work, presentations | 5 |
| As a participant/subject | 4 |
| Aleph | 4 |
| Join a lab | 2 |
| Library resources | 2 |
| Seeking out and applying for research opportunities | 2 |
| Organizations | 1 |

Note: The "general research assistance," " university resource centers," and "flyers" items did not emerge in post-survey.

Q3: The most important thing I learned in this workshop is...

Responses primarily addressed (in order of prevalence):

- How to find and get in touch with faculty, including what to say in an email
- The SRP 99 program and how to enroll in it
- The various research opportunities available on campus and how to get involved with them
- How to get into and start research
- The broad definition of research and what constitutes research
- How to initiate research (student-initiated research)
- The resources available for conducting research

Q4: Did this workshop meet your expectations? Please explain.

Out of 134 responses, the consensus was a resounding "yes" that the workshop met expectations in the following ways:

- Content was good, helpful, and informative
- Speaker was great, engaging, and thorough
- Questions were answered
- Learned a lot about research opportunities, programs, and how to get involved

Critiques of the workshop included:

- Too focused on SRP 99
- Was humanities focused and not as relevant to the sciences
- Was crowded
- Was more helpful for first-year students
- Not enough detail about how exactly to apply and how to start a research project

Cornerstone Workshop 2: Pre-Survey Results

N=49 respondents

- 19 North campus majors
- 30 South campus majors
- 37 Third/Fourth/Fifth years
- 12 First/Second years

Q1: I feel comfortable developing my own topics for research papers and projects.

Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=49 respondents

- 7 Strongly Agree (14%)
- 24 Agree (49%)
- 13 Disagree (27%)
- 5 Strongly Disagree (10%)

Q2: I am confident that I am able to generate a set of possible research questions based on a topic.

Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=49 respondents

- 6 Strongly Agree (12%)
- 24 Agree (49%)
- 15 Disagree (31%)
- 4 Strongly Disagree (8%)

Q3: What are three strategies/methods you can use to develop research topics?

Respondents listed 117 items that varied across 12 categories:

| | |
|--|----|
| Talk with librarians, professors, peers | 18 |
| Go to library/library catalogue, find sources, search databases | 17 |
| Personal interests, observations, experiences | 17 |
| Read journals, articles, previous/existing research | 14 |
| Explore broad subjects, research the topic, collect/analyze data | 12 |
| Brainstorm, outline, map | 9 |
| Ask questions, critical thinking | 7 |
| Other (strong thesis, counter arguments, relatability, substantiability, select topic, resource availability, select keywords) | 7 |
| Don't know, not sure | 5 |
| Societal/world problems, current news issues | 4 |
| Courses or course material | 4 |
| Online search (e.g., Google, forums) | 3 |

Q4: What do you hope to learn during this workshop?

Respondents listed 54 items across 7 categories:

| | |
|--|----|
| How/where to start/find topics | 35 |
| Writing skills | 8 |
| How to get involved with research | 3 |
| Learn the research process/how to conduct research (effectively) | 3 |
| Finding/assessing sources | 3 |
| Learn anything | 1 |
| Other | 1 |

Q5: How did you find out about this workshop?

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| WAC 51 | 17 |
| Email | 8 |
| Professor (2=Shorter) | 5 |
| Class | 4 |
| MyUCLA | 3 |
| Online, website, search | 3 |
| Posted flyer | 2 |
| Word of mouth | 1 |
| Facebook | 1 |
| Undergraduate Research Center | 1 |
| Other, N/A, Don't know | 1 |
| AAP | 1 |

Cornerstone Workshop 2: Post-Survey Results

N=31 respondents

- 14 North campus majors
- 17 South campus majors
- 37 Third/Fourth/Fifth years
- 12 First/Second years

Q1: I feel comfortable developing my own topics for research papers and projects.

Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=31 respondents

- 12 Strongly Agree (39%)
- 19 Agree (61%)
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

These response changes are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Q2: I am confident that I am able to generate a set of possible research questions based on a topic.

Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=31 respondents

- 15 Strongly Agree (48%)
- 16 Agree (52%)
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

These response changes are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Q3: What are three strategies/methods you can use to develop research topics?

Respondents listed 84 items that varied across 8 categories (bolded items new in post-survey):

| | |
|---|----|
| Brainstorm, map, thought bubble | 22 |
| Ask/Talk with librarians, professors, peers | 19 |
| Ask (more in-depth) questions, narrow the focus | 15 |
| Go to library/library catalogue, find sources, search databases | 11 |
| Personal interests, observations, experiences | 7 |
| Other (courses, pick a topic, find a problem, research guides) | 4 |
| Read other research | 3 |
| Seek interdisciplinary perspectives | 3 |

Note: The "explore broad subjects, research the topic, collect/analyze data," "online search," "don't know," and "societal/world problems, current news issues" items from the pre-survey did not emerge in the post-survey. The "courses or course material" item was collapsed into "other" and the "read journals, articles, previous/existing research" item was simplified to "read other research" for the post-survey results.

Q4: The most important thing I learned in this workshop is...

Responses primarily addressed (in order of prevalence):

- How to develop/narrow/widen research questions
- Library resources and how to better search for sources
- Brainstorming, creating thought bubbles, and mapping
- How to connect personal interests to research interests

Q5: Did this workshop meet your expectations? Please explain.

Out of 31 responses, the consensus was a resounding "yes" that the workshop met expectations in the following ways:

- Workshop was well-organized, clear, and concise
- Speaker was great, entertaining, and insightful
- Tools and strategies such as mapping out ideas were helpful

Critiques of the workshop included:

- Concern about telling inexperienced writers to write the thesis last
- More help still desired for developing a specific research question
- Preference for fewer students in order to ask more individual questions

Cornerstone Workshop 4: Pre-Survey Results

N=37 respondents

- 6 North campus majors
- 30 South campus majors
- 1 N/A major

- 28 Third/Fourth years
- 8 First/Second years
- 1 Staff

Q1: I am confident citing sources and creating bibliographies for my research papers and projects.
Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=37 respondents

- 3 Strongly Agree (8%)
- 21 Agree (57%)
- 11 Disagree (30%)
- 2 Strongly Disagree (5%)

Q2: What is a consistent method for keeping track of the sources you find when working on a research paper or project?

Respondents listed 41 items that varied across 8 categories:

| | |
|---|----|
| Take notes | 12 |
| Bookmark or note URL | 9 |
| Make list, write bibliography | 8 |
| Software or online reference manager (e.g., MS Word sources, Zotero, Mendeley) | 4 |
| Save on computer | 2 |
| Cite sources | 2 |
| Other (memory, ordered tabs) | 2 |
| NA, don't know | 2 |

Q3: What is an example of a digital tool or application that can help you manage the sources you find when working on a research paper or project?

Respondents listed 42 items that varied across 12 categories:

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| EasyBib app software, online | 10 |
| Word, Excel software | 9 |
| Website, database, bookmark | 5 |

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Zotero software | 4 |
| Purdue OWL online | 3 |
| Unsure | 3 |
| EndNote software | 2 |
| Google online, software | 2 |
| Library online | 1 |
| NoodleBib online | 1 |
| JSTOR online, digital library | 1 |
| Evernote app software | 1 |

Q4: What do you hope to learn during this workshop?

Respondents listed 40 items across 7 categories:

| | |
|---|----|
| Citing sources efficiently, professionally, correctly, properly | 18 |
| Managing, organizing, keeping track of sources | 6 |
| Specific citation styles or formats; different ways to cite | 4 |
| Citing without (software, reference) assistance; making custom bibliographies, citations | 4 |
| Finding (reputable) sources | 3 |
| Unsure, unspecified, nothing | 3 |
| Other (footnotes, avoiding plagiarism) | 2 |

Q5: How did you find out about this workshop?

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| WAC 51 (also Shorter) | 14 |
| Professor (3=Shorter) | 8 |
| Class | 8 |
| MyUCLA | 2 |
| Library | 2 |
| Word of mouth | 1 |
| Social Science Research Center | 1 |

Cornerstone Workshop 4: Post-Survey Results

N=30 respondents

- 4 North campus majors
- 25 South campus majors
- 1 N/A major

- 25 Third/Fourth years
- 4 First/Second years
- 1 Staff

Q1: I am confident citing sources and creating bibliographies for my research papers and projects.
Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=30 respondents

- 14 Strongly Agree (47%)
- 16 Agree (53%)
- 0 Disagree
- 0 Strongly Disagree

These response changes are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Q2: What is a consistent method for keeping track of the sources you find when working on a research paper or project?

Respondents listed 31 items that varied across 5 categories (bolded items new in post-survey):

| | |
|---|----|
| Zotero software | 23 |
| Take notes | 3 |
| Bookmark or note URL | 2 |
| Software or online reference manager (e.g., Mendeley) | 2 |
| Other (unspecified) | 1 |

Note: The "make list, write bibliography" "save on computer," and "cite sources" responses from the pre-survey did not emerge in the post-survey.

Q3: What is an example of a digital tool or application that can help you manage the sources you find when working on a research paper or project?

Respondents listed 31 items that varied across 5 categories:

| | |
|------------------------------|----|
| Zotero software | 26 |
| EasyBib app software, online | 2 |
| Bookmark | 1 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Citation Machine online | 1 |
| Mendeley software | 1 |

Note: Items from pre-survey not identified in post-survey include: word, excel, website, database, Purdue OWL, EndNote, Google, library, NoodleBib, JSTOR, Evernote. The "unsure" response from the pre-survey did not emerge in the post-survey.

Q4: The most important thing I learned in this workshop is...

Responses addressed the:

- Use and effectiveness of Zotero
- Tools, resources, and methods to cite sources

Q5: Did this workshop meet your expectations? Please explain.

Out of 28 responses, the consensus was a resounding "yes" that the workshop met expectations in the following ways:

- Presenter was helpful, clear, and patient
- Workshop was comprehensive and explained Zotero well
- Workshop was better than expected, above and beyond

Critiques of the workshop included:

- Content was redundant for those with prior familiarity of Zotero
- Content was introductory and more detail on other uses for the program desired

Cornerstone Workshop 5: Pre-Survey Results

N=71 respondents

- 29 North campus majors
- 41 South campus majors
- 1 N/A major

- 56 Third/Fourth years
- 12 First/Second years
- 1 Graduate
- 1 Staff
- 1 Alumnus

Q1: I am aware of tools and strategies for managing the research process.

Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=71 respondents

- 8 Strongly Agree (11%)
- 45 Agree (63%)
- 15 Disagree (21%)
- 3 Strongly Disagree (4%)

Q2: I am confident that I can plan a research project from start to finish.

Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=71 respondents

- 12 Strongly Agree (17%)
- 42 Agree (59%)
- 14 Disagree (20%)
- 3 Strongly Disagree (4%)

Q3: What are three steps involved in the research process?

Respondents listed 255 items that varied across 16 categories:

| | |
|--|----|
| Search, collect, review, or cite literature or sources | 63 |
| Develop topic, thesis, argument, problem, purpose, or significance | 34 |
| Write, revise, or edit paper | 21 |
| Form research question or hypothesis | 20 |
| Create project plan, outline, timeline, or schedule | 18 |
| Develop initial interests or ideas, map ideas, brainstorm | 17 |
| Test hypothesis, conduct research design, do experiment | 17 |
| Analyze data | 11 |
| Other or don't know | 11 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Seek collaboration with or advice from others | 11 |
| Draw or report conclusions or results | 8 |
| Collect data, find supporting data | 8 |
| Develop proposal | 6 |
| Present findings, submit or publish paper | 4 |
| Develop methodology | 4 |
| Find funding or support | 2 |

Q4: What do you hope to learn during this workshop?

Respondents listed 77 items across 9 categories:

| | |
|--|----|
| Research management, planning, structure, or organization | 32 |
| Research processes or strategies | 15 |
| Writing skills | 8 |
| Other or NA | 5 |
| Research methods, skills, or tools | 5 |
| Unsure or unspecified | 5 |
| Available resources | 4 |
| How to find or assess sources | 2 |
| Research opportunities; how to get involved or started with research | 2 |

Q5: How did you find out about this workshop?

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| WAC 51 (also Shorter) | 16 |
| Professor (5=Shorter) | 13 |
| MyUCLA | 12 |
| Word of mouth | 8 |
| Class | 8 |
| Email | 6 |
| Honors 101 | 6 |
| Posted Flyer | 5 |
| Undergraduate Research Center | 4 |
| NA | 1 |

Cornerstone Workshop 5: Post-Survey Results

N=61 respondents

- 25 North campus majors
- 36 South campus majors

- 48 Third/Fourth years
- 11 First/Second years
- 1 Graduate
- 1 Alumnus

Q1: I am aware of tools and strategies for managing the research process.
Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=61 respondents

- 36 Strongly Agree (59%)
- 24 Agree (39%)
- 0 Disagree
- 1 Strongly Disagree (2%)

These response changes are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Q2: I am confident that I can plan a research project from start to finish.
Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=61 respondents

- 35 Strongly Agree (57%)
- 25 Agree (41%)
- 0 Disagree
- 1 Strongly Disagree (2%)

These response changes are statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Q3: What are three steps involved in the research process?

Respondents listed 232 items that varied across 16 categories:

| | |
|--|----|
| Search, collect, review, or cite literature or sources | 36 |
| Develop topic, thesis, argument, problem, purpose, or significance | 36 |
| Create project plan, outline, timeline, or schedule | 33 |
| Write, revise, or edit paper | 24 |
| Form research question or hypothesis | 20 |
| Other or don't know | 15 |
| Present findings, submit or publish paper | 12 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Analyze data | 11 |
| Seek collaboration with or advice from others | 10 |
| Test hypothesis, conduct research design, do experiment | 10 |
| Collect data, find supporting data | 8 |
| Develop methodology | 5 |
| Develop proposal | 5 |
| Draw or report conclusions or results | 4 |
| Develop initial interests or ideas, map ideas, brainstorm | 2 |
| Find funding or support | 1 |

Q4: The most important thing I learned in this workshop is...

Responses addressed the:

- Research process and strategies to conduct research effectively
- Planning, structure, organization, and time management involved in research
- Strategies for effectively writing a research paper

Q5: Did this workshop meet your expectations? Please explain.

Out of 63 responses, the consensus was a resounding "yes" that the workshop met expectations in the following ways:

- Workshop explained the research process and gave concrete strategies to complete a project
- Students learned preparation, planning, and management involved in research, including steps for writing a research paper
- Presenter did a great job and offered helpful explanations

Critiques of the workshop included:

- Content was not helpful for life sciences student
- More long-term project planning was desired

Cornerstone Workshop 6: Pre-Survey Results

N=13 respondents

- 10 North campus majors
- 3 South campus majors

- 10 Third/Fourth years
- 1 First/Second years
- 2 Graduate
- 1 Alumnus

Q1: I plan to share my research through submitting to a conference or journal.
Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=14 respondents

- 8 Strongly Agree (57%)
- 3 Agree (21%)
- 1 Disagree (7%)
- 2 Strongly Disagree (14%)

Q2: What are the elements of an effective "elevator speech" about your research?

Respondents listed 27 items that varied across 8 categories:

| | |
|---|---|
| Succinct, concise, or focused | 6 |
| Informative or well-informed | 4 |
| Interesting or memorable | 4 |
| Other (e.g., has eye contact, gives five W's) | 3 |
| Presents methodology | 3 |
| Explains topic, hypothesis, proposal | 3 |
| Presents methodology | 2 |
| Unsure | 2 |

Q3: What are the elements of an effective abstract?

Respondents listed 32 items that varied across 8 categories:

| | |
|--|---|
| Succinctness and clarity, captures key points | 9 |
| Provides arguments or significance | 6 |
| Includes background information, sources, or theoretical framework | 4 |
| Presents methodology | 4 |
| Offers discussion, results, future directions | 3 |
| Informative or comprehensive | 2 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| States topic or hypothesis | 2 |
| Other (interesting, no surprises) | 2 |

Q4: What do you hope to learn during this workshop?

Respondents listed 15 items across 4 categories:

| | |
|---|---|
| How to share research | 5 |
| How to present research or topic, how to give elevator speech | 4 |
| How to publish research, overview of publications | 3 |
| Unsure or anything | 3 |

Q5: How did you find out about this workshop?

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Email | 6 |
| Honors 101 | 4 |
| Word of Mouth | 2 |
| MyUCLA | 1 |
| Other ("Don't know") | 1 |
| Undergraduate Research Center | 1 |

Cornerstone Workshop 6: Post-Survey Results

N=15 respondents

- 12 North campus majors
- 3 South campus majors

- 11 Third/Fourth years
- 1 First/Second years
- 2 Graduate
- 1 Alumnus

Q1: I plan to share my research through submitting to a conference or journal.
Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

N=15 respondents

- 8 Strongly Agree (53%)
- 5 Agree (33%)
- 0 Disagree
- 2 Strongly Disagree (13%)

These response changes are not statistically significant.

Q2: What are the elements of an effective "elevator speech" about your research?

Respondents listed 26 items that varied across 7 categories (bolded items new in post-survey):

| | |
|--|---|
| Describes significance or relevance, tells contribution to literature | 6 |
| Gives five W's | 5 |
| Explains topic or purpose | 4 |
| Succinct, concise, or focused | 4 |
| Interesting, provides "hook" | 3 |
| Other (i.e., informative, presents methodology) | 2 |
| Includes personal introduction | 2 |

Note: The "unsure" responses from the pre-survey did not emerge in the post-survey.

Q3: What are the elements of an effective abstract?

Respondents listed 45 items that varied across 7 categories:

| | |
|--|---|
| Presents methodology | 9 |
| States or introduces topic, research question, or hypothesis | 9 |
| Offers results or conclusions | 8 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Provides arguments or significance | 7 |
| Succinctness and clarity; gives concise summary | 6 |
| Includes background information | 5 |
| Informative | 1 |

Note: The "other" response from the pre-survey did not emerge in the post-survey.

Q4: The most important thing I learned in this workshop is...

Responses addressed the:

- Resources and opportunities to publish work or present at conferences
- Ability to give an elevator speech or present research

Q5: Did this workshop meet your expectations? Please explain.

Out of 16 responses, the consensus was a resounding "yes" that the workshop met expectations in the following ways:

- Workshop explained the research publishing process and the opportunities available to publish or present research
- Workshop taught how to effectively introduce, present, or pitch research (e.g., through "elevator speech")
- Presenter was very helpful
- List of conferences and journals was helpful

Critiques of the workshop included:

- One student was not aware that the workshop was geared toward undergraduate students

Mapping Your Research Module: Post-Survey Results

Q1: How helpful was the video?

All 31 respondents described the video as either helpful or very helpful. Comments praised the video in the following ways:

- Concise, straightforward, and easy to follow
- Helpful in focusing topic, creating outline, and starting research paper

Recommendations for improvement included:

- Provide more examples
- Offer a more relevant topic
- Increase the volume of the voice audio

Q2: After completing the video, did you feel as though you had more direction for your project topic?

N=46 respondents

- 36 Yes (78%)
- 4 No (9%)
- 6 I Don't Know (13%)

The video gave direction to respondents' research topics in the following ways:

- Aided systematic development and focus of questions
- Suggested what to look for in order to answer questions

Critiques included:

- Not new information
- Low relevance

Suggestions for improvement included:

- Provide more illustrations on developing thesis or topic

Q3: Would you recommend this video to someone who was struggling with developing a research topic?

Out of 46 responses, the consensus of respondents was a resounding "yes" that they would recommend the video. Respondents cited the following reasons:

- Expanded and focused ideas

- Gave insights on how to develop research questions and narrow topics
- Guided students through first steps in writing a research paper

Q4: How did you hear about this video?

| | |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Class | 16 |
| Library website | 4 |
| Other (Lise Snyder, Librarian) | 2 |
| NA | 1 |

Psychology 188B Survey Results

Q1: How many questions did you create?

0-3 questions, 4-6 questions, 7 or more questions

N=60 respondents

- 9 0-3 questions (15%)
- 3 4-6 questions (5%)
- 48 7 or more questions (80%)

Q3: How many keywords did you create?

0-3 keywords, 4-7 keywords, 8 or more keywords

N=60 respondents

- 2 0-3 keywords (3%)
- 6 4-7 keywords (10%)
- 52 8 or more (87%)

Q5: Were you able to find one or more relevant research guides?

One guide, Two or more guides, Not able to find guides, No response

N=60 respondents

- 12 Yes, I found one relevant guide (20%)
- 45 Yes, I found two or more relevant guides (75%)
- 2 No, I was not able to find any relevant guides (3%)
- 1 No response (2%)

Q6: Please share the names of any relevant research guides and databases you found (if any).

Respondents listed 109 items as research guides across 28 categories:

| | |
|---|----|
| Psychology/Psychotherapy | 47 |
| NIH/NIH Public Access Policy/NIH Manuscript Submission System | 8 |
| Communication Studies | 7 |
| Education/Education & Information Studies | 7 |
| Google Scholar | 5 |
| Humanities/Digital Humanities | 4 |
| Biology & Life Sciences | 3 |
| Getting Started/Using Databases | 3 |
| UCLA Library (unspecified) | 3 |
| None or other | 3 |
| Biomedical Library | 2 |
| CITeseerX | 1 |

| | |
|--|---|
| EBSCOhost | 1 |
| Film & TV | 1 |
| UCLA GeoPortal | 1 |
| History of Science, Medicine, & Technology | 1 |
| Health & Politics | 1 |
| JSTOR | 1 |
| Los Angeles Public Library | 1 |
| Medicine | 1 |
| Media History | 1 |
| Model UN | 1 |
| My NCBI Bibliography | 1 |
| ProQuest | 1 |
| Social Statistics & Data | 1 |
| Sustainability | 1 |
| UC Berkeley | 1 |
| UCLA Public Health | 1 |

Respondents listed 140 items as databases across 30 categories:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----|
| PsycINFO | 45 |
| PubMed | 20 |
| Web of Science | 14 |
| PsycARTICLES | 12 |
| ERIC | 9 |
| JSTOR | 7 |
| Electronic Journal of Communication | 3 |
| Google Scholar | 3 |
| ArticlesPlus | 2 |
| ComAbstracts | 2 |
| EBSCOhost | 2 |
| Education Source | 2 |
| ProQuest | 2 |
| American Communication Association | 1 |
| BIOSIS Previews | 1 |
| Common Sense Media | 1 |
| eMarketer | 1 |
| Family & Society Studies Worldwide | 1 |
| GreenFILE | 1 |
| Huffington Post | 1 |
| NIH | 1 |
| Open Access Journals (Communication) | 1 |
| Oxford Academic | 1 |
| Psychotherapy video clips | 1 |
| PsycNET | 1 |
| PsycTESTS | 1 |

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Reference Universe | 1 |
| SpringerProtocols | 1 |
| Statista | 1 |
| Taylor & Francis Online | 1 |

Q7a: How are things going with your search?

Two-thirds of respondents depicted their search progress in a positive light. Most of the remaining respondents offered mixed, qualified, or neutral feedback. Overall, respondents listed a total of 62 items that varied across 8 categories:

| | |
|---|----|
| Found info, articles, databases, resources | 14 |
| Unspecified or miscellaneous positive response | 11 |
| Found tips, tools, strategies, or resources helpful | 9 |
| Found keywords helpful | 8 |
| In process of searching for topics, literature or information; discovering databases | 7 |
| In process of narrowing or focusing search or topic | 6 |
| Challenges (e.g., narrowing interest or topic; searching; accessing articles) | 5 |
| Other | 2 |

Sample comments illustrate students’ responses to the inquiry about their search progress:

- Great! I have already found several empirical articles relevant to my topic.
- Using the strategies suggested in this assignment, I immediately found what I was looking for.
- Great. I am finding what I need and quickly. I like that they give us tips I wouldn't have found out about otherwise.

Q7b: Is there anything we can do to help?

Around two-thirds of students declined the offer for help. Of those who did request help, a large portion sought aid with their searches. In all, respondents listed a total of 57 items that varied across 11 categories:

| | |
|---|----|
| No or NA (unspecified) | 16 |
| Resources, guides, activities, tips, etc. were helpful. | 14 |
| Request for help searching for info or articles; refining search | 8 |
| Will email, ask question or contact library for help, if needed | 6 |
| Request for help navigating, finding, or understanding research guides | 3 |
| Request for help finding and understanding psychology databases | 3 |
| No - still early in the process | 2 |
| Request for remote (off-campus) access to databases | 2 |

| | |
|---|---|
| No - experienced with research | 1 |
| Request for additional info on creating research question | 1 |
| Other | 1 |

The following comments reflect student responses to the offer for help:

- I felt that the activities were very useful and aimed to really direct and guide us [to] develop our research question. They were enough to get me started!
- Tips about how to refine our searches were extremely helpful and more tips such as these would be great in the future.
- I think I am ok, however if I need assistance, I will contact the library staff to help narrow and refine information.

Q7c: Were these activities and strategies helpful? Why or why not?

Among 58 respondents, the consensus was a resounding "yes" that the activities and strategies were helpful or very helpful.

| | |
|------------------|----|
| Helpful | 37 |
| Very Helpful | 18 |
| Somewhat Helpful | 2 |
| N/A | 1 |

In describing the helpful components of the module, respondents listed a total of 85 items that varied across 13 categories. All but the "Challenges" category describe helpful course aspects:

| | |
|--|----|
| Use of databases and tools to search and find information | 17 |
| Creation, narrowing, or organization of question or topic | 11 |
| Review and/or helpful for those with less experience | 9 |
| Discovery of or learning about new databases | 9 |
| Simple, informative, step-by-step process | 8 |
| Useful or time saving tips, techniques, and strategies | 6 |
| Brainstorming, mapping, or considering new ideas | 5 |
| Keyword activity; using or finding keywords | 4 |
| Learning about UCLA library (databases or website) | 4 |
| Yes - unspecified or other | 4 |
| Applied or hands-on aspects (online search, e.g.) | 3 |
| Challenges and suggestions (e.g., trouble watching videos with full screen; scant resources under psychology tab; research guides video unhelpful) | 3 |
| Research guides | 2 |

The following comments illustrate student views on the helpfulness of activities and strategies:

- I have been using these databases for years but [these] strategies and activities were very novel. It changed the way I analyzed my data and thought of new ideas.
- These activities were extremely helpful! They actually walked me through the various ways of how to create a question all the way to how to find specific information for it.
- Yes these activities were very helpful. They laid out the methods of doing research in a simple and understandable way. I have done database research before but this was still helpful in reminding me of certain strategies and I learned some new tips as well.

Q7d: Do you have specific ideas for improvement?

17 of the 40 respondents to this question stated that they had no suggestions for improvement. Nearly half of these respondents described the course or its components as simple, straightforward, comprehensive, thorough, great, well made, etc. The remaining 23 respondents listed 27 recommendations that varied across 8 categories:

| | |
|--|---|
| Suggest/add/share other databases within and outside UCLA library; give help accessing and navigating databases | 8 |
| Other (more interactive; more examples; how to vet search results; more on navigating library site; more conceptual maps; link maps to class concepts) | 6 |
| Clarify how to use research guides; print guides for each subject | 3 |
| Give feedback on exercises/research guides/keywords | 2 |
| Link or incorporate tips/tutorials with library page/databases | 2 |
| Offer more tips to refine search | 2 |
| Share this info with more or all students | 2 |
| Add videos (to supplement slides) | 2 |

The following comments illustrate student ideas for improvement:

- I would suggest them finding more articles and being a little more specific on which databases have better articles. Also, I think something should be added to help navigate the databases and show them how to find peer reviewed articles.
- I think that more tips for how to refine our searches would be very helpful. It would also be nice to be aware of other ways to find databases that are outside of UCLA's library.
- My only concern would be getting a greater amount of the student population involved in learning these strategies to search for research, articles, etc. If I had never taken this course and gotten this exercise assigned, I may have never learned how helpful the UCLA library website is.

Faculty Engagement Interviews

The following case narratives describe how faculty engage with the WI+RE community and utilize the face-to-face and online research and writing tools available through the UCLA Library and Undergraduate Research Center. These tools include the Cornerstone Research Workshops, the Research Notebook, and the online instructional videos. The descriptions highlight faculty perceptions about these research and writing services, the ways in which they meet faculty goals, and the different means of integrating the modules into various courses.

Data were collected via semi-structured interviews with four instructors (two in-person, two via phone) based on an interview protocol developed during a previous WI+RE meeting. The interviews were transcribed and then case narratives were written with representative quotes to capture faculty voice.

Case Narrative #1

Dr. Miriam Posner teaches Digital Humanities 101 – Introduction to Digital Humanities (DH101). She has taught DH101 for 4-5 years and during that time she recalled using the Mapping Your Research Question and Crafting a Savvy Search Strategy: Part 1 modules. She first heard about the modules through Doug Worsham and Renee Romero, who was one of her former students.

Dr. Posner used the library research modules in class in a face-to-face setting. She usually invited librarians to come to her DH101 class to give workshops because she had "a lot of students and they needed a lot of hands on help." She asked Renee "to come and actually give a workshop to [her] class and show the module and then talk about it." She also had Zoe Borovsky talk to her class about developing a research question and show one of the videos. Given the number of years she has taught the class, she believed she may have also "done it once on my own." Another reason why she asked librarians to lead workshops for the class was because "it is always good to [show students] here's what a librarian looks like and you can talk to them, it's fine." She also asked librarians to participate in her Research-a-thon, an activity designed to introduce her students to the library and to help them "get started with their secondary source research."

Dr. Posner's main goal for incorporating the modules into her course was to efficiently introduce her students to research writing. She stated that "a lot of [her] students have never written a humanities paper before or haven't done humanities research." She explained that "in the course of [her] class [students] have to do a relatively advanced project." Therefore, she "needed to get them from zero to able to formulate a question as quickly as [she] could."

Generally, Dr. Posner believed the modules met her goals for the class. Though it was difficult to know the impact for each student, she felt that "a lot of them made a lot of progress." Since students worked in groups, "it was hard to say if every student got it, but we certainly came a long way from when they started, when they were really just completely unable to formulate a good humanities question." She explained that when she first started teaching DH101:

I was just banging my head against the wall trying to get [students] to ask humanities questions about their research topic. ... Once I got a little more systematic about it and started using the modules and getting librarians to talk to them and especially doing the writing and drawing

exercises, it really gave us an opportunity to circle around the room and work with them so they could actually ask better questions. So, I did see the results in terms of the questions they were able to formulate.

Dr. Posner had a very positive experience incorporating the research modules into her class and would "definitely" continue to use them. The module topics "are right in line with what [she] needs for [her] class." Aside from "a little bit of trouble just now Googling for [the videos]," the one challenge that she "really struggles with...is conveying to [students] what the humanities are and the difference between the humanities and the social sciences." She thought that a "video explaining how to approach a humanities question versus a social science question would be great," but understood that "that may be a very specific need" for her class."¹

Case Narrative #2

Dr. Thomas Hitchner teaches English composition 2, English composition 3, and English 5W. His experience with the modules was through the library's Research Notebook, which he used for five quarters of his English composition 3 classes. He first heard about the notebook through his wife, Julia Glassman, an instructional coordinator and one of the notebook's designers. He explained:

My first year of English composition 3, which was in fall 2014, I came to the conclusion that at a certain level all writing is research writing because students are just going to go use Google, and rather than discouraging that, I felt like I should channel it, that is to teach them to do it responsibly, deliberately, and consciously. At the same time that I was trying to have a more online research focused class, Julia told me that they were unveiling this research notebook, so I tried to fold it in that way.

Dr. Hitchner used the notebooks in a hybrid online and face-to-face setting. The notebook was a required element of his class that his students completed on their own as a homework assignment. The notebook was done for the students' research projects and was completed in advance of the class's in-person instructional library session so that he and Julia had "time to look over them and get a sense of where everyone was at before [they] began the session." He emphasized to his students that the notebook was "a good way for [him] and for Julia to keep track of how their research was going." It also compelled students to do the "necessary, helpful preliminary work they could do themselves without having to use up the instruction session for it." This allowed for the in-person library session to be "more focused on edge cases and more complications that come up and also as a way for [students] to help clarify their thinking on their projects as they were shaping up."

Dr. Hitchner's main goal for incorporating the notebook into his course was to demonstrate to his students that research is a deliberate and strategic process. He wanted his students:

...to think about research as a strategy and as something one arranges one's thoughts and plans on in advanced as opposed to the way I think we all do, or almost all of us do everyday research, which is just Google and see what comes up, which I try to emphasize to the students is fine for short term research projects like planning a trip to the movies or something like that, but for academic research can be inefficient or lead one down the wrong path. So, my goal was partly

¹ Dr. Posner also noted that Renee kindly developed a curriculum for students about this difference for her class.

to help students actually tap the breaks and try things a different way than they would normally do it.

Another one of his goals for using the notebook was to coordinate the research strategies between him, Julia, and his students so that they "would all be starting on the same page, rather than them having to walk back some of what they'd done in order to make sense of the library session." He wanted to "give [students] the best foot forward" for their projects and to guide "their understanding of research in general to think about it as a deliberate strategy rather than something they do instinctively."

While acknowledging that "it's a little hard to say" due to the lack of "a control group within one class," generally, Dr. Hitchner felt the notebook met his goals for the class. He stated:

Compared to previous classes I do believe I saw less in the way of students showing up early in the project with lots of first pages of a Google search result, a biography.com and things like that and more in the way of in-depth sources. Not always academic peer reviewed sources because it wasn't always appropriate for the project we were doing, but at least more in depth sources, articles from respected periodicals and that kind of thing.

He also noted that "the instruction sessions were able to proceed at a higher level rather than here's what a database is, here's what we mean by keyword searches." By completing the notebook in advance, the class was "able to get into more probing works on telling what kind of source from another and how can untraditional sources like a tweet be used." He explained that he would rather not spend class time on "really elementary stuff" and preferred that students "learn that outside of class as much as possible so [they] can get to more in depth stuff [in class]."

The hybrid use of the notebook online in conjunction with an in-person library session also helped introduce students to the wider resources available and provided a fuller understanding of what research entails. For example, Dr. Hitchner "found that they use the inquiry lab a lot more." He further stated:

I think [the] combination of the research notebook makes them aware of the library as – I think they come in thinking the library is where the books are and anything they can find that isn't a book they don't need the library for – so, really reframing it as the library being the research center of campus and also at the same time research being a skill and an area of expertise not just a process.

In the future, Dr. Hitchner would be interested in taking a more active, interventionist approach to the notebook. He explained that when he first started using the notebook, it served as a "preliminary check" and then the library session provided an opportunity to follow-up on the work. Now, he would "like to use [the notebook] more as something [he] can repeatedly intervene on." As students do more research on their projects and as the focus changes, he would like them to add more things to the notebook that he can then review. He explained:

...it's easier for me to pretend that research is something that is done with this check box, but of course I know it is an iterative process. You do some research, you learn some stuff that changes some stuff about your project and thus your research itself changes and more research is needed and so on. So really I need to work with [students] and be more interventionist or just check in with them multiple times rather than acting as though we have left that behind.

Dr. Hitchner also suggested a couple of features he would like to see incorporated into the notebook. He noted that "when [students] find certain sources, there is not as much on guiding them through the clues to decode a source or to figure out what type of source it is and determine its reliability." Information that would help in this regard would strengthen the notebook. He also suggested some kind of visual progress tracker that allows students "to determine in advance what [their] questions are and now as [they] find sources, here are some of the answers to those questions [they] are finding...[something that gives them a way of] keeping track of how much progress [they] are making and what remains to be found out." He referred to "one of those kids games where you scratch away different parts and it fills in the picture" as a possible visual example.

Overall, Dr. Hitchner had a very productive experience incorporating the research notebook into his class. While the feedback from students has also been positive, he believed any evidence of improvement would be in students' work. He stated, "Generally I go more for the proof is in the pudding, so if it seems like the projects they are turning in are better and more sophisticated and the sources are especially better than that is what I look to."

Case Narrative #3

Dr. David Shorter teaches World Arts and Cultures 51W – Aliens, Psychics, and Ghosts, a Writing II course. It is a large class with 120 students and five TAs. The writing assignments are reviewed and graded by the TAs. Dr. Shorter referred students in his class to the series of Cornerstone Research Workshops, which he heard about from an email he received in September 2016.

The workshops were integrated into Dr. Shorter's course as an option for students to earn extra credit. Kelly Kistner from the Undergraduate Research Center (URC) helped Dr. Shorter "set up an approval system because [he] didn't want to send a bunch of students unless [the URC] could prepare for them." The opportunity was posted on the CCLE for the class, as well as announced in class and in discussion sections. Dr. Shorter explained that "if [students] attended the first major [workshop], the first one of the quarter, they got X amount of points and if they attended a series or more they got more bonus points." He did not require that students attend the workshop and merely emphasized to students that "this is a good way to get extra credit." He further stated, "If offered again, I don't think I have the ability or the right to make it required, but I will essentially say you only get credit if you attend them all."

Dr. Shorter's main goal for recommending the Cornerstone Workshops to students was "to have them learn basic research and writing skills." He noted that many students in his course are south campus majors "because they need the W2 credit to graduate." There was also a "particular challenge" with some "ESL issues" so he wanted something to help students develop their skills.

The feedback from TAs about the impact of the workshops was progressively positive. As Dr. Shorter explained:

The TAs said they found that the workshop was pretty useful for about 25 percent of the students, which is a pretty good number. It is not fantastic, but it is better than having to teach basic writing to everyone. The problem that they saw was that students were going to the workshops weren't actually using the material. They were just going in to get the signature so they could get the extra credit. The ones that achieved better grades and it was able to be reflected in the evidence of their writing, were the ones who actually attended all the

workshops. So, what the TA was saying was that some were just going to get the extra credit, but there was an effect when the student went to the entire series. For others it seemed like they were going to get a signature. So, if they went and attended one session or two they didn't actually get As. The ones who got As in the class were the ones who went to all the workshops in the order you offered them.

Because of the class structure in which there is "a discussion section once a week on the content of the course and then another discussion section with the exact same students and the exact same TA only focused on writing," the TAs were able to see improvements because "they are reading drafts all along." The sentiment from the TAs was that "the quality of the writing was better when [students] actually attended more than the basic introductory [workshop]."

Dr. Shorter "really appreciates" the workshops and is interested in continuing to integrate it into his course. He felt that "anything that helps us with the difficult task of getting people from south campus to write" would be beneficial for his class. One thing he would consider doing is asking the workshop representatives to come to his class the first week as it might be "more enticing if [students] were actually to see what kind of help was being offered by someone who knew it firsthand rather than from [him] saying, 'I think this is a good thing. I think you might want to go.'" The workshop organizers would be able to articulate "this is what we are covering this is what you need to know."

Another change Dr. Shorter would make is to require students to attend all the workshops in order to receive credit. Though, he did have concerns that some students, such as athletes, would "say they can't make it" and therefore he would also need to offer an alternative option because "we can't punish people for that." He was intrigued to hear that the modules used in the workshops can be offered online and wanted to "to learn more about that because that sounds like a really good opportunity for [him to] have them do writing work without them having to be in that specific workshop." He would appreciate someone reaching out to him to discuss those possibilities.

Case Narrative #4

Dr. Yalda Uhls teaches Psychology 188B – Digital Media and Human Development. This was her first year teaching at UCLA as well as her first time teaching this course. Dr. Uhls indicated that her colleague, Dr. Patricia Greenfield, "suggested that [she] do for research courses, teaching the kids about research, [to] send them to the library. [Dr. Greenfield] told [her] there was a person at the library who was willing to do this." Dr. Uhls added a library tutorial to her syllabus and students "started writing the library and Doug [Worsham] immediately reached out to [her] and said that he was hired for this and then he told [her] about the online modules and said can we make this work in this course and if people need extra help, they can do it in person."

The online module "was embedded in CCLE and it was a required part of the course." She also offered extra credit to students for meeting in-person with a librarian. She recalled, "I gave 5% I think for the online and then 55% for extra credit for in-person." Since this was her first time teaching at UCLA and the course, she "learned a lot on many levels" including "how to phrase [the module component] in [her] syllabus." She stated that "Doug was wonderful" and "gave [her] lots of great feedback." She further noted that the incorporation of the online module was "pretty seamless" and "people loved it."

Dr. Uhls main goal for incorporating the library tutorial into her course was to help students better understand the research process and evaluation of sources. As she explained:

...because literature reviews and reading peer review papers are such a large part of psychology and helping [students] – often as a professor you assign these papers and you hope they understand it. My goal was to give them extra tools to understand how to ask a research question, how to narrow it down and really search appropriately and find the kinds of articles that are the right kinds of articles to cite and how to pull the information from those articles to support their papers. Some of that piece of learning was embedded in assignments and in my classroom teaching, but some of it was embedded in this tutorial and in person.

Though Dr. Uhls did not have concrete evidence of improvement since she "didn't do a before and after" test, the feedback she received about the tutorial from students was very positive. She said that "students informed [her] that they really enjoyed it and learned a lot." She believed both the online module and in-person lessons were incredibly useful and that the librarians were able to give the students "a lot more guidance." She noted that it was "pretty surprising how little undergraduates, and these are all juniors and seniors, how little they understand about searching online, about finding accurate kinds of articles, so [the tutorial] was really, really useful." As affirmation, she "sent an email afterwards to [her] department, which is all the people in Developmental Psych, about how useful it was and [she] suggested they add it to their classes."

Overall, Dr. Uhls' experience with the library tutorial "was 100% positive" and she is "definitely doing it next year." The only change she would make is on her end. She explained, "I think some of the students were confused whether it was online or offline for the required portion. I had someone point that out to me so I had to make that very clear." Next year she would make sure that she is "really being more clear in the syllabus about exactly what is expected."

Cross-case Summary

- Faculty across the board had positive experiences with the workshops, modules, and tutorials.
- The various research and writing tools were incorporated into the courses in a mix of in-person, online, and hybrid modes via class time, library time, and CCLE.
- Extra credit was sometimes used as an incentive for participation.
- The range of tools were very helpful and well designed. Everyone would continue to use them in their courses.
- Faculty desired efficiency in teaching students basics and fundamentals about research writing, the research process, and seeking sources. There was a preference for doing this outside of class time so that class time can be used more productively and for greater depth.
- There was also interest in introducing students to the library as more than just a place for books, but also as a place for additional resources and librarians who can offer further guidance.
- While acknowledging lack of control groups or pre- and post-tests, there still appeared to be evidence of improvement, including greater understanding of research writing and higher sophistication of work from students.