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**Introduction**

This report details the development of training materials for distance education students on the subject of paraphrasing and quoting at the Mythical University as part of a larger information literacy initiative. According to the Association of College & Research Libraries (2017) the information literate student evaluates knowledge sources critically and incorporates selected information into student’s knowledge base and value system. Breivik (2005) feels that “educators in North America must empower our students to evaluate and effectively use the information they access through technology” (p. 26).

Students in the 21st century participate in online education in greater numbers. The Sloan Consortium (2010) reported a twenty-one percent growth rate for online enrollments versus less than two percent growth of the overall higher education student population. The online division of Mythical University has encountered the same growing enrollment over the last five years. This growth has served as a driver for the University’s information literacy initiative. Librarians need to find or develop an online solution to keep the delivery scalable while helping students with this critical need.

The outcomes and delivery details of the paraphrasing and quoting module are covered here. The library staff choose the same learning outcomes for students as the Association of College & Research Libraries (2017) competency standards: 1) reads the text and selects main ideas, 2) restates textual concepts in his/her own words and selects data accurately, and 3) identifies verbatim material and quoting the material appropriately. The materials are made with Microsoft Powerpoint. Assessments are included in the module for each topic. A take-way document will also be developed.

**Analysis**

To meet this need, the Mythical University librarians embarked on a review of existing on-demand elearning materials. Modules from the Austin Community College and were considered. While the modules are of high quality, the required objectives are not fully met.

*Evaluating Information* from the Austin Community College (2014) focuses on five criteria for evaluating internet sources. Students are taught to test the currency, relevance, authority, accuracy, and purpose of materials found online. The module includes interactive practice activities and ends with an assessment. Explanations are provided for course navigation. The layout minimizes text and maximizes the use of graphics. This module helps students select main ideas from the sources and identify material worth of citation. However, the topics of selecting main ideas and restating textual concepts are not covered.

Marquette University’s (n.d.) *Some Friendly Advice: Evaluating Sources* presents four different research questions. Learners review three sources for each topic and provide feedback about the relevance of each source. The simple, graphical layout aids in intuitive course navigation. This module requires students to determine and restate the main ideas of the article.

There are two barriers for reusing this module. This course does not address the objective of identifying verbatim material for quotation. The module requires Marquette University resources that prevent reusability. After completing the module, a librarian provides feedback on student’s explanations. The links in the module require access to Marquette University’s library articles.
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