

Information Literacy Summary for Department Heads

Definition

The Information Literacy rubric at CCP is based on guidelines from the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and focuses primarily on a student's written research project. There are six major skill areas that students should have developed by the time that they graduate:

1. Project rests on a framed research question (Question)
2. Sources located, searched and selected for this project are within the proper scope (Scope)
3. Project reflects student efforts to evaluate sources critically (Critical)
4. Final product shows evidence of accomplishing the objectives of research project (Final)
5. Sources were used ethically and appropriately and facilitate tracing to original information (Ethical)
6. Self Assessment of strengths and weaknesses (Self Assessment)

Assessment History

Information Literacy was examined three times (twice in 2009 and once in 2010). One assessment utilized the Standard Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS), and the other two used the faculty developed assessment rubric (Appendix A).

Assessment 1: Spring 2009

In Spring 2009, 175 students in ENGL 101 and 102 took the SAILS exam. Student scores were compared to a national set of peers. CCP students performed about the same as the institution-type benchmark on the following SAILS Skill Sets: Documenting Sources; Understanding Economic, Legal, and Social Issues. Students performed worse than the institution-type benchmark on the following SAILS Skill Sets: Developing a Research Strategy; Selecting Finding Tools; Searching; Using Finding Tool Features; Retrieving Sources; Evaluating Sources.

There were some concerns among both Library and English faculty about the administration of the exam in terms of self selection of participants and difficulty of the questions themselves. Despite this, the English department made some changes to English 102 to address the issues presented by this and the following assessments.

Assessment 2: Fall 2009

In Fall 2009 a pilot was conducted in five sections of English 102 (91 students) using the Info Lit Rubric (attached). There were some problems with distribution of the assessment rubric, so not all students were assessed using the same, final version of the rubric. Student competency across the skills ranged from 59% (project rests on a framed research question) to 76% (sources were ethically and appropriately). 63% of students were deemed competent across all six skills.

The suggestion was made that for the future, a goal of 75% of students reaching competency in each skill would be appropriate. To achieve this, it was suggested that students in English 102 should be

required to complete online literacy tutorials (either as an assignment or as part of a visit to the Library). Faculty teaching English 102 were also encouraged to use the rubric as part of their grading procedures.

Assessment 3: Spring 2010

A second pilot was conducted in five sections of English 102 (72 students) during Spring 2010 using the same rubric as in Fall 2009. Competency ranged from 81% (final product shows evidence or accomplishing the objectives of the research project) to 68% (student evaluates sources critically). Overall, 71% of students were deemed competent across all areas. (Skill 6, Self Assessment, was not assessed).

No specific recommendations were made at that time. However, the changes in scores over a one semester period demonstrate the limitations of smaller sample sizes (in terms of numbers of classes) in making broad determinations of competence.

Table 1: Rubric Scores 2009 and 2010

Skill Area	Fall 2009		Spring 2010	
	Mean	% Comp	Mean	% Comp
1. Question	2.81	59%	3.17	79%
2. Scope	2.90	69%	3.10	79%
3. Critical	2.97	66%	2.97	68%
4. Final	2.94	69%	3.06	81%
5. Ethical	2.99	77%	2.86	71%
6. Self Assessment	3.00	73%	--	--
Overall	2.93	63%	3.11	71%

Additional Indirect Evidence

Although CCSSE does not have a question directly relating to information literacy, CCP students do rate their education experiences higher in two areas that seem related to the goals of information literacy (learning effectively on your own and thinking clearly and analytically) than their peers at comparable institutions. Scores had also increased in both of those areas between the 2009 and the 2013 administrations. Finally, those two areas had the highest mean scores among the eight broad learning areas measured by CCSSE (3.11 and 3.05 (out of 4.00), respectively).¹

Future Assessments

Information Literacy will be assessed again in Spring 2014, using both methods above.

¹https://my.ccp.edu/render.UserLayoutRootNode.uP?uP_tparam=utf&utf=%2fcp%2fip%2flogin%3fsys%3dsctsb%26url%3dhttp://www.ccp.edu/VPFIN-PL/ir/index.HTM

Outstanding Questions

1. How do we compensate for the challenges of using rubrics that refer to specific assignments?

There may be assignments that better fit the context of a rubric, if we were to move to a system where a group of independent readers were functioning as assessors, there would need to be a fairly consistent assignment to ensure accurate comparisons. Alternately, there would be a need to look at multiple pieces of student work over a semester.

2. Where should students demonstrate competency?

Although we have defined English 102 as the course that sets the foundation for information literacy, should we examine assignments from other courses as well? Alongside this question is the role of Library Services in teaching students in this area and meaningful ways of assessing those experiences.

3. What is the role of national comparisons?

Like several of the other General Education areas, there exist, for Information Literacy, several nationally used exams. Although these, obviously cannot match, point for point, CCPs definition of the subject, is it valuable to have our students placed into a national context? Is just seeing improvement on home grown rubrics enough evidence of growth?

Information Literacy Rubric

Information Literacy Skill	Beginning	Developing	Competent	Accomplished
Project rests on a framed research question (ACRL 1.1--1.4)	Student did not formulate focused research question	Student formulated a basic research question	Student formulated a focused research question which demonstrated a clear understanding of topic	Student formulated a fully developed research question that showed an excellent understanding of topic
	Student had an unclear idea of breadth and depth of topic and information needed	Student had basic idea of breadth and depth of topic and information needed	Student had a clear idea of breadth and depth of topic and information needed	Student had a well-developed idea of breadth and depth of topic and information needed, and modified the topic accordingly
Sources located, searched and selected for this project are within the proper scope (ACRL 1.2; 2.2)	Student had an unclear understanding of appropriate keywords	Student had a basic understanding of appropriate keywords	Student had a clear understanding of appropriate keywords	Student had excellent understanding of appropriate keywords
	Student used inappropriate tools and unclear search strategy to find information	Student used a few appropriate search tools and had a basic search strategy	Student used search tools effectively and had a clear and focused search strategy	Student used multiple search strategies to find the best sources for the topic
	Student identified few or no relevant information sources	Student found a limited number or limited variety of relevant source	Student found a variety of information sources that directly fill the information need	Student's source selection exceeded expectations and the required number of sources
Project reflects student efforts to evaluate sources critically (ACRL 3.1-- 3.7)	Student showed no effort to judge credibility, relevance, accuracy or timeliness of information	Student showed some effort to judge credibility, relevance, accuracy or timeliness of information	Student evaluated the information for credibility, relevance, accuracy and timeliness	Student thoroughly evaluated the information for credibility, relevance, accuracy, timeliness, bias and context
	Student uncritically accepted all information found	Student made limited judgments about what to keep and what to discard	Student made generally good judgments about what to keep and what to discard	Student made thoughtful judgments about what to keep and what to discard
	Student made no effort to use diverse sources or formats	Student made some effort to use diverse sources and/or formats	Student compared diverse and appropriate sources and formats	Student compared a wide variety of diverse and appropriate sources/ formats
	Information used did not match criteria specified for project	Information used somewhat matched criteria specified for project	Information used matched criteria specified for project	Information used exceeded criteria specified for project

Final product shows evidence of accomplishing the objectives of research project (ACRL 4.1—4.3)	Student showed no evidence of grasping information literacy concepts or skills	Information used reflects grasp of most of information literacy concepts and skills	Information used suggests ability to find and evaluate information from a variety of sources	Information used suggests excellent command of finding and evaluating information from a variety of sources
	Student did not integrate new knowledge into existing knowledge base	Student integrated some new knowledge into existing knowledge base	Student integrated significant new knowledge into existing knowledge base	Student extensively integrated new knowledge into existing knowledge base
	Student did not successfully communicate ideas to others	Student communicated limited ideas to others	Student effectively communicated ideas to others	Student showed excellent ability and effort to communicate ideas to others
	Student did not accomplish objectives of research project	Student met minimum expectations for research project	Student effectively accomplished all the objectives of the research project	Student exceeded all the objectives of the research project
Sources were used ethically and appropriately and facilitate tracing to original information (ACRL 5.1—5-3)	Student provided inadequate, incorrect or no citation for others' ideas	Student cited information with mistakes regarding proper format	Student created a bibliography or works cited page using appropriate citation style	Student created a meticulous bibliography or works cited page using appropriate citation style
	Student work reflects lack of awareness of what plagiarism means	Student work shows acceptable understanding of plagiarism rules	Student created a bibliography or works cited page containing required number of sources	Student showed excellent understanding of plagiarism and strategies for avoiding plagiarism and recognizes examples of plagiarism
	Student did not create a workable bibliography or works cited page	Student created a bibliography or works cited page that contained just a few sources	Student showed thorough understanding of plagiarism, strategies for avoiding plagiarism and recognizes examples of plagiarism	Student created a bibliography or works cited page exceeding the required number of sources.
Self-Assessment	Student was unable to identify major strengths and weaknesses in work	Student attempted to identify strengths and weaknesses in work	Student identified strengths and weaknesses in work	Student self-identified strengths and weaknesses and made efforts to improve
	Student did not seek and/or resisted instructor feedback on work	Student did not resist instructor feedback to improve work	Student sought instructor assistance when needed to improve work	Student used instructor feedback to increase self-awareness, improve overall research methods and enhance student learning

