Information Literacy Assessment

Spring 2017

Method:

The General Education Outcome Information Literacy was assessed through the collection of samples of student work. Thirteen courses were chosen for the assessment (see Table 1), which comprised 138 individual classes. These courses were selected for inclusion by the College-Wide Assessment Committee (CWAC) based upon course outcome mapping to the Information Literacy General Education Outcome, or course outcomes having relevance to information literacy in some significant way. Two students were randomly selected for assessment from each class of the four largest courses (MKTG 201, NUTR 104, ENGL 104, ENGL 106), and three students were selected from each class of the smaller courses. This selection method resulted in a sample of 340 students.

Instructors were initially notified of their class's inclusion in the assessment with an email sent within the first month of the semester. This notice informed the instructors of the outcome that was to be assessed in their class and asked them to await instructions in an additional, forthcoming email notice. The second notice was sent two weeks following the initial email and contained the names of their selected students and instructions for submitting their work. Instructors were asked to send samples of work that demonstrated the ability to locate, evaluate, integrate, and credit information effectively. Attached to the email notification was a copy of the rubric that would be used in the assessment to better assist instructors in selecting appropriate pieces of student work. Instructors were also asked to submit a copy or brief description of the assignment in order to assist the assessors in evaluating the student work. Work could be submitted electronically or in paper form. If work could not be submitted, instructors were asked to indicate the reason for the lack of submission, such as the student dropped the course or did not complete the selected assignment. A reminder email was sent to all instructors of selected courses approximately two weeks before the due date for submissions.

All collected artifacts were anonymized and uploaded into the Tk20 assessment software program. A group of ten assessors attended a norming session in which five artifacts were communally assessed in the Tk20 system in order to ensure reliability of the rubric and within the group of assessors. After the successful norming session, all artifacts were assessed within Tk20 using the rubric. Each artifact was assessed twice, by two different volunteers.   The analytic rubric consisted of four dimensions: Locate, evaluate, integrate, and credit. These dimensions were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from 0, no proficiency, to 4, expert proficiency.

Table 1. Courses selected for assessment of Information Literacy

Course	Number of Classes
ANTH 101	9
ARCH 121	1
ASTR 103	11
BIOL 230	4
CIS 110	8
COMM 203	7
CVT 100	1
ENGL 104	14
ENGL 106	18
HUM 101	18
MKTG 201	25
NUTR 104	20
THTR 101	6

Results

Artifacts were assessed for 157 students (46.2%). Artifacts could not be collected from 34 (10%) of the selected students because the students either dropped the course or did not turn in the assignment chosen for assessment. The remaining artifacts either could not be assessed or were not submitted for various reasons, including the class having no required assignments suitable for assessment, or artifacts being submitted after the assessment deadline. Rubric scores for the assessed students are shown in Table 2. Note that row counts do not total the number of assessed students because each student was assessed twice. In addition, "not applicable" and missing scores were not included in the row totals.

Table 2. Rubric scores

Criterion	0-No Proficiency	1-Limited Proficiency	2-Some Proficiency	3- Proficiency	4-Expert Proficiency	Total	Mean(SD)	NA/ Missing
Locate	4 (2.0%)	38 (18.7%)	108 (53.2%)	47 (23.2%)	6 (3.0%)	203	2.06(.78)	111
Evaluate	2 (1.0%)	63 (32.1%)	94 (48.0%)	35 (17.9%)	2 (1.0%)	196	1.86(.75)	118
Integrate	21 (10.3%)	64 (31.5%)	76 (37.4%)	38 (18.7%)	4 (2.0%)	203	1.70(.96)	111
Credit	39 (19.8%)	55 (27.9%)	78 (39.6%)	21 (10.7%)	4 (2.0%)	197	1.47(.99)	117
Total	66 (8.3%)	220 (27.5%)	356 (44.6%)	141 (17.6%)	16 (2.0%)		1.78	