Information Literacy Assessment

Spring 2019

Method:

Information Literacy was assessed through the collection of samples of student work. Fifteen courses were chosen for the assessment (see Table 1), which comprised 351 individual classes. These courses were selected for inclusion based upon course outcome mapping to the Information Literacy General Education Outcome. A stratified random sampling method was used to select the courses for this semester's assessment. Two courses were randomly selected from each department from a list of all of the courses mapped to the outcome from that department's programs. In this way, each department will be represented by two courses in the assessment. However, the same course was randomly selected for two departments, and the course selected to replace that course in the second department in which it was selected did not have any students enrolled for the semester. Therefore, the final sample only included 15 courses representing eight departments. One student from each class of the three highest-enrolled courses (ENGL 101, PSYC 101, and ENGL 102), and two students from each class of the other selected courses were randomly selected for assessment, for a total of 413 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, and that they would be asked to submit a sample of student work that demonstrated the skills represented in that outcome. They were further asked to await specific instructions in an additional, forthcoming email notice. The second notice was sent two weeks following the initial email and contained instructions for submitting the pieces of student work along with the names of their selected students. This email also included, as an attachment, the rubric that would be used to score the student artifacts in order to assist instructors in choosing an appropriate assignment to submit for the assessment. A reminder email that again contained the instructions and student names was sent approximately three weeks before the due date for submission. The day before the due date, a second reminder email was sent to instructors whom had not yet made a submission.

Instructors were asked to send samples of work from the selected students that demonstrated the criteria of the outcome, as outlined in the rubric. 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. 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. Both digital and paper artifacts submitted by faculty members were collected by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. All artifacts were logged and anonymized upon submission.

The College library assessed their course intervention services concurrently with the general education assessment. The library wished to examine the impact of their interventions on students' Information Literacy scores. Artifacts were coded as being submitted from a course without library intervention services, with face-to-face intervention services, or with virtual intervention services.

During the semester of assessment, the College was in the process of implementing a new assessment management system: Nuventive. The Spring 2019 assessment of Information Literacy represented the College's first use of the new system to perform an assessment of a general education outcome. However, a session attended by all of the members of the College-Wide Assessment Committee (CWAC) to norm the rubric was conducted in a shared Google Drive folder, as the Nuventive system was still in the set-up process. In the norming session, all attendees scored the same five artifacts using the rubric, then compared scores and discussed scoring methods to ensure that the rubric was reliable and valid.

At the conclusion of the artifact collection period, all submitted artifacts were uploaded into the Nuventive system and randomly assigned to the 17 assessors. Each artifact was assessed twice, by two different assessors. Assessors were able to access and score their assigned student artifacts using the rubric directly in the Nuventive system.

Table 1. Courses selected for assessment of Information Literacy

Course	Number of Classes
ART 117	1
CJ 208	3
COMM 221	1
ENGL 101	129
ENGL 102	100
ENGL 104	12
ENVS 201	6
GIS 141	2
MUSB 111	1
NURS 244	20
PHYS 212	4
PLGL 102	2
PSYC 101	60
PSYC 213	8
WEB 133	2

Results:

Artifacts were submitted for 236 students (57.14%). Artifacts could not be collected from 66 (15.98%) of the selected students because the students either dropped the course or did not turn in the assignment that was chosen for assessment. The remaining missing artifacts (111 (26.88%)) could not be accounted for.

Each of the 236 submitted artifacts were assigned to two of the seventeen assessors in the jury pool for assessment, resulting in a total of 472 scores. Rubric scores for the assessed students are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Frequency table of rubric scores for all assessed students

Criteria	4- Expert Proficiency	3-Advanced Proficiency	2- Proficiency	1-Limited Proficiency	0- No Proficiency	NA	Mean (SD)
Locates sources relevant to topic (Locate)	11(2.65%)	107(25.78%)	165(39.76%)	46(11.08%)	7(1.69%)	79(19.04%)	2.21(.79)
Selects quality sources for the research need (Evaluate)	6(1.45%)	105(25.30%)	160(38.55%)	63(15.18%)	9(2.17%)	72(17.35%)	2.11(.89)
Integrates sources to support purpose (Integrate)	5(1.20%)	89(21.45%)	166(40.0%)	64(15.42%)	12(2.89%)	79(19.04%)	2.03(.81)
Citation of information reflects appropriate discipline requirements (Credit)	13(3.13%)	71(17.11%)	133(32.05%)	106(25.54%)	23(5.54%)	69(16.63%)	1.84(.95)

Note: NA responses are not included in criteria mean calculations

Three of the four Information Literacy criteria reached proficiency. Mean scores for the criteria showed little variability, with the mean for the Locate criterion being the highest with a mean of 2.21 (0.79), and the mean for the Credit criterion being the lowest, with the mean coming in slightly below the proficiency level at 1.84(0.95).

This assessment had two significant limitations. The first limitation was the large number of Not Applicable scores given to all criteria. Not Applicable scores were given to 18% of all artifacts across criteria. The second limitation was a large number of unassessed artifacts. Two assessors did not complete the scoring of their assigned artifacts, resulting in 57 missing scores. This large number of unscored artifacts and Not Applicable ratings decreased the number of usable scores given for the assessment.