Information Literacy Assessment

Fall 2015

Method:

Information Literacy was assessed through the collection of samples of student work. Seventeen courses were selected for assessment (see Table 1), which comprised 268 individual classes. Two students from each of the classes were randomly selected for assessment, for a total of 536 students.

Instructors for the selected courses were sent an email notification within the first month of classes with instructions for submitting pieces of student work and the names of their selected students. Instructors were asked to send samples of work from the selected students 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. Based on early instructor feedback, it was determined that PLGL 101 did not require an assignment that met the criteria for assessment, and it was replaced with PLGL 102. 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 six volunteers assessed the artifacts using the rubric. The analytic rubric consisted of four dimensions: Locate, evaluate, integrate, and credit. The dimensions were rated on a 5-point Lykert-type scale, ranging from 4, expert proficiency, to 0, no proficiency. Each artifact was assessed twice, by two different volunteers. In addition, the artifacts were divided into two groups based upon the selected students' earned credits. One group comprised students who had earned zero to 30 credits, and the second group over 30 credits. All assessors were assigned to both credit groups in order to avoid possible bias introduced by disparate assessors assigned between the credits group. Bias was also deterred by requiring assessors to attend a norming session in which five artifacts were communally assessed.

Table 1. Courses selected for assessment of Information Literacy

Course	Number of Classes
HIST 101	20
NURT 104	22
PSYC 209	25
PSYC 241	4
ENGL 102	75
ENGL 207	11
EXSC 102	1
PHIL 200	14
CVT 100	1
EDUC 180	2
HUMS 120	4
BIOL 103	30
CIS 110	7
BUSI 201	14
MKTG 201	21
HUM 201	14
PLGL 102	3

Results

Artifacts were submitted for 217 students (42.0%). Artifacts could not be collected from 65 (30.0%) of the selected students because the students either dropped the course or did not turn in the assignment chosen for assessment. The remaining artifacts were not submitted for various reasons, including the course 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.

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/Missing	Mean (SD)
Locate	17(3.9%)	67(15.4%)	196(45.2%)	66(15.2%)	17(3.9%)	71(16.3%)	2.00(.86)
Evaluate	8(1.8%)	57(13.1%)	158(36.4%)	115(26.5%)	19(4.4%)	77(17.8%)	1.78(.86)
Integrate	10(2.3%)	80(18.4%)	130(30.0%)	121(27.9%)	31(7.1%)	62(14.3%)	1.78(.97)
Credit	35(8.1%)	65(15.0%)	125(28.8%)	84(19.4%)	49(11.3%)	76(17.5%)	1.87(1.15)

When assessed students were split into two groups based upon total credits, 141 artifacts were submitted for students who had 30 credits or less and 76 artifacts were submitted for students

with over 30 credits. Scores for students with 30 credits or less were compared to students with more than 30 credits using independent samples *t*-tests. No significant differences in criteria scores were found. Differences between groups for the Integrate criterion approached significance, however, with students earning 30 credits or less scoring slightly higher than students with more than 30 credits ($t(370)=-1.98$, $p=.05$).   Scores on all criteria for the credit groups are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Frequency table of rubric scores categorized by assessed students' credits

	Credits	4	3	2	1	0	Mean (SD)
Locate	0-30	15(5.3%)	45(16.0%)	119(42.2%)	47(16.7%)	12(4.3%)	2.01(.92)
	Over 30	2(1.3%)	22(14.5%)	77(50.7%)	19(12.5%)	5(3.3%)	1.98(.75)
Evaluate	0-30	6(2.1%)	39(13.8%)	100(35.5%)	77(27.3%)	14(5.0%)	1.77(.88)
	Over 30	2(1.3%)	18(11.8%)	58(38.2%)	38(25.0%)	5(3.3%)	1.79(.81)
Integrate	0-30	8(2.8%)	59(20.9%)	86(30.5%)	70(24.8%)	21(7.4%)	1.85(.99)
	Over 30	2(1.3%)	21(13.8%)	44(28.9%)	51(33.6%)	10(6.6%)	1.65(.90)
Credit	0-30	22(7.8%)	47(16.7%)	86(30.5%)	53(18.8%)	30(10.6%)	1.91(1.14)
	Over 30	13(8.6%)	18(11.8%)	39(25.7%)	31(20.4%)	19(12.5%)	1.79(1.20)

Note: Percentages do not total to 100 because NA and missing scores have been excluded