To: College-Wide Assessment Committee
Cc: Eric Daffron, Vice-Provost of Curriculum and Assessment
             Liz Siecke, Library Dean
From: Christina Connor
Date: June 1, 2013
Re: AY 2012-2013 Library Information Literacy Assessment Report

---

The library has 3 information literacy outcomes. For AY2012-2013, librarians assessed all outcomes. Approximately 1,976 students (total) were assessed in courses at the 100, 200 and 300. Of the targets set for those measures, most were met. For those that were not met, most fell short only by a small percentage.

Librarians have opted to not include 400 Level Courses in this annual assessment report, since only about 47 students were assessed. Given the low number of requested 400 Level Courses, librarians are discussing alternative methods of assessing this group.

Report on Past Actions: For Fall 2012, librarians restructured the assessment plan and dropped certain outcomes. The outcomes listed in the current report all represent information literacy skills (as defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries). However, while the SLOs dropped are part of information literacy, we believe certain outcomes should be addressed by members outside the library. For example, while the Association of College and Research Libraries list "citation" as an IL outcome, librarians feel citation should be taught by teaching faculty. The other outcomes that were dropped (terminology in the discipline, academic integrity and integration of sources in work) are best suited as integrated parts within the overall coursework.

Additionally, the collaboration between the Management concentration and the library was revamped over spring 2012 in order to "close the loop" with assessment results. Since this collaboration has not been officially adopted by select individuals of the Management convening group, librarians felt it best that it was dropped from the general IL Programmatic Structure at this time. While it is still being assessed, data is used and disseminated primarily with those currently involved with the project.

Goal 1: Determines the information needed

Outcome 1: Determines a manageable idea/paper topic (not too broad or narrow)

Measure 1:   Information Literacy in-session quiz (1 set of basic questions for 100-200 level courses and 1 set of advanced questions for 300-400 level courses)

Achievement
Target: 75% of students in 100 Level courses assessed within an information literacy session will be able to identify the difference between a topic that is too broad and a topic that is too narrow
85% of students in 200 Level courses assessed within an information literacy session will be able to identify the difference between a topic that is too broad and a topic that is too narrow
75% of students in 300 Level courses assessed within an information literacy session will be able to identify the difference between a topic that is too broad and a topic that is too narrow
85% of students in 400 Level courses assessed within an information literacy session will be able to identify the difference between a topic that is too broad and a topic that is too narrow (not reported)

Findings: When given the choice between various paper topics, 87% of students in 100 level courses, 91% students in 200 level courses and 86% students in 300 level courses could correctly identify which of the listed was an appropriate research topic.

Assessment data indicates students in 100, 200 and 300 Level Courses met (and exceeded) proposed achievement targets.

Outcome 1: Identify an appropriate paper topic	Students Correctly Identifying	Students Incorrectly Identifying	Totals
100 Level Courses	1,028 87%	158 13%	1,186 100%
200 Level Courses	383 91%	39 9%	422 100%
300 Level Courses	316 86%	52 14%	368 100%

Measure 2:	Review of IL SLOs submitted to CWAC from convening groups

Achievement
Target: Within academic programs, 75% of faculty set information literacy achievement targets will be met by students.

Findings: TBD

Actions: While librarians are happy to see all levels meeting targets, they are looking to improve how this outcome is assessed. Therefore, starting in Fall 2013, librarians will begin asking for sample student papers in order to add a second direct measure to this outcome. For now, librarians will focus on CRWT (and possibly FYS) courses, since these courses are the most often requested.

Goal 2: Finds and obtains the information needed.

Outcome 2: Constructs and implements a search strategy and uses various information resources to obtain information in the library and beyond.

Measure 1:   Information Literacy in-session quiz (1 set of basic questions for 100-200 level courses and 1 set of advanced questions for 300-400 level courses)

Achievement
Target: 75% of students in 100 Level courses assessed will be able to identify how to identify an appropriate search strategy
85% of students in 200 Level courses assessed will be able to identify how to identify an appropriate search strategy
75% of students in 300 Level courses assessed will be able to identify how to identify an appropriate search strategy
85% of students in 400 Level courses assessed will be able to identify how to identify an appropriate search strategy (not reported)

Findings: When asked how to find materials in the library, 82% of students in 100 level courses, 84% students in 200 level courses and 63% students in 300 level courses can correctly identify an appropriate search strategy for finding the materials.

Assessment data indicates students 100 Level Courses met (and exceeded) the proposed achievement target. 200 and 300 did not meet proposed achievement target. While 200 Level Courses did not meet the anticipated goal of 85%, it only missed the target by 1%. It should be noted that while it is disappointing that only 63% of 300 Level students assessed could identify appropriate search strategies, it is a dramatic improvement from 2012 (46%).

Outcome 2: Identify an appropriate search strategy	Students Correctly Identifying	Students Incorrectly Identifying	Totals
100 Level Courses	976 82%	210 18%	1186 100%
200 Level Courses	355 84%	67 16%	422 100%
300 Level Courses	201 63%	167 37%	368 100%

Measure 2:   Review of IL SLOs submitted to CWAC from convening groups

Achievement
Target: Within academic programs, 75% of faculty set information literacy achievement targets
                will be met by students.

Findings: TBD

Actions: Librarians notice that Outcome 2 is continually problematic for students. Therefore, a
                number of adjustments are being proposed:
                - Review and alteration of questions associated with this outcome
                - Faculty survey regarding student work
                - Review of student papers in order to add a second direct measure to this outcome

Goal 3: Evaluates and incorporates the appropriate information

Outcome 3: Understands the difference between types of sources (Popular/scholarly, etc.)

Measure 1:   Information Literacy in-session quiz (1 set of basic questions for 100-200 level courses
                and 1 set of advanced questions for 300-400 level courses)

Achievement
Target: 75% of students in 100 Level courses assessed will be able to identify scholarly sources
                85% of students in 200 Level courses assessed will be able to identify scholarly sources
                75% of students in 300 Level courses assessed will be able to identify scholarly sources
                85% of students in 400 Level courses assessed will be able to identify scholarly sources
                (not reported)

Findings: When given qualities (or attributes) of various source types, 73% of students in 100 level courses, 80% students in 200 level courses and 82% students in 300 level courses can correctly identify sources.

Assessment data indicates students in 300 Level Courses did meet (and exceed) proposed achievement targets. 100 and 200 Level Courses did not meet proposed achievement targets. While 100 Level Courses did not meet the anticipated goal of 75%, it only missed the target by 2%.

Outcome 3: Identify scholarly sources	Students Correctly Identifying	Students Incorrectly Identifying	Totals
100 Level Courses	870 73%	316 27%	1,186 100%
200 Level Courses	335 80%	87 20%	422 100%
300 Level Courses	301 82%	67% 18%	368 100%

Measure 3:   Review of IL SLOs submitted to CWAC from convening groups

Achievement
Target: Within academic programs, 75% of faculty set information literacy achievement targets will be met by students.

Findings: TBD

Actions: Many students who are assessed in the 100 and 200 Level Courses are not required to use scholarly sources or are very new to what constitutes a scholarly source. Therefore, there is a proposal to lower achievement targets (at least for the IL quiz). In addition, librarians notice that Outcome 3 is continually problematic for students. Therefore, a number of adjustments are being proposed:
- Review and alteration of questions associated with this outcome
- Faculty survey regarding student work
- Review of student papers in order to add a second direct measure to this outcome