To: College-Wide Assessment Committee
Cc: Eric Daffron, Vice-Provost of Curriculum and Assessment
              Liz Siecke, Library Dean
From: Christina Connor
Date: June 1, 2012
Re: AY 2011-2012 Library Information Literacy Assessment Report

---

The library has set 11 information literacy outcomes. For AY2011-2012, librarians assessed 6 of those outcomes. Approximately 2,017 students (total) were assessed in courses at the 100, 200, 300, and 400 levels. Of the targets set for those measures, students met 6 (27%).

For the fall, librarians will restructure the assessment plan and will drop 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, in order to successfully "close the loop", we believe certain outcomes should be addressed by members outside the library. These outcomes are best suited as integrated parts within the overall coursework.

Additional Notes:

Due to the continued support from Rob Mentore and James Hoch, the majority of library information literacy sessions were requested by faculty teaching First Year Seminar and Critical Reading and Writing courses, and resulted in almost 100% participation of these classes. Therefore, the total number of students assessed in 100 Level Courses is the largest.

Librarians have opted to not include in this annual report assessment findings for 400 Level Courses since only 62 students (total) were assessed. Given the low number of requested 400 Level Courses, librarians are discussing the possibility of permanently excluding that group from their assessment. The majority of 400 Level Courses assessed in the library are seminars in one or two subject areas. Librarians feel it makes more sense to have the upper-level information literacy assessment conducted by teaching faculty within the seminar/capstone programmatic plans. Librarians can review any programs that designate information literacy in the higher level classes and offer help to faculty whose students do not meet their targets.

Additionally, the collaboration between the Management concentration and the library was revamped over spring 2012 in order to "close the loop" with assessment results. Therefore, no data was collected. The library plans to resume assessment initiatives starting in fall 2012.

Goal 1: Determines the information needed.
Determines the information needed.

Outcome 1: Develops an idea
Develops an idea. (2011-2012)

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

Achievement
Target: 75% of students in 100 Level courses assessed will be able to identify an appropriate
                paper topic
                85% of students in 200 Level courses assessed will be able to identify an appropriate
                paper topic
                75% of students in 300 Level courses assessed will be able to identify an appropriate
                paper topic
                85% of students in 400 Level courses assessed will be able to identify an appropriate
                paper topic (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 72% students in 300 level courses could
                correctly identify which of the listed was an appropriate research topic.

Outcome 1: Identify an appropriate paper topic	Students Correctly Identifying	Students Incorrectly Identifying	Totals
100 Level Courses	861 87%	131 13%	992 100%
200 Level Courses	437 91%	42 9%	479 100%
300 Level Courses	309 72%	175 28%	484 100%

Assessment data indicates students in 100 and 200 Level Courses met (and exceeded) proposed achievement
targets. While 300 Level Courses did not meet the desired achievement target of 75%, it only missed the
target by 3%.

Actions: Since such a large sample size of First Year Seminar and Critical Reading and Writing classes were collected, librarians will share findings with the program directors. Librarians plan to increase the coverage of "topic development" in 300 Level sessions.

Measure 2:   Syllabus audit of collected faculty syllabi submitted to librarians when library sessions are requested.

Achievement
Target: 95% of faculty will include course Student Learning Outcomes in their Syllabus

Findings: Librarians randomly selected 20 of the 80 syllabi collected from faculty-requested information literacy sessions in fall 2011. Of the 20 selected, 100% of faculty included student learning outcomes in their syllabi.

	Yes	No	Totals
Includes SLOs in their syllabus	20 100%	0 0%	20 100%

Assessment data indicates achievement target was met and exceeded.

Actions: Librarians are discussing an alternative second measure for this outcome. A faculty survey for those who request classes is being considered. Many faculty comment at the end of the semester how they saw improvement in student papers/projects after library sessions. It would be good to collect that data.

Outcome 2: Identifies key concepts and terms
Identifies key concepts and terms. (2011-2012)

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

Achievement
Target: 75% of students in 100 Level courses assessed will be able to identify appropriate key terms/concepts
85% of students in 200 Level courses assessed will be able to identify appropriate key terms/concepts
75% of students in 300 Level courses assessed will be able to identify appropriate key terms/concepts
85% of students in 400 Level courses assessed will be able to identify appropriate key terms/concepts (not reported)

Findings: When given an example of a thesis statement, 33% of students in 100 level courses, 32% students in 200 level courses and 57% students in 300 level courses could correctly identify appropriate key terms or concepts that would be suitable to conduct an appropriate search strategy.

Outcome 2: Identify appropriate key terms/concepts	Students Correctly Identifying	Students Incorrectly Identifying	Totals
100 Level Courses	329 33%	663 67%	992 100%
200 Level Courses	153 32%	326 68%	479 100%
300 Level Courses	274 57%	210 43%	484 100%

Assessment data indicates students 100, 200 and 300 did not meet proposed achievement targets.

Measure 2: Syllabus audit of collected faculty syllabi submitted to librarians when library sessions are requested.

Achievement
Target: 95% of faculty will identify key concepts in their Syllabus

Findings: Librarians randomly selected 20 of the 80 syllabi collected from faculty-requested information literacy sessions in fall 2011. Of the 20 selected, 75% of faculty included student learning outcomes in their syllabi.

	Yes	No	Totals
Includes key concepts in their syllabus	15 75%	5 25%	20 100%

Assessment data indicates achievement target was not met.

Actions: (Used for both measures) After discussion, librarians decided to remove this student learning outcome from the assessment plan. Librarians recognize this outcome is covered in sessions (and in classes when discussing key concepts related to a subject/field), but it is a difficult skill to assess by itself. Instead, assessment of this skill will be folded into the outcomes on idea development and search strategies since they are closely related.

Outcome 3: Ability to recognize key concepts (not reported – Management/Info Lit program being reworked)
Ability to recognize key concepts and ideas relevant to Major/Field (Management) (2011-2012)

Goal 2: Finds and obtains
Finds and obtains the information needed.

Outcome 4: Constructs and implements
Constructs and implements a search strategy and uses various information resources to obtain information in the library and beyond. (2011-2012)

Measure 1: Information Literacy in-session quiz (1 set of questions for 100-200 level courses and 1 set of 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, 93% of students in 100 level courses, 83% students in 200 level courses and 63% students in 300 level courses can correctly identify an appropriate search strategy for finding the materials.

Outcome 4: Identify an appropriate search strategy	Students Correctly Identifying	Students Incorrectly Identifying	Totals
100 Level Courses	923 93%	69 7%	992 100%
200 Level Courses	396 83%	83 17%	479 100%
300 Level Courses	307 63%	177 37%	484 100%

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 2%.

Actions: Increase coverage of library resources in sessions. Librarians are also discussing restructuring database sessions to further cover this issue for upper level courses.

Measure 2:   Syllabus Audit

Achievement
Target: 95% of Faculty will include library information or recommended key sources in their Syllabus

Findings: Librarians randomly selected 20 of the 80 syllabi collected from faculty-requested information literacy sessions in fall 2011. Of the 20 selected, 60% of faculty include library information or recommended key sources in their Syllabus.

	Yes	No	Totals
Library information or recommended key sources in their Syllabus	12 60%	8 40%	20 100%

Assessment data indicates achievement target was not met.

Actions: Librarians will boast promotion the inclusion of the library's website and other useful resources on syllabi and Moodle pages. Promotion can be heightened at the new faculty orientation and with First Year Seminar and Critical Reading and Writing conveners since librarians have the strongest relationships in those areas.

Outcome 5: Effectively uses information resources (not reported – Management/Info Lit program being reworked)
Effectively uses information resources to find subject-specific information (Management) (2011-2012)

Goal 3: Incorporates the appropriate information
Evaluates and incorporates the appropriate information

Outcome 6: Understands the difference between types
Understands the difference between types of sources (ie. Popular/scholarly; primary/secondary; historical/current) (2011-2012)

Measure 1:   Information Literacy in-session quiz (1 set of questions for 100-200 level courses and 1 set of 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, 71% of students in 100 level courses, 73% students in 200 level courses and 46% students in 300 level courses can correctly identify sources.

Outcome 6: Identify scholarly sources	Students Correctly Identifying	Students Incorrectly Identifying	Totals
100 Level Courses	709 71%	283 29%	992 100%
200 Level Courses	352 73%	127 27%	479 100%
300 Level Courses	225 46%	259 54%	484 100%

Assessment data indicates students in 100, 200, and 300 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 4%.

Actions: Librarians are discussing reworking the questions for this outcome. Many students who are assessed in the 100 and 200 Level Courses are not required to use scholarly sources or are new to the idea of what a scholarly source is. Librarians are also discussing lowering the achievement targets for these levels.

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: Academic programs have set 50 information literacy outcomes. Last semester programs assessed 26 of those outcomes, using 27 measures. Of the targets set for those measures, students met 18 (67%).

Actions: Librarians will offer to work with any programs who did not meet their desired achievement targets in information literacy.

Outcome 7: Begins to critically evaluate (not reported – Management/Info Lit program being reworked)
Begins to critically evaluate different information resources (ie. Popular/scholarly; primary/secondary; historical/current) (2010-2011)

Outcome 8: Ability to synthesize (not reported – Management/Info Lit program being reworked)
Ability to synthesize original ideas with information from MGMT and business sources (Management) (2011-
2012)

Goal 4: Avoids plagiarism
Avoids plagiarism, as well as accesses and uses information ethically and legally

Outcome 9: Demonstrates an understanding
Demonstrates an understanding of what constitutes plagiarism (2011-2012)

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

Achievement
Target: 75% of students in 100 Level courses assessed will be able to recognize various forms of plagiarism

                85% of students in 200 Level courses assessed will be able to recognize various forms of plagiarism

                75% of students in 300 Level courses assessed will be able to recognize various forms of plagiarism

                85% of students in 400 Level courses assessed will be able to recognize various forms of plagiarism (not reported)

Findings: When presented various scenarios (direct copying, paraphrasing, etc.), 87% of students in 100 level courses, 85% students in 200 level courses and 70% students in 300 level courses can correctly identify which situation constitutes plagiarism.

Outcome 9: Identify various forms of plagiarism	Students Correctly Identifying	Students Incorrectly Identifying	Totals
100 Level Courses	860 87%	132 13%	992 100%
200 Level Courses	403 85%	76 16%	479 100%
300 Level Courses	341 70%	143 30%	484 100%

Assessment data indicates students in 100 and 200 Level Courses met (and exceeded) proposed achievement targets. Students in 300 Level Courses did not met proposed achievement targets.

Measure 2:   Syllabus Audit

Achievement
Target: 100% of Faculty will include Ramapo's Academic Integrity Policy in their Syllabus

Findings: Librarians randomly selected 20 of the 80 syllabi collected from faculty-requested information literacy sessions in fall 2011. Of the 20 selected, 95% of faculty include Ramapo's Academic Integrity Policy in their Syllabus.

	Yes	No	Totals
Ramapo's Academic Integrity Policy in their Syllabus	19 95%	1 5%	20 100%

Assessment data indicates achievement target was not met.

Actions: (Using for both measures) While most students are meeting expectations, librarians are considering dropping this as a library student learning outcome. While they believe is it a part of information literacy, it is an outcome that may be better handled by the Center for Reading and Writing as well as in discipline programmatic assessment.

Outcome 10: Uses appropriate documentation style and uses it consistently
Understands the difference between copyright infringement and plagiarism. (2010-2011)

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

Achievement
Target: 75% of students in 200 Level courses assessed will be able to pick out specific parts in a given citation

               85% of students in 300 Level courses assessed will be able to pick out specific parts in a given citation

Findings: When given a citation, 34% students in 200 level courses and 21% students in 300 level courses can correctly identify parts of the citation.

Outcome 10: Uses appropriate documentation style and uses it consistently	Students Correctly Identifying	Students Incorrectly Identifying	Totals
200 Level Courses	164 34%	315 66%	479 100%
300 Level Courses	102 21%	382 79%	484 100%

Assessment data indicates students in 200 and 300 level courses did not meet proposed achievement targets.

Measure 2:   Syllabus Audit

Achievement
Target: 100% of Faculty will include required/recommended documentation style in their
Syllabus

Findings: Librarians randomly selected 20 of the 80 syllabi collected from faculty-requested
                information literacy sessions in fall 2011. Of the 20 selected, 80% of faculty include
                required/recommended documentation style in their Syllabus.

	Yes	No	Totals
Required/recommended documentation style in their Syllabus	16 80%	4 20%	20 100%

Assessment data indicates achievement target was not met.

Actions: (Using for both measures) Librarians will drop this as a library student learning outcome.
                While they believe is it a part of information literacy, it is an outcome that is better handled
                by the Center for Reading and Writing as well as in discipline programmatic assessment.

Outcome 11: Uses appropriate documentation style for business (not reported – Management/Info Lit
program being reworked)
Uses appropriate documentation style for business (APA) and uses it consistently (Management) (2011-2012)