Information Literacy Institutional Assessment Report

2020 - 2021

Core Competency/Area	Information Literacy
Assessment Project Name	Information Literacy Assessment Report
Assessment Cycle Year	2020-2021
Person Submitting Report	Rebecca Romine
Date Report Submitted	06.04.2021

Overview

The University of Hawai'i - West O'ahu (UHWO) is committed to improving educational effectiveness through assessment projects that involve the work of faculty, staff, and students. Campus-wide assessment projects target WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) Core Competencies core competencies, and draw on the protocols, rubrics, and processes outlined by the AAC&U VALUE Institute and other like assessment organizations. Further, these projects take into account national standards and best practices not only for assessment, but also for evaluating how students meet WSCUC core competencies and what professional learning could support faculty and staff in strengthening their teaching praxes.

As a result of this commitment, UHWO has assessed and proposed recommendations for the teaching of Ethics in 2017-2018, Written Communication in 2018-2019, and Oral Communication in 2019-2020. These reports are available on our campus Assessment website. Rating and review of artifacts associated with Quantitative Reasoning, Information Literacy, and Critical Thinking are currently being completed (as of June 2021). **The present report shares key findings, individual course assessments, and recommendations for the teaching of Information Literacy in 2020-2021.**

Core Competency/NSSE Summary/Program Review

One of the WSCUC Core Competencies is Information Literacy. According to the WSCUC Criteria for Review (CFR) 2.2a, "undergraduate programs must ensure the development of core competencies including, but not limited to, written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, and critical thinking." CFR 2.2a also requires that an institution explain learning outcomes in relation to those core competencies and demonstrate the extent to which those outcomes are achieved.

At UHWO Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) directly flow from the WSCUC Core Competencies. Though UHWO doesn't have a specific ILO dedicated to information literacy only, ILO #1: Effective Communication aligns well with the Information Literacy core competency. ILO #1 is defined as **the ability to use relevant information to communicate clearly and effectively** to an intended audience through written and spoken language. More specifically, ILO#1 indicates that **effective written and oral communication typically requires information literacy to access valid source material**. Written communications may include (but are not limited to) narrative, descriptive, expository, and persuasive prose; developed in the context of essays, research papers, position papers, technical writing, reflections, creative writing, lesson plans or letters.

The American Library Association (ALA) has also set competency standards for information literacy within higher education and the rubric (Appendix A) used for this review was adapted from ALA's published rubric. Information literacy can best be described as the ability to recognize not only when information is needed but also how to locate, evaluate, and effectively use the needed information. Student success in regards to this competency is critical, as information literacy forms the basis for lifelong learning and is necessary within all disciplines at every level.

Each degree program at UH West O'ahu has its own Degree Learning Outcomes (DLOs) that align with the ILOs. Refer to the UHWO Assessment website for information regarding DLOs.

Information Literacy Student Learning Outcomes

In August 2015, the library staff developed new Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) based on the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.

Upon graduation from UHWO, students will be able to:

- (SLO-1) Compose a research question (or questions) in order to develop a viable search strategy.
- (SLO-2) Construct a search statement using topic-relevant vocabulary in order to find pertinent information with maximum flexibility.
- (SLO-3) Evaluate information in order to select the most appropriate sources for their research question.
- (SLO-4) Synthesize information from selected sources in order to make sound arguments based on careful analysis of information.
- (SLO-5) Apply discipline-specific citation styles in order to demonstrate ethical use of information.

Information Literacy Benchmarks

WSCUC requires an institution to set a specific level of performance expected at graduation. The UHWO librarians have set the benchmark for Information Literacy at:

- 75% of ENG 200 students will score a **2** (Developing) or better and 50% will score a **3** (Progressing) or better on each SLO for an average total score of 8 or better.
- 75% of Senior Capstone students will score a **3** (Progressing) or better on each SLO for an average total score of 12 or better.

Benchmarks for courses other than ENG 200 and Senior Capstone have yet to be established, and thus determination of student performance in these courses were based on the above benchmarks. In general, most divisions were below the information literacy benchmarks. Recommendations at the end of this report were provided to address this disparity.

Assessment Cycle

The recent departure of the Director of Assessment and budget restraints stemming from the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a temporary assessment procedure for the 2020-2021 Assessment Cycle. The UHWO Divisional Assessment Coordinator Committee was temporarily disbanded, and while an institutional report for Information Literacy has been completed, individual divisional assessment reports were not completed due to the lack of these divisional Assessment Coordinators. The institutional assessment reports for each division were completed through a coordinated effort with the DCs, volunteer faculty, the OVCAA and UHWO's IRO. The Division Chairs (DC) thus worked with volunteer faculty to complete the steps of assessment cycle, including identifying courses within the Division's curriculum maps that offer an Introductory (I) to Reinforcement (R) to Mastery (M) opportunity for students related to the Information Literacy competency. While the DCs and volunteer faculty members coordinated

the identification of courses, artifact collection, and artifact submission, the responsibility of reviewing and rating the artifacts fell to a small group of UHWO Library faculty and staff (see below). A rubric (Appendix A) adapted from the ALA Information Literacy rubric was used and artifacts were rated within a 4-week time period. The 2020-2021 Information Literacy Assessment report will be the first produced to include disaggregated data, as previously recommended by WSCUC.

To summarize the assessment cycle for 2020-2021, Table 1 below provides dates (left column), activities (middle column), and 1-2 sentence descriptions (right column). The DCs, volunteer faculty that assisted with assessment and the UHWO Library Faculty that completed the artifact review are listed after Table 1.

Table 1: 2020-2021 Assessment Cycle

Date(s)	Activities	Description
December 2020	Assessment Plan	Assessment team outlined procedures for collecting examples of direct evidence (artifacts representing student work) and communicated the procedures to Division Chairs. Divisions were asked to identify courses from the curriculum map that Introduce (I), Reinforce (R), and Master (M) Information Literacy. Once the courses were identified, a minimum of 30% of the courses at each curriculum level were randomly selected to be utilized for assessment purposes/student artifact collection.

Date(s)	Activities	Description
January - March 2021	Collection of Artifacts	Division chairs tasked volunteer assessment representatives to submit student artifacts and key course information via a Google Form designed by UHWO IRO. Some divisions also submitted student artifacts via a shared google drive previously created by the former Assessment Director. Artifacts submitted via the Google Form were not graded nor coded/deidentified when submitted to the Assessment Team. Student artifacts included research papers, narrative papers, senior project papers, and lab reports.
April 2021	Artifact Review and Rating	Five UHWO Library Faculty and Staff rated the IL artifacts using an adapted ALA rubric Each rater was assigned ~15 artifacts to review Rating was completed on May 2 and submitted via a pre-formatted excel sheet
May – June 2021	Data Analysis	Data was disaggregated by course, and student gender, ethnicity, etc
July 2021	Assessment Report Draft 1 Generated	Results shared with UHWO Library Faculty and Staff and UHWO Divisions with individual reports A general report shared with the public via UHWO Assessment website
	Final Assessment Report and Findings Distributed	

2020-2021 Division Chairs and Volunteer Assessment Faculty and Staff

- MNHS:

- o Michael Furuto, DC
- o Olivia George
- SSCI
  - o Louis Herman, DC
  - o Mark Hopper
- PUBA
  - o Kristina Lu, DC
  - o Lisa Spencer
- HUM
  - o Jon Magnussen, DC
  - o Lisa Rosenlee
- EDUC
  - o Mary Heller, DC
  - o Jonathan Schwartz
- BUSA
  - o Matt Chapman, DC
  - o Leslie Rush
  - o Marnelli Ulep
- CM
  - o Sharla Hanaoka, DC
- Interim UHWO Assessment Coordinator
  - o Rebecca Romine

Information Literacy Assessment Artifact Raters and Rating Process

Five UHWO Librarians were responsible for reviewing student artifacts for the Information Literacy assessment:

- Carina Chernisky
- Kawena Komeiji
- Maria Lencinas
- Alphie Garcia
- Michiko Joseph

All artifacts were randomly assigned to five individual raters (UHWO Librarians). The librarians met to discuss the timeline and calibrate scoring. As part of calibration, each rater scored the same three artifacts (the first three assigned to Rater 1) and then compared scores. All scores

were either the same or 1 point different. At that point each librarian completed their scoring by May 2.

Key Findings

Overall average rating for Information Literacy was 2.2075 (see Table 1a). Due to low sample size associated with the disaggregated data points, the ability to provide meaningful interpretation of the data was limited. Additional data is needed for more robust analysis and will be done in future assessment.   Detailed tables providing analysis and results related to disaggregated data are available on UHWO's Assessment Website. Additionally, first-generation and Pell students scored lower on information use outcomes than their peers.

An initial review of the results was completed, despite the low sample size, and analysis suggests that UHWO students at both the Introduce and Mastery levels are below benchmark expectations for application of discipline specific citation styles, scoring an average of 1.73 and 2.22, respectively.

Table 1a. Information Literacy Average Ratings

	Access and Use information Ethically and Legally	Apply discipline-specific citation styles in order to demonstrate ethical use of information.	Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	Avg
Total:	2.21	1.95	2.24	2.43	2.21

A key gap in Information Literacy assessment became apparent during this review: Information Literacy assessment has been focussed on courses that are identified as I and M only. No doubt there are courses offered by UHWO that fit at the R curriculum level for Information Literacy, those courses are not clearly defined nor are there currently existing benchmarks for such courses and associated submitted artifacts. This issue is exacerbated by the fact that UHWO does not have an independent ILO or GELO that specifically addresses Information Literacy. **Revising current ILO**s to better align with the WSCUC core competencies in this regard and providing **clearly scaffolded courses as evidenced by an updated curriculum map** for this core competency are the primary of the recommendations. Additionally, development of standardized

training for both students and faculty related to Information Literacy may help sustain a high level of demonstrated student proficiency across the degree program.

Individual Course Assessments

Assessment reports for each respective division were not submitted as the assessment coordinator positions were temporarily put on hold. For the purposes of this assessment, a single, institutional assessment report for Information Literacy was submitted.

Please refer to the UHWO assessment website for detailed tables and dashboards highlighting disaggregated information mentioned in this report.

Business Administration

The majority of artifacts (n=54) reviewed for the information literacy competency were submitted by Business Administration. Student artifacts from five different BUSA courses and several sections of the BUSA senior practicum/project courses were submitted for review. Courses ranged from 300-level to 400-level, but included courses at each curriculum level (I, R, and M). Thus, the information literacy assessment for BUSA gave a representative snapshot of demonstrated student learning across the program. As expected, students at the introductory curriculum level were rated the lowest overall, with an average 1.8 rating compared to 2.3 for students at both the reinforce and mastery level. Artifact rating revealed that, at the introductory curriculum level, "using information effectively" was students' strongest area of competency with an average rating of 2.1. Students at the mastery curriculum level also were rated highest in this same category, with an average rating of 2.8. "Applying discipline specific citation styles" was the most in need of improvement for all three curriculum levels with a range of 1.5-2.1. Only 14% of students from the Senior Capstone (practicum or project) were rated at an average of 3 or better, well below the UHWO benchmark of "75% of Senior Capstone students will score a 3 (Progressing) or better". Please refer to the rubric in Appendix A for further clarification of these ratings, and refer to our assessment site for a detailed dashboard illustrating the disaggregated date for this division.

Creative Media

Creative Media did not submit artifacts for review for the Information Literacy core competency assessment. Given the nature of Creative Media, few courses, including the Senior Capstone, required assignments that aligned with the information literacy rubric.

Education

Artifacts submitted by the Education division were de-identified and unable for use for this assessment report. Detailed aggregated results for EDUC Information Literacy will be available on the UHWO Assessment website.

Humanities

Artifacts submitted by the Humanities division were de-identified and unable for use for this assessment report. Detailed aggregated results for HUM Information Literacy will be available on the UHWO Assessment website.

Math, Natural, and Health Sciences

The recently established Math, Natural, and Health Sciences (MNHS) Division has steadily been increasing the number of courses offered. However, the majority of students within the division's courses are lower level and MNHS specific courses that address information literacy (ie. Capstones) are limited in offering. Thus, a total of 6 artifacts were collected and appropriate for disaggregated use, two in Biology and four in Mathematics. Though the sample size was small, on average students in Biology (2.50) and Mathematics (2.88) scored higher than their peers, and demonstrated increased proficiency in "critical evaluation" and "effective use of discipline specific sources". Please refer to the rubric in Appendix A for further clarification of these ratings, and refer to our assessment site for a detailed dashboard illustrating the disaggregated date for this division.

Public Administration

Artifacts gathered across the I, R, and M curriculum levels for PUBA were de-identified and thus not appropriate for this assessment review. Detailed aggregated results for PUBA Information Literacy will be available on the UHWO Assessment website.

Social Sciences

Social Sciences did not submit artifacts for review for the Information Literacy core competency assessment.

Table 2a. Information Literacy Average Ratings by Subject

	Head count	Access and Use information Ethically and Legally	Apply discipline-specific citation styles in order to demonstrate ethical use of information.	Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	Average
BIOL	2	2.50	1.50	3.00	3.00	2.50
BUSA	54	2.04	1.87	2.06	2.33	2.08
ENG	15	2.73	2.00	2.60	2.53	2.47
MATH	4	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00	2.88
Grand Total/Average	75	2.21	1.95	2.24	2.43	

Table 2b. Information Literacy Average Ratings by Subject and Course Number

	Headcount	Access and Use information Ethically and Legally	Apply discipline-specific citation styles in order to demonstrate ethical use of information.	Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose
BIOL	2	2.50	1.50	3.00	3.00
172L	2	2.50	1.50	3.00	3.00
BUSA	54	2.04	1.87	2.06	2.33
345	30	1.87	1.73	1.93	2.13
435	10	2.10	2.00	2.10	2.30
486(A-M)	6	2.33	1.50	2.33	2.67
490(A-M)	8	2.38	2.50	2.25	2.88
ENG	15	2.73	2.00	2.60	2.53
100	11	2.27	1.73	2.36	2.27
491	4	4.00	2.75	3.25	3.25
MATH	4	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00

	Headcount	Access and Use information Ethically and Legally	Apply discipline-specific citation styles in order to demonstrate ethical use of information.	Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose
304	4	2.50	3.00	3.00	3.00
Grand Total/Average	75	2.21	1.95	2.24	2.43

Recommendations

- Revise benchmarks for Information Literacy for each curriculum level to the following:
  - Introducing: 75% of ENG 100T/100/200 students will score a 2 (Developing) or better for a total score of 8 or better.
  - Reinforcing: 50% of [mid-level courses that require ENG 100 or ENG 200 as a minimum course requirement] students will score a 3 (Proficient) or better on each SLO for a total score of 12 or better.
  - Mastering: 75% of Senior Capstone students will score a 3 (Proficient) or better on each SLO for a total score of 12 or better.
- Scaffold information literacy more effectively across the degree program by selecting specific courses within each concentration to fulfill an introductory, reinforce, and mastery curriculum level experience.
  - Recommend or require an Information Literacy session for all ENG 100 and ENG 200 courses
  - Require all WI courses include Information Literacy session
  - Include Information Literacy session/information in all courses provided with a Oral Communication (OC) designation
- Establish a set course matrix of courses from each division that will be used each semester/year for Information Literacy Assessment.
- Develop a curriculum map for all courses utilized for Information Literacy Assessment.

- Revise Senior Capstone Faculty instructions to
    - include standardized wording for submission of artifacts at the end of each semester for review by Library Faculty and Staff.
    - Include one session with a librarian
- Update Assessment Manual to include distinct procedures for Information Literacy Assessment outside of the proposed multi-year institutional assessment process.
- Create an Information Literacy ILO or GLO at UHWO

Appendix A

UH West O'ahu Information Literacy Rubric

Definition

The ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand. - Adopted from the National Forum on Information Literacy

	Highly Proficient 4	Proficient 3	Developing 2	Benchmark 1	Fails to Meet Basic Level Performance 0
Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically	Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering the importance (to the researched topic) of the multiple criteria used (such as relevance to the research question, currency, authority, audience, and bias or point of view).	Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources using multiple criteria (such as relevance to the research question, currency, and authority).	Chooses a variety of information sources. Selects sources using basic criteria (such as relevance to the research question and currency).	Chooses a few information sources. Selects sources using limited criteria (such as relevance to the research question).	

	Highly Proficient 4	Proficient 3	Developing 2	Benchmark 1	Fails to Meet Basic Level Performance 0
Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose	Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth	Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved.	Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved.	Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved.	

	Highly Proficient 4	Proficient 3	Developing 2	Benchmark 1	Fails to Meet Basic Level Performance 0
Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally	Students use correctly all of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly three of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly two of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	Students use correctly one of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.	