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Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) Information Literacy Committee webinar on:

Information Literacy & First Year Students: Programmatic Instructional Approaches & Assessment

Wednesday, Dec. 9, 2015 from 10:00am – 11:15am
Webinar overview: How librarians engage with first year seminar and learning community courses is as varied as the institutions that we have represented in this webinar. Learn how both larger and smaller institutions are addressing information literacy in these courses and assessing IL learning. Speakers for the webinar include:

**Sara Lowe**, Educational Development Librarian at IUPUI University Library, & **Sean Stone**, Librarian with the Indiana University School of Dentistry – Sara and Sean will share their FYS programmatic assessment work at their former institution, Claremont Colleges.

**Catherine Pellegrino**, Reference & Instruction Librarian at Saint Mary’s College, will discuss starting a new FYS program with an information literacy learning outcome.

**Bill Orme**, Associate Dean for Educational Services, IUPUI University Library, will discuss moving the information literacy component of a first year learning community (IUPUI’s University College, U110) to five, online learning modules.

**Sally Neal**, Associate Dean for Instruction & User Services, Butler University, will review co-assessing student FYS research papers with FYS faculty.
Impact of Information Literacy (IL) Instruction on First-Year Seminars

Sara Lowe & Sean Stone
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Assessment in Action (2013-14)

CLAREMONT TEAM:

• Sara Lowe
• Sean Stone
• Char Booth
• Alex Chappell
• Gale Burrow
• Natalie Tagge
The Claremont Colleges

The Library
“What impact (if any) does librarian intervention in first-year courses have on IL performance in student work?”
Methodology

520 First-Year Papers
5 Colleges
1 Information Literacy Rubric
4 Levels of Librarian Course Collaboration
Levels of Collaboration

1. None = no faculty collaboration with librarian
2. Low = traditional one-shot, little to no syllabus or assignment collaboration
3. Moderate = one or more sessions, moderate syllabus/assignment collaboration
4. High = multiple sessions, online tutorial & quiz, significant syllabus/assignment collaboration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Level of Achievement</th>
<th>Developed</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Initial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attribution</strong></td>
<td>Highly Developed 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows a sophisticated level of understanding for when and how to give attribution.</td>
<td>Attribution indicates understanding of the rationale for and various mechanisms of citation.</td>
<td>Missteps in attribution interfere with the argument or point to fundamental misunderstandings.</td>
<td>Use of evidence and citation is poor, making it difficult to evaluate the argument or sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Documents sources consistently and completely</td>
<td>- Documents sources throughout with occasional errors or inconsistencies.</td>
<td>- Frequently documents sources incorrectly or leaves out some citations.</td>
<td>- Displays fundamental and consistent errors in source documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uses in-text citation and notes correctly and consistently</td>
<td>- Uses in-text citation and notes with occasional errors or inconsistencies.</td>
<td>- Frequent errors and inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes</td>
<td>- Does not include or contains significant inconsistencies with in-text citation and notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cites non-textual sources consistently</td>
<td>- Cites non-textual sources with relative consistency</td>
<td>- Does not consistently cite non-textual sources</td>
<td>- Does not name, title, or cite non-textual sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely</td>
<td>- Usually names and labels figures and/or graphs clearly and completely.</td>
<td>- Names and labels figures and/or graphs inconsistently.</td>
<td>- Does not name or label figures and/or graphs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Sources</strong></td>
<td>Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.</td>
<td>Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.</td>
<td>Source materials used are inadequate.</td>
<td>Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrates sophisticated awareness of universe of literature and community of scholarship</td>
<td>- Explores supporting sources and community of scholarship but might overlook important avenues</td>
<td>- Exhibits weak awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s)</td>
<td>- No evidence of awareness of universe of literature or other sources that could strengthen claim(s) or argument(s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uses a variety of appropriate and authoritative sources</td>
<td>- Sources are used support claim(s) but may not be the most authoritative source</td>
<td>- Relies on too few or largely inappropriate sources</td>
<td>- When included, sources are too few or badly inappropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Always distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td>- Usually distinguishes between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td>- Does not consistently distinguish between types of sources (e.g., primary v. secondary, scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td>- No distinction between types of sources (e.g., scholarly v. popular, fact v. opinion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Demonstrates a thorough critical exploration and knowledge of evidence, theories, and sources selected</td>
<td>- Demonstrates a preliminary critical exploration and knowledge of evidence, theories, and sources selected</td>
<td>- Clearly selected sources out of convenience</td>
<td>- Does not explore outside sources or present evidence when called for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication of Evidence</strong></td>
<td>Evidence is integrated and synthesized expertly to support claims.</td>
<td>Proficient synthesis and integration of evidence.</td>
<td>Weak attempts at synthesis or integration.</td>
<td>No evidence of attempt at synthesis or integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consistently presents evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)</td>
<td>- Generally employs evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)</td>
<td>- Sporadically uses evidence to support claim(s) or argument(s)</td>
<td>- Claim(s) or argument(s) lack necessary evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Synthesizes and contextualizes evidence appropriately for audience</td>
<td>- May present some evidence without context</td>
<td>- Fails to put sources into context (e.g. “The World Banks says...”)</td>
<td>- Fails to contextualize quotes and evidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Uses evidence instrumentally towards rhetorical goals</td>
<td>- Frequently demonstrates using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals</td>
<td>- Usually does not demonstrate using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals</td>
<td>- No demonstration of using evidence instrumentally toward rhetorical goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is consistently clear</td>
<td>- Distinction between own ideas and ideas of others is usually clear</td>
<td>- Consistently blurs distinction between own ideas and ideas of others</td>
<td>- No distinction between own ideas and ideas of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identifies gaps in the literature and contributes creatively and/or significantly to a scholarly conversation</td>
<td>- Begins to identify gaps in the literature or contribute to a scholarly conversation</td>
<td>- Does not identify gaps in the literature or contribute to a scholarly conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric content adapted for the Claremont Colleges by Char Booth, Sara Lowe, Natalie Tagge, and Sean Stone from an instrument originally developed at Carleton College.


This rubric version (2013/14) was revised Summer-Fall of 2013 and finalized September 2013.
A:

Information Literacy Areas Evaluated by Rubric

- **Attribution**: 2.13 (Low) vs. 2.61 (High)
- **Evaluation**: 2.38 (Low) vs. 2.89 (High)
- **Communication**: 2.35 (Low) vs. 2.82 (High)

Legend:
- Blue: Low Librarian Collaboration (Level 2)
- Blue with Diagonal Stripes: High Librarian Collaboration (Levels 3-4)
Assessment in Action – Claremont Colleges Library/SC Information Literacy Rubric Evaluation Project Summary

August 2014

Sara Lowe (Assessment Librarian); Char Booth (Director of Research, Teaching, and Learning Services); Natalie Tago (Social Science Team Leader & Librarian); Sean Stone (STEM Team Leader & Asian Studies Librarian); Alex Chappell (A&H Team Leader & Librarian); & Gale Burrow (Head of Outreach and Public Services, Special Collections and Libraries) – Claremont Colleges Library

Executive Summary

Assessing 2014-15 first-year students’ Information Literacy (IL) skills in their final papers (n=520) from all five undergraduate Claremont Colleges, we sought to answer the question: “What impact (if any) does librarian intervention in first-year courses have on information literacy performance in student work?” Results indicate that students in courses with more strategic and intentional faculty-librarian collaborations have better (statistically significantly better) IL skills than those in course with low collaboration. (Figure 1.) In the classroom, faculty are actively building students’ IL skills. Librarians are expert educators on IL. Through librarian-faculty collaboration both in class and also behind the scenes via faculty development and syllabus/assignment design, faculty and librarians can provide strategic, systematic instruction to produce information literate graduates.

Librarians at the Claremont Colleges have had a long history of collaboration with faculty and students in first-year seminar courses, providing instruction and research support to sharpen essential student “information literacy” (IL) skills such as evaluation of source materials and attribution of evidence. In order to assess the five undergraduate Claremont Colleges (SCs) first-year students’ IL “Habits of Mind” as well as the impact of these library instruction and librarian assignment design collaborations on IL skill performance, the authors worked with first-year seminar coordinators and campus assessment officers to collect papers with corresponding assignment prompts produced by 5C students in first-year seminar courses in Fall 2013 and Spring 2014. Student names and course information were redacted and librarians conducted rubric-based evaluation of IL performance as exhibited in the papers (n=520). (See figure 2 for the number of papers evaluated from each college.)

Methods

This project used the IL in Student Work Rubric to evaluate the 5C first-year seminar student paper sample (Appendix A). This CCL-developed rubric assesses three of five IL “Habits of Mind” (HOMs) in authentic student writing and other work: “Attribution,” “Evaluation of Sources,” and “Communication of Evidence.” The rubric is an easily used evaluation instrument within the 7Cs that has been adopted for accreditation-level student assessment by several of the Colleges.2 It features four evaluation levels – 1-initial, 2-emerging, 3-developed, and 4-highly developed, and is designed to facilitate assessment of IL within any type of student output, regardless of discipline, format, or enrollment status.

Prior to grading, librarian interrater pairs conducted a norming session to calibrate the implementation of the rubric, a practice common to all CCL rubric evaluation efforts. Each pair read two identical sample papers and scored them separately using the common rubric; they then met to discuss scores and come to a consensus on interpreting and applying rubric criteria consistently. Following the norming exercise, each team subsequently scored approximately 30 first-year papers in the post-norming evaluation period. In total, n=520 papers were read and evaluated.

Purpose

During the 2013-14 academic year, each of the 5C first-year seminar programs (Freshman Humanities Seminars (FHS) at Claremont McKenna, HSA 10 at Harvey Mudd, First Year Seminar (FYS) at Pitzer, ID1 at Pomona, and Scripps 50 at Scripps) participated as part of the Association of College and Research Libraries’ (ACRL) Assessment in Action program. The Claremont Colleges Library was one of 75 libraries selected to join the first round of this national assessment initiative, which was funded by a $249,330 National Leadership Demonstration Grant by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS). Over the course of this 14-month long project, the CCL project team sought to answer the question, “What impact (if any) does librarian intervention in first-year courses have on information literacy performance in student work?”

Figure 1 – Overall Scores by Collaboration Level

Number of Papers by College

Figure 2 – Number of papers evaluated by college

1 CCL defines IL as “the ability to use critical thinking to create meaningful knowledge from information. The information literacy Claremont Colleges student engages in a process of inquiry in order to frame intellectual challenges and identify research needs, strategically assesses and evaluates information, communicates information effectively, provides clear attribution of sources, and develops insight into the social, legal, economic, and ethical aspects of information creation, use, access, and durability.” IL Habits of Mind are emphasized in this definition.

2 To date, the CCL IL Rubric has been officially integrated into IL assessment by Claremont McKenna College and the Keck Graduate Institute. Numerous academic departments and writing programs in the other Claremont Colleges (Keck Science, Claremont Graduate Institute, Pitzer College, Scripps College, and Pomona College) have adopted the IL Rubric for assessment and pedagogical purposes since its creation in 2011 and revision in 2012-13 and 2013-14.
Librarians Matter

Q: What impact does librarian intervention in first-year courses have on Information Literacy performance in student work?

520 First-year papers, Fall 2013 and Spring 2014

5 Colleges: Claremont McKenna, Harvey Mudd, Pitzer, Pomona, Scripps

1 Information Literacy Rubric

4 Levels of Librarian Course Collaboration (Low to High)

A: Student performance is statistically significantly better in courses with high librarian collaboration.

FMI: http://libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/AiA
Resources

Project and data: libguides.libraries.claremont.edu/AiA

Claremont Colleges Library IL program documents: libraries.claremont.edu/informationliteracy/

Pilot Study Results:

Full 5-College Results:
Contact Information

Sara Lowe
Education Development Librarian, University Library, IUPUI
mlowe@iupui.edu

Sean Stone
Dentistry Librarian, Indiana University School of Dentistry Library, IUPUI
smstone@iupui.edu
Catherine Pellegrino,
Reference Librarian / Instruction Coordinator
cpellegr@saintmarys.edu

For more information than you could possibly want about our Gen Ed program:

https://www.saintmarys.edu/files/CG4.pdf

(see pp. 30-33 on the Information Literacy outcome and the Critical Thinking Seminar)
Transitioning a FYS Course from Face-to-Face to Modular Delivery

Prepared for Academic Libraries of Indiana
9 December 2015
Bill Orme, Associate Dean for Educational Services, IUPUI
University Library
U110: First-Year Seminar

- “Entering students are required to enroll in a first-year seminar to facilitate their successful transition to college.”*

- “First-year seminars are taught by an instructional team that is anchored by a faculty member and includes an academic advisor, a librarian, and a student mentor.”*

- 6 ‘foundational goals’, the first of which is “Provides students with an introduction to the purposes and values of higher education.”*

---

* IUPUI University College. *A Template for First-Year Seminars at IUPUI.* Indianapolis: Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, University College. 2010, Print.
History of the First-Year Seminar at IUPUI

- 1996: 23 sections/2 academic units (Science SCI120/Liberal Arts S100)
- 2014: 143 sections/12 academic units
- “Variation among individual first-year seminars is expected and encouraged. Content and format are tailored to fit the specific requirements or constraints of the units, schools, or departments that offer them.”
- 2014: 53 University College sections (U110 First-Year Seminar)
  - 13 Thematic Learning Community sections
  - 13 Summer Bridge sections
  - 31 ‘stand-alone’ sections divided among librarian liaisons, in addition to FYS and other courses offered by liaisons’ academic schools or departments
  - 62% of all library instructional sessions were with first-year students, including FYS and Gateway courses
The Argument for a Modular Solution

- Modules relieve personnel pressures brought on by growth of program
- Modules provide consistent content over multiple course sections
- Uniform assessments over multiple course sections
- Content overhaul focuses on introduction to college environment, rather than plunging students into research project (which occurs in Gateway courses)
- Many students academically unprepared to conduct research at a college level
  - ‘Topic’ choices
  - Source selection
  - Search strategies
- Series of short, sequenced modules more ‘digestible’ for students
A New Approach to Content

- Draft of Information Literacy Framework released during module development timeline
  - Focus on ‘foundational ideas’ resonates with U110 course goals
  - Emphasis on ‘dispositions’ (affective outcomes) resonates with U110 course goals
  - ‘Interconnected core concepts’ in IL Frames provide opportunity for discussion of concepts independently from research assignment in a coherent narrative
A New Approach to Content

- Lack of research assignment points to use of illustrations/exemplars
  - Comparison of NYT report on scholarly studies with published studies
  - ‘Anatomy’ of a scholarly article and the function of various sections
  - Access to scholarly publication dependent on institutional affiliation
    - Library database subscriptions (‘pre-paid access’)/Location of appropriate website links
    - Necessity for login/VPN download
  - Examples showing conflicting study results point toward need for resolution/further research
  - Introduction of specific searches in specific library resources (2 multidisciplinary databases and library catalog) provides low-stakes entrée into use of academic resources
A New Approach to Assessment

- Each module has its own assessment
- Each assessment designed to fit appropriate learning domain (affective/cognitive)
  - affective issues addressed through reflective papers
  - cognitive issues addressed through quizzes or authentic tasks
    - database searches/library catalog searches
Technology Issues

- Camtasia recommended by campus Center for Teaching & Learning
  - Robust capabilities
  - Compatible with campus course management system
  - Accommodates variety of assessment measures
  - Accommodates closed captioning
- Production facilities were rudimentary
- Modules housed on University College server/website
  - Modules placed on University College ‘faculty resources’ site
    - Faculty look to UC website for curricular resources
    - Housing modules on library website would invite confusion of location/purpose
From Concept to Reality

- Conversation with University College administration
- Concept and rationale presented to University College Curriculum Committee
- First drafts written
- Faculty focus group solicitation, emphasizing content
- Student focus group solicitation, emphasizing content and vocabulary
- Final drafts written
- First-version modules produced
- Second version modules produced; shared with University College administration
- Announcement of module availability shared with University College faculty
The Modules and Their Assessments:
Module 1

- The Purpose and Structure of Higher Education (5 minutes, 54 seconds)
  - This tutorial suggests that the purpose of higher education is “to advance human understanding”. It differentiates between three institutions of higher education - community college, college, and university and discusses how each helps meet this mission in a different way.
  - Students are assigned a short reflective essay concerning the purpose of higher education and their reason for deciding to further their education.
The Modules and Their Assessments: Module 2

- Tenure, Scholarly Communication, and Peer Review (6 minutes, 52 seconds)
  - This tutorial shares information about the people who help realize the mission of higher education. Teaching, service, and research functions of academic employees are discussed. The concepts of tenure and peer review are explained as they relate to carrying out the research mission. Methods of scholarly communication, including personal contact, conference presentation, and scholarly publication are introduced.

- Students are assigned a short quiz covering basic concepts in the tutorial.
The Modules and Their Assessments: Module 3

- Scholarly Communication and the Scholarly Article (8 minutes, 59 seconds)
  - This tutorial examines how two separate studies are reported in a national newspaper and by researchers in scholarly publications. The various parts of a scholarly article are described along with the function each serves. The role of the university library in providing access to scholarly communication is introduced.

- Students are assigned a short quiz covering basic concepts in the tutorial.
The Modules and Their Assessments: Module 4

- Retrieving Scholarly Articles/The Conversation of Scholarship (6 minutes, 25 seconds)
  - This tutorial introduces students to the IUPUI University Library website and illustrates how to conduct a search in a multidisciplinary database, ProQuest Central. The concept of ‘filtering’ results for full-text and peer-reviewed journals is illustrated. Google Scholar is also introduced and results from a Google Scholar search are examined to reveal the ‘back and forth’ conversation that is at the heart of scholarly communication.

- Students are assigned a short reflective essay on the concept of scholarly conversation, as revealed in the tutorial, and how it compares with familiar ways of seeing information reported.
The Modules and Their Assessments: 
Module 5

- Introduction to Library Databases (4 minutes, 8 seconds)
  - This final tutorial focuses on Academic Search Premier and IUCAT. Academic Search Premier is shown as a database similar in intent to ProQuest Central and a sample search and its results are shown. Students are shown IUCAT and how to conduct a search for materials in the IUPUI University Library collections. The library’s interlibrary loan service is also introduced.

- Students are given the opportunity to complete a short ungraded exercise using a predetermined search in IUCAT. Students have access to the answer key to the exercise so they can know when they have successfully completed the search.

- Students are then given a graded assignment, similar in format to the ungraded exercise, also using a predetermined search in IUCAT.
A Brief Sample . . .
Next Steps . . .

- Analysis of assessment results
- Discuss experience with sample of students
- Survey of faculty
  - Used/Did not use
  - Satisfaction level
  - Thoughts on assessment results
  - Impressions of student reaction to modules
  - Recommended revisions
- Examination of potential of module approach in other FYS courses
- Experimentation with new production facility
- Produce version 2.0 for use in Fall 2016
Questions???
FYS Research Skills Assessment

Sally Neal
Associate Dean for Instruction & User Services
First-Year Seminar

- Core Curriculum
- Year-long seminar
  - 3 LOs
  - “Students will carry out research for the purpose of supplying evidence and support for claims made in exposition and argument.”
  - Traditional one classroom instruction
Assessfest!

• Annual Core Curriculum assessment
• First-Year Seminar
  – 2012-13 & 2013-14 – Research LO
  – Partnered: FYS Coordinator, Assessment Director, Assoc. Provost, English Faculty Advocate
  – Rubric
  – 1 librarian / 1 fys faculty assess each paper independently
# Assess-fest

**FYS Research Assessment Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Needs Substantial Improvement</th>
<th>2 Emerging</th>
<th>3 Proficient/Meets Requirements</th>
<th>4 Distinguished/Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACRL Info. Lit. #3 &amp; #4 (evaluates &amp; incorporates into one’s knowledge base selected information)</strong></td>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>Sources inconsistent with topic or essay needs; may be outdated or have questionable credibility, obvious bias, or other issues.</td>
<td>Sources fit topic or essay needs, but may not be current, or may not be as authoritative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation – use of sources to support argument</strong></td>
<td>Sources used only because the assignment requires them, purposes unclear.</td>
<td>Applies information from sources, but the purpose is unclear or unrelated to the assignment (arbitrary source usage, over-use of single source).</td>
<td>Applies information from sources to accomplish a purpose (support an argument, demonstrate divergent view, etc.) but is not consistent with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACRL Info. Lit. #4 (uses information effectively to accomplish purpose)</strong></td>
<td>Integration – how sources are incorporated to support points.</td>
<td>Sources dominate the presentation to the point of overwhelming the author’s own words. Quotations are obtrusive and are handled ineptly.</td>
<td>Sources integrated effectively, but may be dominated by attribution. Quoted material’s presence becomes a bit more obvious, and may be handled unevenly in terms of introducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACRL Info. Lit. #6 (uses information ethically)</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>Quotations or commenting upon them.</td>
<td>Commentary on the quotations may be inconsistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation is sloppy, formal guidelines are ignored.</td>
<td>Documentation guidelines observed, but not always consistently adhered to.</td>
<td>Formal guidelines are observed and followed in a nearly flawless fashion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First Year Seminar

Assessed Student Learning Outcome(s):
Carry out research for the purpose of supplying evidence as support for claims made in exposition and argument.

Rubric Scores by Category - Spring 2014

In May 2014, five pairs of FYS evaluators examined 198 Spring 2014 student learning artifacts (nearly 40 artifacts per group). Each evaluator independently scored their group’s artifacts generating two scores per artifact – 396 in total.

The assessment rubric used by evaluators had the following four categories:
  - Appropriateness of Sources
  - Implementation – Use of sources to support argument
  - Integration – How sources are incorporated to support points.
  - Documentation

The assessment rubric also had a four-point scale ranging from needs substantial improvement (1) to distinguished/advanced (4). If the evaluator determined the artifact could not be used to evaluate the student learning outcome, s/he marked it as not applicable (NA). Note: all NA scores were excluded from the calculated averages.

The overall average of scored artifacts for each rubric category were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of Sources</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following charts highlight the underlying frequency and percent distributions of these overall averages.
## AssessFest: FYS Research Component, Years 2013 & 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rubric Scores</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of Sources</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation - Use of sources to support argument</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration - How sources were incorporated to support points</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Inter-rated Reliability - [this was calculated differently between the 2 years]*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness of Sources</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation - Use of sources to support argument</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration - How sources were incorporated to support points</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documentation</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For 2013: All ten FYS faculty and librarians evaluated the same four assignments, although they were not aware of this. The percentages above indicate how many evaluators scored the same or within one score of each other.

*For 2014: OIRA calculated the score differential for each pair of evaluators for each artifact. For each category, the percent of paired scores within 1 point are listed above.
Why the difference?

- Different assessors
  - librarians & faculty
- Assignment Requirements
  - Included in 2013, not in 2014
- Norming work
- Inter-reliability was assessed differently
  - Staffing changes in Office of Institutional Research
- Leadership changes: FYS coordinator / Assoc. Provost
Questions
Academic Libraries of Indiana (ALI) Information Literacy Committee

Thank you for your attendance!

Sally Neal
Chair, ALI Information Literacy Committee