

2014

Purposeful and Repeated Use of Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy: A Case Study at a U.S. Private Liberal-Arts University

Carolyn J. Radcliff

Chapman University, cradclif@chapman.edu

Kevin Ross

Chapman University, kross@chapman.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/library_presentations



Part of the [Information Literacy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Radcliff, Carolyn J. and Ross, Kevin, "Purposeful and Repeated Use of Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy: A Case Study at a U.S. Private Liberal-Arts University" (2014). *Library Presentations, Posters, and Videos*. Paper 6.
http://digitalcommons.chapman.edu/library_presentations/6

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Leatherby Libraries at Chapman University Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Presentations, Posters, and Videos by an authorized administrator of Chapman University Digital Commons. For more information, please contact laughtin@chapman.edu.

Purposeful and Repeated Use of Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy: A Case Study at a U.S. Private Liberal-Arts University

Comments

This presentation was given at the Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries conference, which attracts a large multi-national audience of librarians and researchers. The 2014 conference was held in Istanbul, Turkey.

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)



Purposeful and Repeated Use of Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy:

A Case Study at a U.S.
Private Liberal-Arts
University



Carolyn Radcliff, Chair of Public Services
Kevin Ross, Associate Dean

Leatherby Libraries
Chapman University
Orange, California, U.S.A.



The University

- Medium-sized, private, liberal arts university in Orange, California
- Offers undergraduate, graduate, doctoral, and professional degrees in a wide array of disciplines
- Student FTE: 5,446 (undergrad); 1,365 (graduate)
- Faculty FTE: 392



Information Literacy at Chapman

- Student learning outcomes at all levels (curriculum map)
- Based on national standards
- Freshman Foundations Course instruction
- Course-integrated instruction

Information Literacy Curriculum Map

| | Freshmen | Undergraduate | Graduate |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------|----------|
| Differentiate between popular and scholarly periodicals | I | R, M | R, M |
| Differentiate among potential sources for information (e.g., primary and secondary, peer-reviewed, conference proceedings) | | I, R | R, M |
| Construct basic search strategies (e.g., author, title, keyword, subject) using a multidisciplinary database. | I | R, M | R, M |
| Construct advanced search strategies (e.g., truncation, nesting, Boolean operators) using subject specific databases. | | I, R | R, M |
| Retrieve print and online information from Leatherby Libraries resources (e.g., catalog, journal finder, subscription databases). | I | R, M | R, M |
| Retrieve print and online information from other resources. | | I, R | R, M |
| Evaluate the information using criteria such as authority and timeliness. | I | R, M | R, M |
| Evaluate the source using criteria such as bias and accuracy. | | I, R | R, M |
| Recognize when to cite sources to avoid plagiarism. | | I, R | R, M |
| Recognize the elements of citations in order to retrieve or cite sources using an appropriate style (e.g., APA). | I | R, M | R, M |



Assessing Information Literacy

- Formative
 - Needs assessment
 - Faculty evaluations
 - Student evaluations of content and librarian
- Summative
 - Pre-test, post-test
 - SAALS



Research Questions

- 1.** Do students in different majors have the same information literacy levels?
- 2.** Do information literacy levels vary significantly from freshman to seniors?



SAILS: Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills

- Based on national standards (ACRL)
- Cohort assessment
- Individual scores assessment
- Custom questions
- Reporting
 - ACRL standards
 - IL skill sets
 - Benchmarking

Data Gathering

| Admin | Assessment Type | Year | n | Population |
|-------|-------------------|------|-------|-------------------|
| 1 | Cohort | 2007 | 130 | Freshmen |
| 2 | Cohort | 2008 | 165 | Freshmen |
| 3 | Cohort | 2009 | 655 | Freshmen |
| 4 | Cohort | 2010 | 965 | Freshmen |
| 5 | Cohort | 2011 | 1,017 | Freshmen |
| 6 | Cohort | 2012 | 991 | Freshmen |
| 7 | Individual Scores | 2012 | 30 | Seniors |
| 8 | Individual Scores | 2013 | 742 | Freshmen |
| 9 | Individual Scores | 2013 | 165 | Transfer students |
| 10 | Individual Scores | 2014 | 89 | Seniors |

Admin #8: Results

| Freshmen | n | Percent Correct | |
|----------------------------------------|-----|-----------------|-----------|
| | | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Overall | 742 | 57.9% | 12.2% |
| Selected Majors: | | | |
| Business / Accounting / Economics * | 162 | 55.9% | 12.5% |
| Communication Studies | 42 | 54.9% | 13.1% |
| Health Sciences / Athletic Training | 53 | 56.6% | 10.0% |
| Art / Dance / Film / Music / Theatre * | 213 | 60.2% | 11.5% |
| Science / Mathematics | 49 | 58.2% | 14.5% |

Admin #8: Results, continued

Compared to the average person your age, please rate your information literacy skills.

| | n | Percent | Percent Correct | |
|-----------------|-----|---------|-----------------|-----------|
| | | | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Top 10% * | 101 | 13.6% | 59.3% | 12.5% |
| Above Average** | 422 | 56.9% | 59.6% | 11.6% |
| Average *, ** | 215 | 29.0% | 54.2% | 12.3% |
| Below Average | 4 | .5% | 46.8% | 5.8% |
| Lowest 10% | 0 | 0 | | |

Admins #7 and 10: Results

| Seniors | n | Percent Correct | |
|-----------------------------|-----|-----------------|-----------|
| | | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| Overall | 119 | 63.6% | 10.3% |
| Selected Majors: | | | |
| Education | 36 | 62.0% | 10.7% |
| Performing & Fine Arts/Film | 24 | 63.7% | 11.3% |
| Social Sciences/Psychology | 40 | 64.1% | 8.8% |

Comparing Freshmen and Seniors

| Class | n | Percent Correct | |
|----------|-----|-----------------|-------|
| | | M | SD |
| Freshmen | 742 | 57.9% | 12.2% |
| Seniors | 119 | 63.6% | 10.3% |

Independent Samples Test

| t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
|--------|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| -5.398 | 176.104 | .000 | -5.6% | 1.04% | -7.7% | -3.6% |




Limitations

- Results:
 - Not all majors studied
 - Incoming freshmen not yet knowledgeable about the discipline
 - Need more data from seniors
- Recruitment
- Low stakes



Future Considerations

- Longitudinal data gathering to track IL growth over time
 - The student as a freshman compared to the student as a senior
- How do students become information literate? What are the variables?
- What is the role of the library in student development of information literacy skills?



Thank you!