



Project
MUSE[®]

Today's Research. Tomorrow's Inspiration.

<http://muse.jhu.edu>



All Together Now: Getting Faculty, Administrators, and Staff Engaged in Information Literacy Assessment

by Megan Oakleaf, Michelle S. Millet, and Leah Kraus

abstract: Trinity University has established effective strategies for engaging faculty, administrators, and staff in information literacy instruction and assessment. Succeeding in an area in which many libraries struggle, the Coates Library at Trinity University offers a model for libraries seeking to actively engage their campuses through 1) establishing a common definition of information literacy; 2) developing workshops and grants; and 3) engaging in campus-wide information literacy assessment using rubrics. Furthermore, a survey of Trinity faculty, administrators, and staff reveals facilitators and impediments to campus acceptance of collaborative information literacy activities that can inform the evaluation efforts of librarians at other institutions.

Introduction

Student information literacy assessment is a challenge common to many academic libraries; a nearly universal obstacle is securing campus-wide acceptance of information literacy assessment from faculty, staff, and administrators. At Trinity University, librarians have successfully initiated a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for accreditation based on information literacy, and perhaps more important, they have achieved widespread buy-in from their colleagues across the institution. Succeeding in an area in which many libraries struggle, the Trinity University information literacy program serves as a model for other libraries seeking to engage faculty, staff, and administrators in ongoing information literacy assessment through 1) establishing a common definition of information literacy and goals for the campus; 2) developing a series of workshops and grants; and 3) engaging in a continuous campus-wide conversation about assessing

portal: Libraries and the Academy, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2011), pp. 831–852.

Copyright © 2011 by The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD 21218.



information literacy using collaboratively constructed rubrics. Furthermore, a survey of Trinity faculty, staff, and administrators reveals potential facilitators and impediments to campus acceptance of collaborative information literacy assessment that may inform the efforts of librarians at other higher education institutions.

Literature Review

Importance of Information Literacy in Higher Education

Information literacy skills, as defined by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*, are crucial for learning across all academic disciplines and higher education environments.¹ These skills are also necessary for success in the working world, where individuals need to navigate multiple information sources, apply information to specific tasks, and absorb continuous technological changes.² Since a deficit of information literacy skills leaves individuals “deficient in skills to locate, retrieve, organize, and evaluate critically the retrieved information and use it effectively for personal as well as professional accomplishments,” as Indira Koneru says, it is essential that students leave college with well-developed information literacy skills.³

Unfortunately, many college students lack such skills. Indeed, navigating through information resources to find relevant and accurate materials can be a major challenge for to-

Many students believe themselves to be proficient in information retrieval and use, despite evidence to the contrary.⁵

day’s undergraduate students. This challenge is compounded by both the ever-increasing abundance and availability of information resources.⁴ Ironically, many students believe

themselves to be proficient in information retrieval and use, despite evidence to the contrary.⁵ This disconnect underscores the need to teach and assess information literacy skills on campuses nationwide.

Importance of Collaborative Information Literacy Instruction

Whose job is it to teach students information literacy skills? The responsibility rests with both librarians and faculty members. In fact, collaboration between these two groups is an essential component of successful information literacy instruction.⁶ Librarians and faculty teach students complementary information skills and concepts. While librarians are experts in information retrieval, new technology, and electronic information resources,⁷ faculty can provide disciplinary context to for the information literacy instruction.⁸ By providing a disciplinary context for information literacy instruction, faculty contribute to student motivation to learn; students are more likely to value information literacy instruction when information skills are presented within disciplinary contexts.⁹

Barriers to Collaborative Information Literacy Instruction

Although most librarians will acknowledge the importance of collaborative information literacy instruction, many barriers impede effective faculty collaborations. For example,

some faculty do not recognize the importance of teaching information literacy skills. Instead, they believe information literacy is something students already know, something they will “pick up,” or something that cannot be taught.¹⁰ Even when faculty members acknowledge the importance of information literacy instruction, they may not make time to integrate instruction into their courses.¹¹ Indeed, faculty culture is characterized by “lack of time; emphasis on content, professional autonomy, and academic freedom”; consequently, many faculty may utilize their limited instructional time toward the teaching of disciplinary content.¹² Faculty perceptions of librarians can also prevent effective collaborations. Some faculty members perceive librarians as support staff with a status “less than faculty” who are not meant to have a teaching role.¹³ Other faculty, however, recognize both the value of information literacy instruction and the role of librarians in teaching such skills.¹⁴ Clearly, there is a wide spectrum of faculty attitudes pertaining to information literacy collaboration. Some impede collaboration; others facilitate partnerships.

Although most librarians will acknowledge the importance of collaborative information literacy instruction, many barriers impede effective faculty collaborations.

Importance of Collaborative Information Literacy Assessment

While library literature includes examples of collaborative information literacy instruction, few examples of collaborative information literacy *assessment* exist.¹⁵ Certainly, many authors emphasize the importance of collaborative assessment. Patricia Iannuzzi states, “There are at least four levels at which we should assess information literacy outcomes: within the library; in the classroom; on campus; and beyond the campus. Librarians [working alone] can only perform the first of these.”¹⁶ Therefore, faculty involvement is necessary to evaluate the lasting impact of information literacy instruction on student knowledge, skills, and abilities outside of the library. Indeed, feedback from faculty and students is needed to help librarians refine information literacy instruction and meet stakeholder needs and expectations.¹⁷ Collaborative assessment results can also be used to reaffirm the importance of the information literacy instruction to faculty and encourage new faculty members and departments to become involved with information literacy initiatives.¹⁸

At Trinity University, librarians and faculty have recognized the importance of information literacy skills and committed to collaborative information literacy instruction and assessment. By examining Trinity University as a model, other librarians can learn how to engage faculty and librarians campus-wide in collaborative information literacy programs.

Campus-wide Engagement in Information Literacy Instruction: A Case Study

Trinity University is a selective, master’s level private college in San Antonio, Texas, with a full time enrollment of approximately 2500 students, more than 240 full time faculty, and 10 librarians. Primarily a residential campus, the curriculum focuses on an



undergraduate liberal arts education. Trinity University is a member of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). Recently, SACS instituted a new accreditation requirement: every campus in their region was required to develop a QEP as part of their reaffirmation of accreditation. According to SACS, a QEP “describes a carefully designed course of action that addresses a well-defined and focused topic or issue related to enhancing student learning.”¹⁹ SACS requires the QEP to be selected by campus consensus, be feasible, and be assessable. As long as institutions adhere to these general guidelines, they can select their own QEP focus; the topic selection process within an institution is often competitive.

Getting Started

At Trinity University, the emphasis on campus engagement in information literacy instruction started in 2003. That year, the Coates Library underwent a physical transformation from a 1970s-era library to a bustling space with an information commons, collaborative workspaces, and a coffee shop. At the same time, the University Librarian redesigned an open position to hire an information literacy coordinator to work with faculty. The new information literacy coordinator augmented the existing outreach efforts of ten liaison librarians by building a coalition of faculty members with two characteristics: they expected their students to demonstrate high-level research skills (which their students often did not do) and they viewed librarians as teachers. First, the information literacy coordinator approached small faculty groups, targeting specific stakeholders and curriculum areas, such as the required first-year experience seminars. Next, the coordinator utilized a grant from the Associated Colleges of the South to hold a series of lunch meetings to integrate information literacy into the first-year experience seminars. During the lunches, faculty welcomed suggestions about redesigning assignments and adding some face-to-face library instruction in their courses. As a result, library instruction in first-year experience seminars grew from 60 percent participation in 2003–2004 to 90 percent participation in 2007–2008. Librarians worked with other small faculty groups to revise information literacy assignments and held individual research appointments

with students, either in lieu of or in addition to face-to-face instruction. Overall course-integrated library instruction grew 151 percent from 2002–2003 to 2007–2008. One consequence of the increased instruction was that more faculty viewed librarians

One consequence of the increased instruction was that more faculty viewed librarians as educational partners.

ians as educational partners. These initial efforts were of critical importance when the opportunity for a campus-wide information literacy initiative emerged.

Getting an Opportunity

In 2006, prior to Trinity University’s ten-year reaffirmation of accreditation, the university president called for proposals for QEP themes from the university community, and appointed a committee of faculty, staff, students, and alumni, to receive and review submitted proposals. By late fall, twelve proposals were received and the committee



asked for further descriptions, budgets, and details from ten of the proposal authors. The proposal committee then narrowed the field to six proposals, which were presented to the Trinity University community on January 24, 2007. The six finalists were “Difficult Dialogues,” “Global Learning Enhancement through Coordinated Seminars,” “Improving Science Appreciation,” “Service Learning: Enhancing Education through Community Engagement,” “Toward Global Citizenship,” and “Integrating Information Literacy Across the Curriculum.” All of the proposals were well received by the campus community. After careful evaluation, the proposal committee forwarded three finalists to the president, among them the information literacy proposal. In March of 2007, the university president chose the information literacy proposal, which was renamed “Expanding Horizons: Using Information in the Twenty-First Century.” Next, he formed an implementation committee which planned the deployment of the QEP, beginning by composing an eighty-six page blueprint document.²⁰ The blueprint calls for 1) a common definition of information literacy and goals for the campus; 2) a series of workshops and grants to support campus-wide integration of information literacy instruction; and, after achieving the first two goals, 3) the initiation of a continuous conversation among faculty, staff, and administrators about assessing information literacy.²¹ Upon the successful visit from the SACS accreditation team, the implementation committee was dissolved and replaced by the president-appointed Information Literacy Committee (ILC). The ILC took up the challenge of deploying the QEP plan.

Information Literacy Definitions and Goals

As one of its first tasks, the ILC defined information literacy as the ability to gather, critically evaluate, and use information creatively and ethically.²² The goals of Expanding Horizons are modeled on the ACRL *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education*.²³ The five goals of the plan seek to develop information literate students that:

- Understand the nature of information and the varieties of information sources [UNDERSTAND]
- Access internal and external information efficiently and effectively [ACCESS]
- Understand the concept of intellectual property and the economic, legal, and social contexts of information and using information ethically [USE ETHICALLY]
- Evaluate information and its sources [EVALUATE]
- Incorporate and synthesize information into existing knowledge for individual and group products [CREATE]

Workshops and Grants

In order to provide faculty, staff, and administrators with the support they needed to teach information literacy skills, the QEP committee developed several strategies, including workshops, grants, symposia, and the formation of a curriculum database. Among these strategies, workshops and grants have been most effective in engaging faculty in information literacy instruction. Because the QEP project strives to create a faculty-driven information literacy program on campus predicated on faculty-librarian collaboration, the library and the ILC host faculty from across the disciplines in annual workshops.



During the workshops, faculty and librarians collaborate to redesign courses, create new courses, and develop specific information literacy assignments. Faculty workshop attendees are eligible to apply for QEP-funded grants to either redesign existing courses by incorporating information literacy goals or to introduce an entirely new course that addresses the information literacy goals. This strategy has been very successful. In both 2008 and 2009, the workshops were full to capacity and have resulted in 47 faculty grants. These grants have been a major incentive for faculty because they support the time it takes for faculty to examine their existing teaching patterns and integrate new information literacy content, a barrier previously noted throughout the literature.

While the first-year of Expanding Horizons implementation (2008–2009) went extremely well, librarians soon realized that assessment of student information literacy skills posed a difficult hurdle for faculty. In fact, faculty reported numerous difficulties in identifying and analyzing the information literacy skills demonstrated in their students' work as well as understanding the difference between assessment of learning and

Faculty reported numerous difficulties in identifying and analyzing the information literacy skills demonstrated in their students' work.

evaluation for grading. While they were comfortable providing qualitative comments about student work, faculty were uncertain about how to pull together quantitative evidence that demonstrated information literacy skill acquisition. The librarian ILC co-chair recognized that teaching faculty needed tools to jump-

start an ongoing conversation about assessing information literacy. After some reflection, the committee decided that information literacy rubrics designed specifically for Trinity University were the perfect tools to facilitate continuous dialogue.

Campus-wide Engagement in Information Literacy Assessment: A Rubric Approach

In order to engage faculty, staff, and administrators in an ongoing conversation about student learning of information literacy skills, the ILC decided to develop information literacy rubrics and integrate them into teaching and assessment activities as well as campus-wide continuous improvement processes for accreditation. They envisioned rubrics that could be used in a number of ways: to help students engage in self- and peer-evaluation, to expedite faculty and staff scoring processes, and to track student learning across time and multiple programs on a campus level.

Rubric Workshops

Librarians kicked off this strategy with rubric workshops that engaged librarians, faculty, staff, and administrators in the construction of rubrics designed to assess the information literacy skills evidenced in first-year and senior level research papers and projects. (Note: First-year and senior level rubrics were developed with two different groups of faculty; however, the workshops were led by the same external consultant and the activities were identical.) The workshop content may serve as an example for other libraries seeking to involve faculty and staff in information literacy assessment.



Each rubric workshop began with a short introduction to rubrics. The introduction included different rubric models (checklists, Likert scales, scoring guides, and full-model rubrics), scopes (general vs. task, holistic vs. analytic), components (criteria and performance levels), benefits and limitations, and example rubrics from other disciplinary fields. After this review, workshop participants (librarians, faculty, staff, and administrators) engaged in Stevens and Levi's 4-step rubric creation process: 1) reflecting, 2) listing, 3) grouping, and 4) creating.²⁴

During Step 1, workshop participants reflected on student information literacy skills as evidenced by previous student papers and projects using three guiding questions:

- Why did we create this assignment?
- What happened the last time we gave this assignment?
- What is the relationship between this assignment and the rest of what students will learn?

In Step 2, participants used a listing activity to generate initial ideas for an information literacy rubric. Using three questions as a prompt, participants wrote down their individual answers on sticky notes during a silent working sessions, one answer per sticky note. The three questions were:

- What specific learning outcomes do we want to see in the completed assignment?
- What evidence can students provide in this assignment that would demonstrate their learning?
- What are our expectations of student work and what does that look like?

In Step 3, participants shared the answers they wrote on the sticky notes and worked collaboratively to group the sticky notes into categories. As each category emerged, participants gave them labels that captured the main idea of each category.

In Step 4, participants considered each category and described the best possible student performance they could expect in that category, followed by the least desirable student performance. Then, they envisioned a middle developmentally expected performance between the two and entered all their performance descriptions into a draft rubric template. Finally, the workshop closed with a discussion of common flaws in rubric design and ways to translate rubric scores to grades. The draft first-year rubric was collected (see Appendix 1), piloted by faculty and students in spring 2010 courses, and subjected to an additional round of faculty, administrator, and staff revision during two additional workshops (see Appendix 2).

Faculty, Staff, and Administrator Reaction to Information Literacy Rubrics

After the workshop, all participants received a survey (see Appendix 3) to gauge their opinion of the collaborative rubric development process as well as to elicit opinions about what barriers might impede widespread adoption of the rubric. The survey was developed by the library staff and the external consultant. The survey included seven statements followed by Likert scale options ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," two ranking questions, and three open-ended questions. It was



e-mailed to 12 participants one week after the workshop and one reminder e-mail was sent. The response rate was 64 percent. A library staff member who did not participate in the workshop collected the data, removed all personally identifying information, and aggregated the results.

Survey Results – The Rubric

- Survey results revealed that all participants (librarians, administrators, faculty, and staff) were in agreement on nearly all points:
- All agreed or strongly agreed that the rubric developed during the workshop was visually clear, easy to read, and comprised understandable words and concepts.
- All agreed or strongly agreed that the rubric will accurately measure student information literacy skills.
- All agreed or strongly agreed that they could envision themselves using the rubric and sharing the rubric with students; they also could imagine how results of the rubric, or an adaptation of it, could be used to improve teaching and learning of information literacy skills across classes in their department or over time.
- All but one participant believed that other people using the rubric would assign the same scores that s/he would.
- Taken together, these results indicate the participants' confidence in the product of their collaboratively-developed assessment tool and suggest that ongoing rubric-based collaborative information literacy assessment at Trinity University has a bright outlook. The sole concern voiced, regarding rubric interrater reliability, is legitimate and can be directly addressed through rubric norming processes and revision.²⁵

Survey Results – Assessment Barriers

All these strategies—definitions, goals, workshops, grants, and rubrics—have been useful in building an ongoing collaborative information literacy assessment approach at Trinity University. However, while librarians have achieved success with a core group of faculty and staff, they seek to grow the number of faculty and staff involved in information literacy assessment even more. Therefore, librarians also surveyed the faculty and staff who participated in the rubric workshop about factors that may facilitate or impede their use of the information literacy rubric they developed, or an adaptation of it, as a campus-wide assessment tool. Survey respondents also provided feedback about what might help or hinder their university colleagues as they move forward with campus-wide information literacy assessment. The facilitators and impediments listed on the survey were drawn from Oakleaf and Hinchliffe's survey of librarians' use of information literacy assessment data.²⁶

Survey results indicate that the faculty and staff already involved in the collaborative information literacy assessment initiative require the following to move forward: a campus commitment to the process, assistance adapting information literacy assessment tools (i.e. the rubric) to their specific needs, and time to engage in the assessment process. They perceive that the main barriers to their progress are a lack of time, a lack



of rewards for their efforts, and a lack of coordinated structures for assessment, such as a point person or committee.

The same respondents offered insight into the facilitators and impediments impacting their faculty and staff colleagues. When asked what they believed the main barriers to their colleagues' involvement in information literacy assessment and the use or adaptation of an information literacy rubric, they listed a lack of time and rewards for assessment efforts. They also believed that a lack of familiarity with rubrics, information literacy, and assessment in general would prevent their colleagues from moving forward. However, the study respondents also offered a lengthy list of ways to facilitate increased faculty and staff collaboration in the information literacy assessment process. First, respondents suggested that their colleagues need to gain an understanding of the value of assessment—a belief that assessment “is worth” the time. Second, for a rubric-based approach, they believed that their colleagues need to conceptualize the rubric creation as a “bottom up” approach in order to feel ownership in the process. Third, their colleagues need increased awareness of and communication about information literacy assessment. They need a greater understanding of information literacy as a concept and either support or “pressure” from their departments or central university administration. Finally, respondents believe their colleagues will respond to incentives like grant money or participation in workshops.

Overall, the survey results appear to indicate that faculty and staff need increased time, knowledge, structures, and rewards to participate in collaborative assessment of student information literacy skills. While these results require replication on a greater scale and on multiple campuses, even this small-scale, preliminary information can be used to plan for future efforts to engage faculty and staff in information literacy assessment.

Time – Librarians and/or administrators who seek to include faculty and staff in information literacy assessment efforts need to schedule time dedicated to the effort. Librarians may need to carve out ongoing meeting times to meet with faculty and staff. Administrators who seek to encourage collaborative information literacy assessment may need to allow faculty and staff to delegate a portion of their existing responsibilities to make time for new assessment activities.

Knowledge – Faculty and staff require additional knowledge so that they can participate fully in collaborative information literacy assessment efforts. They need to know more about information literacy as a concept, assessment (especially authentic and performance assessment), and major assessment tools, including rubrics. Librarians can help close these knowledge gaps by engaging faculty and staff in professional development opportunities, providing readings, or orchestrating consultant visits. Administrators can provide support and travel funding to allow faculty and staff to participate in non-local professional development opportunities.

Structures – For faculty and staff to engage fully in information literacy assessment, structure is required. Librarians should articulate the structural and curriculum connections between information literacy assessment and existing assessment and strategic plans for the overall institution as well as academic and student support departments and programs. Administrators can appoint both individuals and teams to assist in assessment efforts. They can also supply funding for the hiring of additional personnel with assessment expertise as well as the purchase of assessment tools and software.



Rewards – Finally, rewards and incentives complement other strategies for engaging faculty in information literacy efforts by communicating the value placed on assessment within the institution.

The Future

In the fall of 2010, the ILC shared the first-year rubric with faculty campus-wide, and the senior year rubric will be finalized by fall 2011. In addition to these “global” rubrics, the information literacy committee and individual librarians have worked with several faculty to design their own course rubrics (see Appendix 4).

Since the inception of rubric assessment of student information literacy skills, there is no doubt that the conversation on campus regarding information literacy and how it relates to student learning has changed dramatically. This is evident in the number of grant applications received and awarded by the campus information literacy committee and attendance at events, but also with the increased number of faculty who seek to integrate information literacy into their courses even without seeking the extrinsic reward of grant funding.

Conclusion

Trinity University has succeeded in its efforts to get faculty, administrators, and staff engaged in information literacy instruction and assessment. By establishing a common definition of information literacy and goals for the campus, developing a series of workshops and grants, and engaging in a continuous conversation about assessing information literacy using rubrics, Trinity librarians have developed a successful model for campus-wide information literacy collaborations and thus set an example from which other academic librarians can learn.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the work of the Trinity University Information Literacy Committee, Associate Vice President for Information Resources & Administrative Affairs Diane Saphire, and the Trinity University librarians. They would also like to thank Steven Hoover for contributing the rubric found in Appendix 4.



Appendix 1

Draft of First-Year Rubric

	BEGINNING	DEVELOPING	EXEMPLARY
ACCESS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All internet sources No consultation of experts Doesn't use library Poor search No academic sources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some academic sources May show evidence of use of library May show that he/she consulted experts Evidence of good search 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses sources beyond internet Construct a quality search Uses library sources Uses librarians and other experts Uses academic sources
USE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses Sources incorrectly and superficially Uses minimal variety sources and no experts Confuses primary, secondary, and tertiary Basic or no searching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates mixed use of sources Uses some variety sources in types May confuse primary, secondary, tertiary sources Demonstrates basic searching principles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mines a source Uses a variety of sources—primary, secondary, tertiary sources Understand Explores mechanics of a source (searching advanced, limits vocabulary)
EVALUATE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses no credible sources Uses only popular sources Uses sources not relevant to topic Fails to recognize bias 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses mix of credible and questionable sources Uses disproportionate amount of popular sources Uses some but not all sources relevant to topic Partially recognizes and/or deals with bias 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses only credible sources Distinguishes popular and academic sources Includes scholarly/quality sources Uses sources relevant to topic Recognizes and deals with bias appropriately

Appendix 1, continued.

	BEGINNING	DEVELOPING	EXEMPLARY
CITATION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to properly identify and cite all sources according to the standards of ethical and fair use of intellectual property • Does not include a complete bibliography • Uses source material as indirect quote without adequate paraphrasing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properly identifies and cites all sources according to the standards of ethical and fair use—may be minor mistakes in formatting • Includes a complete bibliography which may contain formatting errors • Attempts to paraphrase or summarize cited material but poorly worded/rephrased 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Properly identifies and cites all sources according to the standards of ethical and fair use and intellectual property • Includes a complete bibliography • Uses proper format for the subject area • Effectively paraphrases or summarizes ideas/information from the cited source materials using original language
SYNTHESIS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not develop original thesis, or does not consider a range of sources, perspectives • Demonstrates little or no synthesis of arguments/ideas: unable to integrate sources with each other or with one's own argument • Misrepresents other positions on the topic, or fails to identify or acknowledge other views • Shows little to no awareness of topic's broader significance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops some original insights based on some sources and perspectives • Demonstrates some critical engagement with sources tending toward summary, rather than higher-level synthesis • Represents some other positions, with varying degrees of accuracy—may fail to acknowledge some major perspectives • Shows some awareness of topic's broader significance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develops original contribution (thesis) based upon variety of sources, perspectives • Demonstrates sophisticated, level of creative, critical synthesis (reflection) • Accurately represents major/leading positions on the topic • Clearly articulates the significance/value of topic in context



Appendix 2. Revision of First-Year Rubric Information Literacy in First Year Courses

Some rows of this rubric may not be applicable to all writing samples. Some may be more appropriate if the assignment includes an annotated bibliography, research log, or an assignment done in advance of the writing project.

	BEGINNING	DEVELOPING	ADVANCED	NA / cannot evaluate	PROCESS
ACCESS	Student work does not show evidence of library use (physically or online).	Student work shows evidence of library use (physically or online).	The student uses sources that are available from the library (physically or online).		P
	The student selects sources that suggest the use of elementary search strategies.	The student selects sources that demonstrate basic searching principles.	The student explores the searching mechanics of information resources (searching advanced, limits vocabulary).		
UNDERSTAND	The student confuses primary, secondary, and tertiary sources	The student may understand the difference between primary, secondary, and tertiary sources, but uses one type of source when another is available or more appropriate.	The student understands the difference between primary, secondary, and tertiary sources and uses each appropriately.		



Appendix 2, continued.

	BEGINNING	DEVELOPING	ADVANCED	NA / cannot evaluate	PROCESS
EVALUATE	The student uses sources that are not relevant to the topic.	The student uses some sources that are not relevant to the topic.	The student uses sources that are relevant to the topic.		
	The student uses no credible or authoritative sources.	The student uses a combination of credible/authoritative and questionable sources.	The student uses only credible or authoritative sources.		
	Does not incorporate credible sources.	Includes mix of credible and questionable sources.	Includes only credible sources.		
USE ETHICALLY	Uses sources not relevant to topic.	Uses mix of relevant and irrelevant sources.	Uses sources relevant to topic.		P
	Fails to recognize bias.	Partially recognizes and/or deals with bias.	Recognizes and deals with bias appropriately.		P
	Fails to properly identify sources of information and ideas according to the standards of ethical use of intellectual property.	Properly identifies all sources of information and ideas according to the standards of ethical use —may be minor mistakes.	Properly identifies all sources of information and ideas according to the standards of ethical use and intellectual property. There are no noticeable mistakes.		



Does not include a functional bibliography and/or in-text citations.	Includes a bibliography or in-text citations which may contain minor formatting errors or omissions.	Bibliography and in-text citations are consistent with each other and in proper formatting for the subject area.
Uses source material as indirect quote without adequate paraphrasing.	Attempts to paraphrase or summarize cited material but poorly worded/ rephrased.	Effectively paraphrases or summarizes ideas / information from the cited source materials using original language.
CREATE	Does not develop insight, or does not include a range of sources and perspectives.	Develops meaningful insights based upon variety of sources and perspectives.
Demonstrates little or no synthesis of arguments/ ideas: unable to integrate sources with each other or with one's own argument.	Demonstrates some engagement with sources tending toward summary, rather than-higher level. synthesis	Demonstrates sophisticated, level of creative, critical synthesis.
Misrepresents other positions on the topic, or fails to identify or acknowledge other views.	Represents some other positions, with varying degrees of accuracy— may fail to acknowledge some major perspectives.	Accurately represents major/ leading positions on the topic.

Developed by multiple groups of faculty over the course of several afternoon workshops. Please feel free to add or subtract from this rubric to make it as useful as possible for your courses and assignments.

(P) These criteria may need more examination during earlier stages of the research process before a final paper



Appendix 3 (part 1)

Information Literacy Rubric Workshop Survey, 2009

This rubric is visually clear and easy to read.

- Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 No Opinion
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Don't Know

I understand the words used in this rubric.

- Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 No Opinion
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Don't Know

I understand the concepts included in this rubric.

- Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 No Opinion
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Don't Know

I believe this rubric will accurately measure student information literacy skills.

- Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 No Opinion
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Don't Know

The rubric is missing something that would improve its ability to measure student information literacy skills.

- Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 No Opinion
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Don't Know

If Agree or Strongly Agree, please describe the omission:

I can imagine how results from this rubric, or an adaptation of it, could be used to improve teaching and learning of information literacy skills in my class(es).

- Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 No Opinion
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Don't Know

I can imagine how results from this rubric, or an adaptation of it, could be used to improve teaching and learning of information literacy skills across classes in my department, program, or over time.

- Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 No Opinion
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Don't Know

I can envision myself using this rubric, or an adaptation of it, to assess student information literacy skills.

- Strongly Disagree
 Disagree
 No Opinion
 Agree
 Strongly Agree
 Don't Know



Appendix 3 (part 2)

I can envision myself sharing this rubric, or an adaptation of it, with students for them to use as a self-evaluation tool.

Strongly Disagree Disagree No Opinion Agree Strongly Agree Don't Know

I can envision myself sharing this rubric, or an adaptation of it, with students for them to use as a peer-evaluation tool.

Strongly Disagree Disagree No Opinion Agree Strongly Agree Don't Know

I believe that other people using this rubric would probably assign the same scores as I would.

Strongly Disagree Disagree No Opinion Agree Strongly Agree Don't Know

I believe this rubric is free of cultural, ethnic, and gender stereotypes and biases.

Strongly Disagree Disagree No Opinion Agree Strongly Agree Don't Know

What was the best thing about the rubric creation process?

What support do you need to move forward with assessing information literacy using this rubric, or an adaptation of it?

Please rank order the top 5 barriers that may impede you from assessing information literacy using this rubric, or an adaptation of it? (Use 1 for the largest barrier and 5 for the smallest)

- ___ Lack of time
- ___ Lack of financial resources
- ___ Lack of staff support
- ___ Lack of professional development opportunities
- ___ Lack of reward for effort
- ___ Lack of familiarity with information literacy
- ___ Lack of familiarity with assessment
- ___ Lack of familiarity with rubrics
- ___ Lack of coordinated structures for assessment ("point person", committee, etc)
- ___ Uncertainty about faculty role in assessment (beyond student grades)
- ___ Uncertainty about faculty role in information literacy assessment (beyond student grades)
- ___ Concerns about utility or accuracy of assessment tools
- ___ Concerns about use of assessment data



Appendix 3 (part 2)

What do you think it would take to convince your colleagues to assess information literacy using this rubric, or an adaptation of it?

Please rank order the top 5 barriers that may impede your colleagues from assessing information literacy using this rubric, or an adaptation of it? (Use 1 for the largest barrier and 5 for the smallest)

- Lack of time
- Lack of financial resources
- Lack of staff support
- Lack of professional development opportunities
- Lack of reward for effort
- Lack of familiarity with information literacy
- Lack of familiarity with assessment
- Lack of familiarity with rubrics
- Lack of coordinated structures for assessment ("point person", committee, etc)
- Uncertainty about faculty role in assessment (beyond student grades)
- Uncertainty about faculty role in information literacy assessment (beyond student grades)
- Concerns about utility or accuracy of assessment tools
- Concerns about use of assessment data

I attended the:

- First-Year Rubric Workshop
- Senior Rubric Workshop

I am a:

- Faculty member
- Librarian
- Other: _____

Appendix 4.

Example of Faculty Adaptation of First-Year Rubric

Criteria	+	-	+
Scope / Focus	Focus inappropriate for page requirements (too big/ too small). Many hanging threads. Alternative points of view not addressed.	Appropriate focus. A few hanging threads. Alternative views addressed, but not with supporting evidence or not handled well.	Establishes focus appropriate for page requirements. No hanging threads. Addresses alternative views with evidence.
Flow	References disrupt flow (not integrated). No transitions or severely lacking in transitions. No logical progression of arguments.	References do not disrupt flow for the reader. Uses some transitions. Argumentation follows a logical progression.	Incorporates reference well. Uses good transitions throughout. Argumentation follows a clear and logical progression.
Evidence / Research (Understand Evaluate / Create)	No or severely lacking in supporting evidence or textual references.	Uses supporting research and references, but sometimes in a questionable manner.	Selects appropriate supporting evidence. Uses supporting research and references appropriately and efficiently.
Citations (Use Ethically)	No citations for references or the majority of citations are incorrect.	Over-cites or under-cites. Majority of cited items are cited correctly.	Does not over or under-cite. Correct citations throughout (in-text and references). APA format for all items.



Appendix 4, continued.

<p>Criteria</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Punctuation/ Grammar</p>	<p>Frequent arcane or disruptive punctuation choices. Frequent errors, run-on sentences, and questionable word choice.</p>	<p>Mostly reasonable punctuation choices. A few errors and run-ons, but not so many as to cause reader distraction. Mostly appropriate word choices.</p>	<p>Excellent punctuation choice. No errors or run-ons. Grammar and word choice appropriate for an academic paper.</p>
<p>Overall Impression (Not for Grade)</p>			



Megan Oakleaf is Assistant Professor in the iSchool at Syracuse University; e-mail moakleaf@syr.edu. Michelle S. Millet was the Information Literacy Coordinator and Associate Professor at Trinity University; e-mail Michelle.Millet@UTSA.edu. Leah Kraus is a graduate assistant in the School of Information Studies at Syracuse University; e-mail leah.m.kraus@gmail.com.

Notes

1. Association of College and Research Libraries, "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education," American Library Association, (2000), <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/standards.pdf> (accessed 6 April 2011); Jo Anne Bryant, Alyssa Martin, and Jana Slay, "Partners with a Vision: Librarians and Faculty Collaborate to Develop a Library Orientation Program at a Non-Traditional Campus," *Southeastern Librarian* 55, 1 (2007): 14–25; Katherine Kearns and Tracy Thrasher Hybl, "A Collaboration Between Faculty and Librarians to Develop and Assess a Science Literacy Laboratory Module," *Science & Technology Libraries* 25, 4 (2005): 39–56; Lynn Lampert, "'Getting Psyched' About Information Literacy: A Successful Faculty- Librarian Collaboration for Educational Psychology and Counseling," *The Reference Librarian* 43, 89/90 (2005): 6–7; Chuck Malenfant and Nora Egan Demers, "Collaboration for Point-of-Need Library Instruction," *Reference Services Review* 32, 3 (2004): 264–73; and Keith Stanger, "Implementing Information Literacy in Higher Education: A Perspective on the Roles of Librarians and Disciplinary Faculty," *LIBRES* 19, 1 (2009), 1–6.
2. Hannelore B. Rader, "Building Faculty-Librarian Partnerships to Prepare Students for Information Fluency: The Time for Sharing Information Expertise is Now," *College & Research Libraries News* 65, 2 (2004): 74.
3. Indira Koneru, "Strategic and Collaborative Approaches for Fostering Information Literacy via an Information Portal," *DESIDOC Bulletin of Information Technology* 26, 6 (2006): 4.
4. Ibid.
5. Patricia T. Viele, "Physics 213: An Example of Faculty / Librarian Collaboration," *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship* 47 (Summer 2006): 1.
6. Koneru, "Strategic and Collaborative Approaches," 6–7.
7. William Badke, "Can't Get No Respect: Helping Faculty to Understand the Educational Power of Information Literacy," *The Reference Librarian* 43, 89/90 (2005): 70.
8. Barbara Fister, Elizabeth O. Hutchins, and Kris Huber MacPherson, "From BI to IL: The Paths of Two Liberal Arts Colleges," in *ACRL Tenth National Conference*, proceedings of the annual meeting of the Association of College and Research Libraries (Denver, Colorado, March 15–18, 2001), <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/events/pdf/fister.pdf> (accessed 6 April 2011).
9. Evan Farber, "Faculty-Librarian Cooperation: A Personal Retrospective," *Reference Services Review* 27, 3 (1999): 229–234.
10. Claire McGuinness, "What Faculty Think: Exploring the Barriers to Information Literacy Development in Undergraduate Education," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 32, 6 (2006): 576–579.
11. Gloria Leckie and Anne Fullerton, "The Roles of Academic Librarians in Fostering a Pedagogy for Information Literacy," in *ACRL Ninth National Conference*, proceedings of the annual meeting of the Association of College and Research Libraries (Detroit, Michigan, April 8–11, 1999). <http://0-www.ala.org.sapl.sat.lib.tx.us/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/events/pdf/leckie99.pdf> (accessed 7 April 2011).
12. Larry Hardesty, "Faculty Culture and Bibliographic Instruction: An Exploratory Analysis," *Library Trends* 44, 2 (Fall 1995): 348–356.
13. Edward K. Owusu-Ansah, "Information Literacy and Higher Education: Placing the Academic Library in the Center of a Comprehensive Solution," *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 30, 1 (2004): 6–7.



14. Kate Manuel, Susan E. Beck, and Molly Molloy, "An Ethnographic Study of Attitudes Influencing Faculty Collaboration in Library Instruction," *The Reference Librarian* 43, 89/90 (2005): 39–61.
15. Trudi E. Jacobson and Thomas P. Mackey, *Information Literacy Collaborations That Work*, New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers, 2007.
16. Patricia Iannuzzi, "We Are Teaching But Are They Learning: Accountability, Productivity, and Assessment," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 25, 4 (1999): 304–305.
17. Bryant, Martin, and Slay, "Partners with a Vision," 20–21.
18. Robin Lockerby, Divina Lynch, Elizabeth Nelson, and James Sherman, "Collaboration and Information Literacy: Challenges of Meeting Standards When Working with Remote Faculty," *Journal of Library Administration* 41, 1/2 (2004): 243–253.
19. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, "The Quality Enhancement Plan," www.sascoc.org.
20. Trinity University, "Expanding Horizons: Using Information in the 21st Century: A Quality Enhancement Plan for Trinity University, 2008–2013," (prepared for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges, February 2008) http://www.trinity.edu/departments/academic_affairs/qep/ExpandingHorizonsQEPpublic.pdf (accessed 6 April 2011).
21. Michelle S. Millet, Jeremy Donald, and David W. Wilson. "Information Literacy Across the Curriculum: Expanding Horizons," *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 16, 2/3 (2009): 180–193.
22. Trinity University, "Expanding Horizons," 2.
23. "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education," 2–3.
24. Dannelle D. Stevens and Antonia J. Levi, *Introduction to Rubrics: An Assessment Tool to Save Grading Time, Convey Effective Feedback, and Promote Student Learning* (Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2005).
25. Megan Oakleaf, "Using Rubrics to Assess Information Literacy: An Examination of Methodology and Interrater Reliability," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 60, 5 (2009), 969–983.
26. Megan Oakleaf and Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe, "Assessment Cycle or Circular File: Do Academic Librarians Use Information Literacy Assessment Data?" in *Proceedings of the 2008 Library Assessment Conference: Building Effective, Sustainable, Practical Assessment*, Steve Hiller et al., eds. (Seattle, Washington, August 4–7, 2008), <http://meganoakleaf.info/circularfile.pdf> (accessed 6 April 2011).