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Context at LIU Brooklyn Library

• Lots of change
  – New Dean of University Libraries
  – University-wide strategic planning initiatives
  – Information Literacy Instruction road map project
Information Literacy Roadmap

Current instruction:
- 1 session in Orientation Seminar
- 2 sessions in English Composition
- 2 sessions in Core Seminar

-Needed more instruction in the upper division and graduate courses
What We Knew We Needed
Artifact Collection

• Asked Chair of the School of Business permission to gather syllabi
• 79 syllabi from the School of Business spanning AY 2011-2012, undergrad and grad courses
• Had our artifacts, needed to design our questions
# AAC&U VALUE Rubric

## INFORMATION LITERACY VALUE Rubric

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine the Extent of Information Needed</td>
<td>Effectively defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Effectively determines key concepts. Types of information sources selected directly relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the research question or thesis completely. Can determine key concepts. Types of information sources selected relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.). Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access the Needed Information</td>
<td>Accesses information using effective, well-designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources.</td>
<td>Accesses information using variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search.</td>
<td>Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically</td>
<td>Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others’ assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Identifies some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position.</td>
<td>Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth.</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved.</td>
<td>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 fully achieved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally</td>
<td>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 content; 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.</td>
<td>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 content; 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.</td>
<td>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 content; 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAC&amp;U VALUE Rubric Dimension</th>
<th>Content Analysis Question</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine the Extent of</td>
<td>Q1. Does the syllabus require the student to conduct independent research?</td>
<td>Independent research requires a student to define an information need as well as the scope of research required. An independent research project would indicate the presence of this outcome in the course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access the Needed Information</td>
<td>Q2. Does the syllabus require the student to independently use library resources?</td>
<td>The access question hinged on whether the student was asked to go beyond the textbook and other assigned readings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate Information and its</td>
<td>Q3. Does the syllabus state learning outcomes related to critical thinking?</td>
<td>Critical thinking skills are often present if unnamed in courses, making this a difficult outcome to evaluate. For the purposes of this study, the authors determined that the outcome needed to be named explicitly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources Critically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Information Effectively</td>
<td>Q4. Does the syllabus include a cumulative project requiring students to integrate multiple viewpoints or resources from across the course?</td>
<td>This learning outcome asks whether students are able to integrate and synthesize information to accomplish a specific goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to Accomplish a Specific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Use Information</td>
<td>Q5. Does the syllabus address academic integrity issues (e.g., plagiarism, intellectual property, the importance of correct citation)?</td>
<td>The presence of statements about plagiarism or cheating would indicate the importance of this outcome in a course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethically and Legally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Library Use

• Also asked one descriptive question – variation of question originally asked by Rambler in pioneering 1982 study

“Does the syllabus direct students to the library or mention the library as a place to find information resources?”
Methodology: Norming, Coding

• Normed the content analysis questions prior to coding using a set of 3 unrelated syllabi
• Discussed and resolved disagreements in application of the content analysis questions in 1 norming session
• Coded syllabi separately
Interrater Reliability

- Percent Agreement method – pros: popular and easy to calculate
- Cons: does not account for chance between raters
- Expressed by the equation:
  Agreements/(Agreements + Disagreements)
Interrater Reliability

• Krippendorff’s alpha – pros: accounts for chance between raters, more accurate
• Cons: difficult to calculate, would need a statistical analysis software or help of a statistician if using interval data and 3+ raters/observers
• Expressed by the equation:

\[ \alpha = 1 - \frac{D_o}{D_e} \]
Interrater Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Krippendorff's alpha
Percent Agreement Method
Findings

- **Q1. Does the syllabus require the student to conduct independent research?**
  - Yes: 72.15%
  - No: 27.85%

- **Q2. Does the syllabus require the student to independently use library resources?**
  - Yes: 72.86%
  - No: 27.14%

- **Q3. Does the syllabus state learning outcomes related to critical thinking?**
  - Yes: 47.14%
  - No: 52.86%

- **Q4. Does the syllabus include a cumulative project requiring students to integrate multiple viewpoints or resources from across the course?**
  - Yes: 74.00%
  - No: 26.00%

- **Q5. Does the syllabus address academic integrity issues?**
  - Yes: 64.29%
  - No: 35.71%

- **Q6. Does the syllabus address academic integrity issues?**
  - Yes: 94.94%
Opportunities for In-depth Library Instruction

Q2. Syllabi requiring student to independently use library resources: 37

Q4. Syllabi including a cumulative project: 45

Syllabi requiring both a cumulative project and independent use of library resources: 28
Courses requiring less sophisticated information literacy skills

Q2. Syllabi requiring student to independently use library resources: 37

Q4. Syllabi not including a cumulative project: 25

Syllabi requiring independent use of library resources but no cumulative project: 8
Limitations

• Insufficient norming process resulted in the elimination of Q3 from the data analysis – more thorough norming in future iterations
• Nature of syllabi as artifacts – do not always accurately reflect learning outcomes of the course (as when a template is used to design the syllabus)
• Curricular map would offer more context
Next steps

- Share results with School of Business
- Propose initial collaboration with sample of 28 targeted courses
- Develop access-based information literacy instruction strategies (electronic course guides, etc.) for eight courses requiring independent library use without a cumulative project
- Target next department for syllabus analysis project
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