



Learning Goal: Information Literacy

Date: Fall 2018

What was assessed: 207 work products from nine course sections of CSC 105, ENG 201, THR 165, NSG 415, PSY 355.

How it was assessed: by 10 faculty members using the AAC&U Information Literacy VALUE rubric

Results: Lower Division

Lower-Division Courses		
<i>Dimension</i>	<i>% of Work Products Scored Two or Higher</i>	<i>% of Work Products Scored Three or Higher</i>
IL 1 Determine Extent of Information Needed	84.6%	30.1%
IL 2 Access Needed Information	89.7%	39.1%
IL 3 Evaluate Information Critically	58.9%	19.2%
IL 4 Use Information Effectively	76.2%	29.4%
IL 5 Use Information Ethically and Legally	68.5%	49.3%

Summary:

- Scores were highest (based on the percentage of scores at levels 3 and 4) on IL5 Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally (49.3%).
- 9% of papers received a zero on IL5, the highest percentage of level 0 scores for any Information Literacy dimension, indicating that those papers did not show evidence of the ethical and legal access and use of information.
- Scores were lowest (based on the percentage of scores at levels 0 and 1) for IL3 Evaluating Information and Its Sources Critically.

Results: Upper Division

Upper-Division Courses		
<i>Dimension</i>	<i>% of Work Products Scored Two or Higher</i>	<i>% of Work Products Scored Three or Higher</i>
IL 1 Determine Extent of Information Needed	100%	72.5%
IL 2 Access Needed Information	98.0%	84.3%
IL 3 Evaluate Information Critically	98.0%	66.6%
IL 4 Use Information Effectively	100%	72.5%
IL 5 Use Information Ethically and Legally	100%	96.1%

Summary:

- Scores were highest (based on the percentage of scores at levels 3 and 4) for upper-division work on IL5 Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally (96.0%). Unlike the lower-division sample, however, no papers collected from upper-division courses were assigned a 0 score on IL5.
- There were no 0 scores for any dimension and only a few level 1 scores for two dimensions: IL2 Access the Needed Information and IL3 Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically.

Analysis Across Course Levels:

There was no statistically significant difference in scores across race and ethnicity groups, transfer vs. freshman-start students, Pell grant vs. non-Pell grant recipients, high school type (e.g. public, private, homeschool, adult diploma), and rural vs. non-rural home county. The numbers of Honors students and Isaac Bear students were too small for statistical hypothesis testing. There were significant differences in scores in the following:

- Gender: females scored higher than males on IL1, IL3, and IL5
- Class level (freshman through senior): juniors scored highest on IL1, IL2, and IL3 and seniors scored highest on IL4 and IL5
- Classes taught by tenure-line faculty vs. non-tenure-line faculty: scores were higher on all dimensions in courses taught by tenure-line faculty
- Lower division vs upper division courses: scores in upper-division classes were higher on all dimensions of the Information Literacy rubric than the lower-division scores

GPA was significantly correlated with scores on all the rubric dimensions, as were total hours. ACT scores were significantly correlated with IL3 and IL5. Scores on all the Information Literacy rubric dimensions were significantly positively correlated with all the other Information Literacy rubric dimensions.

For additional discussion of these findings, see the 2019 Annual Report available at <http://www.uncw.edu/assessment/general/findings.html>.