Information Literacy Program Assessment Report 2003-2004

Department: Information Studies
Submitted by: Anne Ryan, Library Coordinator (Spring 2004)

Minneapolis Community & Technical College Mission Statement
Minneapolis Community and Technical College is a two-year college located in downtown Minneapolis, serving the diverse, multicultural communities of Minneapolis and St. Paul. We provide a comprehensive offering of developmental, liberal arts, pre-professional, professional, and technical programs to prepare students to live and work in a democratic society within a changing global community. Our student-centered learning environment is designed to serve students with differing abilities, interests, and goals to promote lifelong learning and the development of each student's potential.

The spirit in which the faculty, staff and administration of Minneapolis Community and Technical College fulfill this mission reflects our commitment to opening doors of opportunity, creating a respectful environment, providing dynamic, high quality educational programs, serving students, and building bridges to the community.

I. Department Mission Statement
The Information Studies department assists students in becoming lifelong learners by teaching them research and critical thinking skills. It provides students with the opportunity to explore how information and knowledge shapes their lives, their community, and the world. Students become critical users of information, learning how to situate information and knowledge in a diverse global environment. In addition to courses offered to liberal arts students, the Information Studies department offers degree and certificate programs that train students to work in libraries at the paraprofessional level.

II. Information Studies Student Demographics
As the college as a whole, the Information Studies program is composed of a very diverse student population. During the 2002-2003 academic year (the most current year for program data), the Information Studies Department served 700 unduplicated students. Of those students 35.86% were men, 47.86% were women, and 16.29% were undisclosed; 71% were listed as academically disadvantaged, 57% were listed as economically disadvantaged, 31% were first generation college students, 15% were non-native English speakers, and 6% were students with disabilities. The average age of students in the program was 25.55 years. European Americans made up 46.14% of the students in the program, Black Americans 23.29%, Asian Americans 5.29%, Hispanic Americans 1.57%, Native Americans 3.57%, Non-Resident Aliens 3%, and undisclosed Americans 11%.

The Information Studies faculty ask students to fill out a questionnaire on the first day to determine how many college credits students have taken prior to INFS 1000, as well as

English Composition and College Reading placement. INFS 1000: Information Literacy and Research Skills requires completion of ENGL 0900 and READ 0200, or placement into ENGL 1110 and READ 1300, as prerequisites to the course. INFS 1000 must be completed within the first 24 college-level course credits.

The Information Studies faculty gathered student data from Fall Semester 2003 INFS 1000 course sections (10 of 11 course sections were used). The data is not a precise head count for the sections, as some students do not show up the first day of class, and some students drop the course. The data provides a valid sample of student placement in the English Composition and Reading programs.

The sample below represents the responses of 233 students. The numbers in all categories do not add up to 233 since students are requested to list completion or current enrollment status of each English composition and Reading course. Also, some of the numbers do not add up properly because students did not accurately complete every question.

Program Enrolled In:	Prior Credits (A.A. only)
A.A. Degree: 102 (64.2%)	0-12: 35 (34.3% of 102)
	13-24: 21 (20.6%)
	25-64: 31 (30.4%)
	65+: 10 (9.8%)
A.S. Degree: 32 (20.1%)	
A.A.S. Degree: 14 (8.8%)	
Diploma: 1 (.6%)	
Other: 10 (6.3%)	
Total: 159	
Completed ENGL 0900	Tested out of ENGL 0900
40 (25.2% of 159)	108 (67.9% of 159)
Completed ENGL 1110	Enrolled ENGL 1110 this semester
96 (60.4%)	52 (32.7%)
Completed ENGL 1111	Enrolled ENGL 1111 this semester
22 (13.8%)	17 (10.7%)
Tested out of READ 0200	Completed READ 0200
110 (69.2%)	24 (15.1%)
Completed READ 1300	Will not take READ 1300
28 (17.6%)	54 (34%)

III. Student Outcomes (at the departmental/program level):
Students will gain:
- The ability to critically examine information and determine its authenticity, credibility, intellectual content, bias, etc.
- The ability to determine the proper tool needed to locate desired information
- The ability to use print, electronic, and Internet indexes in the various academic disciplines to locate information
- The ability to use and understand library reference tools and classification systems

Students will:
- Understand how knowledge is produced and organized in society
- Understand how information and knowledge is affected by cultural, political and economic factors
- Understand issues related to copyright, intellectual freedom, and the public vs. private ownership of information

IV. Department Assessment Plan of Student Learning:
The department uses in-class exercises, out-of class assignments, and mid-term and final competency examinations to assess student learning. The final competency exam is comprehensive and is used to assess students based upon ACRL Information Literacy Standards, Objectives and Performance Indicators.

In addition to the class exercises and exams, the department uses a course/instructor evaluation tool that allows students to provide critical evaluations of the instructors' teaching abilities as well as the usefulness of the course.

Instructors in the department meet once each semester to assess student progress. Faculty develop new course content based on this data as well as data collected from course assignments. During the program assessment meetings faculty also review course readings and make recommendations for new course readings and texts.

V. Assess Student Learning at the Program/Division Level:
The department uses a standardized grading rubric to score the exams. Data from these forms are used to assess student performance at the program level. Faculty discuss exams that represent students performing in the highest, the middle, and at the lowest skill levels. The faculty use student course evaluations to assess the effectiveness of course and program quality and content.

VI. Compile, Analyze, and Summarize the Results
The Information Studies Department taught a total of 26 sections of INFS 1000 over three semesters in the 2003-2004 academic year.

Each faculty member in the program is responsible for gathering the appropriate data for their course sections. The faculty come together once per semester to analyze the data, and the program coordinator summarizes and reports the results to the administration.

Summary of Results:
The department evaluated competency examinations and course evaluations from students in our INFS 1000 courses during Fall Semester 2003.

Competency Examination Results:
> We evaluated exam results from 181 students who completed the exam during Fall Semester 2003. We compiled data for five of the major information literacy competency areas that are assessed on the exam. Students in INFS 1000 are assessed by all instructors using a common grading rubric. The total number of points possible for the exam is fifty.

> **Area 1: Did the student specify the dimensions of the topic? Clearly state the scope of the topic? Develop an appropriate working thesis statement? Take appropriate steps to narrow the topic? (10 points possible)**

Number of points	Number of students receiving points	Percentage
10	41	26.8%
9–9.9	46	30.1%
8–8.9	46	30.1%
7–7.9	7	4.6%
6–6.9	8	5.2%
5–5.9	1	0.7%
4–4.9	0	0.0%
3–3.9	0	0.0%
2–2.9	0	0.0%
1–1.9	1	0.7%
0–.9	3	2.0%

> **Area 2: Was there a clear research strategy? Did the student clearly articulate the process used to locate and identify resources on the topic? (10 points possible)**

Number of points	Number of students receiving points	Percentage
10	35	22.9%
9–9.9	48	31.4%
8–8.9	43	28.1%
7–7.9	16	10.5%
6–6.9	3	2.0%
5–5.9	2	1.3%
4–4.9	0	0.0%
3–3.9	0	0.0%
2–2.9	3	2.0%
1–1.9	0	0.0%
0–.9	3	2.0%

Area 3: Did the student write down and use keywords and subject headings appropriate to the topic? (6 points possible)

Number of points	Number of students receiving points	Percentage
6	43	28.1%
5–5.9	61	39.9%
4–4.9	26	17.0%
3–3.9	20	13.1%
2–2.9	1	0.7%
1–1.9	1	0.7%
0–.9	1	0.7%

Area 4: Did the student select resources that were appropriate for the topic and demonstrate why these were good choices? (10 points possible)

Number of points	Number of students receiving points	Percentage
10	29	19%
9–9.9	46	30.1%
8–8.9	31	20.3%
7–7.9	23	15%
6–6.9	11	7.2%
5–5.9	5	3.3%
4–4.9	3	2%
3–3.9	1	0.7%
2–2.9	2	1.3%
1–1.9	2	1.3%
0–.9	0	0.0%

Area 5: Did the student evaluate the resources according to specific criteria? (i.e., credibility, authority, accuracy, reliability) (9 points possible)

Number of points	Number of students receiving points	Percentage
9	27	17.6%
8–8.9	37	24.2%
7–7.9	20	13.1%
6–6.9	27	17.6%
5–5.9	20	13.1%
4–4.9	9	5.9%
3–3.9	1	0.7%
2–2.9	2	1.3%
1–1.9	3	2.0%
0–.9	7	4.6%

<u>Student Course Evaluation Results</u>:
>   The department tallied the results of 148 student course evaluations from Fall Semester 2003. We focused on three questions to give us a sense of student feelings about course workload and difficulty.

For me, the pace at which the instructor covered the material was:
1. very slow   1%
2. somewhat slow   7%
3. just about right   68%
4. somewhat fast   18%
5. very fast   2%

The level of difficulty of this course was:
1. very elementary   1%
2. somewhat elementary   11%
3. about right   56%
4. somewhat difficult   26%
5. very difficult   3%

The workload for this course was:
1. much lighter   1%
2. lighter   7%
3. about the same   43%
4. heavier   34%
5. much heavier   13%

Your classification:
1. first year   33%
2. second year   50%
3. third year   8%
4. fourth year   4%
5. graduate   4%
6. other   1%
7. omitted   3%

VIII. Proposed Program Changes to Improve Student Learning:

The Information Studies department will develop a research skills evaluation instrument with the English department that will be used in ENGL 1111. The two departments will work together during fall semester 2004 to develop the instrument for use in spring semester 2005. We will pilot the assessment instrument in five or six ENGL 1111 course sections. The two departments will evaluate the results of the pilot project and make modifications and a recommendation of whether or not to continue the assessment for the following year in some or all sections of ENGL 1111.

Based upon student feedback the department will modify the course and bring it to the Academic Affairs and Standards Committee to request a change to 2 credits.

IX. Communicating Across the Curriculum:

In 2003-2004, Virginia Heinrich and Tom Eland served as members of the campus Communicating Across the Curriculum caucus. As part of the overall campus goal of assessing student communication skills, library faculty facilitated a workshop on January 8, 2004 with campus faculty on information literacy and what skills and resources students and faculty needed. A follow-up workshop was presented to faculty on April 9, 2004, focusing on how to evaluate and assess information literacy in student work. Virginia will continue her work with the caucus over the summer and next year. The caucus tentatively plans to do a campus-wide assessment of information literacy in 2006-2007.