

Overview of Information Literacy

Graduate students would again be expected to have mastered general information literacy skills as part of their undergraduate degree. Information literacy goals in graduate programs would be aimed at developing and mastering discipline-specific skills such as working with discipline-specific databases. The University Libraries provides additional opportunities for students to develop information literacy skills through individual instruction including reference services or group instruction such as information literacy workshops or instructional sessions embedded in disciplinary courses.

METHODS

CSUEB Academic Senate policy requires that each graduate program align to at least two university ILOs, as specified in the ILO Long-Term Assessment Plan. All graduate programs have submitted ILO-PLO mappings to indicate the ILOs to which they would align, and these alignments are available on the College assessment web pages.

Due to the wide variation in the goals of the various graduate programs with respect to the written communication ILO (e.g., proficiency in technical report writing vs. persuasive essays), each aligned graduate program was asked to develop program-specific rubrics for assessing the Written Communication ILO. The same is true for the programs which aligned to the Information Literacy ILO. This process is in contrast to the assessment of ILOs in the undergraduate program where a common rubric is used to assess all undergraduate work across all programs for each ILO.

Each aligned graduate program identified one or more graduate courses in which the ILO was to be assessed, and the instructor of the course was asked to identify or develop an assignment that could be effectively used for assessment purposes. Individual programs decided how many samples they would gather in each assessed course and also identified faculty members responsible for applying the program-specific rubrics to generate the assessment data. The results of the assessment efforts were provided in each program's annual report to the Academic Senate [Committee on Academic Planning and Review \(CAPR\)](#) and to the [Office of Graduate Studies](#).

Assessment of Graduate Level ILO Written Communication Student Work 2018- 2019

Table 1. Numbers of programs aligned by college for Written Communication and Information Literacy ILOs 2018-19.

College	Programs Represented	# Programs Aligned to Written Communication ILO	#Programs Aligned to Information Literacy ILO
CBE	Accounting Business Analytics Economics	2	1

communication skills or may be the result of discipline-specific terminology and proposed assessment methods in specifying those outcomes.

Table 2. Characterization of Rubrics for Written Communication ILO Assessment

College	Program	Rubric	# Criteria	Scale
CBE				
	Accounting	Discipline-specific	5	1-8
	Business Analytics	Discipline-specific	4	1-4
CEAS				
	Early Childhood Education	Discipline-specific	1	1-4
	Educational Technology	Discipline-specific	3	1-4
	Online Teaching and Learning	University	6	1-4
	Reading and Literacy	Discipline-specific	5	1-4
	Hospitality, Recreation, and Tourism	University	6	1-4

CLASS

values for the university rubric is given below. Only one program from CBE reported Written Communication ILO assessment results, and so those results have not been shown in the College view for confidentiality reasons.

Table 3. Average score on all Written Communication criteria on scale of 1-4

	University	CBE	CEAS	CLASS	CSCI
Average score	3.36	Withheld due to low N	3.53	2.98	3.44

1 Major Gaps 2 Some Gaps 3 Competent 4 Fully Competent

õVj g rkgtcwtg tgyky cuuki po gpvy cu o qtg f hlewhqt o cp{ í uwf gpw dqj k p vto u
of writing and information literacy. The main difficulties included developing a clear
purpose for the literature review, finding appropriate sources, and using sources
cr r tqr tkvgn{ vj uwr r qtvj g y tkgtõ r wtr qug.õ
õUwf gpw y gnguvctgcu y gtg k rpi wci g wuci g cpf o gej cpleu. Au pgctn{ cmuwf gpw
in our graduate program are not native English speakers, this is not surprising.õ

Assessment of Graduate Level ILO Information Literacy Student Work 2018-2019

Only one graduate program aligned with the Information Literacy ILO. For confidentiality reasons, that data is not reported here. Ip cf f kkp, cp õpõ qhqqg ku vqg uo cmvq r tqxide meaningful results. The ILO Subcommittee will address this issue in the future.

PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS FOR FUTURE GRADUATE PROGRAM ILO ASSESSMENT CYCLES

In discussions with Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) members and Institutional Research (IR), it became clear that it would be advantageous, in terms of data analysis and comparison of assessment results, to follow the data collection processes used in assessing undergraduate programs to the extent possible. That process is given here from the [ILO Calibration Guide for the Assessment of Student Learning](#):

Faculty Assessed Student Work: For each participating course section, four student samples were selected using Blackboard Outcomes, an electronic a792 2(ng)lu TETQ EMC /P ÆMCID 2

would also require that each assignment be assessed by two different assessors to protect against individual assessor scoring bias. Most graduate programs used a single assessor.

Undergraduate programs will be using a single assessor to assess Quantitative Reasoning in 2019-2020 due to the discipline-specific nature of the ILO. One could argue that most of the ILOs become discipline-specific at the graduate level, and hence a single assessor might always be appropriate. Graduate programs which chose to use two assessors to assess a limited number of assignments could still reduce the burden compared to assessing large numbers of assignments with a single assessor.

On a related note, in terms of reporting, it would be helpful to provide the number of assignments which y gtg ueqtgf cvgcej tcnpi hqt gcej etkgtk lp c r tqi tco atwdtk tcvj gt vj cp a single average score. This additional granularity of data would be useful for analysis purposes. Again, no guidance was provided as to the format of the data to be reported, and each program used their own reporting method.

A second consideration identified by Institutional Research was that analysis of collected data is challenging given the wide variety of rubrics chosen by the individual graduate programs. Due to the variability in the writing goals for the students in the various graduate programs, it is appropriate to allow for differences in the rubrics used to assess the student assignments. It would be advantageous, however, to emphasize any commonality that does exist. IR suggested that programs might re-evaluate whether the university rubric could be used for a given program, either in whole or part. Many programs however have developed rubrics to closely match their program goals or are bound to use rubrics specified by the accrediting bodies. In these cases, it may be reasonable to specify a mapping of program-specific criteria to the criteria in the university rubric. Even a partial mapping of program criteria to the university criteria as appropriate would allow for a reasonable level of data analysis.

Assessment Plan and EEC Communication Plan focused on discussions in fall of 2019 and implementation in Spring 2020. This includes reviewing those results that add meaning to their discussions about improving student performance in Written Communication and Information Literacy.

Support for College and Graduate Advisory Council Discussions

Please see University Summary Report for contacts and potential meeting format. Possible additional graduate-specific discussion questions include:

1. How do results of graduate assessment compare to undergraduate assessment in departments with both undergraduate and graduate programs? 24 ssment in