1. Action Plan Title: Information Literacy Measurement

2. Unit Submitting Action Plan: Library

3. Contact Person(s)/Action Plan Leader(s): Ruth Moon, Librarian

4. Date of Initial Proposal: 4/2/2008

5. Action Plan Description (100 words or fewer): This action plan proposes an inclusive, district-wide process for identifying and selecting an assessment instrument that can best provide a baseline measurement of our students’ Information Literacy skills, abilities, and understanding. Further, to collaborate with faculty across divisions, to consult with IR and other stakeholders, and through that process, determine the best method to administer the selected instrument to students. Baseline data from the assessment or survey will then be available to inform future decisions regarding instructional needs for Information Literacy (IL).

6. Action Plan Link to Program Review (discuss how the Action Plan is linked to program review goals, objectives and/or Quality Improvement Plans of programs impacted by this plan): IL is one of four primary components of the Library Mission Statement: “Promote information literacy, critical thinking, intellectual independence, and lifelong learning skills.” The Library’s most recent three year transformation plan includes, “implement research based planning.”

7. CR Strategic Goal(s) and 2008-09 Objective(s) specific to the Action Plan:
Goal 1: Enable student attainment of educational goals: IL skills are critical to student success and are transferable to the workplace, to additional higher education goals, and for lifelong learning. Specific Objectives to be addressed include: 1.1 Reduce barriers to persistence; and 1.5 Increase the number of transfers

Goal 3: Build a culture of assessment: IL assessment data will inform planning decisions within courses, disciplines, and in program and service development. Specific Objectives to be addressed include: 3.1 Increase student learning performance through student learning outcomes

8. Key Performance Indicators specific to the Action Plan: Obviously, measurement alone will not improve KPIs, but once we have a baseline of students’ IL competency levels, we can measure improvements that result from workshops or courses and their impact on KPIs such as Student Satisfaction, Completion, Retention, Persistence, and Transfer Rates. Research on the correlations between IL instruction and these KPIs has been for many years a focus of librarians’ research at colleges and universities.

9. ACCJC/WASC Accreditation Standard(s) specific to the Action Plan: This Action Plan is in support of Standard I: The institution provides the means for students to learn, assesses how well learning is occurring, and strives to improve that learning through ongoing, systematic, and integrated planning; and of Standard II: Instructional programs, student support services, and
library and learning support services facilitate the achievement of the institution’s stated student learning outcomes.

10. Data supporting the intent of the Action Plan (include enrollment data, committee minutes, etc): Current data on CR student’s abilities to locate, find, use, and evaluate information (IL competencies) is nonexistent or anecdotal. Lacking a measurement tool, and in the absence of any baseline data, we have no way to determine effectiveness of current IL instruction, or its effect on student satisfaction, retention, persistence, or transfer rate. The following review of historical and recent actions and research support the need for IL assessment and program development at this college:

Spring, 1998, the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges (ASCCC) affirmed information competency as ‘essential to student success in the Information Age,’ in the report, “Information Competency in the California Community Colleges.” This report defined Information Competency and recommended that the fundamentals be introduced into college orientation/learning skills courses, and be further developed by embedding them in general education transfer and other required courses. (http://www.asccc.org/Publications/Papers/Info_competency.html)

January 2000, the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) approved “Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education,” which include performance indicators and outcomes that define information literacy and competency, and which have become the universally accepted standards nationwide. (http://www.ala.org/ala/acrl/acrlstandards/informationliteracycompetency.cfm)

Spring 2002, the ASCCC published “Academic Literacy: a statement of competencies expected of students entering California’s public colleges and universities,” which focused on identifying skills and habits of mind essential to student success in college. In this report, specific IL skills deemed as essential, many of which stand as examples of the outcomes to be measured, include:

- college writing assignments frequently require analysis, synthesis, and, notably, research
- conduct college-level research to develop and support their own opinions and conclusions
- correctly document research materials to avoid plagiarism
- critically assess the authority and value of research materials that have been located
- embrace the value of research to explore new ideas through reading and writing
- evaluate the authenticity of the Website, the credibility of the author, and the validity of material found on the Web
- have adequate access and experience with computer technology
- have information finding and basic Internet research skills
- have research skills, including the ability to conduct disciplined, planned inquiry
- know how to cite Internet sources
- know what constitutes plagiarism and how to avoid it when using the Internet
- synthesize information from several sources
- use research to support/challenge
- use search engines effectively
- use the library catalog and the Internet to locate relevant sources

(http://www.asccc.org/Publications/Papers/AcademicLiteracy/main.htm)
In 2003, the Association of American Universities and The Pew Charitable Trusts published “Understanding University Success: a report from standards for success,” in which IL was documented as one of the key skills required for students to do well in college. Available in numerous locations on the web, including: (http://www.murraystate.edu/secsv/parents/Understanding_Success.pdf)

Glendale CC librarians evaluated students who had taken a semester length IL course, compared to those who had not, over a 5 year study (2000-2005). They found both short and long term positive effects on student success, using measures such as GPA, number of units completed per semester, and persistence rate. The Glendale librarians also evaluated students taking the typical one-hour library workshops. The average success rate for students who had taken a workshop was 13% higher than for those students who had not taken a workshop. (http://www.glendale.edu/library/instruction/IC-research-report.html)

11. Intended Action Plan Outcomes (include baseline data where applicable): An assessment instrument will be selected that best meets student and faculty needs. A plan to implement the assessment instrument will be devised. Results of the initial assessment will be analyzed and used to inform future planning regarding student learning outcomes in information literacy and how best to achieve them at this college. Data from the initial and any possible subsequent assessments will support library service improvements, and the integration of course and program IL SLOs.

12. Action Plan Activities and Proposed Timeline:
Aug 2008 Collect examples of available IL assessment tests or exercises
Sep 2008 Review the tests and analyze suitability for this institution
Oct-Dec 2008 Consult with Division Chairs, faculty, the Assessment Team, and IR on administration procedures
Dec 2008 Select a test that provides the best match for student, faculty, and institutional data needs
Feb-Mar 2009 Administer assessment instrument to students
Apr 2009 Collect input from students and faculty about the process
Apr 2009 Analyze effectiveness of administration method
Apr-May 2009 Analyze results of assessment

13. Is the Action Plan an inter-unit project? If yes, describe. Rather than devising a plan within one specific area or department, this plan requires input from departments and divisions institution-wide. Part of the work of this pilot project is to seek the buy-in of faculty and administrators. Whatever assessment tool is selected must meet the needs of the college, and consultation with faculty and staff is critical to understanding those needs.

Library: provide leadership; conduct research; schedule consultations
Institutional Research: provide guidance in review and selection of assessment instrument
Division Chairs: provide input to aid in selecting an administration method
Assessment Team: review along with other assessments being proposed or in use at CR

12 A. Contact information of involved manager(s) (name, title, email, phone)
Librarian Ruth Moon, ruth-moon@redwoods.edu, 476-4263
14. Identify any additional organizational areas that may be affected or involved in this Action Plan:

- Facilities/Maintenance
- Marketing
- ITS/TSS
- Library
- Disabled Students Programs/Services
- Student Services (List Specific Department(s):)

15. Identify the impact on resources and anticipated costs of the Action Plan.

Range of price per student for assessment instruments are from $0 - $20. Testing 2,000 students could thus cost anywhere from $0 - $40,000.

More exact estimates can’t be predicted until after an assessment tool and administration method has been selected. While cost should be one factor in choosing a test, it should not be the only, or ultimate deciding factor.

Additionally, the number of students to assess should be selected based on sound statistical principles, and not solely on cost. Determining the sample size is part of the administration method analysis. Overall, the size of the sample and the cost can be balanced to target an acceptable cost ceiling.

I am requesting for this pilot project $5,000, which I estimate to be adequate to this project. This is to cover the cost of purchasing the assessment. If a free, or lower cost measurement tool is selected, excess funds will be returned. All other costs are in already existing personnel, as listed in item 13. above. There are no other material costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Plan Budget Submission Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies (expendable, consumable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (non-expendable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (ITS/TSS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources (students, staff, faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expected Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Manager Review: ___________________________ Date: ___________

*(name and title)*
**Impacted Area Review (for all units/departments listed in items 12 and 13):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit/Department Name</th>
<th>Manager (name, title, signature)</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>Jason Leppaluoto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
<td>Martha Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCMM Division Chair</td>
<td>Michael Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALSS Division Chair</td>
<td>Justine Shaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTECH Division Chair</td>
<td>Helen Edwards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSE Division Chair</td>
<td>Tony Sartori</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Team</td>
<td>Co-Chairs Susan Nordlof &amp; Cheryl Tucker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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