The Program Review online system was enhanced in Spring 2014 to include incorporation of the institution-set standards for successful course completion rate and course retention rate, and each discipline received data to evaluate the percentage of total college certificates and degrees it has awarded each year (in addition to the number awarded annually). This data was analyzed as part of the program review process. In addition, disciplines were asked to evaluate their levels of performance in relation to the institution-set standards, to develop strategies and/or interventions to be implemented to bring about improvement in the achievement outcomes where needed, and to assess the effectiveness of any implemented strategies and interventions. The analysis of the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 program reviews was further examined by the academic deans and the Educational Planning Committee. The College has established a process to review the institutional set standards which is being implemented Fall 2014.

The College continues to make progress on refining its online SLO/PLO/ILO reporting system and its SLO website. These two systems have been evaluated to correct any inconsistencies. Benchmarks for student success have been established for each SLO/PLO/ILO. Six-year master schedules for assessment of all learning outcomes have been created for the academic, student service, and administrative service areas and are updated each semester. These schedules also are linked in the program review template for ease of reference and they are posted on the SLO website. The SLO Coordinators, department chairs, deans, and vice presidents review their respective areas to assist with quality control.

A summary of the results reported in the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 Program Review and the Department Chairs’ Fall 2013 and Spring Semester 2014 SLO/PLO Summary Reports was distributed and discussed at the Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (LOAC), Senate, and Council of Instruction (COI), thus ensuring broad-based distribution of results and college-wide engagement.

The Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (LOAC) met 16 times during the 2013-2014 academic year. This committee is co-chaired by the SLO Coordinator and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. All committee meetings were well attended and almost all academic departments were represented. In addition, members include representatives from the Student Service and Administrative Service areas. The last three meetings during Spring 2014 were joint meetings with the Program Review Oversight Committee (PROC). Together LOAC and PROC wrote joint recommendations for the creation of a structure and process that will more strongly integrate SLO assessments and student learning improvements with institutional planning and resource allocations. Agendas and minutes of these meetings are posted on the College SLO website.

LOAC helped to plan and conduct the PLO Assessment Retreat on May 2, 2014 and the 2nd Annual SLO Summit on October 17, 2014. This retreat and the two annual summits have provided further opportunities for cross-disciplinary dialog and a venue for sharing assessment results and plans for improvement. The interaction during these events and feedback assist the
college with future planning and data driven decisions. The cross-discipline “Deep Dialog Discussion” groups, which began meeting in the Fall of 2013 and continued through the Spring of 2014, also provided opportunities for extensive discussion and sharing of assessment results and improvements.

In Summer 2014, modifications were made in the SLO online system: each PLO is now not only linked with its supporting course SLOs but also with all their corresponding assessments. Proportions of students who have reached the SLO benchmark (stated underneath the rubric), in addition to the rubric averages, are now listed. A comment textbox has been added for chairs and faculty to evaluate further the program outcome assessment work that has been done. ILO assessment links also have been added to the assessment section; thus when a faculty member creates a new assessment or modifies an existing assessment, he/she is required to select at least one of the ILOs that were assigned to the SLO when it was created. This will make it easier to do additional ILO roll-up assessments.

In Spring 2014, an Information Competency ILO Assessment was completed and the analysis was conducted over the summer. The results are posted on the SLO website. A follow-up assessment will be conducted in Fall 2014. All seven LAMC ILOs have now been assessed, and LOAC is involved in discussing the results and planning for the follow-up assessments according to the Master Schedule.

An addendum to the Course Outline of Record (COR) was created and modified over the summer to make it easier to update SLOs and to fast track the changes through the curriculum process to ensure consistency of the CORs with the course syllabi. LAMC’s Web Architect has also developed a system to archive previous, but no longer used, SLOs and their assessments.

Departments have been working on streamlining their Program Learning Outcomes and archiving degrees and certificates that are no longer relevant. In fall of 2013, 95.5% of courses had at least one SLO assessed and most had assessed all course SLOs and were on the second and third round of assessment. In Spring 2014, 249 course assessments were conducted and posted on the online SLO system (compared to 186 in the fall). These statistics demonstrate the acceleration in assessments that had been requested of the College and the commitment of the faculty to meet the desired expectations. By the end of the fall semester, all SLOs and PLOs will have been assessed. Progress has been assisted by the Vice President of Academic Affairs who is now beginning his third year at LAMC and the hiring of two academic deans, and a research analyst to assist the recently hired Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. At a Council of Instruction meeting in September a subcommittee was formed to write a policy for “outliers”—those faculty who have been behind in completing their assessments. Consequences are being delineated and will be enforced.

As stated in the ACCJC’s letter of July 3, 2014, “The College has addressed Recommendation 2, resolved the deficiencies, and now meets associated Eligibility Requirements and standards.”
Conclusion: The college is working hard to develop a comprehensive system that is broad-based, with college wide engagement and broadly distributed results.

The college has designed and implemented a strategy to assess the achievement and learning outcomes on set standards, a portion of which has been implemented.

The college sets assessment dates for course level outcomes beginning a new cycle in spring 2014 for courses that appear on the Master Schedule. 95.5% of courses have had at least one SLO assessed. 78% of courses have had assessments evaluated and 59% have had changes implemented as a result of SLO assessment.

The college is in the process of assessing its ILOs and tracking assessments. It has assessed six and the seventh is being assessed spring 2014.

The college has 95 programs of which 63 have ongoing outcomes assessment. Work still needs to be done to insure that all programs have ongoing PLO assessment and that PLOs mapped to SLOs are assessed using tools that yield cross-curriculum data, and that programs are not relying solely on achievement data to assess PLOs. Additionally, programs vary with respect to the analysis and use of the achievement data.

Because of the variable or uneven implementation with respect to outcomes assessment, analysis of results, and use of results to improve pedagogy, the college does not yet meet the proficiency level. A continuous process of assessment will require a broader and deeper evaluation of reliable assessment data, implementation of interventions, and the assessment of intervention strategies.

The College is in the process of addressing the recommendation and correcting deficiencies, but is not yet in full compliance with Eligibility Requirement 10 and the Accreditation Standards.
LOAC GOALS – 2014-2015

Draft

1. Evaluate the assessment processes and make recommendations on how to improve those processes for all academic programs, the library, student support services, and administrative service areas.

2. Analyze the results of assessment (institutional learning outcomes, academic programs, student support services, and administrative service areas) and implement changes that improve learning and services.

3. Report to the appropriate constituencies the findings of our evaluations, surveys and analyses of assessment results.

4. Recommend to the appropriate constituencies how the assessment results could be used for institutional planning.

5. Initiate and promote campus-wide dialogue on student learning needs and issues revealed through the committee's survey and analysis.

6. Write an annual Assessment Report to be incorporated into the Mission College Learning Report.
Institutional Learning Outcomes
Information Competency
Spring 2014 Pilot Assessment Report

Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee
Los Angeles Mission College

Assumption:
The college recognizes that it is important for students to be information competent when they leave Mission College since it is one of LAMC's Institutional Learning Outcomes.

Statement of Purpose:
The purpose of this report is to present the process, results, observations, and recommendations of the spring 2014 pilot assessment of the Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) of Information Competency.

Assessment Process:
1. The assessment methods and process were developed and implemented spring 2014 by the ILO Information Competency Assessment Taskforce of LAMC’s Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee (LOAC).
2. 187 active courses linked one or more of their SLOs to the ILO of Information Competency. 124 of these courses were offered in spring 2014. Faculty, the SLO Co-chair, a librarian, and the Research Analyst formed the information competency assessment taskforce. 10 volunteers from 10 disciplines and 15 sections participated in the pilot assessment.
3. Assessment participants were recruited individually by the taskforce and by department chairs of disciplines that mapped one of their SLOs to the ILO of Information Competency.

### Spring 2014 Information Competency Assessment Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th># of pages</th>
<th>Research Assignment</th>
<th>Student Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>3126</td>
<td>Art 101</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0135/01346</td>
<td>Bio 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0225 online</td>
<td>Eng. 101</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>1000 words</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0554</td>
<td>Eng 101</td>
<td>Research Paper</td>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>3249</td>
<td>ESL 8</td>
<td>Research Report</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0264</td>
<td>ESL 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0293</td>
<td>Health 11</td>
<td>Research Paper</td>
<td>2.5-3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0332</td>
<td>Lib Sci 101</td>
<td>Annotated Bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>7804 H.S.</td>
<td>Lib Sci 101</td>
<td>Annotated Bibliography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0328</td>
<td>Micro 20</td>
<td>Research Paper/Report</td>
<td>1000 word min.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>3396</td>
<td>Philosophy 020</td>
<td>Essay</td>
<td>5-7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0424</td>
<td>Physiology 001</td>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0425</td>
<td>Physiology 001</td>
<td>Oral Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>7804</td>
<td>Poli Sci 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>0434</td>
<td>Poli Sci 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. The assessment was comprised of two parts.
   - Part I of the assessment was developed to assess students' application of IC outcomes. For this assessment, the Information Competency Assessment Taskforce adopted a common rubric (LOAC minutes, 3/13/2014) to be used by faculty to assess a research assignment in one of their classes.
   - Part II of the assessment was designed to assess what students know. For this part of the assessment, a student information competency survey was developed and distributed to students enrolled in the classes that participated in the common rubric assessment. Questions were designed to measure the information competency outcomes adopted by Los Angeles Mission College's Academic Senate in 2002. Based on the recommendation of Mission's Research Analyst, we narrowed the number of questions to fit on two pages of the survey. The survey was produced on Class Climate and included Student ID numbers so that results could be linked to college data.

**Assessment Results:**
- The ILO Information Competency Assessment Taskforce reviewed and analyzed the data from the two assessments in June 9, 2014 and again in June 30, 2014 when additional data was available. The observations and recommendations made by the taskforce will be presented to the Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee in fall 2014 for discussion and revision.

**Assessment Results--Part I: Common Rubric Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Art 101 (0225)</th>
<th>Eng 101 (0554)</th>
<th>ESL 8</th>
<th>Health 11</th>
<th>Micro 20</th>
<th>Phil 1 (0424)</th>
<th>Phys 1 (0425)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Ethics</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students scored fairly evenly across each criteria of the rubric for a total score overall of 3.1 out of 4 points or 76.2%. If the institutional benchmark were to be set at 70%, this score would
meet the benchmark. Students scored highest in the area of “Evaluate” at 3.11 or 77.8% and lowest in the area of “Find” at 2.98 or 74.3% and “Follow Ethics” at 3.03 or 75.7%.

Faculty assessors identified specific strengths and weakness of students in terms of information competency skills in their assessment analysis narrative. Based on the identified student weaknesses in the ILO information competency assessment, faculty planned the following curriculum modifications:

- Assuring that all students come prepared to participate in the group project will improve the overall success of the group projects and individual efforts. I’m modifying this assignment. I am going to assign points based on individual and group efforts to encourage better student preparedness.
- Provide students with specific instructions and examples of how to correctly cite sources used in their paper. Follow up throughout semester with voice, email, or etude reminders on expected citation format.
- Explicit instructions during class time on how to integrate source material into writing.
- Better prepare the students in understanding how to critique rather than summarize articles. Provide handout to help students better understand what a critique is and How to Critique an article.
- More strongly emphasize what plagiarism is and require students to turn in an outline prior to submitting their paper to ensure that they plan their papers first and then write it out in their own words.
- Students need to understand the value of researching opposing perspectives on moral disputes. This needs to be listed as a requirement in the assignment.

Observations and Recommendations--Part I — Common Rubric Assessment:

- The scores using the common information competency assessment rubric were higher than expected.
- It was difficult to apply the same rubric to different types of projects. Additionally, the voluntary aspect of the assessment might have lead to inflated scores.
- There was not a significant difference in the successful application of information competency skills from students who completed 30 or more units than those with less than 30 units.
- The sample size for the pilot ILO Information Competency common rubric assessment was too small to draw definitive conclusions.
- Some faculty did not have an assignment that could be assessed using all outcomes in the information competency common rubric; however, their class participated in the Information Competency Student Assessment Survey. It would be beneficial to the institutional ILO assessment process to explore revising the information competency common rubric so that the information competency assessment could include more types of assignments.
- The common rubric assessment data and curriculum modifications suggest that the college might benefit from engaging in discussions on how to best explain to students the concepts of avoiding plagiarism, integrating source material into writing, properly citing sources, critiquing
rather than summarizing articles, researching and presenting information from a variety of perspectives.

Assessment Results--Part II: Information Competency Student Assessment Survey

### Results by Units Completed and Highest English Level Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest English</th>
<th>Number of Surveys</th>
<th>Average Score on ILO Survey</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;30 units</td>
<td>30-59 units</td>
<td>60+ units</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above English 101</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 101</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76.9%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 6A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below English 21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results by Units Completed and Highest English Level Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest English</th>
<th>Number of Surveys</th>
<th>Average Number of Correct Responses (out of 11)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;30 units</td>
<td>30-59 units</td>
<td>60+ units</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above English 101</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 101</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English 21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESL 6A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below English 21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions:

364 students responded to the Information Competency Assessment Survey. Students averaged 8.2 correct answers out of 11 questions or 74.5%. This met our expectation that students who completed 30 units at Mission would answer 70% of the questions correctly, however, our expectation that students who completed 60 or more units at Mission and completed English 101 or higher would answer 80 percent or more of the Information Competency Survey questions correctly was not met. According to the spring 2014 survey data, the only group of students who answered 80% of the questions correctly were students who completed fewer than 30 units at Mission and had not completed any level of English at Mission. The data also reveals that most students who completed more than 60 units at Mission did not do as well on the survey as students who completed fewer than 30 units. The level of English completion with the exception of English 21 did not alter these results.
The "Correct Responses by Question" data illustrates that the information competency assessment questions were answered correctly 75% of the time. The five questions missed most frequently with a score of less than 70% correct responses indicate that students might need additional help in identifying an information need, evaluating information, understanding plagiarism, and citing sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Correct Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2.1 Information Competency is one of Mission College’s Institutional Learning Outcomes. Information Competency is described as:</td>
<td>8 17 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.2 Which is the best place to find research published by scholars, experts or professionals?</td>
<td>1 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.3 A primary source is:</td>
<td>166 58 134 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.4 An abstract is:</td>
<td>40 18 298 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.5 You see the following citation: Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997) Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. American Sociological Review, 62, 465-480. This citation is for:</td>
<td>118 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.6 Question eliminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.7 An effective thesis statement</td>
<td>40 37 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.8 How do you know if someone is an authority on climate change?</td>
<td>4 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.9 Which requires a current source of information?</td>
<td>67 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.10 Who would represent the target audience for the Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior?</td>
<td>25 308 28 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.11 Which of the following is true about plagiarism?</td>
<td>14 95 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2.12 APA and MLA style both refer to?</td>
<td>14 354</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations and Recommendations-- Part II: Information Competency Student Assessment Survey:

- Scores on the student survey were higher than expected.
- It is unclear why students who completed fewer than 30 units and no English at Mission answered more questions correctly than other students. The taskforce discussed that the survey sample might not be representative of the overall Mission College student population since the spring 2014 information competency pilot assessment was based on a volunteer sample rather than a random sample.
- Because the data is inconclusive from the student survey, the assessment taskforce recommends repeating the assessment in fall 2014 using a larger sample size and reevaluating the data before drawing definitive conclusions from the student assessment survey.

Summary of Recommendations for next ILO assessment:

- Begin ILO assessment process at the beginning of the semester.
- Expand number of disciplines participating in the institutional assessment of Information Competency.
- Rather than self-selected volunteer assessors, base the institutional assessment of Information Competency on a random sample of the active courses that link one or more course SLOs to the ILO of Information Competency.
- Consider modifying the common rubric to include more types of assignments or adopting a separate rubric for each identified IC outcome.
- Because Information Competency is an institutional learning outcome, measuring student performance of the ILO is incomplete if we do not assess faculty understanding of the ILO and how they share the information with students. The taskforce recommends that a survey be developed and given to faculty who mapped one of their SLOs to the ILO of information competency. The taskforce also recommends that Flex days include discussions on information competency and how we share our expectations with students.
- Prior to the next ILO common rubric assessment of Information Competency, establish a norming session with faculty assessors to discuss the meaning of each outcome.
- Use Flex Day or spring into spring for deep dialog about Plagiarism—strengthen and reinforce common plagiarism statement on syllabi. Offer plagiarism training/discussions.
- LOAC discuss merging the institutional assessments of Written Communication and Information Competency.
- Make Class Climate ILO student survey available to online students.
- LOAC's involvement in ILO assessment is important. The Taskforce recommends that LOAC follow up on recommendations resulting from ILO assessments.
- Curriculum ECD should include a link to definition and ILO outcomes. ECD should link to more detailed information about Information Competency (LOAC Minutes, 2/26/2014).
- Department Chair support is very important for successful assessment of Information Competency ILO (LOAC Minutes, 3/26/2014).
Appendices
Information Competency Outcomes
Courses that linked SLO to Information Competency
IC Rubric
IC Common Rubric Assessment Instructions
IC Student Survey (incorrect)
IC Student Survey Instructions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>4 Exemplary</th>
<th>3 Proficient</th>
<th>2 Developing</th>
<th>1 Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know:</td>
<td>Has a well-developed and engaging topic, research question or thesis</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the topic, research question or thesis completely</td>
<td>Defines the scope of the topic, research question, or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.)</td>
<td>Cannot formulate a topic, research question, or thesis based on an information need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find:</td>
<td>Retrieves relevant, quality information from a variety of sources</td>
<td>Retrieves relevant information from a variety of sources</td>
<td>Retrieves relevant information from limited and similar sources</td>
<td>Retrieves information that lacks relevance and quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate:</td>
<td>Compares and evaluates information according to specific criteria appropriate to the discipline</td>
<td>Selects sources that are appropriate for academic work</td>
<td>Selects sources that are appropriate for academic work</td>
<td>Uses sources that are not timely, accurate, relevant or credible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use:</td>
<td>Expands on conclusions from sources and is able to clearly communicate ideas</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources and achieves intended purpose</td>
<td>Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources, but does not synthesize information so that the intended purpose is not fully achieved.</td>
<td>Communicates information from sources but the information is fragmented or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased) Does not achieve the intended purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow Ethics:</td>
<td>Properly incorporates the ideas/published words of others into their work building upon them</td>
<td>Gives credit for works used by quoting, citing and listing references accurately according to a selected writing style and guidelines</td>
<td>Inconsistently gives credit for information and others' ideas</td>
<td>Uses the information and ideas of others (copies and paraphrases) without giving credit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Thank you for completing this survey. Your responses will help Mission College improve support services for students.

1.1 What is your Student ID number?

1.2 What support services have you used this semester? Mark all that apply.
- MLA or APA workshop
- Ebooks workshop
- Library research orientation with class
- Research workshop
- Health workshop
- Databases workshop
- Health online tutorial
- Learning Center writing tutors
- Watched online critical thinking videos

2. Please select the best answer for each question below.

2.1 Information Competency is one of Mission College's Institutional Learning Outcomes. Information Competency is best described as:
- The ability to read complex documents.
- The ability to recognize when information is needed and to locate, evaluate and use information effectively and responsibly.
- The ability to search the free web for information.
- The ability to summarize information you need.

2.2 Which is the best place to find research published by scholars, experts or professionals?
- amazon.com
- books and scholarly journals
- newspapers
- general interest magazines

2.3 A primary source is:
- an original document such as a diary, letter, etc.
- a collection of critical essays
- the first book or journal article written on a topic
- an article or book that extensively analyzes a topic
2. Please select the best answer for each question below. [Continue]

2.4 An abstract is:
- a quotation from a book
- a type of government document
- a full text article
- a summary of a resource

2.5 You see the following citation: Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997) Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. American Sociological Review, 62, 45-480. This citation is for:
- a book
- a newspaper article
- a journal article
- a website

2.6 Which of the following choices provides the best list of keywords to use for the following assignment? Prepare a presentation on the gains achieved by women during the 1980s.
- presentation, women, gains
- women, gains, achieved
- women, gains, 1980s

2.7 An effective thesis statement
- Should be clear and specific
- Identifies the subject of the paper, and is a statement not a question
- Takes a stand rather than simply announcing a subject
- All of the above

2.8 How do you know if someone is an authority on climate change?
- She has her own website
- She uses technical jargon that most readers wouldn't understand
- She has a PhD

2.9 Which requires a current source of information?
- An analysis of the 2000 Presidential election recount
- A critique of Shakespeare's sonnets
- A biography on Cesar Chavez
- Marketing statistics on flat screen TVs

2.10 Who would represent the target audience for the Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior?
- Members of Weight Watchers
- Professors, researchers, and students in human nutrition
- Athletes and coaches
- Chefs looking for nutritious recipes

2.11 Which of the following is true about plagiarism?
- The same essay submitted to different classes is plagiarism
- Passing off someone else's work as your own is plagiarism
- Giving credit to your sources is a way to avoid plagiarism
- All the above

2.12 APA and MLA style both refer to?
- Library classification systems
- Formats for documenting the sources used for a paper
- Call numbers
- Article indexes
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