|  |
| --- |
| *Fall 2013 Information Literacy Reliability* |
|  | Criteria | Link to GE Assessment Mapping (Outcome) | Inter-rater Reliability (calculated as Kappa) |
|  | Citation (4a.2 & 4b.2) | 1a-Analyze, synthesize, and/or evaluate ideas, concepts, and/or evidence. | .31 |
|  | Evaluating Assumptions (4a.1, 4b.1, 4a.2 & 4b) | 1a-Analyze, synthesize, and/or evaluate ideas, concepts, and/or evidence. | .08 |
|  | Identifying Key Concepts and Sources (4a.1, 4) | 1b-Describe diverse aspects of a discipline using discipline-specific concepts. | .19 |
|  | Selecting Appropriate Sources (4a.2 & 4b.2) | 1b-Describe diverse aspects of a discipline using discipline-specific concepts. | .15 |
|  | Types of Source Materials (4a.1 & 4b.1) | 1c-Apply appropriate problem-solving strategies to discipline-specific issues | .31 |
| \*Rubric reliability: α = .92 |

|  |
| --- |
| *Fall 2013 Information Literacy Expectations*  |
|  | Citation (4a.2 & 4b.2) | Evaluating Assumptions (4a.1, 4b.1, 4a.2 & 4b) | Identifying Key Concepts and Sources (4a.1, 4) | Selecting Appropriate Sources (4a.2 & 4b.2) | Types of Source Materials (4a.1 & 4b.1) |
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Does not meet expectation | 62 | 57.4 | 65 | 60.2 | 57 | 52.8 | 38 | 35.5 | 34 | 46.6 |
| Meets expectation | 10 | 9.3 | 11 | 10.2 | 11 | 10.2 | 13 | 12.2 | 4 | 5.5 |
| Exceeds expectation | 36 | 33.3 | 32 | 32 | 40 | 37 | 56 | 52.3 | 35 | 47.9 |
| Total | 108 | 100 | 108 | 100 | 108 | 100 | 107 | 100 | 73 | 100 |

|  |
| --- |
| *Fall 2013 Information Literacy Percent Agreement Among Raters* |
|  % Agreement | Citation (4a.2 & 4b.2) | Evaluating Assumptions (4a.1, 4b.1, 4a.2 & 4b) | Identifying Key Concepts and Sources (4a.1, 4) | Selecting Appropriate Sources (4a.2 & 4b.2) | Types of Source Materials (4a.1 & 4b.1) |
|  |  | % |  | % |  | % |  | % |  | % |
| 100 | 49 | 45.4 | 32 | 29.6 | 41 | 37.9 | 37 | 34.3 | 33 | 45.2 |
| 80 | 51 | 47.2 | 68 | 62.9 | 63 | 58.3 | 66 | 61.1 | 39 | 53.4 |
| 60 | 7 | 6.5 | 7 | 6.5 | 3 | 2.8 | 3 | 2.8 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 40 | 1 | .9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .9 | 0 | 0 |
| 20 | 0 | 0 | 1 | .9 | 1 | .9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 108 | 108 | 108 | 108 | 73 |

|  |
| --- |
| *Fall 2013 Information Literacy*  |
|  | **All Enrolled At SU** | **Sampled for Assessment** |
|  | **N** | **% of All** | **GPA** | **N** | **GPA** | **% of All** | **% of GE Course**  |
| **Native SU Students** |
| Freshman | 1521 | 31% | 2.86 | 26 | 2.99 | 2% | 3% |
| Sophomore | 1207 | 25% | 3.04 | 25 | 3.1 | 2% | 7% |
| Junior\* | 1148 | 23% | 3.08 | 25 | 3.3 | 2% | 17% |
| Senior | 1049 | 21% | 3.18 | 26 | 3.25 | 3% | 32% |
| **Transfer SU Students** |
| Freshman | 126 | 5% | 2.28 | 24 | 2.73 | 14% | 28% |
| Sophomore\* | 650 | 24% | 2.46 | 24 | 2.85 | 3% | 9% |
| Junior | 1031 | 38% | 2.8 | 26 | 2.78 | 3% | 15% |
| Senior | 915 | 34% | 3.05 | 23 | 3.11 | 3% | 31% |
| Demographic and cumulative grade comparisons were made to examine the similarities of the sampled students, all students enrolled in the selected courses, and all undergraduate students enrolled at SU. Overall, cumulative grades were similar across most comparison groups. However, the average cumulative grade point average (GPA) for SU native juniors was significantly lower than the cumulative GPA for SU native juniors sampled for this assessment. Additionally, the cumulative GPA for sophomore transfer students enrolled at SU in fall 2011 was significantly lower than the cumulative GPA for sophomore transfer students sampled for this assessment. Thus, results for these two groups *may* overestimate the ability of the average SU student. |