

Millikin University Assessment of Student Learning

Due August 1.

College/School	Staley Library
Department or Program	Library Instruction
Assessment Coordinator	Matthew Olsen
Email(s)	molsen@millikin.edu

Assessment is a means to review and improve, NOT prove. It is to be expected that learning goals may need to change over time, that pedagogies may or may not be successful, and that changes may take time to show effects. The Annual Assessment Update should review and report progress on learning goals over the last 1-3 years, provided extensive changes in learning outcomes or assessment practices have not occurred. ***Only half of the program learning goals will be assessed in this report.***

Year 1: Assessment of Student Learning, focusing on first half of Student Learning Outcomes

Year 2: Assessment of Student Learning, focusing on second half of Student Learning Outcomes

Year 3: Fiscal Review

Year 4: Assessment of Student Learning, focusing on first half of Student Learning Outcomes

Year 5: Assessment of Student Learning, focusing on second half of Student Learning Outcomes

Year 6: Program Review

This Annual Update includes describing any modifications of pedagogies employed or how learning is being assessed. In addition to summarizing annual findings, if there are changes that should be employed or new learning goals examined, these should be described with the approximate timeline needed to adequately assess whether they are successful; one year will likely not be enough time to produce a verdict in support or opposition of the change.

Please submit Department/School Reports to the appropriate Dean and Director of Academic Effectiveness. University Studies Reports should be submitted to the Director of Academic Effectiveness only.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLO): Outcomes and Rationale

For historical and/or informational purposes, please list the student learning outcomes (SLO) of your program below. This is information that should not need to be updated annually, unless there are changes to the SLO.

1. Students will identify the use and purpose of potential information sources and formats.
2. Students will develop and implement search strategies to retrieve resources using library and non-library tools.
3. Students will evaluate the information that they find to determine its context, value, and to identify bias or deception.
4. Students will understand ethical aspects of information and information technology.

Rationale for Student Learning Outcome(s). Explain why this/these outcome(s) is/are important to the program and/or to the institution overall. Limit 750 words.

The mission of Staley Library's instruction program is to empower students to become information literate adults who are confident in their information seeking abilities and who can apply critical thinking skills in the discovery, evaluation, and ethical use of information. The program supports the academic curriculum of Millikin University and strives to develop students who are not only successful academically, but also who are prepared to use information critically and ethically throughout their lives.

The four learning outcomes for Staley Library's instruction program cover the entire research process and are based on the Association of College & Research Libraries' "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education." They also complement the University Writing learning goal that students will "practice all aspects of writing processes including invention, research, drafting, sharing with others, and revising," the Writing in the Disciplines learning goals that students will "conduct in-depth primary and secondary research," "evaluate sources for credibility, bias, quality of evidence, and quality of reasoning," and "develop arguments rooted in research in order to enter disciplinary and cross-disciplinary conversations," and the Honors Writing Studio learning goal that students will "conduct research to participate in academic inquiry."

The library's learning outcomes also correspond to the University-wide learning goals:

1. Millikin students will prepare for professional success.
2. Millikin students will prepare for democratic citizenship in a global environment.
3. Millikin students will prepare for a personal life of meaning and value.

The table below shows how Staley Library's learning outcomes relate to University-wide learning goals.

Library Learning Goal	Corresponding MU Learning Goal
Students will identify the use and purpose of potential information sources and formats.	1, 3
Students will develop and implement search strategies to retrieve resources using library and non-library tools.	1, 3
Students will evaluate the information that they find to determine its context, value, and to identify bias or deception.	1, 3
Students will understand ethical aspects of information and information technology.	2, 3

This section last reviewed/updated on ____July 15, 2025____ by ____Matthew Olsen____.

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)

An effective plan should outline the type of data you will assess, an instrument used for data collection, and a measurable target for achieving the SLO. Cumulative analysis of multiple years can be beneficial for identifying trends in outcomes, especially if annual artifact collection is low.

Each learning outcome should be assessed separately. Please assess a single learning outcome below in sections A-F. This template provides room for analysis of 3 SLOs; please contact the Director of Academic Effectiveness if you need a modified template.

Which learning outcome are you assessing in this section?

3. Students will evaluate the information that they find to determine its context, value, and to identify bias or deception.

We chose to focus on this learning outcome because for the past several years students have performed poorly on this SLO, especially in EN181.

A. Review of assessment cycle. List the relevant year(s) for this assessment cycle, i.e. current or previous academic year, and briefly summarize the academic unit's assessment activities during this cycle. Describe any modifications to previous assessments.

This assessment report covers the 2025-2026 academic year.

Most of the library's instruction takes place in introductory University Studies courses, which are the focus of this assessment report. Because these courses are taken by all Millikin students early in their college career, this approach allows us to provide an information literacy foundation that students can use in all their coursework. All three of the library faculty (Elizabeth Hollendonner, Matthew Olsen, and Amanda Pippitt) teach in the library's instruction program. Librarians offer instructional activities in all sections of:

- IN140: Millikin Foundations
- HN183: Honors University Seminar
- EN181: University Writing
- EN281: Writing in the Disciplines
- HN150: Honors Writing Studio I
- HN151: Honors Writing Studio II

The instruction in IN140 & HN183 consists of a self-guided tour of the library and an in-class instruction session. The tour assessment (a worksheet and a survey) focus on SLOs 1 & 2 and is not included in this report, and the instruction is assessed in the pre- and post-test administered in EN181 (see below).

In EN181 the librarians offer an optional video on research questions that students are encouraged to watch prior to the two in-class instruction sessions with a librarian. During the sessions students complete a worksheet on developing effective research questions and keywords. Assessment for EN181 is done through a pre- and post-test that students take in Moodle. The pre-test is taken prior to any library instruction, and the post-test is taken after the library instruction is complete. The pre- and post-test were modified this year to focus exclusively on SLOs 3 & 4.

In EN281 the librarians offer two optional videos, one on research in the disciplines and one on primary and secondary sources. There are two in-class library instruction sessions for each section of EN281. Assessment is done through a review of the final portfolios collected by the writing faculty. The librarian review of the portfolios assesses SLOs 3 & 4. The rubric (modified this year to focus on SLOs 3 & 4) has been used for several years to assess the EN281 portfolios.

In HN150 the librarians offer two library instruction sessions, and in HN151 the librarians typically offer one library instruction session. The instruction activities in Honors Writing Studio are assessed through a pre-test that is administered in Moodle to all HN150 students in the fall semester prior to any library instruction and a Moodle post-test in the spring semester for all HN151 students after the library instruction is complete. The tests consist of two parts, one on students' confidence in the research process and a second part that assesses students' skills. Part 1 covers all four learning outcomes and was administered in full, although only the results pertaining to SLOs 3 & 4 are included in this report. Part 2 was modified this year to focus exclusively on SLOs 3 & 4.

B. Summary of Data Source(s). In what course(s) did the assessment occur? What instruments/assignments were used? How many students participated in the assessment? Complete the table below for this Learning Outcome (there may be more rows than needed). If tests were administered or a rubric was used, please provide a copy in an appendix at the end of your report.

Course Assessed	# of Sections	Instructor	# of Students Enrolled	What artifact was Collected? (paper, exam, etc.)	How many artifacts were collected?	How many artifacts were assessed?
EN181	22	Hollendonner, Olsen, Pippitt	369	Pre- & Post-Test	Pre-Test = 189 (51%), Post-Test = 166 (45%)	Pre-Test = 187, Post-Test = 166
EN281	18	Hollendonner, Olsen, Pippitt	275	Portfolio (collected by writing faculty)	9 (3%)	9
HN150	4	Hollendonner, Pippitt	55	Pre-Test	29 (53%)	29
HN151	4	Hollendonner, Pippitt	60	Post-Test	38 (63%)	38

C. Target for Success. What is the measurable target you expect to achieve? If using target verbs such as “increase”, “reduce”, “improve”, or “decrease” -- what is the baseline comparison value? e.g., 70% of students performing at mastery level on a specific assignment, an increase of 5% in number of students attaining mastery over prior year, etc. A benchmark value *must* be provided for comparison.

For the EN181 pre- and post-test we are targeting a 20% average increase in correct responses across all the questions and all the assessed learning outcomes. For the HWS pre- and post-test we are targeting a 10% increase in research confidence and information literacy skills from the pre-test to the post-test. In the past we have seen smaller increases in the scores in the honors courses because the honors students tend to score higher on the pre-test.

For the EN281 portfolios we are setting a target score of 2 or above for each of the categories in the rubric. This would place students in the “developing” heading towards “proficient” designation.

D. Assessment Data. Provide a summary of data/results from the assessment measures utilized. This may include quantitative and/or qualitative data. Be as specific as possible; include numbers/percentages of students who were determined to meet the specified SLO. Compare results to prior years if applicable. May be included as a table or graph if beneficial. *Do not attach actual student artifacts.*

EN181 – Pre- and post-test comparison

Question	Pre-Test (n=187)	Post-Test (n=166)	Percent Change
2. Website evaluation	44%	46%	5%
3. Credible Sources	76%	95%	25%
Average	60%	70%	18%

EN281 – Portfolio analysis

(n=9)	Credible Sources	Sources Support Thesis	Overall
Average	1.56	1.56	1.56
Median	2	2	2.00

HWS (HN150 & HN151) – Pre- and post-test comparison of research confidence

Part 1, Questions 6, 9 & 10	Pre-Test (n=29)	Post-Test (n=40)	Point Change	Percent Change
Average (out of 5)	3.08	3.28	0.20	7%

HWS (HN150 & HN151) – Pre- and post-test comparison of information literacy skills

Part 2, Question	Pre-Test (n=29)	Post-Test (n=38)	Percent Change
2. Website evaluation	54%	66%	23%
3. Scholarly Sources	45%	76%	70%
Average	49%	71%	44%

E. Analysis. Provide a discussion of your findings. To what extent did you achieve the target specified above (e.g., completely, partially, did not achieve)? This section should be 1-2 pages.

For the EN181 pre- and post-test the average increase of 18% fell slightly short of our target of a 20% increase. There was a large disparity across the two questions that we used to assess this learning outcome. For the selected response question (#3), there was a 25% change from the pre-test to the post-test and the average score on the post-test was very high at 95% correct. For the constructed response question (#2) on evaluating websites for credibility, the percent change was only 5% and by the time of the post-test the average score was 1.37 out of 3 or 46%.

For EN281 the two categories of the rubric that assess SLO 3 had (coincidentally) an average score of 1.56 and a median score of 2. The average score did not meet our goal of 2, although the median score did match our target. The majority of the portfolios scored 2, with one 3 and two 0s. Compared with the last two years, the average score on the rubric category on the use of credible, current sources decreased while the score on the use of sources to support the author's thesis stayed essentially the same (0.1 point increase from the year before). This year we had a smaller number of portfolios to review (9 this year versus 16 last year). Every portfolio included enough elements to allow us to assess the artifact, which was not the case last year.

In Honors Writing Studio for Part 1 of the assessment, students showed a 7% increase in research confidence on questions assessing learning outcome 3. This is slightly below our target of 10%, although at a score of 3.28 out of 5, students were in the "this is neutral" heading towards the "this is easy" category. For Part 2 of the assessment, students demonstrated a 44% increase in correct responses from the pre-test to the post-test and an astonishing 70% increase on the selected response question (#3). The percent change was smaller (23%) on the constructed response question (#2) on evaluating websites for credibility and the average post-test score on this question was lower at 1.99 out of 3.0 (66%).

F. Takeaway: what do the results mean? Provide a discussion of what the results mean to the program overall. Do they indicate strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, or areas that warrant additional attention? Are there any gaps or inadequacies in assessment methods that may need to be changed for future assessments?

While the EN181 students fell short of our target, we did see an increase in the correct responses to the questions assessing SLO 3. For question 3, which asks students to identify scholarly articles as a source of objective and accurate information on a topic, 95% of the students made this identification correctly. Identification and discovery of scholarly articles is a major focus of our instruction for EN181, so these results are very encouraging. For the question on evaluating online sources (#2), the increase from pre-test to post-test was much smaller and the scores were much lower. However, for the previous two years we saw double-digit *decreases* in correct scores on this question, so this year is an improvement. As explained in previous reports, part of the issue is that evaluation of online sources is a focus of our instruction in Millikin Foundations (IN140), which almost all students take in the fall semester. Thus, the post-test for the spring EN181 sections are asking about material that students learned in the fall. If we look only at the difference from the pre-test to the post-test in the fall semester, when students are taking IN140, the percent increase from the pre-test to the post-test is almost 10% or double the overall average. The upshot is that students *are* increasing their ability to evaluate information and thus meeting learning

outcome 3 based on our library instruction, although perhaps not at the level that we would prefer.

The average scores for EN281 failed to meet our target, which continues a trend that we have seen for the past two years. Students generally struggle with incorporating sources into their writing in a way that is scholarly and authentic. While the students do use and cite sources, the sources typically do not support their overall argument and their inclusion does not seem organic. For example, a common strategy is to use one source per paragraph and to have one quote from that source in the paragraph. Students rarely bring sources into conversation with each other. For the rubric category on credible, current sources, we saw a decrease in the average score this year when compared to previous years. In part that can be explained by the inclusion of non-existent sources. Students provided citations with links that didn't work, DOIs that didn't point to an article, or articles that couldn't be found by searching for the article's title or author. Perhaps this was a result of sloppy citations. More likely it was a product of using artificial intelligence to search for sources, and the sources were hallucinated by the AI.

The Honors Writing Studio students' results were similar to what we have seen in the past. Students were relatively confident coming into their library instruction as evidenced by the pre-test results, and they were slightly more confident after the library instruction. Looking at the individual questions that address learning outcome 3, students had the lowest confidence on "having to sort through all the irrelevant results I get to find what I need" and showed the largest increase on this question (12%). Historically, when we have asked students what they learned or would like to learn in library instruction working through search results to find relevant resources is a common theme. For the skills-based questions, the HWS students' substantial increase from the pre-test to the post-test is very encouraging. Question 3, which is different from the question asked on the EN181 assessment, asked students to identify the most important consideration when deciding to use a scholarly source in their project. It is quite a challenging question. It asks students to move beyond simply understanding scholarly articles as credible sources of information and to recognize that deciding when to use a type of source is dependent on the context in which that source will be used. Exposing students to different types of sources and discussing their strengths and weaknesses is a focus on library instruction in the Honors Writing Studio classes, so this large increase is very encouraging. That 76% of students answered the question correctly indicates that while we did see a large improvement, it remains a challenging question and concept. The results for question #2 on evaluation of online sources are also encouraging even if the percentage increase from the pre-test to the post-test was smaller and the absolute scores were lower. We have some of the same challenges in HWS that we see in EN181 in that the bulk of our instruction on evaluating online sources takes place in HN183 in the fall and students receive the post-test at the end of the spring semester, thus there is a substantial gap between learning the material and being assessed on it.

For both EN181 and Honors Writing Studio, the pre-test and post-test format continues to work well for us. The tests are administered through Moodle and the course instructors have students complete the assessment before and after library instruction. This maximizes the librarians' time in the classroom while providing meaningful results. Teaching faculty are very supportive of our assessment, which is evidenced in the participation rate, which ranged from 45% to 63% – slightly higher for EN181 this year than last and slightly lower for HWS.

G. What actions will be taken based on analysis of the assessment results? Closing the feedback loop is essential. What does your academic unit intend to do with the information it has evaluated? Provide a brief explanation of how the results will be used to make any necessary specific changes within the program. If no changes are planned, briefly describe how the data suggest this as an appropriate course of action.

Possible changes include revisions to curriculum, courses, pedagogies, assignments, assessment methods, etc. If these changes will require resources beyond what your academic unit can provide, indicate what your academic unit anticipates needing and where it will seek these resources. For example, changes may require faculty development opportunities and initiatives, or the procurement of new resources or personnel.

While the results show that our library instruction is improving students' confidence and ability with learning outcome 3, evaluation of online sources, which is an important component of this SLO, is a continuing area of concern. Scoring the results both on the pre-test and the post-test demonstrated that while it is clear that students are familiar with some basic principles of online source evaluation, e.g., the importance of determining the author of the source or its date, they are also often using outdated evaluation principles like looking at the domain name ending or looking only within the source. Our goal is to get students to apply critical thinking and look outside the source using a strategy called "lateral reading." The post-test shows that relatively few students take this additional step and frequently fall back on methods they likely learned in high school or earlier.

In the last assessment report, we suggested reinforcing this material in EN181. We did some of that last year and will continue to find opportunities to do so. Adding the additional question to assess this SLO also helped to provide a better sense of how well we are meeting it (previously the online source evaluation question was the only one assessing this SLO). However, before the next assessment cycle for this SLO the librarians will need to revisit our instruction on this topic not only to ensure that students are taking a more sophisticated approach to online source evaluation but also because the online world is changing very rapidly. Artificial intelligence chatbots and AI elements in traditional search engines have changed how people find and subsequently evaluate information. Our instruction on this topic will likely have to be modified to address these changes. These recommendations also apply to Honors Writing Studio.

The portfolios for EN281 continue to be, frankly, disappointing. In many of the EN281 sections, we spend time working with students on thinking about how their sources can be used to support their writing, e.g., using reference sources for background information or peer-reviewed articles to support their argument. However, library faculty don't get to see students' writing and don't get to provide feedback as students go through the drafting process, thus there is a limit to how much instruction we can provide. We can, and do, provide instruction on finding credible sources, so the seeming use of AI to find low-quality or non-existent sources is disappointing. In the future, we can spend time teaching students about the danger of hallucinated sources, which is a well-known problem in the library community, and strategies for finding out if a source is real. In some cases, we observed that different sources were cited in the annotated bibliography than in the final research paper draft. The librarians typically provide instruction while classes are working on their proposal, so as with the incorporation of sources, Writing faculty also need to ensure that

students are using credible, real sources. We will communicate with the Writing faculty the deficiencies that are seeing and work with them to address these issues.

Which learning outcome are you assessing in this section?

4. Students will understand ethical aspects of information and information technology.

A. Review of assessment cycle. List the relevant year(s) for this assessment cycle, i.e. current or previous academic year, and briefly summarize the academic unit's assessment activities during this cycle. Describe any modifications to previous assessments.

This assessment report covers the 2025-2026 academic year.

See A. above for a description of the library's assessment activities.

B. Summary of Data Source(s). In what course(s) did the assessment occur? What instruments/assignments were used? How many students participated in the assessment? Complete the table below for this particular Learning Outcome. If tests were administered or a rubric was used, please provide a copy in an appendix at the end of your report.

Course Assessed	# of Sections	Instructor	# of Students Enrolled	What artifact was Collected? (paper, exam, etc.)	How many artifacts were collected?	How many artifacts were assessed?
EN181	22	Hollendonner, Olsen, Pippitt	369	Pre- & Post-Test	Pre-Test = 189 (51%), Post-Test = 166 (45%)	Pre-Test = 189, Post-Test = 166
EN281	18	Hollendonner, Olsen, Pippitt	275	Portfolio (collected by writing faculty)	9 (3%)	9
HN150	4	Hollendonner, Pippitt	55	Pre-Test	29 (53%)	29
HN151	4	Hollendonner, Pippitt	60	Post-Test	38 (63%)	38

C. Target for Success. What is the measurable target you expect to achieve? If using target verbs such as “increase”, “reduce”, “improve”, or “decrease” -- what is the baseline comparison value? e.g., 70% of students performing at mastery level on a specific assignment, an increase of 5% in number of students attaining mastery over prior year, etc. A benchmark value *must* be provided for comparison.

For the EN181 pre- and post-test we are targeting a 20% average increase in correct responses across all the questions and all the assessed learning outcomes. For the HWS pre- and post-test we are targeting a 10% increase in research confidence and information literacy skills from the pre-test to the post-test. In the past we have seen smaller increases in the scores in the honors courses because the honors students tend to score higher on the pre-test.

For the EN281 portfolios we are setting a target score of 2 or above for the category in the rubric that assesses SLO 4. This would place students in the “developing” heading towards “proficient” designation.

D. Assessment Data. Provide a summary of data/results from the assessment measures utilized. This may include quantitative and/or qualitative data. Be as specific as possible; include numbers/percentages of students who were determined to meet the specified SLO. Compare results to prior years if applicable. May be included as a table or graph if beneficial. *Do not attach actual student artifacts.*

EN181 – Pre- and post-test comparison

Question	Pre-Test (n=189)	Post-Test (n=166)	Percent Change
4. Citation & Research Process	75%	89%	20%
5. Citation Purpose	83%	91%	10%
Average	79%	90%	15%

EN281 – Portfolio analysis

(n=9)	Citations	Overall
Average	1.78	1.78
Median	2	2

HWS (HN150 & HN151) – Pre- and post-test comparison of research confidence

Part 1, Questions 13, 14 & 15	Pre-Test (n=29)	Post-Test (n=40)	Point Change	Percent Change
Average (out of 5)	3.39	3.58	0.19	5%

HWS (HN150 & HN151) – Pre- and post-test comparison of information literacy skills.

Part 2, Question	Pre-Test (n=29)	Post-Test (n=38)	Percent Change
4. Citation & Research Process	86%	87%	1%
5. Citation Purpose	90%	95%	6%
Average	88%	91%	3%

E. Analysis. Provide a discussion of your findings. To what extent did you achieve the target specified above (e.g., completely, partially, did not achieve)? This section should be 1-2 pages.

For the EN181 pre- and post-test the average increase of 15% fell slightly short of our target of a 20% increase. Question 4 on citations and the research process did meet our goal of a 20% increase while question 5 on the purpose of citations showed less of an increase at 10%. For both questions student scores on the pre- and the post-test were quite high with an average correct score of 90% by the time of the post-test.

For EN281 we had a single category in the rubric to assess SLO 4. We looked at the correctness of the citations in the works cited and the in-text citations of the final draft of the research paper. The average score was 1.78 and the median score was 2. While the average is below our target, this score is 0.35 points higher than last year and none of the portfolios were in the unacceptable (0) category.

In Honors Writing Studio for Part 1 of the assessment students showed a 5% increase in research confidence on questions assessing learning outcome 4. This is below our target of 10%. Students showed the largest increase in confidence in “knowing when I should cite a source” and the highest score on the post-test on this question with 3.90 out of 5. Students expressed the lowest confidence in knowing how to cite a source in the right format by the time of the post-test. For Part 2 of the assessment, students demonstrated a 3% increase in correct responses from the pre-test to the post-test, which is below our 10% increase target. However, the scores were very high in the post-test with an average 91% correct and 95% correct on question 5 on the purpose of citations.

F. Takeaway: what do the results mean? Provide a discussion of what the results mean to the program overall. Do they indicate strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, or areas that warrant additional attention? Are there any gaps or inadequacies in assessment methods that may need to be changed for future assessments?

While the EN181 scores fell short of our target, the percentage of correct responses by the time of the post-test is encouraging. Students know when and why they should be citing their sources. Question 5, which asks how citations are helpful to readers, is especially encouraging. The correct response that citations help to connect readers to the original source of information shows that students understand that citations are more than a way to avoid plagiarism; they are a way to help readers and draw them into the scholarly conversation of which a student's writing is a part.

The improvement of the scores in EN281 from the year before is also encouraging; a majority of the scores were a 2 or in the "developing" category, which is our target. Generally, the librarians do not spend a lot of time in the classroom working with students on their citations, although one Writing faculty did request that instruction for their students this academic year. We do show them the citation tools in the database and stress the importance of citations. We also provide an online citations guide and encourage Writing faculty to share that guide with their students.

As with EN181, the Honors Writing Studio students' results did not meet our target for increases from the pre-test to the post-test, yet the overall scores were high and show that students understand the importance of citations. The HN151 students are also quite confident in knowing when they should cite a source. Students were less confident in knowing how to cite a source in the proper format. They were between the two in their confidence in knowing when using, or not using, a source constitutes plagiarism. Neither the specifics of citation styles nor a sustained discussion of plagiarism are components of our instruction with the Honors Writing Studio classes. In the previous year's assessment, the scores on these three questions were similar, although this year the increase from the pre-test to the post-test was smaller.

As discussed above, the pre-test and post-test format For EN181 and Honors Writing Studio continues to work well for us. With the help of the Writing and Honors faculty, they return meaningful results in a way that does not impinge on class time.

G. What actions will be taken based on analysis of the assessment results? Closing the feedback loop is essential. What does your academic unit intend to do with the information it has evaluated? Provide a brief explanation of how the results will be used to make any necessary specific changes within the program. If no changes are planned, briefly describe how the data suggest this as an appropriate course of action.

Possible changes include revisions to curriculum, courses, pedagogies, assignments, assessment methods, etc. If these changes will require resources beyond what your academic unit can provide, indicate what your academic unit anticipates needing and where it will seek these resources. For example, changes may require faculty development opportunities and initiatives, or the procurement of new resources or personnel.

The results from EN181 and Honors Writing Studio show that our instruction on the importance and purpose of citations is meeting its goal. Citation is a major component of the ethical use of information in a scholarly context. However, it is not the only dimension of information ethics. In future assessment cycles we could consider expanding our instruction and assessment in this area to focus on topics like intellectual property, copyright, or privacy. Underrepresentation in the creation of information or the lack of access to information are areas in which there are opportunities for instruction, although these are more complex topics that are difficult to teach and discuss in an instruction session or two. There may be opportunities to work with disciplinary faculty to have some of this content taught by them during the semester.

For EN281, our assessment focused more on the mechanics of citations and ensuring that citations are formatted correctly so that readers can find the materials that the students have used in their research. Overall, students are doing fairly well in this regard, although there is still room for improvement. We will continue to stress the importance of properly formatted citations to students, demonstrate tools that can help students create their citations, and share our findings with the Writing faculty so that they can reinforce this content with their students.

Appendix

EN181 Pre-Test & Post-Test

(Correct answers are indicated in italics)

2. Describe a strategy for evaluating an online source (website, social media post, etc.) for credibility.

3. You are doing research for a speech on the potential health benefits and drawbacks of energy drinks (Monster, Red Bull, etc.). Which source is most likely to have **objective and accurate** information on this topic?

A discussion on the subreddit (Reddit forum) *r/energydrinks/*.

A peer-reviewed research article in a nutrition journal.

A website for one of the energy drink manufacturers.

A survey conducted by the Coca-Cola Company.

4. When is the best time in the research process to make note of the details about your sources (author, title, date, etc.), so that you can cite them properly?

The first time you access a source you might want to use.

After you have finished writing the section of the paper that uses information from a source.

When you are working on your reference list.

When the teacher asks you for proof that you did not plagiarize in the paper.

5. How are citations most helpful to the readers of your work?
- It saves them from reading the entire work
 - It helps them to understand your personal views
 - It prevents them from thinking that you plagiarized
 - It allows them to find the original sources of information*

EN281 Portfolio Rubric

	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Emerging (1)	Unacceptable (0)
Use of credible, appropriately current sources <i>Program SLO #3</i>				
Use of sources to support thesis <i>Program SLO #3</i>				
Correctness according to style of references / bibliography / works cited page & in-text citations <i>Program SLO #4</i>				

HWS Pre-Test & Post-Test

Part 1

When you think about the ENTIRE research process—from the moment you get the assignment until you turn in your research paper—what is the level of difficulty for the following tasks? [Scale of 1 to 5: 1 = Very difficult, 2 = Difficult, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Easy, 5 = Very easy]

1. Defining a topic for the assignment.
2. Narrowing my topic.
3. Selecting search terms.
4. Finding articles in the research databases on the Library's website. (EBSCO, JSTOR, ProQuest, etc.)
5. Finding sources to use "out on the web" (using Google, Wikipedia, or other search sites).
6. Determining whether a website is credible or not.
7. Figuring out where to find sources in different parts of the library.
8. Finding up-to-date materials.
9. Having to sort through all the irrelevant results I get to find what I need.

10. Evaluating the sources that I've found.
11. Reading and understanding the material.
12. Integrating different sources from my research into my assignment.
13. Knowing when I should cite a source.
14. Knowing how to cite a source in the right format.
15. Knowing whether or not my use of a source, in certain circumstances, constitutes plagiarism.
16. Knowing whether or not I've done a good job on the assignment.

Part 2

(Correct answers are indicated in italics)

2. Describe a strategy for evaluating an online source (website, social media post, etc.) for credibility.
3. Which of the following is the most important consideration when deciding whether to use a scholarly source in your research project?
 - The credentials of the author
 - The context in which the information will be used*
 - The length of the source
 - The length and variety of the reference list
4. When is the best time in the research process to make note of the details about your sources (author, title, date, etc.), so that you can cite them properly?
 - The first time you access a source you might want to use.*
 - After you have finished writing the section of the paper that uses information from a source.
 - When you are working on your reference list.
 - When the teacher asks you for proof that you did not plagiarize in the paper.
5. How are citations most helpful to the readers of your work?
 - It saves them from reading the entire work
 - It helps them to understand your personal views
 - It prevents them from thinking that you plagiarized
 - It allows them to find the original sources of information*

EN181 & HWS Pre-Test and Post-Test Rubric for Grading Question 2

0	1	2	3
No strategy, "I don't know," or failure to answer the prompt, e.g., explaining a search strategy or expressing a preference for scholarly articles	Strategy based on the <i>appearance</i> of the website, e.g., - URL - Format – nicely laid out, free of obvious errors - Ads - Sources or Reference List - Date	Strategy based on a checklist that focuses on the site alone, e.g., - Currency - Relevance - Authority - Accuracy - Purpose	Strategy based on <i>lateral reading</i> or <i>critical thinking</i> , e.g., comparing different sources, assessing authority using external sources, tracing claims, evaluating claims based on logical reasoning, considering one's own biases or perspective

This rubric is based on the work of Grace Liu and her *4-Step Source Assessment*:

<https://sandbox.acrl.org/library-collection/4-step-source-assessment-strategy>