Off the RAILS! The Rubric Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (RAILS) Project at UW Bothell
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Directed by Megan Oakleaf (Syracuse University), funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS)

- 3 years, 10 institutions
- Investigates how rubrics can be used by librarians & faculty to assess IL skills
- Practical assessment tools & results + broader research questions
Why did we want to participate?

1. Kick-start our assessment activities

2. Learn more about developing student learning outcomes & using rubrics to measure outcomes
What did we do?

• Developed a local rubric focused on using information legally & ethically

• Collected 100 samples of student work

• Assembled a team of 11 faculty & librarians to assess student work

• Participated in a day-long process of norming and scoring of student work
• Demystified the process: assessment is do-able!

• Started a sustainable assessment process

• Clarified our assessment goals

• Increased our understanding of rubrics

• Provided a basis for conversations with faculty about assignment design & expectations for student work
# UW Bothell RAILS Project Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Information Ethically and Legally</th>
<th>Performance Level 3: Advanced</th>
<th>Performance Level 2: Developing</th>
<th>Performance Level 1: Beginning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applies outcome successfully; Many strengths are present</td>
<td>Shows skill in this outcome; Improvement still possible</td>
<td>Evidence of the outcome may be minimally or not at all present; Need for improvement outweighs apparent strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style conventions</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follows style guide conventions correctly</td>
<td>Follows style guide conventions with errors</td>
<td>Does not follow style guide conventions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bibliography and in-text citations</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography &amp; in-text citations are consistent with each other and references are complete*</td>
<td>Includes a bibliography or in-text citations that may contain omissions or that may not consistently correspond*</td>
<td>Does not include a functional bibliography and/or in-text citations*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common knowledge and attribution of ideas</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistently distinguishes between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution</td>
<td>Inconsistently distinguishes between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution</td>
<td>Does not distinguish between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paraphrasing, summarizing, quoting</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrases, summarizes, or quotes in order to integrate the work of others into their own</td>
<td>Paraphrases, summarizes, or quotes, but does not always select appropriate method for integrating the work of others into their own</td>
<td>Does not paraphrase, summarize, or quote in order to integrate the work of others into their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rubric Norming Process

1. Project leader models “think aloud” scoring of an example.
2. Ask raters to independently score a set of examples.
3. Bring raters together to review their scores to identify patterns of consistent and inconsistent scores.
4. Discuss and then reconcile inconsistent scores.
5. Repeat steps 2-4.

Note: Ordinarily, two to three of these sessions calibrate raters’ responses.

From: Megan Oakleaf (2011). Rubric Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (RAILS) training session [Powerpoint slides].
Your Turn: Independent Scoring

• What scores would you assign to this example?
Reconciling Differences

• Where do we disagree?

• Can we come to consensus?
## The numbers

### Average Scores by Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergrad. year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Avg</td>
<td>2.038</td>
<td>2.111</td>
<td>2.123</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>2.211</td>
<td>2.393</td>
<td>2.407</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># students/10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class Averages, Learning Objective Detail

- Style conventions
- Correspondence
- Common knowledge & attribution
- Summarizing, paraphrasing, quoting

Undergrad. year
"I learned maybe twice as much in forty five minutes as I have in eight months just bumbling around the library on my own." - student
Applications at the UW Libraries

Libraries-wide student learning goals and outcomes will:

• Measure Libraries’ impact on fostering information literacy and research skills in undergraduate and graduate students across disciplines.

• Demonstrate to a variety of educational stakeholders the Libraries' impact on student learning and the value of the Libraries Teaching & Learning program.
Questions?

Copy of Powerpoint: http://libguides.uwb.edu/rails