



Part I: Follow-up Assessment Report

Date of Follow-up Report Submission: 7-6-2021

Name of Department / Unit: University Library

Name of Contact Person: Susan Shultz

Name of Person(s) Completing Follow-up Report: Susan Shultz and Ashley McMullin

Follow-Up on Last Year's Assessment Report Recommendations

The 2019-2020 Library assessment project was a benchmarking analysis of both peer and model institutions to understand best practices for developing and sustaining successful open educational resources (OER) and affordability initiatives. The Library's OER/affordability initiative began with the establishment of the OER Working Group in 2017. The 2019-2020 assessment cycle provided a formal opportunity for the Library to gather evidence about how to effectively grow and sustain our initiative. Our assessment question was: what are the best practices and common challenges for developing and sustaining successful OER and/or textbook affordability initiatives in an academic library? Our methodology included a document analysis, survey and interviews.

While we discovered that OER programs markedly differ between public and private institutions, we found that DePaul lacks key components of most successful programs, including the essential elements of faculty incentives and library staffing dedicated to affordability. An unexpected finding from our assessment was that DePaul uniquely includes affordability in its strategic plan. We also found that key partnerships for increasing awareness and adoption of affordable course materials include university administration, faculty advocates, centers for teaching, learning and accessibility, the bookstore and student organizations. The University's commitment to affordability in the strategic plan provides an institutional foundation for us to successfully address the recommendations we developed from our findings.

We developed recommendations for FY21 (short-term) and post-FY21 (long-term) given that the long-term recommendations are contingent upon additional Library staffing dedicated to affordability initiatives. For the purpose of this summary, I will provide a status report on the short-term recommendations.

Short-Term Recommendations (FY21)

- Meet with University Administration and Provost to discuss findings of the Benchmarking Assessment Study.

Status: Due to uncertainty, delays and staffing challenges caused by the pandemic, we have postponed this discussion until FY22 given that some of our recommendations may require additional staffing and University funding.

- Determine who has been tasked with OER in the University's 2024 Strategic Plan and reach out to align efforts.

Status: We determined that Steve Stoute, Vice President Strategic Initiatives and Chief of Staff was responsible for the 2024 Strategic Plan. We provided information about our OER efforts to date that align with the strategic plan to Steve Stoute through Provost Ghanem. This communication generated discussion and action steps in the OER Working Group to develop a plan for gathering OER awareness and adoption data to report to university administration going forward. This is an initiative for the working group in FY22.

- Formalize an initiative/relationship with the Bookstore.

Status: The OER Working Group and Barnes & Noble Bookstore staff members held an initial meeting in June 2021 to begin discussions about how we can collaborate to address affordable course materials and student success. The key outcome of this initial meeting was an agreement to share relevant information with each other: a list of required textbooks from the Bookstore, and a list of reserve items from the Library. There was also an agreement that the Working Group and the Bookstore will meet on a quarterly basis.

- Formalize an initiative/relationship with the Student Government Association.

Status: The OER Working Group has determined who the newly elected SGA officers are for 2021-2022, as well as the faculty/staff advisor. We will be reaching out to these individuals over the summer to schedule an initial meeting in late August or early September to begin discussions about collaborating to address course material affordability.

- Protect and prioritize reserves book budget line.

Status: The Library preserved the reserve book budget line for FY22, despite a reduction to the overall collections budget.

- Promote the newly acquired resource EBSCO Faculty Select, an open textbooks search interface.

Status: The EBSCO Faculty Select database has been promoted through the Library's *Full Text* Blog, Newslines, and in quarterly emails that subject liaisons send to their faculty.

Long-Term Recommendations (post-FY21)

These long-term recommendations have been shared with the OER Working Group and they will continue to move these recommendations forward.

- Allocate staff funds for an OER Librarian position or incorporate OER and affordable course content responsibilities into a library staff person's job description with a minimum of 30% specified for these responsibilities.
- Implement a faculty grant program to incentivize OER adoption and/or creation. This is contingent upon library staff time being allocated for OER. The institutions that have made headway in this area devote considerable time to this activity.
- Conduct a listening tour of faculty.
- Pursue the acquisition of Pressbooks or another relevant platform for Open Pedagogy.
- Develop a marketing campaign to promote OER and affordable course materials.

We shared the findings of our study both internally at DePaul and externally with selected individuals in the academic library community. At DePaul, our findings were presented to our colleagues at the Library's 2020 Annual Workshop in December 2020. We also presented our findings to the Library Review Board in February 2021. The Executive Summary of the report was shared with the interviewees in our study as well as the members of the OER Committee of the Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI).



Part II: Annual Assessment Report: Learning
Academic Year: 2020-2021

Date of Report Submission: 7-7-2021

Name of Department / Unit: DePaul University Library / Reference, Instruction & Academic Engagement (RIAE)

Name of Contact Person: Firouzeh Rismiller

Name of Person(s) completing report or contributing to the project: Firouzeh Rismiller, Jennifer Schwartz

I. Abstract:

This learning assessment project explored whether students enrolled in online Writing, Rhetoric & Discourse (WRD) 104 courses could evaluate an article's usefulness based on a provided set of criteria. This assessment project will allow the Library to better align its WRD 104 online and WRD 104 in-person programs by incorporating an evaluation section in the WRD 104 online program. Investigators collected data by creating an additional question that was included in an existing library assignment that students were required to complete as part of their WRD 104 coursework online. The investigators learned that the majority of students were able to successfully evaluate the usefulness of an article related to structure and format, although students were more successful with certain criteria than with others. A task force will be assembled in Summer 2021 to formally update the curriculum and add the evaluation component for Fall Quarter 2021.

II. Assessment Question:

To what extent are WRD 104 students able to evaluate the appropriateness of information sources based on their format, structure, and purpose? Through this assessment project, the investigators specifically sought to determine if an updated assignment designed for WRD 104 online courses contributes to the students' ability to evaluate sources of information for their research.

III. Introduction & Context:

Project Overview

A key element in information literacy is the ability to evaluate articles (and other sources of information) to determine usefulness and appropriateness. This project assessed students' ability to evaluate an article based on a set of provided criteria. Students in 6 online sections of WRD 104 during Winter Quarter 2021 participated in the study.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

This project assessed the following learning outcome:

- Students attending instruction sessions or workshops, and engaging with our services will be able to evaluate the appropriateness of information sources based on their format, structure, and purpose.

While the learning outcome states three criteria for evaluating sources, namely format, structure and purpose, this assessment project focused only on structure and purpose. Understanding the format of an information source is important for evaluating primary source material, but is less relevant than structure and purpose for evaluating secondary sources. This assessment project only investigated students' evaluation of secondary sources.

Context for This Year's Report

Both DePaul University and the DePaul University Library address the importance of information literacy in their strategic plans. Section 3.1 of DePaul University's 2024 "Grounded in Mission" plan states the need to "Ensure that DePaul prepares undergraduate students to be well-rounded critical thinkers and lifelong learners." And further, (3.1.B.) "Ensure that all graduates demonstrate core competencies and transferable skills (e.g., cultural agility; technological, **information, and data literacy**;¹ computational thinking; critical and systems thinking; effective communication; and ethical and moral reasoning)." In order to work toward this University goal, the Library has highlighted information literacy as one of its own goals in the University Library's Strategic Plan. Implemented in 2021, the Library's Strategic Plan states that the Library will "Prepare students for academic, professional, and personal success by fostering critical information literacy and cultural competency skills."²

There is agreement in the professional literature that information evaluation should be a part of information literacy programs in higher education.³ The Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL) sets standards and guidelines for information literacy programs in libraries. In 2016, ACRL adopted the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education, which defines information literacy as "the set of integrated abilities encompassing the reflective discovery of information, the understanding of how information is produced and valued, and the use of information in creating new knowledge and participating ethically in communities of learning" (ACRL, 2015). While this definition of information literacy is expansive, it includes the understanding of information's "value," which is directly tied to the ability to evaluate a source and determine its usefulness.

The DePaul University Library has a longstanding relationship with the First-Year Writing Program to work together to provide information literacy instruction to students in the WRD 104 course. Partnering in these courses is the foundation of the Library's information literacy program, and it is where the Library introduces these concepts to as many first-year students as possible.

¹ Office of the President. Grounded in Mission: The Plan for DePaul 2024. (2019).

<https://offices.depaul.edu/president/strategic-directions/grounded-in-mission/Pages/default.aspx>. Emphasis added.

² DePaul University Library Strategic Plan 2020-2025. (2021). <https://library.depaul.edu/about/about-the-library/strategic-plan/Pages/default.aspx>

³ Cox, C., & Lindsay, E. (2008). *Information literacy instruction handbook*. Association of College & Research Libraries.

Source evaluation is part of the Library's in-person WRD 104 program, but it has never been integrated into the online curriculum. The online curriculum includes videos and a graded assignment which are all focused on developing a research question and finding resources. For this assessment project, the investigators added a section to the graded assignment on source evaluation. This additional section (Question 6) presents 7 essential criteria to be considered when evaluating a source, and asks students to use these criteria to evaluate a source they had found earlier in the assignment. These same criteria are addressed during the in-person library instruction for WRD 104. By adding this question about source evaluation to the online homework assignment, the investigators will be able to assess students' ability to evaluate the information they find, and will further determine how best to integrate this material into the online curriculum to support student success.

The increase in online courses during the 2020-2021 academic year additionally highlighted the importance of aligning the online curriculum with the in-person curriculum. While the University will shift most of these courses back to in-person for the 2021-2022 academic year, the online option will continue, and the Library should be prepared for an increase in online options in the future.

IV. Data Collection & Methodology:

Population and Sample

The investigators collected data from students enrolled in 6 sections of WRD 104 during Winter Quarter 2021. WRD 104 is a required course for all DePaul undergraduate students and as per the WRD 104 course description, WRD 104 "is part of the university Liberal Studies core, and students must achieve a grade of C- or better to receive graduation credit". DePaul University Library has identified WRD 104 as the place to provide students with foundational information literacy skills. The Library collaborates closely with the First-Year Writing Program to integrate the library component in both in-person and online WRD 104 courses.

The Library has used two different curricula for in-person and online WRD 104 courses. This assessment project is related to the Library's WRD 104 online curriculum. During a typical quarter, there are fewer than 5 sections of WRD 104 offered online. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, all sections of WRD 104 were offered online which allowed the investigators to collect data from more online classes than they would have been able to collect pre-pandemic.

49 sections of WRD 104 were offered online during Winter Quarter 2021, and 6 sections were chosen to participate in the assessment project. The 6 sections were chosen because the investigators had a strong working relationship with those WRD 104 faculty and felt confident they could collaborate on this assessment project. All students enrolled in those 6 sections were chosen to participate in the assessment project. A total of 133 students were enrolled in those classes in Winter Quarter 2021 and 127 of those students submitted a library assignment.

Data Collection

An assignment was used to collect the data (Appendix A). Completion of the library assignment is a required component for WRD 104 online students. The assignment has previously had 5 questions. A 6th question was added during Winter Quarter 2021 to determine whether students could use an article they had identified in Question 5 and evaluate its appropriateness based on a set of provided criteria. In Question 6, students were presented with seven different criteria broken up in two Groups. The first Group contained 4 criteria pertaining to purpose, (Purpose, Accuracy, Audience, and Relevance) and the second Group contained 3 criteria pertaining to structure (Scholarly, Currency, and Authority). Each criterion provided a list of questions that students could consider when evaluating their selected article. Students were asked to list 1 criterion from each Group and explain how it helped them determine if the article was or wasn't appropriate for their research. The assignment was shared with students in D2L as part of the library module and students uploaded their completed assignments to D2L. The assignment was completed between weeks 2 and 4 of Winter Quarter 2021.

Data Analysis

The investigators received 127 completed library assignments. The investigators created an original analytic rubric to score Question 6 (Appendix B). The Question was scored using a 3-point scale (1=doesn't meet expectations, 2=meets expectations, 3=exceeds expectations). The two investigators conducted a norming session and each investigator scored library assignments from 3 sections of WRD 104 online courses. The lowest possible score a student could earn on Question 6 was 8 and the highest possible score a student could earn was 20. Students who received a score of 14 (70%) or higher were considered to successfully meet our learning outcome (score of 14 to 16 meets expectations, score of 17 to 20 exceeds expectations).

Participant Consent

Permission to use the updated library assignment in online WRD 104 courses in winter 2021 was requested via email from faculty members selected to participate (Appendix C). The email described the project's timeline and rationale, and it also included a copy of the updated assignment as an attachment. The faculty members were informed that the addition of Question 6 to the assignment would not significantly increase the time commitment for students. Additionally, given that the completion of the library assignment is a required component for WRD 104 online students, the faculty members were notified that students were required to complete the entire assignment, and they wouldn't have the opportunity to opt out.

After careful considerations, the investigators decided not to inform students about the assessment project as completing the library assignment is already a required component for WRD 104 online students.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the investigators completed this assessment project while working from home. The students submitted their library assignment through D2L. The identifying data collected included the students' first name, last name, DePaul ID number. The investigators also requested the following demographic data from Information Services: first-

generation status, Pell eligibility, year in school, admit type, full-time/part-time status, and race. The data was saved on the investigators' DePaul-owned computers. The investigators did not use any online sharing tools to store or analyze student data with identifying information. The investigators completed the scoring of the assignments prior to merging the demographic data with the student ID number to prevent any biased scoring.

V. Data & Findings:

Response Rate and Demographics

There were a total of 133 students enrolled in the 6 sections of WRD 104 online that participated in this assessment project during Winter Quarter 2021. All students were given the opportunity to complete the library assignment and 127 students submitted the library assignment for a 95% response rate.

The investigators collected data on first-generation status, Pell eligibility, year in school, admit type, full-time/part-time status, and race.

For race, 65 students identified as white, 30 students identified as Asian, 18 students identified as Hispanic / Latino, 4 students identified as Black / African American, and 6 students identified as Foreign. Additionally, 3 students did not specify race and there was no demographic data available for 1 student.

For first-generation status, 46 students were classified as first-generation, 80 students were classified as not first-generation and there was no demographic data available for 1 student.

Among all of the demographic descriptors that were examined, different outcomes were only observed with first-generation status.

Key Findings

Overall, 30 of 127 (24%) students did not meet expectations while 58 of 127 (46%) students met expectations and 39 of 127 (31%) exceeded expectations.

When splitting overall scores by first-generation status, the students who were first-generation performed better with 39 of 46 (85%) students meeting or exceeding expectations. Students who were not first-generation performed worse with 57 of 80 (71%) students meeting or exceeding expectations.

For Group 1, Relevance was the most selected criteria with 71 of 127 (56%) students choosing that criteria (Appendix E). Accuracy and Audience were the least selected criteria with only 6 of 127 (5%) students choosing each criterion respectively. Students who chose Relevance from Group 1 performed best on Question 6 with 87% of students meeting or exceeding expectations. Students who chose Accuracy performed the worst with 67% of students meeting or exceeding expectations. The Other category includes students who did not select one of the criteria provided or those students who selected two criteria from the same Group.

For Group 2, Currency was the most selected criteria with 77 of 127 (61%) students choosing that criteria (Appendix F). Excluding Other, Authority and Scholarly were the least common criterion chosen with 24 of 127 (19%) students choosing Authority and 21 of 127 (17%) students choosing Scholarly. Students who chose Currency performed the best with 84% of students meeting or exceeding expectations. Students who chose Authority performed the worst with 67% of students meeting or exceeding expectations. The Other category includes students who did not select one of the criteria provided or those students who selected two criteria from the same Group.

Program Level Learning Outcome	Number of Students Assessed	Number of Students with Acceptable or Better Performance
Students attending instruction sessions or workshops, and engaging with our services will be able to evaluate the appropriateness of information sources based on their format, structure, and purpose.	127	97

The Question was scored using a 3-point scale (1=doesn't meet expectations, 2=meets expectations, 3=exceeds expectations). The lowest possible score a student could earn on the Question was 8 and the highest possible score a student could earn was 20. Students who received a score of 14 (70%) or higher were considered to successfully meet the learning outcome (score of 14 to 16= meets expectations, score of 17 to 20=exceeds expectations). 97 of 127 (77%) students met or exceeded expectations.

VI. Discussion & Interpretation of Findings:

- Overall, the majority of students (77%) who were part of the assessment project were able to successfully evaluate the usefulness of an article related to structure and format, although students were more successful with certain criteria than with others. This high success rate shows that most students were able to both understand the assignment as well as accurately evaluate the article that they found. Among those students who were not successful, some seemed confused by the instructions, and others had trouble with certain criteria. While the information provided in the assignment was generally effective at guiding the students through the evaluation process, the investigators will determine

how to simplify the instructions and include more information around those criteria where students were less successful.

- Among the criteria provided in the two Groups, Relevance was the most selected criteria from Group 1 and Currency was the most selected criteria from Group 2. Additionally, students who selected Relevance and Currency performed the best. Students may have selected those criteria most often because they were most confident in their knowledge of those concepts and avoided others they were less knowledgeable about.
- Among the criteria provided in the two Groups, Accuracy and Audience were the least selected criteria from Group 1 while Scholarly and Authority were the least selected criteria from Group 2. Additionally, students who chose Accuracy and Authority performed the worst. This indicates that students might not understand Accuracy, Audience, Scholarly, and Authority in the context of academic research.
- Given this assessment project was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, the investigators were surprised by the high response rate (95%). Similarly, it was impressive how well students performed on Question 6 of the assignment with 77% of students meeting or exceeding expectations during such a challenging year.
- It is noteworthy that first-generation students performed better than students who were not first-generation. Additional investigations would be needed to understand the reason behind the difference in performance.
- One limitation that may have affected the findings was that the sample sizes were too small to analyze performance by each of the demographic descriptors. For example, there were only 4 students who identified as Black / African American and 6 students who identified as Foreign, thus preventing statistically significant analysis for those populations.
- Another limitation was that the student's score was the result of the investigators' subjective review. To counter the impacts of the investigators' subjective reviews, a norming session was completed to provide consistency.
- Evaluation of information is a critical component of any information literacy program. This assessment project will allow the Library to incorporate pertinent criteria for source evaluation in our WRD 104 online program. Once the program is updated and Question 6 is formally included in the library assignment, instruction librarians will be able to assess students' ability to evaluate the information they find.

VII. Recommendations and Plans for Action:

Recommendations

The investigators found that most students were able to evaluate articles based on criteria related to structure and format, although students were more successful with certain criteria than with others.

Based on our findings, the investigators will take the following actions affecting the online library instruction program:

- Ensure that the Library provides source evaluation instruction in the online curriculum for WRD 104. This will involve changing the online curriculum to more closely align with our in-person curriculum.
- Provide instruction that adequately covers all pertinent criteria for evaluating sources, with special attention to those criteria where students performed more poorly. The Library Instruction Working Group will determine if the new curriculum will necessitate additional videos, tutorials, or other learning objects that will contribute to students' ability to evaluate information sources.
- Ensure that the online library assignment is clear and concise. The embedded librarian should be able to easily grade the assignment and provide effective feedback to the students.

No other units in the Library or other departments in the University will need to take actions based on our assessment project.

Action Plan

Based on the results of this assessment project, the investigators will undertake the following:

- Re-align the online curriculum with the in-person curriculum to ensure inclusion of the source evaluation component. The instruction librarian will assemble a task force to examine both curricula, and will determine if the online source evaluation component requires the creation of new videos or other learning objects.
Timeline: Summer 2021, for implementation Fall 2021
- Simplify the evaluation component of the online assignment for better student comprehension and ease of grading. Update the grading rubric as necessary.
Timeline: Summer 2021, for implementation Fall 2021
- Consult with the Center for Teaching and Learning to ensure the Library is taking advantage of all available tools in D2L to simplify the assignment, and to maximize student success.
Timeline: Summer 2021

- Provide additional training for librarians who embed in WRD 104 online courses to discuss the new curriculum, revised assignment, and revised rubric.
Timeline: Summer 2021
- Monitor student success with the new online assignment through the FY22 Academic Year and make changes or improvements to the assignment or curriculum as necessary for Fall 2022.
Timeline: Fall 2021 through Summer 2022

Sharing the results

Assessment findings and recommendations will be shared within the Library and with different stakeholders in the First-Year Writing Program.

- The Instruction Librarian will meet with the Director and Associate Director of the First Year Writing Program during the Summer 2021 to discuss this assessment project and the findings.
Timeline: Summer 2021
- The investigators will share this report or a summary of this report with the 5 WRD faculty who participated in this project
Timeline: Fall 2021.
- The Instruction Librarian will share an overview of the assessment project and the findings with the First-Year Writing Faculty at their annual meeting.
Timeline: September 2021.
- The investigators will share an overview of the assessment project and the findings within the Library during the annual Instruction Workshop.
Timeline: December 2021.

Appendix A: “Finding Articles” Library Assignment



Name _____

WRD 104 Online: Finding Articles

1. Watch the [Constructing a Search Strategy Tutorial](#) to help you complete this assignment.
What is your research question?

Research Question:

2. Complete this question after watching the [Getting Started with Academic Search Complete](#) video. Find Academic Search Complete, a multidisciplinary database, in the A-Z Databases list: <http://libguides.depaul.edu/az.php>. **Search Academic Search Complete and identify one relevant article that you would use for your research.** Include the full citation below.

Full citation for article found in Academic Search Complete:

TIP: Look for the “cite” feature in the article record to get a citation in MLA or APA format.



3. Take your research question and **create a search strategy** using what you learned in the tutorial in Question #1: [Constructing a Search Strategy Tutorial](#)

Concept 1 (_____ OR _____ OR _____)

AND Concept 2 (_____ OR _____ OR _____)

AND Concept 3 (_____ OR _____ OR _____)

The screenshot shows the Academic Search Complete search interface. On the left, there are three concepts labeled (Concept 1), (Concept 2), and (Concept 3) with arrows pointing to the search fields. Concept 1 points to the first field containing 'obesity OR overweight'. Concept 2 points to the second field containing 'AND : children OR child OR teenagers'. Concept 3 points to the third field containing 'AND : soda OR coke OR sugary beverages'. The interface includes a 'Search' button, a 'Clear' button, and a 'Choose Databases' dropdown. At the bottom, there are links for 'Basic Search', 'Advanced Search', 'Visual Search', and 'Search History'.

Example:



4. Watch the [Finding Subject-Specific Resources](#) video to help you **identify and list 2 subject-specific article databases** relevant to your topic.

Database 1:

Database 2:

TIP: Check out the [Research Guides](#) for subject-specific databases listed under the "Articles" tab.

5. **Choose one** of the subject-specific databases you identified in Question #4 to search for an article related to your topic.

Name of the subject-specific database chosen:

Search your chosen database using the search strategy you completed in Question #3. **Find one relevant article** that you would use for your research. **Include the full citation** below. Do not list the same article you found in Academic Search Complete.

Full citation for article found in a subject-specific database:

TIP: Email the citations to yourself, too, so you have them for your bibliography.

-CONTINUE ON THE NEXT PAGE-



6. Using the article you identified in Question #5, think about the criteria listed below to help you determine if you would use that article for your research paper. List 1 criteria from each group and explain how it helped you determine if this article was or wasn't appropriate.

Group #1	Group #2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose: Why does the information exist? Was it published to inform? Persuade? Answer a research question? Provide an overview of a topic? • Accuracy: How reliable or truthful is the content? Does the article refer to studies or the sources from which the information came? Does the article include a bibliography or list of references at the end? • Audience: Who is this article written for? The general population? People in a particular profession? Researchers or students in a specific field of expertise? • Relevance: How well does the information fit your needs? Does this article provide information that will be useful in answering your research question? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarly: Is this a scholarly article? Does it come from an <u>academic journal</u>? Does it follow the structure of a typical scholarly article? (A scholarly article generally includes a methodology section, a results section, a conclusion, and a bibliography among other sections). • Currency: When was this article published? Does it provide information that is current enough for your topic? • Authority: Who is the author? Are their credentials listed? Are they affiliated with a university or other organization? Which organization? Does the organization have a possible conflict of interest with the content of the article?

Choose 1 criteria from each group and write 1-2 sentences explaining how it helped you determine the appropriateness of your article.

Example:

Criteria: Currency.

How did it help: This article was written more than 5 years ago and I need more current information, so I would not use this article.

Group #1	Group #2
Criteria _____	Criteria _____
How did it help: _____	How did it help: _____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Appendix B: Question 6 Rubric

Student's Name				
Student ID				
Research Question:				
Question:	Assessment Notes:	1	2	3
		(doesn't meet expectations)	(meets expectations)	(exceeds expectations)
Question 6: Group 1 (Purpose)	<i>Criteria (score either 1 or 2):</i>			
	Is the explanation of the criteria sufficiently tied to the criteria?			
	Is the explanation of the criteria sufficiently tied to the article?			
	Is the conclusion accurate (score either 1 or 2)?			
Question 6: Group 2 (Structure)	<i>Criteria (score either 1 or 2):</i>			
	Is the explanation of the criteria sufficiently tied to the criteria?			
	Is the explanation of the criteria sufficiently tied to the article?			
	Is the conclusion accurate (score either 1 or 2)?			
	Column Totals			
	Total Score			

	1 (doesn't meet expectations)	2 (meets expectations)	3 (exceeds expectations)
Is the explanation of the criteria sufficiently tied to the criteria?	No explanation related to criteria OR inaccurate explanation related to the criteria.	Explanation related to the criteria is generic or broad.	Explanation related to the criteria is specific OR demonstrates why source did not meet the criteria.
Is the explanation of the criteria sufficiently tied to the article?	No explanation related to criteria OR inaccurate explanation related to the article.	Explanation related to the article is generic or broad.	Explanation related to the criteria is specific OR demonstrates why source did not meet the criteria.
Is the conclusion accurate?	Conclusion is inaccurate.	Conclusion is accurate.	

Appendix C: Participation Consent: Email to Faculty

Hello (instructor name),

I hope you're doing well. I'm reaching out for two reasons. First, I wanted to let you know that I'll be the embedded librarian in your WRD 104 class in WQ21 and I look forward to working with you again!

The second reason is to ask your permission to use an updated assignment in your class this winter. For the annual learning outcomes assessment project we're completing for 2020-2021, my colleague and I would like to assess the extent to which students who complete the library component delivered through WRD 104 online courses are able to evaluate the appropriateness of information sources based on their format, structure, and purpose.

Therefore, we have updated the existing "finding articles library assignment" to include a source evaluation component. The first 5 questions of the assignment are identical to the assignment used in past quarters, but the 6th question is new. This question is very similar to the source evaluation exercise students complete during the in-person visit to the library. I have attached a copy of the updated assignment to this email (please see question #6). We don't anticipate the additional question to significantly increase the time commitment for students.

We'll notify the students that their assignment will be part of the library's assessment project when we include details about the library assignment in D2L. They will be expected to complete the entire assignment for the class, and won't have the opportunity to opt out.

Once we have completed our assessment project, we will share our findings with our colleagues in the library, with the faculty in First Year Writing, and with the students. We will be piloting the assignment in 6 sections of WRD 104 during the winter quarter, including yours. If using the updated assignment is okay with you, we will be sure that the appropriate module is added to your course in D2L.

Finally, it would be helpful if we could meet virtually or over the phone before the start of the quarter. Do you have some time for us to meet before the holidays? I'm happy to answer any questions you might have and I look forward to hearing from you!

Best,
(Librarian name)

Appendix D

Assessment Result	Not First-Generation		First-Generation	
	# of Students	% of Students	# of Students	% of Students
Did Not Meet Expectations	23	28.8%	7	15.2%
Met Expectations	28	35.0%	11	23.9%
Exceeded Expectations	29	36.3%	28	60.9%
Total	80	100%	46	100%

Appendix E

Group 1 Criteria	Number of Students	% of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations
Accuracy	6	67%
Audience	6	83%
Other	7	0%
Purpose	37	70%
Relevance	71	87%
Total	127	

Appendix F

Group 2 Criteria	Number of Students	% of Students Meeting or Exceeding Expectations
Authority	24	67%
Currency	77	84%
Other	5	0%
Scholarly	21	76%
Total	127	

Appendix G: Works Cited

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2015). *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*. American Library Association.
<https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>

Cox, C., & Lindsay, E. (2008). *Information Literacy Instruction Handbook*. Association of College & Research Libraries.

DePaul University Library Strategic Plan 2020-2025. (2021).
<https://library.depaul.edu/about/about-the-library/strategic-plan/Pages/default.aspx>

Office of the President. *Grounded in Mission: The Plan for DePaul 2024*. (2019).
<https://offices.depaul.edu/president/strategic-directions/grounded-in-mission/Pages/default.aspx>