

River Parishes Community College
Quality Enhancement Plan:
Improving Students' Information Literacy Skills



2011-2012 Annual Report

RPCC 2011-2012 QEP Annual Report

Title and Brief Description

This annual report details progress on the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) during 2011-2012. This, along with subsequent reports will culminate in the required SACS/COC Fifth-Year Interim Report (Part IV: The Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan). The College is assessing student performance of freshmen and that of 30+ hour students to determine gains in information literacy competencies.

River Parishes Community College (RPCC) is using direct and indirect assessment measures to assess the student learning outcomes. The direct measures include SAILS: Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills developed by Kent State University and the College's current general education assessment process. These are knowledge-based assessments that provide direct assessment of students' information literacy competencies. The indirect measures include use of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the College library statistics and bibliographic instruction surveys. These measures provide relevant data concerning instructional practices and student activities that promote and facilitate information literacy competencies.

Goal and Intended Student Learning Outcomes of the QEP

The goal of River Parishes Community College's QEP is to improve students' information literacy skills. Thus, RPCC is implementing a plan that facilitates learning opportunities for students to manage, access, evaluate, and use information ethically and effectively.

The five student learning outcomes (SLOs) are mapped to associated American College and Research Libraries (ACRL) information literacy performance indicators, objectives, and more detailed outcomes in the ACRL Information Competency Standards for Higher Education and the Objectives for Information Literacy Instruction: A Model Statement for Academic Librarians. (See the Executive Summary for additional information.) The College is using SAILS

to measure four of the SLOs (#1,2,3,& 5) and an internal general education assessment process to measure SLO (#4). The data collected provide information on the student learning outcomes and information literacy competencies for each of the five.

Fall 2008 - Spring 2012 Data: Impact on Information Literacy SLOs

This section reports data collected from fall 2008 through spring 2012, as outlined in the QEP Assessment Grid in the full QEP document. Assessment data from the direct measures are summarized in this section with the complete reports and data available.

Direct Measures

SAILS Fall 2008 – Spring 2011 Data

The fall 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011 freshman reports indicate that RPCC freshmen performed “worse than” the other comparison “institution type” community colleges on ACRL Standards #1, 2, 3, & 5. This data confirms the need for information literacy instruction and the usefulness of this QEP focusing on improving student learning as it pertains to these competencies. (See the RPCC website under RPCC QEP for the full SAILS report.)

Impact of QEP: SAILS Data Show Improvement for 30+ Hour Students on Student Learning Outcomes #1, 2, 3, & 5

The fall 2008 through spring 2012 QEP SAILS assessment data show comparative performance of freshman groups each fall semester with the performance of 30+ hour student groups each spring semester. The intent of the QEP is to improve students’ information literacy skills from students’ first semester to the point at which students accumulate 30+ hours. In comparing the freshmen cohort each fall to the 30+ hour cohort each spring, there was a marked increase for each of the SAILS-tested student learning outcomes (SLOs 1, 2, 3, & 5). (See Appendix A.)

Each of the data sets shows improvement of students’ information literacy skills from the point of entry to the point of 30+ hours. These data reveal the increasing enrollment of the college and the accompanying lower information literacy competency of the incoming freshman

class. RPCC is not the only institution experiencing this trend; according to the SAILS test, RPCC’s cohort member institutions show a similar drop in freshman performance.

Testing of RPCC’s 2010 freshman group revealed the lowest information literacy competency since testing began in 2008, yet this low-achieving group also registered notable improvement in each of the ACRL Standards #1, 2, 3, & 5 when tested as 30+ hour students. This positive trend in performance indicates the effectiveness of the current QEP and shows the positive effect of the college’s instruction on information literacy. In testing RPCC’s fall 2011 incoming freshman group, the information literacy competency scores held at comparable levels from the previous 2010 freshman group. The fall 2011 SAILS data confirm there remains a definite need for continued focus on students’ information literacy skills.

Impact of QEP on Student Learning Outcome #4 & General Education Goal #12:

The benchmarking data for General Education Goal #12 begins with the fall 2010 semester and spring 2011 semester. These skills sets are assessed for students’ ability to demonstrate effective performance on a specific assignment or project. During the fall 2010 semester, 379 individual assignments were collected for General Education Goal #12. During the spring 2011, 997 individual assignments were collected for General Education Goal #12.

The General Education assessment Rubric #12 data measure student performance on information literacy assignments related to ACRL Standard #4:

“The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information to accomplish a specific purpose.”

The following components will measure the outcome for: Utilize Library/Information Resources (effectively selecting, evaluating, and synthesizing information from a variety of formats)

- _____ 1. demonstrates the ability to apply information using a variety of formats to plan and create a particular product or assignment.
- _____ 2. demonstrates the ability to revise the development process for the product or assignment. (examples: outlines, draft & final paper, peer-review, student’s own editing or reflection notes)
- _____ 3. demonstrates the ability to produce and effectively communicate the product or assignment.
- _____ 4. demonstrates the ability to effectively use search tools. (examples: library catalog, electronic databases, internet search engines)
- _____ 5. demonstrates the ability to correctly cite sources used for a specific assignment.
- _____ **Goal Completion Score derived from above components**

Each General Education Goal #12 rubric was entered into SPSS in order to collect benchmarking data and to form a baseline for comparison with future semester performance data. The results of the student performance were as follows:.

Year * GE12CS Crosstabulation

		GE12CS						Total
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
Year	10F	7	60	53	144	74	41	379
	11S	25	32	164	363	342	71	997
	Total	32	92	217	507	416	112	1376

Data were collected from fall 2010 freshman students and spring 2011 sophomore (30+ hour) students. Successful completion of three or more skills sets is passing. During the fall 2010 semester, 259 out of the 379 freshmen completing the General Education Goal #12 assignment successfully met the competencies. During the spring 2011 semester, 776 of the 997 30+ hour students completing the General Education Goal #12 assignment successfully met the competencies. This means that for Student Learning Outcome (SLO) #4 there was a 13.89 % improvement, as shown by the increase in student performance and students' success rate in demonstrating successful completion of this general education competency.

Fall 2011 and Spring 2012

The first set of data for the General Education Goal #12 rubric begins with the fall 2011 and spring 2012 semesters. These skills sets are assessed for students' ability to demonstrate effective performance on a specific assignment or project. During the fall 2011 semester, 1,180 individual assignments were collected. During the spring 2012, 1,661 individual assignments were collected. This data set reflects a large number of individual assignments due to the requirement that students submit an assignment for each class in which they were enrolled.

For the fall 2011 and spring 2012 General Education Goal #12, data were entered into Excel for analysis. In the previous benchmarked data, there was no method of differentiation between students who did not complete the assignment and those who dropped the course. In

addition, there was no way to determine whether the student did not complete the component or the component was not addressed in the assignment. As a result, when the data for fall 2011 and spring 2012 were entered, there was differentiation between components not addressed, not completed by the students, or the student dropped the course. The results of the student performance were as follows:

Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 General Education #12 Data								
Semester	0 Components	1 Component	2 Components	3 Components	4 Components	5 Components	Students Dropped	Total
Fall 2011	285	22	96	228	254	112	183	1,180
Spring 2012	352	58	158	412	414	136	131	1,661
Total	637	80	254	640	668	248	314	2,841

Data were collected from fall 2011 freshman students and spring 2012 sophomore (30+ hour) students showing their proficiency in completing the five rubrics of the General Education Goal #12. During the fall 2011 semester, 594 out of the 1,180 freshmen successfully completed the General Education Goal #12 assignment. Included in the 1,180 individual assignments collected are 183 students who dropped. There is a 50.3% success rate for freshmen during the fall 2012 semester. During the spring 2012 semester, 962 of the 1,661 30+ hour students successfully completed the General Education Goal #12 assignment. Included in the 1,661 individual assignments collected are 131 students who dropped. There is a 57.9% success rate for 30+ hour students during the spring 2012 semester. This means that for Student Learning Outcome (SLO) #4 there was a 15.1% percent change, as shown by the increase in student performance and students' success rate.

Indirect Measures

The indirect measures include use of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the College library statistics and bibliographic instruction surveys. The CCSSEE reports student responses regarding community college involvement and academic activities. According to the 2011 report, RPCC showed a decrease in classroom presentations and number of assigned written papers. Although there was a decrease in the

number of papers and presentations students were required to complete, there was an increase in time students spent preparing for classes and studying. Additionally, there was an increase in the basic skills required for effective independent learning (See Appendix A for complete CCSSE data.) The library data show a decrease in actual foot traffic, but there is a substantial increase in the utilization of online resources. This change is due in part to the students being technology-driven and wanting to access resources from off-campus (See Appendix B for complete College library data.) CCSSE and the College library data provide relevant associated data regarding instructional practices and student activities that promote and facilitate information literacy competencies.

Continued Foci and SLO Improvement Projections:

In August of 2010, the QEP Leadership Team met to review the assessment data from the previous academic cycles and to set target percentages for the upcoming academic cycles related to anticipated gains in students’ information literacy skills from freshmen to 30+ hour students. The committee’s projections are based on baseline data from previous academic cycles. The committee agreed to retain the projected targets for SLOs (1, 2, 3, & 5) and to set the SLO #4 at 11% for the spring 2012 and spring 2013 cycles. This was due to the noticeable downward trend in incoming students’ information literacy competencies, both nationally and at RPCC. The fall percentages are collected and reported each fall term as the baseline for comparison to the targeted increases for the corresponding spring term.

	Direct Assessment	Fall 2011 (Freshmen)	Spring 2012 (30+)	Fall 2013 (Freshmen)	Spring 2013 (30+)
SLO #1	SAILS	Fall Baseline	8.1%	Fall Baseline	8.1%
SLO #2	SAILS	Fall Baseline	6.1%	Fall Baseline	6.1%
SLO #3	SAILS	Fall Baseline	6.5%	Fall Baseline	6.5%
SLO #4	Gen. Ed. #12	Fall Baseline	11%	Fall Baseline	11%
SLO #5	SAILS	Fall Baseline	7.9%	Fall Baseline	7.9%

The SAILS data for Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 show improvement in SLOs 1, 2, 3, & 5 exceeding the estimated target projections, as follows: SLO #1 (11.16%), SLO #2 (9.5%), SLO #3 (8.33%), and SLO #5 (18.89%).

SAILS Data	Fall 2008 Freshmen		Spring 2009 30+ Hour Students		Fall 2009 Freshmen		Spring 2010 30+ Hour Students		Fall 2010 Freshmen		Spring 2011 30+ Hour Students		Fall 2011 Freshmen		Spring 2012 30+ Hour Student	
	RPCC	Other 2 YR	RPCC	Other 2 YR	RPCC	Other 2 YR	RPCC	Other 2 YR	RPCC	Other 2 YR	RPCC	Other 2 YR	RPCC	Other 2 YR	RPCC	Other 2 YR
SLO #1	529	550	570	550	498	543	543	539	427	478	472	478	430	475	478	465
			Increase 7.75%					Increase 9.04%					Increase 10.54%		Increase 11.16%	
SLO #2	515	538	539	539	502	536	535	533	443	483	478	483	442	481	484	471
			Increase 4.66%					Increase 6.57%					Increase 7.90%		Increase 9.50%	
SLO #3	519	549	563	544	517	541	541	539	401	458	444	458	408	454	442	426
			Increase 8.48%					Increase 4.64%					Increase 10.72%		Increase 8.33%	
SLO #5	503	529	534	524	481	522	516	518	379	421	417	421	381	420	453	428
			Increase 6.16%					Increase 7.28%					Increase 10.03%		Increase 18.89%	

Summary

Compared to other cohort institutions, RPCC has shown an increase in several areas including: synthesizing information, developing skills to become independent learners, and developing skills to think critically and analytically, which coincides with the focus of the institution’s QEP. Reinforcing the CCSSE results, the data for the General Education Goal #12 show a continued increase in student performance from freshmen to 30+ hour students. Additionally, the SAILS data reveal an increase each year in SLO #1, #2, and #5. Over the last four years, each of these SLOs has increased in percent change from the previous year’s data. For SLO #3, there has been an increase each year; however, the increase was not consistently greater than the previous year’s percent change. Finally, the library data reveal an increase in the utilization of electronic resources. This increase is due in part to the change in the eBook and electronic databases. Additionally, there are more technology-driven students who want to access library resources electronically. This is reinforced with the drop in face-to-face interactions, including gate count and attendance at workshops.

**CCSSE: Community College Survey of Student Engagement 2009/2011
SACS/COC Cohort Comparison Data [External Assessment]**

College Activity by students during the year	Means				Key for Means
	2009 RPCC	2009 Other 2 Year	2011 RPCC	2011 Other 2 Year	
Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions	3.05	2.91	3.00	2.92	1 = never 2 = sometimes 3 = often 4 = very often
Made a class presentation	2.36	2.05	1.98	2.08	
Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment	2.93	2.46	2.59	2.50	
Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	3.12	2.72	2.94	2.77	
Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with instructors outside of class	1.84	1.74	1.76	1.75	
Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class	2.36	2.56	2.46	2.57	
Synthesized and organized ideas, information, or experiences in new ways	2.79	2.72	2.81	2.76	
Used information read or heard to perform a new skill	2.71	2.76	2.76	2.80	
Number of book length assigned course readings	2.83	2.86	2.76	2.90	
Number of unassigned books read for personal reasons	1.96	2.09	1.91	2.10	
Number of written papers or reports	2.73	2.83	2.63	2.89	1 = very little 2 = some 3 = quite a bit 4 = very much
Were encouraged to spend significant amounts of time studying	2.80	2.97	2.98	3.01	
Used computers in academic work	3.13	3.12	2.92	3.18	0=none 1=1.5 hours 2=6-10 hours 3=11-20 hours 4=21-30 hours 5= < 30 hours
Number of hours spent preparing for class	1.69	1.92	1.73	2.00	
Developed skills to learn effectively on your own	2.97	2.91	3.02	2.93	
Developed skills to write clearly and effectively	2.91	2.70	2.85	2.75	
Developed skills to speak clearly and effectively	2.82	2.61	2.81	2.66	
Developed skills to think critically and analytically	3.00	2.89	3.04	2.92	1 = none 2 = 1-4 3 = 5-10 4 = 11-20 5 = < 20
Used computing and information technology	2.93	2.73	2.83	2.77	
Developed skills to work effectively with others	2.94	2.73	2.78	2.76	

APPENDIX B

LIBRARY SERVICES USAGE STATISTICS																
SERVICE	Quarter	Fall		Change	Percentage	Spring		Change	Percentage	2010-2011		2011-2012		Change	Percentage	
		2010	2011			2011	2012			2010-2011	2011-2012	2011-2012	Change			Percentage
Circulation Counts	Includes all charges & renewals, reserve charges & renewals, and items used in-house	2811	1752	-1059	-37.67%	2018	1894	-124	-6.14%	4829	3646	-1183	-24.50%			
E-books	Number of accesses to the e-book collection	1610	2211	601	37.33%	1242	1205	-37	-2.98%	2852	3416	564	19.78%			
Database Usage	Seasons/Signons Searches/Queries Documents retrieved	6142 14009 30390	21786 31610 51363	15644 17601 20973	254.71% 125.64% 69.01%	4883 16463 36940	20789 36306 31068	15906 19843 -5772	325.74% 120.53% -15.67%	11025 30472 67230	42575 67916 82431	31550 37444 15201	286.17% 122.88% 22.61%			
Gate Count	determined by using the gate at the circulation desk and halving the totals	21898	19181	-2717	-12.43%	18516	15897	-2619	-14.14%	40414	35078	-5336	-13.20%			
Bibliographic Instruction: In-class	Instructors	8	6	-2	-25.00%	9	6	-3	-33.33%	17	12	-5	-29.41%			
	Classes	24	20	-4	-16.67%	29	18	-11	-37.93%	53	38	-15	-28.30%			
	Students enrolled	473	436	-37	-7.82%	656	360	-296	-45.12%	1129	796	-333	-29.50%			
Surveys returned	252	332	80	31.75%	308	224	-84	-27.27%	560	556	-4	-0.71%				
Other services	Student Success Workshops relevant to Library Services or Information Literacy	Attendance	28	18	-10	-35.71%	11	0	-11	-100.00%	39	18	-21	-53.85%		
	Sessions offered	23	5	-18	-78.26%	7	3	-4	-57.14%	30	8	-22	-73.33%			

Drops in these numbers compared to previous semesters may be due to the complete discontinuation of lending textbooks starting with Fall 2011.