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abstract: Librarians at Washington State University Vancouver helped the campus develop a method of assessing its General Education Program, a program based on university learning goals, one of which is information literacy. The assessment method, which relies on an electronic portfolio (ePortfolio) along with rubrics to evaluate work in the ePortfolio, enables the librarians to evaluate their information literacy program based on ACRL best practices guidelines, authentic assessment techniques, and the tenets of phenomenography. This paper will describe the library’s use of this assessment method, while looking at the advantages and disadvantages of this process for assessment.

Introduction

In its “Characteristics of Programs of Information Literacy that Illustrate Best Practices: A Guideline,” the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) sets guidelines for what components are necessary for a valid information literacy program assessment. The program that subscribes to best practices has an established process of ongoing planning for improvement and directly measures progress toward meeting the goals and objectives of that program. Assessment is integrated with course and curriculum assessment as well as institutional evaluation and accreditation expectations. The program also uses multiple methods and purposes for evaluation.1

Librarians at Washington State University Vancouver (WSU Vancouver) were involved in helping the campus develop a method of assessing its new General Education Program, which is based on the six WSU university learning goals, one of which is
information literacy. The development of the learning goal matrix within the campus' electronic portfolio (ePortfolio) along with the use of rubrics enables the librarians to assess their information literacy program based on the ACRL best practices guidelines. In this paper, we will describe WSU Vancouver Library’s use of a combination of an ePortfolio and rubrics and look at the advantages and disadvantages of this method for program assessment.

History and Literature Review

In the Middle Ages at the University of Paris students studied under a master who set daily exercises for the students to learn grammar and philosophy before being admitted to the higher schools of medicine or law. Masters put one student in competition with another as a learning exercise; and, in this way, assessment happened daily, ending with one student being praised and the other ridiculed. Ultimately, the master nominated his student for examinations, which were public events in which the candidate was questioned and required to deliver a lecture on a text given him only hours before. The examination was designed so that the student could demonstrate his skill at lecturing, the skill for which he was being trained. These were the first authentic assessments of student learning. In the following centuries, as the number of students to be assessed increased dramatically, and the need for written proof of accomplishment became more important, assessment became more about knowledge gain and less about application of that knowledge. Examinations grew, and more authentic methods of assessing a student’s abilities to apply knowledge became rare.

It was not until the 1960s in the United States, as demands for more accountability in education increased, that interest in more authentic methods of assessment returned. This was jump-started in 1966 by James Coleman’s report, Equality of Educational Opportunity, which examined the distribution of resources in education and found an inequity in achievement scores between races. This report helped to shift the focus in education from inputs to outcomes. Policymakers, public officials, and community activists insisted that educators be held accountable for student performance. It was also in the 1960s that accreditation for universities and colleges began as a means to demonstrate to the federal government a level of competency that would allow them to access federal funds for research, loans, and grants. It is becoming clear that educators need to return to the practice of authentic assessment in order to satisfy these governing bodies and to ensure that students are actually learning the skills and knowledge they need for success in the real world.

Continuing the search for authentic methods for evaluation of student learning in the 1970s, Swedish researchers became interested in why “some people are better at learning than others” and developed a research methodology that is now known as phenomenography. This methodology included studying learning “under comparatively natural conditions, and the aim was to describe it through the eyes of the learner.” The application of this method was another attempt to bring more authenticity to the assessment of student learning. Today, the use of reflective portfolios and rubrics as methods of assessment echoes the interest of phenomenography, which looks at “how people learn from their world in order to explore the process of learning and enhance the quality of this experience.”
Just as educators have been struggling throughout history to devise methods of authentic assessment, librarians, too, have been interested in accurate methods of assessing their impact on student learning. As early as 1876, it was recognized that “the college librarian was more educator than custodian and [it was] argued that faculty and librarians should work together for the education of students.” However, it was not until the 1960s, as library instruction became more integral to the librarian’s role in the university, that assessment of the educational impact of library instruction entered the literature. Recently, Denise Koufogiannakis conducted a systematic review of published library instruction assessment projects, which provides insight into the history of assessment methods since 1963. Librarians have used a variety of methods to assess student learning, some of which include pre- and post-tests, citation analysis, and search strategy analyses. Assessment activities were given a great boost in 2000 when ACRL developed its “Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education.”

With this new emphasis on information literacy and the need to assess learning outcomes, librarians are now searching for new methods that will measure student and program achievement of learning goals based on best practices in assessment and evaluation. Some recently published projects most related to the Vancouver assessment project have included citation analysis, integration of information literacy outcomes into other curricula, and portfolio assessments.

Citation analysis studies generally focus on program assessment and do incorporate the attributes of authentic assessment, but they are generally unable to assess the full range of information literacy outcomes and do not involve student selection of artifacts and self-reflection on their work, key components of portfolio work.

Integrating information literacy outcomes into other curricula is another method used recently. Ann Fiegen, Bennet Cherry, and Kathleen Watson, for example, worked on integrating information literacy into the business curriculum at the San Marcos campus of California State University. A key to determining the success of curriculum integration is to build in assessment methods, which this project did. Although this is an extensive and laudable approach to information literacy instruction, the student learning assessment instruments revert to the standard pre- and post-tests and one-time assignment analysis.

Finally, a novel approach to assessment has been the use of portfolios to assess information literacy outcomes. Unlike citation analysis, this approach is able to address the full range of information literacy components but, so far, has focused on using portfolios as an end-of-course method to determine course-specific evaluation for individual students. Portfolios, especially as showcases for best work or as end-of-program assessment, have been integral to some academic programs for decades. Their use for assessment of information literacy outcomes, however, is an innovation.

With the increased interest in accountability, as noted above, and with ACRL’s emphasis on assessing outcomes, librarians are starting to look at portfolios, or most recently electronic portfolios, as vehicles to use for authentic assessment. Portfolios (or ePortfolios) allow access to a collection of self-selected student work and self-reflection organized around specified learning goals, one of which can be information literacy. The collection of self-selected work and reflections are the real strengths of using portfolios for assessment.
Reliable evaluation of that student work and reflection can be accomplished through the use of an assessment rubric. Rubrics are easy to adapt to ACRL standards and through objective criteria give a clear measure of the level of the learning attained by the student. Rubrics are transferable to many disciplines and learning environments. Librarians and teaching faculty who create a rubric together develop a shared belief in information competency; and, because rubrics are effective for authentic assessment, they make it easy for educators to close the feedback loop into the learning environment. This method of information literacy assessment adheres to the principles of phenomenography in that it “emphasizes an holistic evaluation of people’s experience of information literacy as an aspect of learning, rather than the assessment of measurable attributes and skills associated with specific information-seeking practices.”

Facing the need for an authentic method for program assessment with the advent of the newly invented General Education Program at WSU Vancouver, the campus decided to use, as one method of assessment, the combination of an ePortfolio, assessment rubrics, and learning outcomes. Because one of the campus learning goals is information literacy, the library is able to use this same method to assess its information literacy program.

Background

WSU Vancouver, as a non-residential, regional campus of Washington State University, was an upper division and graduate only institution with approximately 1,500 FTE until recently. In 2005, the Washington State Legislature charged the campus with the goal of admitting 200 entry-level students in the fall of 2006, while maintaining its active transfer student program. During the planning period, the Lower Division Planning Committee developed a new general education program based on six university learning goals, which were being written concurrently. There was a commitment on the part of the campus to use the opportunity of a new program to increase student engagement and to bring more cohesion to each student’s educational experience. It was decided that the incorporation of an ePortfolio system into a general education program could assist with these goals.

Three aspects of the newly created General Education Program relevant to this paper are the information literacy learning goal, the use of an ePortfolio to gather data and support program assessment, and the use of rubrics for assessment. Librarians, along with other faculty, wrote the information literacy goal based on the ACRL standards. This has brought a campus-wide prominence to the importance of information literacy . . .

Since the use of an ePortfolio in the new General Education Program was already being discussed, the Lower Division Planning Committee requested that an assessment
tool be included. This tool would be used as an integral part of the program to measure progress for each student in each of the six learning goals. The ePortfolio was conceptually designed by a faculty/staff committee, which was chaired by a librarian. After the committee considered several products, looked at the timeline for development, and considered the capacity for future customization, it was decided that the open source system of OSP through Sakai was the best fit.

Per the committee recommendation, the OSP software package came with a developed matrix/reflection tool that could be adapted for use in program assessment for student learning of the university learning goals. Students interact with this learning goal matrix three times during their education at WSU Vancouver, corresponding to their enrollment in the three required one-credit learning goal courses. This allows for the longitudinal study of the General Education Program as a whole and of each student as he or she progresses through the program. Implementation of this matrix tool took place in the fall of 2006, and evaluation of work created during the initial semester took place at the beginning of 2007.

Methodology

The learning goal matrix, as part of the ePortfolio, allows students to add two pieces of evidence for each learning goal (see illustration 1). Students choose evidence from course work, co-curricular activities, or work experiences. For a student activity that does not result in an artifact, which can be stored in the matrix, the ePortfolio provides a form for students to use to describe learning in work, volunteerism, or other life experiences. This encourages students to use evidence from a wider variety of activities and to identify how their coursework integrates with interests outside of the classroom.

Once evidence is added to the matrix, students then reflect on each piece of evidence by answering the question, “How does the work you chose demonstrate your progress toward meeting this criterion?” Finally, students reflect on how each goal integrates with their personal, educational, and career goals by answering the question, “How has your understanding of your educational, career, and/or personal goals changed as a result of your work in meeting this criterion?” Over the course of a student’s career at WSU Vancouver, the matrix is filled out as a final project in three required learning goal courses. The learning goal courses are taken during the beginning, middle, and end of each student’s educational experience.

Faculty who teach these learning goal courses ensure that the students complete the project but do not assess for program success. Program assessment is done by a campus committee that created rubrics for assessing the learning in each of the outcomes and that recruited faculty to perform the rating. (See the appendix for the rubric associated with the communication and information literacy goal.) A random sample of ePortfolio matrices is selected, ensuring that the students whose work is selected are representative of the students currently enrolled. Student work is rated for each rubric point on a scale of one to six within three major categories: emerging, developing, and integrating. It was hypothesized that not only would entry-level students most likely score in the emerging category, whereas seniors—if the program were successful—would score in the integrating category but also that entry-level students would score lower than transfer students.
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Results

The program assessment of all of the learning outcomes in the first ePortfolios for the fall semester was implemented in December 2006, and the results have been analyzed. Although results are available for all six learning outcomes, this paper will only highlight the results of the communication and information literacy (CIL) outcomes. Twenty-five ePortfolios were randomly selected within parameters that would allow for even distribution between transfer and entry-level students and would accurately reflect the overall campus gender and race demographics. The CIL outcomes were analyzed based on the variables of transfer status, gender, age, and race; although, because of the small survey sample, race could only be divided into majority and minority populations. In CIL, all students had mean scores within the emerging category of the rubric (see the appendix), with entry-level students scoring a 2.09 and transfer students scoring a 2.59 on the six-point scale, a statistically significant difference (p < .05). Female students scored slightly below their male counterparts (2.29 vs. 2.45), and majority students scored a 2.45 as compared to the 2.15 of minority students. Differences in the scores for gender and race were not statistically significant, although this may have been due to the limited sample size. Although age was not statistically significant, there was an observable positive correlation between age and skill level (older students scored higher in CIL than younger students). More detailed analysis based on all seven CIL components will be completed later in 2007.

Figure 1. Learning Goal Matrix
Analysis

The validity of the results and the strength of the rubric as an assessment instrument are evidenced by positive results on a variety of reliability tests (multivariate, item correlation, and factor analysis). Multivariate tests demonstrated that each student was at the cusp of development in their skills across the board. It was noted that the rubrics, as a scale, held up well in item correlation tests. When evaluating the CIL rubric (see appendix), specifically, item consistency was high for items one through six (> .8 on Cronbach's Alpha), showing that these items were observable indicators of CIL. CIL seven, however, was not consistent with the others (< .1), indicating that it could not be measured with this instrument as reliably as the others. This was confirmed by the rotated component matrix. Perhaps this is not surprising since item seven involves behavior and group interaction, both of which may be difficult to demonstrate in an artifact. Finally, factor analysis of the results indicates that raters did evaluate each learning outcome uniquely rather than scoring students' ePortfolios as a whole.¹⁹

It is the impression of the two librarians who were on the rating committee that the original hypothesis that entry-level students would score in the emerging category and score lower than transfer students was correct, although entry-level students scored at the high end of the emerging category. It was surprising that junior transfer students, although scoring higher than the entry-level students, did not score overall outside of the emerging category. The librarians are looking forward to seeing the longitudinal data in order to assess the impact of the on-campus library instruction program.

After going through this process for the first time, both instructors and raters have discovered some of the strengths and weaknesses of this assessment model. The first

---

**Chart 1**

CIL Rubric Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Significance (p &lt; .05 is significant.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-level</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

problem was simply lack of time. With the very short implementation time, many instructors were not trained in the ePortfolio and the matrix methods until a few days before classes began. This meant that the instructors were learning how to use the technology as they taught the course and were essentially acting as beta testers for the technology. From the instructors’ viewpoint, it took much more class time than expected to get students to understand the purpose of the matrix and to get them comfortable with the process of evidence collection and reflection. It was also difficult for instructors to find a way to provide feedback that would help students write appropriate reflections without coaching them on “correct” answers. Finally, this first semester presented some campus organizational challenges that affected student attitudes about the learning goal courses and the learning goal matrix.

Instructors did note some of the benefits of using the learning goal matrix. Students who were enrolled in more than one general education course started to see how their courses and co-curricular activities were overlapping to help them create a whole out of their educational experiences. As one student noted, “During the course, it was very useful to participate in class activities, as well as assignments to reflect on the individual goals. These projects enabled me to connect my new knowledge of each goal with my previous knowledge and then apply it to situations in other classes and even life off of the WSUV campus.” Some students commented that, after doing the matrix, they suddenly saw that there was more to a college education than the content of individual courses, and working on the matrix helped them to finally understand what the program at WSU Vancouver was trying to accomplish. According to an entry-level student, “University learning goals enabled me to better understand myself as an individual and my role in the society. I see it as my first baby steps in [my] college career, where the goal is to not only come out with a degree but also become an adult with better comprehension of the society and one’s role in it.”

The librarians who served on the assessment committee that rated the matrices also identified problems to be solved before the next rating sessions. They agree that time for additional training would have improved their experience as raters. All of the raters were trained in two sessions. The first session was instruction in the technology involved in the process, and the second was on the use of the rubrics. After reading through the rubrics and exemplar samples, the raters participated in a normalizing exercise. After training was complete, the selected ePortfolios were assessed by a minimum of two people. Twenty-five percent of the student work needed to have a third rater, indicating one of the weaknesses of using rubrics. Frequently, and as in this case, those creating the rubrics are not the raters who apply them. It takes time for the raters to truly understand the rubrics in a consistent way; therefore, more normalizing activities are needed to bring consistency to the process.

The librarian raters confirmed other criticisms of rubrics, which have been mentioned in the literature. One of these involves the availability of course assignments from which students could choose evidence for their matrices. Librarians note that the
lack of appropriate artifacts for each learning goal may have been due to the lack of choices students felt they had, as well as a misunderstanding of the matrix. They note that students might have scored higher in information literacy had there been a clearer understanding about what type of artifacts to place in each of the specific cells and had students had these artifacts easily available. Another criticism concerns the inability of a rubric to address every aspect of a learning goal. As noted before, the rubric stood up well in six out of the seven aspects of CIL but was unable to address a student’s ability to work appropriately in a group.24

In addition to concerns about the rubrics, librarian raters had concerns about the reflection tool. They felt that students might have scored higher if they had made better use of the reflection tool indicating how each artifact demonstrated information literacy. Again, other researchers have noted this problem, indicating that students do not always see the personal benefit to what they are doing and feel that it is more work than the amount of credit earned. 25 In Vancouver’s case, raters wondered if the lack of descriptive reflections was due to a lack of understanding on the part of the student or simply a lack of taking that part of the process seriously. Some instructors noted that students who were disgruntled about the new General Education Program were unmotivated to provide informative reflections.

Based on the instructors’ and raters’ feedback, changes were implemented before the beginning of spring semester to address concerns expressed during the fall. The biggest changes took place within the first learning goal course. It was redesigned to allow more class time to discuss and complete the matrix. In addition, a more concerted effort was made to have other courses interact with the ePortfolio so that students would have more and a greater variety of artifacts to choose from when looking for evidence. In conjunction with this, the use of forms to document student learning was restricted to the more complex and informative forms that supplied evidence that could stand up to the needs of the rating system. Instructors feel more confident about teaching the technology now that they have gained experience with it, and the technology itself has become less frustrating since a few bugs have been resolved. Finally, the campus is gaining more experience with the new General Education Program, so the difficulties that contributed to student confusion have been lessened.

Conclusion

The future procedure for ePortfolio learning goal matrix assessment at WSU Vancouver will look different from this seminal process. During the summer of 2007, as the General Education Committee continues to work out issues with the learning goal classes and the way they conduct assessment, the librarians will analyze the communication and information literacy artifacts in all matrices. It is expected that the analysis of the information literacy artifacts will indicate adjustments that can be made in information literacy instruction to improve learning. In the fall, student learning will be evaluated again on the matrices from the second learning goal course, with the anticipation of progress in all of the learning outcomes, including information literacy. As this assessment collects longitudinal data about students’ progress (or lack of progress) on the communication and information literacy goal throughout four years, the library’s instruction program can be changed in response to this data in the hopes of improving student learning.
Finding authentic methods to assess student learning is a process that has been undergoing change since the first lectures at the University of Paris. Recently, this search has become more vigorous due to the increasing pressures for accountability in education. The use of the ePortfolio to document student learning in conjunction with the use of rubrics for assessment is spreading throughout educational institutions. It is the expectation that, as Helen Barrett and Judy Wilkerson suggest, an assessment of this nature will serve the needs of the students and the institution. Students come to understand the criteria by which their progress will be judged, and they have the opportunity to see and reflect upon the progress that they are making toward the university learning goals. The institution benefits because the rubrics clearly define the tasks that will be used to assess progress, the analysis will clearly indicate where improvements need to be made, and the methodology is congruent with the philosophy of the institution.

When used as one of multiple methods to assess an information literacy program, the ePortfolio/rubric method adheres to ACRL’s recommendations for program assessment. It integrates information literacy assessment into the campus’ overall program assessment by establishing a process through which ongoing programs can be assessed, and it directly measures student progress on meeting the goals of the program. Librarians who do not have access to material through an electronic portfolio can access material for evaluation through other means. With appropriate permissions, after grading, faculty could provide copies of student work or partnerships could be made with a program or department for student work to be gathered at the beginning and the end of their educational experiences. In addition to adhering to best practices, assessing student information literacy learning using the ePortfolio/rubric method follows the key components of phenomenography. It uses artifacts created “naturally” throughout a student’s educational career, and it attempts to see progress through the eyes of the student by asking for reflection on each artifact and how it affected learning.

The WSU Vancouver project is exciting because it has included, from the beginning, an information literacy goal and has involved librarians in all aspects of planning and implementation. As with every new program, it will be some time before the impact of this project can be understood and all necessary improvements made. However, this level of commitment to the assessment of student learning, especially assessment of information literacy in this complex information age, and appropriate response to that assessment by program improvement will only strengthen the institution and reinforce the centrality of student learning in this institution’s mission.

Karen R. Diller is assistant vice chancellor for academic affairs, Washington State University Vancouver, Vancouver, WA; she may be contacted via e-mail at: diller@vancouver.wsu.edu.

Sue F. Phelps is reference librarian, Library, Washington State University Vancouver, Vancouver, WA; she may be contacted via e-mail at: asphelps@vancouver.wsu.edu.
Appendix
Communication and Information Literacy Rubric

Below are the definitions for each of the three major categorical anchors:

- **Emerging**: Exhibits limited / minimal recognition or identification of appropriate tools, theories, or problems.
- **Developing**: Demonstrates recognition of contexts and implications; provides analysis; selects appropriate theories or tools to approach problem; thoughtful and systematic exploration of alternatives.
- **Integrating**: Demonstrates application of knowledge to real world situations; provides synthesis of bodies of knowledge; evidence of transference (application of knowledge to other contexts); draws appropriate inferences with justification.

Information in parentheses denotes Information Literacy (IL) and Communication (C) performance criteria listed in the GE Learning Outcomes that are being assessed.

1. Determines the extent, type, and context of information needed to address a problem, question, or work assignment. (IL1; C1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draws primarily from anecdotal or personal experience.</td>
<td>Considers multiple types of information needed and multiple perspectives.</td>
<td>Considers and evaluates underlying biases and values of multiple sources of information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Designs an effective search strategy using multiple sources such as computer, print and other people. (IL2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>3 4</td>
<td>5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goes directly to search tool (search engine, library database, person) without thinking about how the toolsearch technique will shape what types of information is found.</td>
<td>Applies some thought to choosing a variety of contextually appropriate tools to the type of information sought.</td>
<td>Demonstrates an understanding of how tool selection determines information found; evaluates and incorporates less traditional avenues to advantage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops search strategies using basic keywords.</td>
<td>Develops search strategies using and continually refining keywords and synonyms.</td>
<td>Develops effective search strategies using appropriately focused keywords, synonyms, and subject headings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Manages and organizes information and communication technologies effectively and efficiently. (IL3; C3; C4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging 1 2</th>
<th>Developing 3 4</th>
<th>Integrating 5 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relies primarily upon one potential source (e.g., search engine, library database, directory, or person) to retrieve information.</td>
<td>Demonstrates some knowledge of appropriate search logic (e.g., Boolean logic, field searching, limiters, etc.).</td>
<td>Demonstrates proficient use of contextually appropriate search logic (Boolean logic, field searching, limiters, etc.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emerging 1 2

- Little or no understanding of how to record and manage information and its sources (e.g., typically requires numerous attempts to retrieve information).
- Only considers one communication technology (e.g., web or Powerpoint).

Developing 3 4

- Demonstrates some organizational skill at managing information from multiple sources.
- Considers multiple potential communication technologies.

Integrating 5 6

- Accurately and efficiently manages information and its sources.
- Evaluates the implications of technology and media selection for organizing and communicating information.

4. Assesses credibility and applicability (e.g., pertinence, validity) of information. (IL4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging 1 2</th>
<th>Developing 3 4</th>
<th>Integrating 5 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepts information without question (e.g., quotes sources without comment or evaluation). Unable to determine if the original information need has been satisfied.</td>
<td>Articulates and/or applies basic evaluation criteria to information and sources. Determines if original information need has been satisfied or if additional information is needed.</td>
<td>Clearly articulates and applies evaluation criteria to both the information and the sources (e.g., differentiates between and uses primary and secondary sources). Recognizes applicability of information to other domains.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Articulates and/or applies basic evaluation criteria to information and sources.
- Determines if original information need has been satisfied or if additional information is needed.

- Clearly articulates and applies evaluation criteria to both the information and the sources (e.g., differentiates between and uses primary and secondary sources).
- Recognizes applicability of information to other domains.
5. Uses information effectively, ethically, and legally to accomplish a purpose. (IL5; IL6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Emerging**
  - Uses information without referencing the source of that information or without abiding by established etiquette, institutional policies, or legal regulations related to the use of that information.
  - Uses sources out of context.
  - Fails to acknowledge or distorts opposing viewpoints.
  - Relies heavily on quotes.
  - Makes multiple errors when citing sources.

- **Developing**
  - Acknowledges the source of information and uses it in ways that comply with established etiquette, institutional policies, and/or legal regulations related to the use of that information.
  - Acknowledges opposing viewpoints.
  - Uses more paraphrasing than quotes.
  - Makes minimal errors when citing sources.

- **Integrating**
  - Demonstrates a thorough understanding of the established etiquette, institutional policies and/or legal regulations related to the use of that information.
  - Respects the context and integrity of sources of information.
  - Integrates opposing viewpoints into broader contexts.
  - Integrates quotes and paraphrases appropriately to formulate an argument.
  - Makes no errors when citing sources.

6. Uses communication medium (e.g., visual, written, graphic, audio, oral) and technology (from simple to advanced) to express concepts, propositions, and beliefs in a coherent, concise, and technically correct form. (C2; C3; C4; C5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Integrating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3 4</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Emerging**
  - Uses language in writing and presenting without considering the audience.
  - Selects inappropriate communication medium or technology to express ideas.
  - Expresses concepts, propositions, and beliefs with minimal clarity

- **Developing**
  - Voices own opinion and allows others to make their viewpoints heard.
  - Considers constructive feedback.
  - Meets obligation to group.

- **Integrating**
  - Demonstrates sophisticated use of communication strategies.
  - Choice of communication medium or technology adds to (rather than detracts from) the content of the presentation.
  - Consistently expresses concepts, propositions, and beliefs in a clear and concise manner.
7. Follows social norms for individual behavior and group interactions, which includes listening actively. (C6; C7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emerging 1 2</th>
<th>Developing 3 4</th>
<th>Integrating 5 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primarily recognizes and values own opinions and viewpoints (e.g., interrupts or ignores others when they speak).</td>
<td>Voices own opinion and allows others to make their viewpoints heard.</td>
<td>Allows others to voice opinions and integrates those opinions into future comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids obligation to group.</td>
<td>Meets obligation to group</td>
<td>Makes use of constructive feedback.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Exceeds obligations to group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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