

## **Scoring rubric for Information Literacy Skills**

### **Notes for assessors**

#### **Purpose of the scoring rubric**

The purpose of the scoring rubric is to grade students' information literacy skills. We use the term "information literacy skills" to describe students' competencies in sifting through the abundance of information with which they are presented to find particular items of information that are of value to them, and which meet quality standards such as reliability and topicality. Accordingly, students with adequate information literacy skills are capable of making critical judgements. They are also able to incorporate information in a meaningful way into their own knowledge products, such as research reports. A third aspect pinpointed in the context of information literacy skills involves the ethical use of information. Students must respect copyright and academic standards, such as the use of citations and legally purchased tools (software). Teaching staff can use this scoring rubric to grade students' performances (in terms of information literacy skills) on the basis of their product (paper) and the process report.

#### **Form and use of the scoring rubric**

The scoring rubric itself consists of eight assessment criteria. Five criteria relate to the final product (the report, or the paper), while the other three involve the search strategy that is part of a process report. Each of these assessment criteria is associated with descriptions of performance characteristics at two different levels:

- ~ professional
- ~ inadequate.

Check boxes precede the descriptions of the characteristics of professional and inadequate behaviour. This allows assessors to complete the scoring rubric by simply ticking the appropriate check boxes. For a number of assessment criteria, the characteristic of "inadequate behaviour" is indicated by more than one check box. In such cases, students are considered to have performed inadequately if their work is characterised by one or more of the descriptions in question.

In some cases, the characteristics are supplemented with "examples". These examples are not exhaustive, so they can easily be supplemented with additional examples.

#### **Grading scale**

The descriptions of professional and inadequate behaviour include a Likert scale ranging from “excellent” to “very poor”. The descriptions of “professional behaviour” correspond to grades of “good” or “excellent”, while descriptions of inadequate behaviour are graded as “poor” or “very poor”. The grading scale was added to the scoring rubric to allow assessors the opportunity of forming relatively nuanced judgements. The use of check boxes alongside descriptions of behaviour can be seen as a way of underpinning the Likert scale grade that was awarded.

### **Numerical score**

Assessors can enter a number in the text box on the right-hand side of the scoring rubric. Depending on the criterion in question, up to 10, 15, or 20 points can be awarded per assessment criterion.

Numerical scores are not always an appropriate way of assessing information literacy skills. Accordingly, assessors can decide whether or not to use the scoring system option, which would allow them to determine the “total score”. The Likert scale scores are, by definition, an integral part of the assessment process!

In the interests of completeness, I have included the following description of how values on the Likert scale correspond to numbers on a scale of 1 to 10.

excellent 10	poor 5
good 8	poor 3
satisfactory 6	very poor 1

### **Bachelor's-Master's**

The grading scale can be used for both Bachelor’s and Master’s students. Bachelor’s students are assessed on all aspects, but less strictly than Master’s students.

### **Cannot be assessed**

In practice, an assessor may conclude that a student’s work cannot be assessed on the basis of a given criterion, simply because too little information is available. In such cases, assessors can leave the row in question blank or, better still, cross out the entire row to indicate that the criterion has not been assessed.

*Jos van Helvoort*

*The Hague University of Applied Sciences*

*27 August 2009*

*Adapted for university use by*

*Bert Boxem (University of Twente) ,*

*Anneke Dirkx (Leiden University Library)*

*Marjolein Drent (University of Twente)*

*Imke Limpens (VU University Library),*

*Caroline Timmers (University of Twente, Saxion University of Applied Sciences)*

*May 2010*

*Nicole will (Delft University of Technology), July 2011*