

The Slow Assessment Movement: Using Homegrown Rubrics and Capstone Projects for DIY Information Literacy Assessment

Darcy Gervasio, Kimberly Detterbeck, and Rebecca Oling



This paper will explore how librarians at Purchase College leveraged ideas from the slow movement and authentic assessment to design a rubric to assess information literacy skills in senior projects. We will discuss how we normed and tested the rubric and share the next steps in this process.



Introduction:

Purchase College was established in the late 1960s by then Governor Nelson Rockefeller as a landmark campus within the SUNY system that could marry the liberal and creative arts. Born of that perspective, the college has long required students to create “senior projects.” A college-wide requirement for both bachelors of arts and science degrees, the senior project is the capstone and hallmark of the Purchase educational experience; many projects cross disciplines with unique results. Students devote two semesters to an in-depth, original, creative study. These research artifacts provide evidence of how graduating seniors use information and demonstrate research skills. Since 1973, the Purchase College Library has collected, archived, and cataloged senior projects from the School of Liberal Arts and Sciences.¹ Since they are archived in the Library (or, more recently, online), senior projects are easy for librarians to access.

Despite easy access to senior projects, when the Library’s Assessment Working Group was asked to

find a means to measure student success, standardized tests initially seemed like the fastest, most convenient, most “measurable” option. During the 2010–2011 academic year, the Library’s Assessment Working Group compared several commercial tools for programmatic level assessment of students’ information literacy skills, including Information Literacy Test (ILT), Project SAILS, and iSkills by ETS. Our analysis determined that the one-size-fits-all nature of these third-party assessments did not reflect the research experience of students using Purchase College Library resources.²

Standardized tests for information literacy assessment are also challenging to implement longitudinally. Working with the College Writing program, the Library could easily recruit freshmen to take a standardized test, but it would be significantly more difficult for the Library to recruit seniors to participate in such an assessment without a broader campus-wide curricular mandate.³ Without a mandate, assessment of seniors would rely on self-selected volunteers and

Darcy Gervasio is Reference and Instruction Librarian, Purchase College, e-mail: darcy.gervasio@purchase.edu; Kimberly Detterbeck is Art Librarian, Purchase College, e-mail: kimberly.detterbeck@purchase.edu; Rebecca Oling, Coordinator of Instruction and Literature Librarian, Purchase College, e-mail: rebecca.oling@purchase.edu

therefore diminish the authenticity of our results. We needed meaningful data based on actual student research products, not test scores, in order to fully and practically assess the level of information literacy skills demonstrated by Purchase College students. We needed something local and more authentic. And we had that in front of us in our senior projects. As an alternative to testing, we developed a rubric-based assessment of senior projects.

Authentic Assessment & Slow Assessment

Focusing on senior projects was a natural fit for us. Not only were they easy for librarians to access, but they represent the culmination of a student's undergraduate education. Each project is created within the student's own discipline, and students often use these to market themselves to employers after graduation. Authentic assessment, as defined by Gulikers, is assessment that requires students to "use the same competencies, or combinations of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, that they need to apply in the criterion situation in professional life."⁴ Sometimes called "performance or direct assessment," authentic assessment is distinguished from standardized testing because students "actually demonstrate skills rather than answer questions about them."⁵

Authentic assessment dovetails perfectly with the principles of the Slow Movement which focus on reflection, choice, leveraging local assets, and resisting cultural pressures to hurry. The Slow Movement has its origins in the Slow Food Movement. Begun in Italy in 1989, Slow Food resists fast food and "fast life," the over-industrialization and obsession with speed that afflicts many Western nations.⁶ The Slow Movement rejects this "cult of efficiency" and "time sickness" in favor of doing things at a more natural pace. Yet it is not necessarily about doing everything slowly. As Carl Honoré explains in his seminal book *In Praise of Slowness*:

[T]he Slow movement offers [a] middle path, a recipe for marrying *la dolce vita* with the dy-

namism of the information age. The secret is balance: instead of doing everything faster, do everything at the right speed. Sometimes fast. Sometimes slow. Sometimes somewhere in between. Being Slow means never rushing, never striving to save time just for the sake of it. It means remaining calm and unflustered even when circumstances force us to speed up.⁷

The philosophy of Slow has been applied to food, travel, work, sex, architecture, parenting, fashion, web design, technology, reading, and education. The Slow Movement is making small inroads into Library and Information Science as well. A 2014 Delphi study of seventeen librarians concluded that Slow principles are useful as a user-centric lens for understanding information-seeking behavior: "Slow may be better seen as a focus on speed and choice, in information terms" and on "the power that an individual has, particularly in the context of everyday life, to choose [research] options according to reflectively determined need, rather than being swayed by conventional societal forces."⁸ The focus on choice and socio-economic forces recalls the values in the "threshold concepts" that form the basis for ACRL's revised *Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education*, suggesting that Slow principles have much relevance to librarianship today.

The common threads in Slow Reading, Slow Education, and Slow Technology are reflection, choice, and meeting local or individual needs. Slow Technology seeks to counter technological determinism and the *better, faster, stronger* mentality which have driven information technology (IT) development for years and have led to planned obsolescence and a culture that is always on. Instead, Slow Tech proponents advocate clean, sustainable IT driven by careful reflection.⁹ Similarly, Slow Education emphasizes reflective learning. Arguing for reforms to accelerated nursing education programs, Sellman points out that "ideas of Slow are consistent with much that is known about learning. It is known that students learn in different ways and at different speeds."¹⁰ Sellman recommends

building time for reflection into nursing curricula and valuing quality over quantity. “Slow encourages a step back from haste in all things, a re-appraisal of the obsession with quantity towards the appreciation of quality.”¹¹ Ashworth explains that it’s important for K-12 teacher education programs to set aside time for contemplation and deliberation as well; she laments “standardized degrees” and how the rigid nature of teacher training programs in North America “mimic the structure and speed of the business world.”¹² Berg and Seeber address similar concerns from the perspective of university faculty in their empowering article about Slow principles in higher education: “By taking time for deliberation, reflection, and dialogue, the Slow Professor takes back the intellectual life of the university.”¹³

Slow Education and Slow Reading proponents oppose standardized testing and “teaching to the test” and seek to combat the McDonaldization of education.¹⁴ In a widely cited critique of *No Child Left Behind*, Maurice Holt compared the standardization of education with the “deterministic thinking that governs the production of fast food.”¹⁵ In Holt’s view, “between the precision of tests and the raw variety of classroom life lies a vast gulf” that is not as easy to quantify as administrators might like.¹⁶ In his book on Slow Reading, Thomas Newkirk warns against timed tests and assessing for its own sake and addresses the hidden values students learn through standardized test preparation: “We all want our students to do well on tests, but how many of us know what values underlie these tests? ... Comprehension becomes identical to doing well on this test; the test, rather than being built on a value system, becomes the value system. We become our numbers.”¹⁷

Slow Education advocates are not against all assessment. After all, educators need to know whether their teaching methods are working and students are learning. Reflective papers, experiential learning, and capstone projects are the preferred assignments of the Slow Education movement; however, little has been written on how Slow principles can help educators become better assessors or what Slow Assessment might look like.

Defining Slow Assessment

Drawing on the ideas of the Slow Movement, particularly Slow Technology, Slow Reading, and Slow Education, we offer Slow Assessment as a model that emphasizes reflection, choice, and meeting local needs to provide more meaningful evaluations of library services and students’ research skills and to combat the corporatization of higher education. Slow Assessment embraces reflection throughout the process. Common pitfalls such as poorly-constructed surveys and a failure to “close the loop” can result from rushed planning and opting for the quickest, most convenient path, often compounded by outside pressures and deadlines set by administrators or accreditation bodies. Program-level assessment in universities is often treated as a series of hoops to jump through so administrators can check boxes to ensure a program is meeting bare-bones requirements. Slow Education advocates object to this corporate mentality which prizes fast metrics over reflective, meaningful evaluation. These pressures lead libraries to resort to cursory, easily quantifiable metrics like gate counts, circulation stats, website hits, or raw numbers of instruction sessions taught. Such data can be useful, but data alone does not reflect the true mission and value of a library in the life of its users.

When librarians try to conduct more meaningful assessments or research studies, they are often hampered by the same problems Berg and Seeber identify: time poverty, competing responsibilities, work-life balance, workplace stress, outside deadlines, and lack of space for reflection and professional development.¹⁸ As a result, many libraries turn to one-size-fits-all commercial tools or tests for assessing public services and information literacy, which may not be the best fit for their specific institution’s culture or assessment goals. Even when an assessment is home-grown, the pressure to be efficient can lead librarians to deploy hastily-crafted online surveys rather than take the time necessary to construct a proper research study. Berg and Seeber remind us that “efficiency” was originally a corporate value and argue that “[s]tandardization loses sight of the open-endedness of

intellectual inquiry. The consumerism that has taken hold in higher education propels the belief that time is money, resulting in superficial learning.”¹⁹

Slow principles give librarians and instructors the choice to resist the cultural temptation to speed through assessment and assess for its own sake. Slow Assessment does not mean librarians have to be less efficient; it means you can choose to assess at a speed that is appropriate for your library, students, schedules, resources, and staff. It promotes reflection and quality over quantity. The first step is giving yourself permission to be slow and deliberate. You will likely still have outside deadlines, but Slow Assessment lets you focus on the choices you *do* have. Within imposed limitations, librarians can still choose which skills to assess, which methods to employ, which standards or learning outcomes will underpin an assessment. A Slow mindset can help you work through setbacks by allowing you to strive for balance and focus on what’s most important to your library.

In addition to reflection and choice, Slow Assessment is about thinking locally. The Slow Food movement focuses on sustainability and local agriculture. Exemplified by the farmer’s market, “eating local” reduces pollution, prizes freshness, and connects farmers and eaters.²⁰ Likewise, Slow Assessment involves tapping into a library’s local assets. Adapt your assessment strategy to the needs, weaknesses, and strengths of your library and your campus—exploit the unique quirks of your institution rather than forcing yourself to conform to a cookie-cutter, standardized tool. Local factors will dictate the speed with which you plan and conduct assessments, but there is no right or wrong speed. The *tempo giusto* is one that allows you, your colleagues, your library, and your institution ample time to reflect, plan, and carry out a thoughtful assessment that will yield usable data and meet your most important goals.²¹ In the end, it may take the Purchase College Library assessment team several months or several years to complete our rubric assessment, but we believe the process of Slow Assessment will provide richer results that are usable and sustainable while avoiding staff burnout. We hope that by

laying the foundation deliberately and with care, we are creating sustainable assessment practices at Purchase College that can be adapted and enriched for years to come.

Developing the Rubric: Mapping to Standards

We began developing the Senior Project Information Literacy Skills Assessment rubric (SPILSA) in 2011. Although SUNY has an “information management” requirement for all campuses, this is generically defined, and Purchase College does not currently have any campus-wide assessment of students’ information literacy competencies.²² Because of the lack of local standards and our desire to assess Purchase College graduates against current national standards, we used ACRL’s *Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education* as the basis for our rubric.²³ We identified the most measurable criteria in the ACRL Standards, matching our rubric categories and benchmarks to specific standards, indicators, and outcomes. Our final criteria include: presence of a thesis statement, authority of references, variety of references, consistency of attribution, quality of citations (in text & works cited), ability to paraphrase/summarize/quote effectively, integration of resources to support a thesis, overall organization of content, and limitations of research. For each criterion, the SPILSA rubric defines the attributes a senior project must have to meet a minimum level of competency in information literacy.²⁴ In our benchmarks, we are looking for a basic level of competency in information literacy, not full mastery or evidence of exhaustive graduate-level research. The rubric reflects this by using the benchmarks “exceeds expectations,” “meets expectations,” “meets some expectations,” and “meets few or no expectations.”

In 2012, the Assessment Working Group won a campus wide assessment award for our efforts. The Associate Provost for Academic Affairs and Director of Assessment took an interest in our project and asked us to revise the rubric to adhere to SUNY’s system-wide student learning outcomes, particularly

those related to critical thinking. We strove to balance the needs of the library with the desires of campus administration. The result was a compromise: we added a column to our rubric tying each of our existing criteria to SUNY's Student Learning Outcomes. This is an example of a "slow assessment" mindset in practice: rather than completely rework our rubric, we mapped our rubric to fit administrators' needs in keeping with our values and goals.

Although the revised *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education* is still under review at the time of publication, academic librarians are clearly moving towards a "threshold concepts" approach to information literacy instruction which focuses on "core concepts with flexible options for implementation" rather than "any prescriptive enumeration of skills."²⁵ While we support this approach, instruction librarians still need to be able to measure skill acquisition through authentic assessments. We feel the SPILSA rubric allows us to look at student work as a whole and as a practical artifact of learning. As Megan Oakleaf explains, "by articulating exactly what librarians are looking for in student achievement of outcomes at each stage in the student journey, rubrics ensure a more valid approach to assessment. When rubrics are 'normed' or calibrated for use by multiple raters, they also lead to reliable assessment results."²⁶ We believe there is room for both flexibility and norming within the new *Framework for Information Literacy* because it aims to make information literacy instruction—and, by extension, assessment—more localized and customizable.

Testing the Rubric

We chose to assess only research-based senior projects from the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. We did not include senior projects from art and design (painting, drawing, graphic design, printmaking, sculpture, and new media) or conservatory programs (music, dance, theater arts, creative writing) because these majors do not always have a written, research component or require students to submit senior projects to the Library archive. Addi-

tionally, the ACRL Information Literacy Standards are not obviously exemplified in creative works, making assessment via the SPILSA rubric less applicable.

To compile an anonymous random sample of projects for review, we drew from our 2011-2012 Moodle repository because it was readily accessible to us in a digital format. We attempted to represent a mix of disciplines but were not concerned about having an equal number of projects from each discipline.²⁷ To avoid biasing the raters, we trained student workers to choose every third project in the Moodle archive and redact all identifying information. This process produced a random sample of 130 anonymous senior projects, which were uploaded to Dropbox.

Recognizing the importance of norming the rubric, we used a random number generator (www.random.org) to choose a test sample of ten senior projects from our larger sample. Each project was scored by all three of us; we then calculated basic correlations for each of the nine rubric criteria. As a result of this first test, which took place in 2013, we revised the phrasing of certain rubric items. We also converted the rubric into a Google form to facilitate scoring and added the exact definitions of each benchmark to the form.

In 2014, we conducted a second round of testing, using the revised rubric to score a random sample of twenty senior projects. Each of the three librarians scored each project. To measure interrater reliability, i.e. consistency and agreement among scorers, we calculated the Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for each of the nine rubric criteria and for the average score for each senior project.²⁸ The ICC test corrects for chance and measures agreement among three or more raters who use the same set of criteria to assess the same group of subjects.²⁹ In SPSS, we ran a two-way random effects ICC test on the total score, average score, and each of the nine rubric criteria.³⁰ The single measures ICC for the average score was 0.725, suggesting an acceptable level of agreement among the three raters. According to Landers, "ICC tends to be low if you are assessing any...constructs with only single items each."³¹ In other words, because of our small sample size and relatively low number of

variables (only nine rubric criteria, each assessing a different skill), calculating ICC for the overall average scores, rather than each individual rubric criterion, is a more accurate measure of our interrater agreement. For this reason, the ICC for individual criteria such as “Attribution” or “Addresses Thesis” is lower than for the overall average score. Landers explains that “for ‘practical decisions’ like grades, the reliability level recommended by Nunnally is 0.8 to 0.9. In practice, that’s obviously quite rare.”³² Generally speaking, an ICC of 0.7 is considered a minimum acceptable level of interrater agreement for research purposes.³³

While the testing process has taken many months, especially since all three librarians are working around our primary reference and instruction duties, we feel that taking the time now to assure interrater reliability will help us reach our long-term goals of creating a rubric assessment that can be implemented for years to come. Adopting a Slow Assessment mindset has allowed us to avoid cutting corners and develop this rubric at a pace that is both deliberate and feasible.

Implementing the Rubric: Next Steps

Given the promising results of the second round of testing, our next step is to conduct a frame-of-referencing session to unify the mental models of each of the three raters. We will compare papers with the highest degree of disagreement and come to a consensus on the “right” score. We will also choose “anchor papers” as examples of senior projects that exceed, meet, meet some, and meet no expectations. This process of norming will allow each librarian to score a separate set of senior projects with high confidence in the consistency of our grading. Once we have finished norming the rubric, we will assess a full set of 100 randomized, anonymous senior projects. Ultimately, we believe our data will show to what degree Purchase College seniors meet minimum national information literacy competency standards as defined by ACRL.

The Library is hopeful that data gathered from SPILSA will help inform and hone our instructional approach in information literacy sessions and further our mission to more fully embed our support across

the curriculum. Based on the data we gather from SPILSA, which can be broken down by board of study (department) and by academic year, the Assessment Working Group can identify where Purchase seniors excel and where there is room for improvement. This information can be used by the Library to adjust our research instruction session curricula. Individual boards of study could also use the results of this assessment to build information literacy education into the curriculum for their majors and senior project students. We expect the SPILSA data will help us in our outreach efforts so that we will better understand which courses and boards of study need more guidance in supporting juniors and seniors’ research skills.

The Library Assessment Working Group will assess a sample of senior projects from various disciplines, but individual boards of study can also use the SPILSA rubric to assess a larger number of senior projects within their major(s). We envision that subject liaison librarians will partner with boards of study to implement SPILSA and produce results tailored to a particular major or discipline. Thanks to Moodle Rubrics, SPILSA could easily be integrated into an individual instructor’s grading process for senior projects—or research projects in other courses—on an ongoing, sustainable basis.³⁴

In the future, we hope SPILSA can go beyond senior projects. Our rubric could be adapted by individual boards of study to determine students’ information literacy competency levels at different points during students’ progression through their major. Because the information literacy standards in the rubric are general enough to apply to most undergraduate-level research projects, the SPILSA rubric could also be used to assess information literacy skills using research papers of students in introductory courses, junior seminars, or senior seminars. While boards of study have their own student learning outcomes, SPILSA specifically focuses on the information literacy component and can therefore complement broader or discipline-specific assessment plans. The data gathered from SPILSA could help a board of study develop a curriculum that embeds information literacy

into key classes throughout the major, ensuring that seniors are better prepared for their senior project research as well as life after college.

Thinking long-term, we hope to use the SPILSA rubric to compare senior work with research papers submitted by freshmen. This comparison will provide a longitudinal picture and further our understanding of Purchase students' retention of, improvement in, and acquisition of information literacy skills over time. This information could lead to a campus-wide set of tiered, minimum competencies for information literacy at each level (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior). The Library hopes that by sharing the results of this assessment, we will bring attention to the importance of information literacy instruction at Purchase College, both inside the Library and in various boards of study.

Sharing the Rubric: Making it Local

Any library can embrace the principles of Slow Assessment and create meaningful, authentic assessments that fit local needs. We encourage other libraries to adapt our rubric and embrace Slow Assessment by keeping it local, collaborating with key allies on campus, and giving yourself permission to be slow and reflective.

Local needs, assets, staffing, and resources will differ from library to library, but you can leverage your strengths to create sustainable, local assessment. Some libraries may not have access to senior theses, but they may offer credit-bearing information literacy courses where standardized information literacy tests could be deployed thoughtfully and effectively. One library may have a designated assessment librarian, while another may need to assemble a team of librarians whose primary duties lie elsewhere. Some campuses may have librarians embedded in junior-level research methods courses who could ask instructors for student papers,

presentations, or other research artifacts for authentic assessment. For example, Purchase College librarians recently shared our rubric with colleagues at Manhattan College. Manhattan College does not have an institutional repository of capstone projects, but librarians are heavily embedded in the Communications department and are able to obtain a set of final papers from those courses to assess.

Identifying potential allies inside and outside the library can help make authentic, slow assessment seem less daunting. Many campuses have an assessment office or office of institutional research that can assist with data analysis. You can also reach out to individual faculty members and statisticians who are willing to partner with you. At Purchase, we adapted our rubric to campus-wide student learning outcomes through our collaboration with the Associate Provost. Eventually, we plan to use the Library's existing partnership with the College Writing program to apply the SPILSA rubric to freshman research papers, comparing the results to our senior project assessment for a longitudinal view.

Finally, Slow Assessment gives you permission to take time to reflect on what is right for your staff, your students, and your library. Our assessment team made concessions to the Provost's agenda, but we tried to remain true to our core goal of gathering usable, authentic data that can be used long-term to improve information literacy instruction. When you find yourself under pressure from external forces, try to remain focused on your overarching goal. If that means scaling down an assessment, assessing a smaller sample of research artifacts, or assessing fewer or more targeted learning outcomes, so be it. Slowing down and looking beyond inauthentic, standardized assessments in favor of a reflective, continuous, ever-growing Slow Assessment model can foster a "culture of assessment" at your library in a more sustainable, deliberate way.

APPENDIX.
Senior Projects Information Literacy Skills Assessment Rubric. Purchase College Library
<http://tinyurl.com/SPILSARubric>

ACRL Standard	SUNY Learning Outcome	Performance	Exceeds Expectations (4)	Meets Expectations (3)	Meets Some Expectations (2)	Meets Few or No Expectations (1)
1.1.b	SLO 1: Students will produce coherent texts within common college level forms. ("Writer presents an easily identifiable and focused controlling purpose or thesis.")	Thesis Statement	"Writer presents easily identifiable, focused, and original thesis statement based on information need"	Clear and concise thesis statement based on information need	Defines a thesis statement based on information need (it is present, but may not be clear and concise)	Unclear or absent thesis statement or research question
1.2.b	SLO 9: Students will locate, evaluate, and synthesize information from a variety of sources ("all sources are of good quality, well-selected and appropriate to the topic")	Authority of References	All references are peer-reviewed professional journals or other discipline appropriate sources	References are primarily peer-reviewed professional journals or other discipline appropriate sources	Although most of the references are professionally legitimate, a few are questionable within that discipline (e.g., trade books, internet sources, popular magazines, ...).	Most of the references are from sources that are not peer-reviewed and have uncertain reliability
1.2.b	SLO 9: Students will locate evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources ("student has located adequate information from a variety of print and electronic sources.")	Variety of References	Uses a mix of sources, appropriate to the discipline, and balances use of these sources and source types throughout	Uses a mix of sources, Does not rely too heavily on one source or source type	Too heavily relies on one source or source type (as appropriate to discipline)	Uses only one type of reference or obtains all references from one source (i.e. all articles from the same journal or same author)
2.5.c	SLO 3: Students will research a topic, develop an argument, and organize supporting details. ("carefully documented sources in an accepted style")	Attribution	Attribution is clear in all cases. Source of ideas and information is always identified.	Attribution is clear in most cases. Source of ideas and information is mostly identified.	Occasional attribution, but many statements seem unsubstantiated. Source of ideas and information is sometimes identified.	Little to no attribution. Reader is confused about the source of ideas and information.

2.5.c	SLO 3: Students will research a topic, develop an argument, and organize supporting details. ("carefully documented sources in an accepted style")	"Quality of Citations (in text & works cited)"	All in-text and bibliographic citations are complete and consistent	Most in-text and bibliographic citations are complete and consistent	Some in-text and bibliographic citations are incomplete/inconsistent	Most in-text and bibliographic citations are incomplete/inconsistent
3.1.b	SLO 3: Connects paraphrases and quotations to the larger thesis. SLO 9: "[Sources] are consistently well-integrated into the paper"	Paraphrasing, summarizing, quoting	Expertly (in both quality and quantity) summarizes, paraphrases, or quotes in order to integrate the work of others into their own (ex: are graphs, tables, and other images well integrated)	Adequately summarizes, paraphrases, or quotes in order to integrate the work of others into their own (ex: are graphs, tables, and other images well integrated)	Does not consistently summarize, paraphrase, or quote, and does not always select appropriate method for integrating the work of others into their own	Does not summarize, paraphrase, or quote in order to integrate the work of others into their own
3.7.a	SLO 3: "conclusions demonstrate writer's conscious attempts to integrate his or her own thinking with an analysis of outside sources"	Addresses & relates to thesis statement and research question	All parts of paper relate to thesis statement in a meaningful way.	Most parts of paper relate to thesis statement in a meaningful way.	Some goals of thesis are not met. Some parts of paper don't relate back to thesis.	The goals (if any) outlined in the introduction are not met. Reader unclear what conclusions are drawn
4.7.a	SLO 6: Students will identify, analyze, and evaluate arguments as they occur in their own and others' work.. SLO 7: Students will develop well-reasoned arguments	Limitations of Research	Substantively discusses limitations of research and outlines areas of further inquiry.	Discusses limitations of research and outlines areas of further inquiry.	May mention, but does not substantively address limitations of research or outline areas for further inquiry.	Does not address any limitations of research or outline any areas for further research.
4.1.a	"SLO 3: Students will research a topic, develop an argument, and organize supporting details. SLO 7: Students will develop well-reasoned arguments"	Organization of Content	Organizes content in a manner that expertly supports the thesis. Always provides clear and meaningful transitions or sections.	Organizes content in a manner that adequately supports the thesis. Generally provides clear transitions or sections.	Organizes content in a manner that somewhat supports the thesis. Provides some transitions or sections but not consistently.	Does not organize content in a manner that supports the thesis. Lacks clear or meaningful transitions or sections.

Notes

1. The Library has a small selection of senior projects from the School of the Arts, but these are not collected with consistency.
2. For example, on one standardized test, the correct answer for where one goes to look for a journal title was the library's catalog. In our case, only current print subscriptions are listed in our OPAC. We must access updated journal information through our "eJournals by Title" link off the library's homepage.
3. College Writing is a required freshman course that includes a research paper and a library workshop. Librarians at Purchase College work closely with administrators and instructors in this program.
4. Judith Gulikers, "A Five-Dimensional Framework for Authentic Assessment: EBSCOhost," *Educational Technology Research & Development* 52, no. 3 (2004): 69. For a complete literature review on authentic assessment, please see Gulikers, "A Five-Dimensional Framework" and Carol Perruso Brown and Barbara Kingsley-Wilson, "Assessing Organically: Turning an Assignment into an Assessment," *Reference Services Review* 38, no. 4 (2010): 536–56.
5. Brown and Kingsley-Wilson, "Assessing Organically," 538.
6. Folco Portinari, "The Slow Food Manifesto," *Slow Food*, December 10, 1989, http://www.slowfood.com/about_us/eng/manifesto.lasso.
7. Carl Honoré, *In Praise of Slowness: How a Worldwide Movement Is Challenging the Cult of Speed* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 2004), 275.
8. Elizabeth Poirier and Lyn Robinson, "Slow Delphi: An Investigation into Information Behaviour and the Slow Movement," *Journal of Information Science* 40, no. 1 (2014): 95.
9. Norberto Patrignani and Diane Whitehouse, "Slow Tech: A Quest for Good, Clean and Fair ICT," *Journal of Information, Communication & Ethics in Society* 12, no. 2 (2014): 78–92.
10. Derek Sellman, "Does the Slow Movement Have Anything to Offer Nursing Education?" *Nurse Education Today* 34, no. 12 (2014): 1415.
11. Ibid.
12. Elizabeth Ashworth, "Slow and Local: A Re-Vision of Teacher Education in Ontario," *Journal of Unschooling & Alternative Learning* 8, no. 15 (2014): 71.
13. Maggie Berg and Barbara Seeber, "The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy," *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal* 6, no. 3 (2013): 6.
14. Thomas Newkirk, *The Art of Slow Reading: Six Time-Honored Practices for Engagement* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2012). Maurice Holt, "It's Time to Start the Slow School Movement," *Phi Delta Kappan* 84, no. 4 (2002): 265–71. Maggie Berg and Barbara Seeber, "The Slow Professor: Challenging the Culture of Speed in the Academy," *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching & Learning Journal* 6, no. 3 (2013): 1–7.
15. Holt, "It's Time," 268.
16. Holt, "It's Time," 270.
17. Newkirk, *The Art of Slow Reading*, 12.
18. Berg and Seeber, "The Slow Professor," 1–7.
19. Berg and Seeber, "The Slow Professor," 5.
20. Honoré, *In Praise of Slowness*. Portinari, "The Slow Food Manifesto."
21. Honoré uses the Italian expression "tempo giusto" meaning "the right speed" to define the Slow Movement.
22. According to SUNY's Information Management Competency, "students will...perform the basic operations of personal computer use; understand and use basic research techniques; and locate, evaluate and synthesize information from a variety of sources." Office of the Provost, State University of New York, "Guidelines for the Approval of State University General Education Requirement Courses," SUNY, last modified September 9, 2010, http://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/academic-affairs/general-education/GenedCourseGuidelines_20120530.pdf
23. Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), "Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education," *ACRL*, February 2004, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/informationliteracycompetency>.
24. To view the SPILSA rubric, please see Appendix A or visit <http://tinyurl.com/SPILSARubric>.
25. Association of College & Research Libraries (ACRL), "Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education," *ACRL*, February 2, 2015, <http://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>.
26. Megan Oakleaf, "A Roadmap for Assessing Student Learning Using the New Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 40, no. 5 (2014): 513. For a detailed explanation of assessment rubrics, please see Megan Oakleaf, "Using Rubrics to Assess Information Literacy: An Examination of Methodology and Interrater Reliability," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 60, no. 5 (2009): 969–983.
27. In 2011–2012, students submitted senior projects electronically as PDFs to a locally-developed repository in Moodle, our learning management system. Disciplines included in our assessment are: art history, arts management, anthropology, cinema studies, economics, environmental studies, history, literature, psychology, and sociology.
28. The authors thank Dr. Amy H. Gervasio, Dr. Craig Wendorf, and Dr. Richard N. Landers for their invaluable assistance and advice in helping us understand and calculate interrater reliability and intraclass correlation statistics.
29. Domenic V. Cicchetti, "Guidelines, Criteria, and Rules of Thumb for Evaluating Normed and Standardized Assessment Instruments in Psychology," *Psychological Assessment, Special Section: Normative Assessment*, 6, no. 4 (December 1994): 286. Patrick E. Shrout and Joseph L. Fleiss, "Intraclass Correlations: Uses in Assessing Rater Reliability," *Psychological Bulletin* 86, no. 2 (March 1979): 420–28. Richard Landers, "Computing Intraclass Correlations (ICC) as Estimates of Interrater Reliability in SPSS," *NeoAcademic*, November 16, 2011. <http://neoacademic.com/2011/11/16/computing-intraclass-correlations-icc-as-estimates-of-interrater-reliability-in-spss/>.
30. A Two-Way Random ICC(2) calculation is appropriate here

because all raters scored all ratees, and as Landers explains in “Computing Intraclass Correlations”: “1) it models both an effect of rater and of ratee (i.e. two effects) and 2) assumes both are drawn randomly from larger populations.” Also, as Cicchetti explains in “Guidelines, Criteria, and Rules”: “(a) ICC can distinguish those paired assessments made by the same set of examiners from those made by different sets of examiners; (b) it distinguishes those sets of scores that are merely ranked in the same order from test to retest from those that are not only ranked in the same order but are in low, moderate, or complete agreement with each other; and (c) it corrects for the extent of test-retest (or interexaminer) agreement expected on the basis of chance alone.”

31. Landers, “Computing Intraclass Correlations.”
32. Ibid.
33. Matthew Graham, Anthony Milanowski, and Jackson Miller, *Measuring and Promoting Inter-Rater Agreement of Teacher and Principal Performance Ratings*, Center for Educator Compensation Reform, February 2012, http://cecr.ed.gov/pdfs/Inter_Rater.pdf, 9.
34. To learn more about Moodle Rubrics please see <https://docs.moodle.org/22/en/Rubrics>