# Leveraging accreditation to integrate sustainable information literacy instruction into the medical school curriculum

Natalie Tagge, MS

## APPENDIX A

### Information literacy in student work rubric, Temple Health Sciences Libraries (version 2017/18)

| Learning outcome | Level of achievement | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Highly developed 4** | **Developed 3** | **Emerging 2** | **Initial 1** |
| **Inquiry** | *Expert articulation of information need.*<br>• Constructs highly effective research strategy (e.g., keywords, sources) demonstrating sophisticated thought | *Satisfactory articulation of information need.*<br>• Research strategy contains some flaws (e.g., misses obvious keyword synonyms or major databases) but is sound overall | *Partial articulation of information need.*<br>• Research strategy contains multiple or major errors (e.g., irrelevant keywords or sources) | *Poor to no articulation of information need.*<br>• Poor to no research strategy (e.g., no keywords or sources) |
| **Evaluation of evidence** | *Source materials employed demonstrate expertise and sophisticated independent thought.*<br>• Uses appropriate and authoritative sources to support claims<br>• Demonstrates a knowledge of evidence and sources selected | *Source materials are adequate and appropriate but lack variety or depth.*<br>• Sources are used to support claim(s) but might not be the most authoritative source to make claim<br>• Demonstrates a preliminary critical exploration and knowledge of evidence, and sources selected | *Source materials used are inadequate.*<br>• Relies on largely inappropriate sources<br>• Clearly selected sources out of convenience<br>• Demonstrates little critical exploration and knowledge of sources selected | *Source materials are absent or do not contribute to claim(s) or argument(s).*<br>• When included, sources are too few or badly inappropriate<br>• No evidence of critical exploration and knowledge of sources selected |
| **Communication of evidence** | *Evidence is integrated and synthesized expertly to support claims.*<br>• Consistently presents evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)<br>• Synthesizes and contextualizes evidence appropriately for audience | *Proficient synthesis and integration of evidence.*<br>• Generally employs evidence to support claim(s) and argument(s)<br>• May present some evidence without context | *Weak attempts at synthesis or integration.*<br>• Sporadically uses evidence to support claim(s) or argument(s)<br>• Frequently fails to put sources into context (e.g. "says…") | *No evidence of attempt at synthesis or integration.*<br>• Claim(s) or argument(s) lack necessary evidence<br>• Fails to contextualize evidence |

**Identification**

Group # _____     Scorer name _____     Program/Year_____

Quality of attribution, evaluation, and communication of IL (see rubric for details):

| | Highly developed (4) | Developed (3) | Emerging (2) | Initial (1) | Comments | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Inquiry** | | | | | | |
| **Evaluation of sources** | | | | | | |
| **Communication of evidence** | | | | | | |
| | | | | | Sum: | |

Edited 2017 by Natalie Tagge for the Temple Health Sciences Libraries. Rubric content adapted for the Claremont Colleges by Char Booth (char_booth@cuc.claremont.edu), Sara Lowe (sara_lowe@cuc.claremont.edu), Natalie Tagge (natalie_tagge@cuc.claremont.edu), and Sean Stone (sean_stone@uc.claremont.edu) from an instrument originally developed at Carleton College, Gould Library Reference and Instruction Department. Information literacy in student writing rubric and codebook. Northfield, MN: Carleton College; 2012. <http://go.carleton.edu/6a>). *This rubric version (2017/18) was revised summer–fall of 2017 and finalized September 2017.*