

Library Department Unit-Level Assessment Liaison Report Spring 2019

Todd Heldt

We continue to evolve!



It is an ongoing process of continual revelation and awe!

But we remain committed to our central focus:

Departmental Outcomes!

Student Learning Outcomes for General Library Instruction

Assessment of student learning outcomes is an important part of the Harold Washington College library. As teaching faculty, we realize the necessity of honing our pedagogy and supporting the College's mission statement. To these ends, we use several direct and indirect measures to ensure that we are meeting our objectives. In accordance with the library's mission statement, students who receive the full complement of instruction in the Harold Washington College library should acquire the skills to:

1. Identify key concepts and terms (keywords, synonyms and related terms) that describe the information they seek.
2. Construct search strategies using appropriate commands, including Boolean operators.
3. Retrieve information in a variety of formats using various information resources.
4. Evaluate web sites for authority, credibility and currency.
5. Recognize the legal and ethical importance of citations and cite information accordingly.

These outcomes align to the ACRL (Association of College and Research Libraries) Framework for Information Literacy.

Authority Is Constructed and Contextual

Information Creation as a Process

Information Has Value

Research as Inquiry

Scholarship as Conversation

Searching as Strategic Exploration

Outcome 1 aligns with Research as Inquiry

Outcome 2 aligns with Searching as Strategic Exploration

Outcome 3 aligns with Information has Value

Outcome 4 aligns with Authority is Constructed and Contextual

Outcome 5 aligns with Scholarship as Conversation and Information Creation as a Process

But we thought our results from Fall 2018
could be improved upon!

This is the very heart and soul of assessment:

Continuous improvement!

We Revised tools!

The old one had a research question that could have been confusing:

Library Assessment - SPE 101 Spring 2018

Directions:

1. Read the following research question.
2. Circle the keywords/keyword phrases.
3. Write the keywords at the top of the column.
4. Provide two (2) synonyms or related concepts for each keyword.

Question:

How can community colleges assist students to overcome obstacles in order to find success?

Keywords:

Keyword from Question			
Synonym/ Related Concept 1			
Synonym/ Related Concept 2			

The new one has a more focused research question:

Library Assessment -Keywords Spring 2019

Directions:

1. Read the following research question.
2. Circle the keywords/keyword phrases.
3. Write the keywords at the top of the column.
4. Provide two (2) synonyms or related concepts for each keyword.

Question:

How can community colleges facilitate student success?

Keywords:

Keyword from Question	Keyword 1	Keyword 2	Keyword 3
Synonym/ Related Concept	Synonym 1	Synonym 1	Synonym 1
Synonym/ Related Concept	Synonym 2	Synonym 2	Synonym 2

Findings were mixed:

Keyword Assessment Results Fall 2018

Class Summary	Finding Keywords	Finding Synonyms/ Related Concepts
Average	2.386666667	2.013333333

On scale of 1-3 where 3=complete mastery and
1=not meeting the outcome

Keyword Assessment Results Spring 2019

Class Summary	Finding Keywords	Finding Synonyms/ Related Concepts
Average	2.44292804	1.508436725

Findings were mixed:

Boolean Operator Assessment Results Fall 2018

	AND	OR	NOT
Average	2.27184466	2.058252427	2.058252427

On scale of 1-3 where
3=complete mastery and
1=not meeting the outcome

Boolean Operator Assessment Results Spring 2019

	AND	OR	NOT
Average	2.174193548	1.748387097	2.206451613

Other Librarians Share Wisdom

In *Dangers and Opportunities: A Conceptual Map of Information Literacy Assessment Approaches* Megan Oakleaf looks at different approaches to skills-based assessment:

Fixed choice tests, performance assessments, and rubrics all contained inherent drawbacks, ranging from lack of depth, time limitations, or expense.

Dhawan and Chen in *Library Instruction for First year Students*, cogently sum the problem:

Given that IL is interwoven into the entire undergraduate curriculum and that the total instruction time is 50 minutes, the foremost questions [are]: what can be covered in 50 minutes? How can it be assessed meaningfully? And is it possible to assess accurately without taking away valuable class time?

What can we do?

Given these roadblocks, many librarians avoid assessment of one-shots altogether.

Those who do often use assessments that are either indirect or of the affective domain.

Data from such tools seems less informative than direct, skills-based data.

But 50 minutes is not much time.

Class time is better spent on the lesson than it is in the assessment of that lesson.

Even then, the information is new to students and comes at them quickly.

Can anyone absorb it all in a single meeting?

Different Roles, Different Measures

Librarians have dual roles:

We teach credit-bearing information literacy courses, in which we serve as an academic department.

But we also teach one-shots, in which we serve a slightly different role more akin to student support.

Two Roles?

Two Sets of Outcomes!



For credit-bearing courses:

- Research Skills
- Critical Thinking Skills
- Information Organization Skills
- Information Ethics

These require authentic and skills-based assessment tools!

For One-Shots:

There is a whole world of affective domain information that we would benefit from measuring:

- Do students feel that can count on us to help them?
- Do they feel welcomed?
- Are they comfortable navigating the website?
- Do they feel more confident in their abilities?
- More sound in their understanding?

All of it is important!

The next step is to draft a second set of outcomes within the affective domain in order to capture the important data that one-shot assessment could provide.