Outcomes Assessment Plan

Educational Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Program/Dept Name*** | **LIBRARY** | *Date* | **Feb 2011** |
| ***Submitted by***  | **Library Faculty** |  |

1. **Program Objective: Students can identify and choose appropriate information sources: a component of Critical Thinking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Intended Outcome(s)1** | **3. Criteria or Target** | **4. Comparison2** | **5. Assessment Methods or Tools** | **6. When/How Assessment will be Accomplished** |
| Students will choose appropriate resource specific assignment criteria | Students who have a library orientation will be at least 50% more likely to choose appropriate sources over students who do not have an orientation | Comparison of four classes; two with orientations and two without. | *Rubric* | Winter 2008. Librarians will work with four separate Psychology classes. |
| Students can identify scholarly v. non-scholarly materials | 75% of students who have are taught by library faculty can identify scholarly resources | Comparison of four psych. classes; two with orientations and two without. | *Rubric* | Winter 2008 |
| Students in PILR ESL classes will be able to successfully choose appropriate information sources  | 50% of students in PILR class choose appropriate resource.  | baseline | *Rubric* | Winter and Spring 2009 |

1 Outcomes should include one or more of the following: 1) Cognitive Learning Outcome, 2) Behavioral Learning Outcome, 3) Affective Learning Outcome, or 4) Attainment Outcome.

2 Note if comparison data or groups are available using 1) pre-test/post-test, 2) baseline data, or 3) regional or national data and a brief description if needed.

1. **What were the results of the assessment(s)?** Students will choose appropriate resource for certain criteria as well as identify scholarly v non-scholarly information. Results showed that students overwhelmingly were able to selectappropriate resources and identify scholarly v. non-scholarly information if librarians taught the students information literacy skills. Students in the librarian-taught classes selected and evaluated information were over 75% better in performing information literacy standards. Librarians, Chari McRill and Susan Kent both taught information literacy skills in ESL classes for several quarters as part of a PILR (Pre-college Information Literacy). The librarians along with ESL instructors, created a lesson plan to incorporate information literacy into the course. An assignment was created to grade the students on their information literacy skills. The assignment was graded using a rubric that was developed and used in ESL classes across the state. As part of an ongoing grant (which is ending winter quarter, 2011) the lessons and assignments have been revised quarterly. The students are currently testing above the 50% in their ability to choose appropriate sources for their assignments.
2. **How were the results used to improve**? Library faculty used this information to demonstrate the impact of library instruction to SVC instructional faculty. This created a temporary increase in library orientations, which unfortunately did not last. The librarians are continuing to work with developmental classes in ESL and GED and this is generating more connections between the departments as well as an (un-assessed) increase in ESL students in the library.

Outcomes Assessment Plan

Educational Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Program/Dept Name*** | **LIBRARY** | *Date* | **2008 - 2010** |
| ***Submitted by***  | **Library Faculty** |  |

1. **Program Objective: Librarians will provide online reference services to provide students with better access to resources.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Intended Outcome(s)1** | **3. Criteria or Target** | **4. Comparison2** | **5. Assessment Methods or Tools** | **6. When/How Assessment will be Accomplished** |
| Librarians will provide virtual reference services to students | In order to reach online students, librarians will log onto chat service during library hours | Baseline data | *# of sessions* | Ongoing assessment of statistics will be evaluated. |
| Embedded librarians | Each librarian will try to be embedded in at least one class | Baseline Data as we have not done this before. | *Number of classes in which librarians are embedded* | Fall 2009  |
| Increased online resources | 40% increase in online resources and 25% increase in use. | Comparison 2006 – 2010 numbers | *# of databases**# of hits on databases* | Ongoing annual statistics |

1 Outcomes should include one or more of the following: 1) Cognitive Learning Outcome, 2) Behavioral Learning Outcome, 3) Affective Learning Outcome, or 4) Attainment Outcome.

2 Note if comparison data or groups are available using 1) pre-test/post-test, 2) baseline data, or 3) regional or national data and a brief description if needed.

1. **What were the results of the assessment(s**)? Online Reference had a slow start. We began offering online reference in connection with Gray’s Harbor Community College. We were able to offer online services only when one of the two libraries was open. Since this was a new way of providing reference, the library faculty had to gain competency and we had to educate both students and faculty about this new offering. We discovered after using our first service, that we could not adequately gather statistics. However, in 2009, we became part of the ASKWA consortium. ASKWA allowed us to become part of a 24/7 online reference service that has librarians around the world answering questions around the clock. This allows our students to receive research assistance when and wherever they are. We have grown from answering 1 -2 questions a week to answering 105 sessions last year. This number is continuing to escalate as students learn about and use this service.

 Librarians became embedded in eight classes. We met with varying success in the classes we worked with. Although we were happy with the number of classes as it exceeded our goal of one per librarian, we found that the majority of classes did not all have a real research component. We solicited for classes that had a research need, however we found the research needs of the majority of the classes to be minimal. We believe this is still a viable way to reach and educate our online students. It is also extremely time-consuming and if the class does not have an ongoing research component it is not an effective use of the librarians’ time. We stepped back from this project, but are still looking at ways to make this program more successful.

Since 2007, we have gone from 13 to 19 online databases. This is an increase of 68% and shows our focus of a change from print to more online resources. Total database access in the 2007-8 school year was 158,973. Total database access for the 2008-9 school year was 415,353. Students require information literacy instruction to understand the nuances of the different databases and how to select, evaluate and use the information in the various resources.

Since then, we have also added the TILT (Texas Information Literacy Tutorial), which provides basic online instruction in information literacy. In 2007, 593 students took the quiz assessments at the end of each module. By 2009, that number rose to 1,071.

**8. How were the results used to improve?** When we realized that we could not gather statistics and had other problems with our first online reference software providers, we wondered how viable this service would be. Through the 24/7 ASKWA model, our statistics are increasing and we are seeing more of our students accessing this service. The first attempts, helped us realize that a 24/7 consortium model would benefit our students as they could use the service when they needed it, not when we were open and able to have a librarian online. The embedded librarian project, as already mentioned is on hold. We need to work with instructional faculty to come up with a model that will work best for our students. The library faculty constantly evaluate our holdings, both in print and online. We use the results of our statistics to retain or weed databases and evaluate the types of information our students need. This is an ongoing process. The addition of TILT was a way to reach online students with basic information literacy instruction. It covers topics such as how to effectively search for and evaluate information from a variety of sources, including the library and web. TILT statistics indicate that this is proving a useful tool for faculty who want students to get some online instruction. TILT is not meant to replace library orientations, which are tailored to specific classes and assignments, but provides a good overview of the research process, and is one more way for students to learn about information literacy, especially if they are in online classes where having a face-to-face library orientation is not an option.

Outcomes Assessment Plan

Educational Outcomes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Program/Dept Name*** | **LIBRARY** | *Date* | **2008-2010** |
| ***Submitted by***  | **Library Faculty** |  |

1. **Program Objective: Information Literacy will be viewed as an important component of the college’s general education values.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Intended Outcome(s)1** | **3. Criteria or Target** | **4. Comparison2** | **5. Assessment Methods or Tools** | **6. When/How Assessment will be Accomplished** |
| Faculty who attend information literacy will gain understanding of information literacy as a gen. ed. value and learn how to incorporate it in their course. | Faculty who include Information Literacy in their learning outcomes and attend workshop | Inclusion of information literacy components in assignments before and after the workshop | *Rubrics and survey* | Spring 2008. Library faculty will help instructional faculty create an IL assignment and a rubric for assign.  |
| Students in pre-college classes who have access to library instruction will improve their information literacy skills | Students in three different pre-college classes who take part in PILR grant. | Baseline | *Rubric* | Ongoing project from 2009 – Winter 2010 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1 Outcomes should include one or more of the following: 1) Cognitive Learning Outcome, 2) Behavioral Learning Outcome, 3) Affective Learning Outcome, or 4) Attainment Outcome.

1. Note if comparison data or groups are available using 1) pre-test/post-test, 2) baseline data, or 3) regional or national data and a brief description if needed.

**7. What were the results of the assessment(s)?** 12 instructional faculty attended the information literacy workshop. The librarians assessed the assignments that instructional faculty brought to the workshop and realized that while many faculty thought they had an information literacy component in their class the assignments did not truly represent information literacy skills as established in our general education values. After teaching information literacy standards, faculty re-worked their assignments to include the standards. Instructional faculty scored the workshop on a 4 point rating scale and ranked the workshop all 3’s and 4’s for finding the workshop useful and instructional. Library faculty worked with instructional faculty to develop individual rubrics during the workshop to ensure that information literacy standards were included in their assignments and was being assessed.

The PILR grant is coming to an end with the winter 2011 school year. Each quarter, the librarians and instructional faculty would use a rubric (that was created and used by all the community college librarians state-wide who were involved in the grant) to assess the students ability to select and use appropriate resources. After using the rubric to assess the student results the lesson plan would be tweaked in order to improve it each quarter.

**8. How were the results used to improve?** The results helped us promote information literacy with the 12 faculty who attended the workshop and we used the results to promote working with the librarians in this area to other instructional faculty. We wrote an article about the workshop for the CLT newsletter and sent faculty emails based on the results of the workshop.

The PILR grant has increased communication and work across the departments. We are seeing more pre-college students in the library (just recognizing them, we have not surveyed their use.). Students in the classes did well in their assignments and the results of the rubric grading shows that over 50% were able to successfully complete information literacy based assignments.