

Annual Assessment Report to the College 2010-11

College: Oviatt Library

Department: Reference & Instruction; Technical Services; Access Services

Program: N/A

Note: Please submit your report to (1) the director of academic assessment, (2) your department chair or program coordinator and (3) the Associate Dean of your College by September 30, 2011. You may submit a separate report for each program which conducted assessment activities.

Liaison: Katherine Dabbour

1. Overview of Annual Assessment Project(s)

1a. Assessment Process Overview: Provide a brief overview of the intended plan to assess the program this year. Is assessment under the oversight of one person or a committee?

The intended plan was to focus on authentic assessment of information competency knowledge, skills, and attitudes.

Assessment in the library is under the direction of the Library Assessment Coordinator, Katherine Dabbour. However, on occasion, other individuals will undertake specific projects and their efforts are also reported herein.

1b. Implementation and Modifications: Did the actual assessment process deviate from what was intended? If so, please describe any modification to your assessment process and why it occurred.

The original intention of the project described below for the Simplifying Assessment Committee was to test out an online repository for student work created by Institutional Research. However, the practicality of the library faculty using this methodology quickly proved more trouble than it is worth, at least for the initial gathering of student assignments and aggregate survey data. Therefore, Moodle was used to collect student

work, and administer and create survey data. However, a recent announcement from the Faculty Technology Center indicates that Moodle courses will no longer stay up indefinitely; therefore, the student work will have to be moved ScholarWorks, the Institutional Repository. However, it is not clear how aggregate data from surveys can be transferred over since it is not tied to an individual student. Therefore, this methodology has to be re-examined.

2. Student Learning Outcome Assessment Project: Answer questions according to the individual SLOs assessed this year. If you assessed more than one SLO, please duplicate this chart for each one as needed.

2a. Which Student Learning Outcome was assessed this year?

The Association of College & Research Libraries, Information Literacy Competency Standards, are used as the basis of our Student Learning Outcomes, which were assessed as a whole. They are, in abbreviated form, as follows:

Students will be able to:

1. Determine the nature and extent of the information needed
2. Access needed information effectively and efficiently
3. Evaluate information and its sources critically and incorporate selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.
4. Individually or as a member of a group, use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.
5. Demonstrate understanding of the many economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information, and access and use information ethically and legally

2b. What assessment instrument(s) were used to gather evidence about this SLO?

Authentic, direct assessment of student work was performed using a rubric based on the SLOS's listed in 2a. Pertinent sections of student projects (abstract, annotated bibliography); a search journal; and survey of library instruction experience and attitudes were used as evidence.

2c. Describe the participants sampled to assess this SLO: discuss sample/participant and population size for this SLO. For example, what type of

students, which courses, how decisions were made to include certain participants.

The participants were chosen based on a convenience sample of all sections of Prof. Bobbie Eisenstock's Journalism 372 course: two in the fall 2010 and one in spring 2011. JOUR 372 is both a Writing Intensive (WI) and Information Competency (IC) Certified course for upper division G.E., which would bring in both continuing and transfer students.

2d. Describe the assessment design methodology: For example, was this SLO assessed longitudinally (same students at different points) or was a cross-sectional comparison used (comparing freshmen with seniors)? If so, describe the assessment points used.

Experimental design: students in one section of Jour 372 in the fall 2010 received library instruction geared toward the JOUR 372 assignments and the other section did not. In spring 2011, the students received library instruction in the one section. Students were asked to deposit their work and take a survey in the course Moodle to which the Library Assessment Coordinator had access in the role of the course librarian.

2e. Assessment Results & Analysis of this SLO: Provide a summary of how the evidence was analyzed and highlight important findings from the collected evidence.

In process.

2f. Use of Assessment Results of this SLO: Think about all the different ways the resulting evidence was or will be used to improve academic quality. For example, to recommend changes to course content/topics covered, course sequence, addition/deletion of courses in program, student support services, revisions to program SLO's, assessment instruments, academic programmatic changes, assessment plan changes, etc. Please provide a clear and detailed description of how the assessment results were or will be used.

The project was undertaken for 3 reasons:

- 1) The Library Assessment Coordinator was a member of the Simplifying Assessment Committee and used this project as an opportunity to engage in authentic, direct assessment of student learning through the online gathering of student work.
- 2) The project encouraged the creation and application of a rubric to student work to measure information competency (IC) SLOs instead of relying on assessing student performance on objective pretest posttests of IC concept knowledge.
- 3) The results will be analyzed to determine if this methodology should become a template for IC SLOs assessment to encourage other library faculty to participate and expand the scope of the Library's IC assessment program, which has been largely the work of the Library Assessment Coordinator.

3. How do this year's assessment activities connect with your program's strategic plan and/or 5-yr assessment plan?

The Oviatt Library's Assessment Plan calls for information competency skills assessment on an continual basis to demonstrate our impact on this Fundamental Learning Competency (Intellectual and Practical Skills), which is considered one of the skills, knowledge, and abilities that every student can expect to have the opportunity to achieve upon completing their degrees, regardless of major.

4. Overall, if this year's program assessment evidence indicates that new resources are needed in order to improve and support student learning, please discuss here.

Yes, given library instruction crosses all disciplines, with over 21,000 students attending sessions last year in both major and G.E. courses, at the undergraduate and graduate level, it is difficult for one library faculty member to ensure that we are getting a true picture of CSUN student information competency and the efficacy of our instruction program. While authentic, direct assessment of student work is considered the ideal methodology in the pedagogical literature of higher education and librarianship, it is not feasible to do across the disciplines if it remains a one-person operation. For the past ten years, the Library Assessment Coordinator has used either random samples and/or convenience samples of students, generally having to rely on the interest of disciplinary faculty willing to provide access to their students. While not ideal in terms of assessing IC and instruction across the campus, it is relatively easy to do. Therefore, the Library has 3 options:

- 1) Require more library faculty to participate and perform direct, authentic assessment projects in the disciplines they serve;
- 2) If it continues to be a one-person operation, continue to rely on pretest/posttest and/or surveys of students, perhaps moving toward a regular schedule of random sample surveys;
- 3) Hybrid option of 1 and 2: combine methodologies and requiring more librarians to participate.

5. Other information, assessment or reflective activities not captured above.

- Curriculum Mapping of IC SLOs addressed in General Education IC Certified Courses, Spring 2011
 - Survey of library faculty to start curriculum mapping project.

- Oviatt Library Mobile Services Survey, April 2011 (Mobile Services Committee)
 - To determine how the Library's mobile services can meet the needs of our patrons, who increasingly rely on mobile technology for research, asking questions, and reading.
- Library Instruction Pretest for CSUN Summer Bridge 2011, July 2011 (Library Assessment Coordinator and Library Outreach Coordinator)
 - First part of a study that will follow one summer bridge cohort until next fall 2012 as they have tiered library instruction and work on progressively more difficult research assignments, to be followed by a posttest.
- 3 Survey's of the Library's Message in a Minute Video Series, August 2011: By the Library's Outreach Coordinator
 - The videos target faculty to educate them about various library services. The surveys ascertained their self-assessment of learning and satisfaction with the video.

6. Has someone in your program completed, submitted or published a manuscript which uses or describes assessment activities in your program? Please provide citation or discuss.

Dabbour, K.S. & Ballard, J.D. "Information literacy and US Latino college students: a cross-cultural analysis," *New Library World* 112 (No. 7/8 2011):347 - 364

This peer-reviewed article was based on a large-scale, random sample survey of CSUN student information competency knowledge, and library and internet access and use.