

Oviatt Library Assessment Report 2017-2018

Executive Summary

Oviatt Library conducted a meta-analysis of program assessments conducted by other academic departments on campus to identify where student learning outcomes (SLOs) relevant to the library's mission of information literacy were assessed, and where the library had contributed (or not) to the achievement of those student learning outcomes. We identified eighteen courses assessed for information literacy relevant SLOs; student achievement was satisfactory in all but two. These two courses were the gateway and capstone undergraduate history courses, where the library's subject liaison is highly engaged in some sections but not in others. To implement an effective change, we hope that the History department's own perception of need will give that liaison librarian a point of access for further engagement with additional faculty.

Method

The Library Assessment Team collected the program assessment reports, created by individual academic departments, from the campus Director of the Office of Academic Assessment and Program Review. Not all programs were required to submit reports this year, but the team collected all that were submitted to the director.

These reports assessed student learning objectives (SLOs) chosen by the department, typically only a selected few of the overall SLOs for the department or for specific courses within the department or program, and assessed students' mastery of them through a variety of means, including direct assessment of student work products and surveys of students. Team members reviewed each program assessment report to determine:

- 1) if the student learning objectives chosen by the department for evaluation this year were relevant to information literacy and the library's central mission. For example, one SLO assessed by the Department of Jewish Studies was "explain the concept of diaspora" which is discipline-specific content knowledge central to the field but not to information literacy. Other departments assessed other aspects of their programs, such as Journalism internships. By contrast, an SLO such as one assessed by the Department of Manufacturing Systems Engineering – "find relevant sources of information necessary to complete design projects" - is a discipline-specific version of information literacy that can be supported by library instruction.
- 2) if, by the department's own measures and standards, the student work and/or responses reflected a satisfactory level of program performance.

Departments with Assessments not covering Information Literacy

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Asian American Studies | Economics |
| Accounting | English |
| Anthropology | Geography |
| Art | Geology |
| Biology | Gender & Women's Studies |
| Business | Health Sciences |
| Chicana/o Studies | Journalism |
| Child & Adolescent Development | Jewish Studies |
| Cinema & Television Arts | Liberal Studies |
| Civil Engineering & Construction Management | Mathematics |
| Communication Disorders & Sciences | Physical Therapy |
| Communication Studies | Political Science |
| Computer Science | Religious Studies |
| Criminal Justice Studies | Sociology |
| Deaf Studies | University |
| Electrical & Computer Engineering | |

Among the departments that did evaluate student learning outcomes relevant to information literacy, there were 18 individual courses assessed for information literacy outcomes.

| Course | Met benchmarks | Sections with Library Instruction | LibGuide |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| Africana Studies 300 | Yes | 50%-100%* | Course-specific |
| Africana Studies 350 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Africana Studies 398 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Central American Studies 421 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Chemistry 461 | Yes | 100% | Course-specific |
| Chemistry 464 | Yes | 100% | Course-specific |
| History 301 | No | 33% | Course-specific |
| History 497 | Some | 50% | Course-specific |
| Manufacturing Systems Engineering 488BCS | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Music 601 | Yes | 100% | Subject general |
| Social Work 501 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Social Work 521 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Social Work 535 | Yes | 33% | Subject general |
| Social Work 601 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Social Work 630 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Social Work 635 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Social Work 698 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |
| Urban Studies 450 | Yes | 0% | Subject general |

*The face-to-face section of this course met with the subject liaison librarian for two class sessions in the library. There was also an online section of this course, but Oviatt Library does not keep records of librarian instruction in Canvas.

As the table above indicates, nearly all of the departments that evaluated student learning outcomes on information literacy were satisfied with student achievement of those outcomes.

In four departments – Central American Studies, Manufacturing Systems Engineering, Social Work, and Urban Studies – students reached the information literacy outcomes to the satisfaction of the department with no or only minimal support from library instruction.

In three departments – Africana Studies, Chemistry, and Music – students achieved the information literacy goals established by the department’s learning outcomes with significant support from Oviatt librarians. These are important successes.

The History Department, however, is a challenge. The two courses evaluated are the gateway to the history major and the capstone research seminar. As the table above indicates, the

subject liaison librarian, Lynn Lampert, has made significant, ongoing connections with some of the history faculty, but not all. The student work evaluated for the assessment was a sample across all of the sections of the courses, and so it included both students who received library instruction and those who did not.

Library instruction could help students reach the learning outcomes established by the History Department. The revisions to the courses proposed in the department's assessment report do not even consider the library or their subject liaison librarian as a resource. However, the suggested steps do include the idea of two to three meetings a semester of the faculty teaching the different sections of History 301. Perhaps the faculty who are currently collaborating with the history liaison might be willing to invite her to one (or more) of these meetings to encourage their colleagues to incorporate library resources and instruction more fully into their courses.

The library assessment team would be happy to forward any program assessment report to liaisons who would like them.