Annual Report for Assessment of Outcomes 2012-13

Subject Area Committee Name: Library

Contact person: Torie Scott, SAC chair; Pam Kessinger, Dept Chair

For LDC/DE: Core outcome(s) assessed: Critical Thinking, Professional Competence

Please address the questions below and
send to *learningassessment@pcc.edu* by **June 21, 2013** with Annual Report in the subject line

Note: Information provided in this report may be inserted into or summarized in Section 2C Program Review Outline.

1. Describe <u>changes that have been implemented</u> towards improving students' attainment of outcomes that <u>resulted from recent outcome assessments</u>.   These may include but are not limited to changes to content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc. Please be sure to **describe the connection** between the assessment results and the changes made.

Last year we realized that we were taking a top-down approach approach to the assessment of students' achievement of learning outcomes for LIB 101 (the Library's main credit course), and it didn't work well. The library faculty who teach the credit-bearing Library course worked as a group to come up with a rubric for assessment SLOs. This rubric was refined and normed at a meeting in June 2013.

The LIB 101 instructors, a sub-set of the Library SAC as not all library faculty teach LIB 101, applied to rubric to a sample of LIB 101 final projects. While we decided the rubric was functional, using it brought up a question, or dilemma, which we have not yet resolved: should we expect students to demonstrate competency in all the learning outcomes for LIB 101 in the final project? For example, students from one section of LIB 101 did not demonstrate the ability to identify the slant or bias of an information source in the final project, but the instructor noted that students had demonstrated this ability in other work they did during the course.

This provoked a discussion about using a portfolio in LIB 101, instead of an annotated bibliography, for the final project.

For <u>each outcome assessed this year</u>:

2. Describe the assessment design (tool and processes) used. Include relevant information about:

   - The nature of the assessment (e.g., written work, project, portfolio, exam, survey, performance etc.) and if it is direct (assesses evidence mastery of outcomes) or indirect (student's perception of mastery). Please give rationale for indirect assessments (direct assessments are preferable).

- The student sample assessed (including sample size relative to the targeted student population for the assessment activity) process and rationale for selection of the student sample. Why was this group of students and/or courses chosen?
- Any rubrics, checklists, surveys or other tools that were used to evaluate the student work. (Please include with your report – OK to include in appendix). Where appropriate, identify benchmarks.
- How you analyzed results, including steps taken to ensure that results are reliable (consistent from one evaluator to another.

We did direct assessment of students achievement of learning outcomes by applying a rubric to the class final project -- an annotated bibliography, or summary of research findings with attached bibliography.

We applied the rubric to a random sample of final projects for sections taught at SY, RC, SEC, CA, by different instructors. The LIB 101 instructors met face-to-face to make sure we got the same, or similar, results when we applied to rubric to a sample of final projects. We discussed our differences, and identified problems with the rubric. The rubric was hard to understand, and we figured out how to make it clearer.

The Library SAC has not yet applied the rubric to a large sample of student work. We plan to do this in Summer 2013.

Rubric attached.

Rubric was applied and discussed in June 2013 meeting. We believe that we can now use it independently, and apply it to a broader sample.

3. Provide information about the results (i.e., what did you learn about how well students are meeting the outcomes)?
   - If scored (e.g., if a rubric or other scaled tool is used), please report the data, and relate to any appropriate benchmarks.
   - Results should be broken down in a way that is meaningful and useful for making improvements to teaching/learning. Please show those specific results.

We have not yet applied to rubric to a large enough sample to provide results data.

4. Identify any changes that should, as a result of this assessment, be implemented to help improve students' attainment of outcomes. (These may include, but are not limited to, changes in curriculum, content, materials, instruction, pedagogy etc).

SAC will look at Outcomes for LIB 101 in 2013-14 year, to make sure they are both achievable and assessable. LIB 101 is a one-credit class, and the learning outcomes may be too big for a short class.

The LIB 101 instructors will also try alternative ways of having students demonstrate their achievement of the course learning outcomes. At least several instructors will use a portfolio method in Fall Term.

5. Reflect on the effectiveness of this assessment tool and assessment process. Please describe any changes to assessment methodology that would lead to more meaningful results if this assessment were to be repeated (or adapted to another outcome). Is there a different kind of assessment tool or process that the SAC would like to use for this outcome in the future?   If the assessment tool and processes does not need to be revised, please indicate this.

Using a rubric to assess student achievement of learning outcomes in LIB 101 will be moderately useful. In the process of norming the rubric, instructors exchanged ideas about teaching methods and activities.

The Library SAC undertook an additional assessment project, one that took a very different tack on assessment. This project was led by Sara Seely, a librarian at Rock Creek, working collaboratively with Comp/Lit instructors across the District and with librarians at each campus. This assessment project was a Library instruction program-level assessment of Writing students, in order to gauge to what extent students "care where their information comes from" in a variety of contexts this academic year (2012-2013); the purpose was to get a temperature-check on how students are critically evaluating information sources. This assessment work lines up with the Writing 121 and Writing 122 CCOGs.

After a fall pilot, the Library faculty widely circulated a survey to WR 121 and WR 122 courses in winter 2013. Brief survey description:

- *the survey presents students with a thesis/claim and a list of four sources--the title, author, and publication--and asks students to select one to support the claim*
- *the survey then prompts students to explain their source selection*
- *writing faculty who volunteered to participate asked their students to take the survey around the 10th week of winter term, assuming that students at that point in the term had practice and instruction in source evaluation and selection*
- *writing courses from CA, RC, SEC, SY, and WEB campuses were recruited*

Link to the online survey and instructions: https://sites.google.com/site/pccsourceselection/

Participant snapshot

Total responses	WR 121	WR 122

| 206 | 70% (n142) | 30% (n64) |

After a fall pilot, the library faculty widely circulated a survey to WR 121 and WR 122 courses in winter 2013. Brief survey description:

- *the survey presents students with a thesis/claim and a list of four sources--the title, author, and publication--and asks students to select one to support the claim*
- *the survey then prompts students to explain their source selection*
- *writing faculty who volunteered to participate asked their students to take the survey around the 10th week of winter term, assuming that students at that point in the term had practice and instruction in source evaluation and selection*
- *writing courses from CA, RC, SEC, SY, and WEB campuses were recruited*

Link to the online survey and instructions: *https://sites.google.com/site/pccsourceselection/*

Participant snapshot

Total responses	WR 121	WR 122
206	70% (n142)	30% (n64)

Summary
- *68% of WR121 and WR122 students who participated in the assessment selected the most relevant, authoritative, accurate, and substantial source (Source B)*
- *majority of students who chose Source B provided at least **2 responses and averaged 2 types of statements** showing students made more than one consideration when evaluating an information source*

Analysis
- *the ability to evaluate and select information, and articulate the reasons why the source was selected, are integral to the CCOGs for Writing 121 and Writing 122, and directly supported by the Library SAC through individual and group instruction*
- *while 68% achievement is meeting our expectations for student learning, we will set a goal for students to achieve 80% for future assessments*

Next steps
- *review and analyze the responses for sources other than Source B*
- *discuss results with Writing faculty on each campus*
- *consider how results inform our approach to teaching source evaluation and selection*

- *consider developing a video tutorial series on the source evaluation and selection process to embed in WR121 and WR122 courses*

Use this sheet to figure out how to score LIB 101 final projects.
Use a separate, blank scoring sheet to score each final project

1. Learning Outcome #1: **Upon successful completion, students should be able to locate, evaluate and select pertinent information in order to make informed decisions based on data.**

      A. In the bibliography as a whole, student demonstrates the ability to locate pertinent information from a variety of sources (publication types).

1-2 types of sources indicates student is not proficient = 0	3 types of sources indicates student is proficient =2	more than 3 types of sources indicates student is highly proficient =4

      B. The student recognizes the relationship between information source and their topic.

          a. Apply these criteria to **each entry** in the annotated bib, and score each entry numerically.

score= 0 neither	score=2 one but not the other	score=4 both
source is not related and student doesn't comment on relationship or lack thereof.	source is related but students' comment is wrongheaded or missing altogether	Student specifies which part of the question/topic is addressed by source

          b. student demonstrates ability to recognize a relationship between info source and their topic in the bibliography as a whole.

never=0	rarely=1	frequently=3	consistently=4

2. Learning Outcome #2: **Upon successful completion, students will be able to evaluate sources of information to distinguish between facts and opinions.**

A. The annotation articulates student's reasoning regarding the quality of the source and/or info provided.

a. Apply these criteria to each entry in the annotated bib, and score each entry numerically.

score=0 annotation gives no analysis of source	score=2 annotation gives superficial or elementary analysis of source.(student thought fleetingly about it)	score=4 annotation gives substantive evidence supporting their analysis of source, for example author's qualifications, the currency of the info.

b. Student demonstrates ability to evaluate information sources in the bibliography overall.

never=0	rarely=1	frequently=3	consistently=4

B. the annotation notes the point of view and/or bias of information source.

a. Apply these criteria to each entry in the annotated bib, and score each entry numerically

score=0 annotation gives no analysis of point of view	score=2 annotation gives brief analysis of point of view .	score=4 annotation gives detailed and accurate analysis of point of view .

b. Student demonstrates abilty to identify point of view or bias in info sources in the bibliography as a whole.

never=0	rarely=1	frequently=3	consistently=4

This rubric is to assess students' achievement of the Learning Outcomes for LIB 101, using students final annotated bibliographies as evidence. It was drafted by LIB 101 instructors on 12/11/12.

Use this sheet to score each LIB 101 Final Project.

1. Learning Outcome #1: **Upon successful completion, students should be able to locate, evaluate and select pertinent information in order to make informed decisions based on data.**

   A. In the bibliography as a whole, student demonstrates the ability to locate
    pertinent information from a variety of sources (publication types).   **Score**:

   B. The student recognizes the relationship between information source and their topic.

      a. Apply criteria to **each entry** in the bibliography, score each entry numerically, enter
      one number per box.

bib entry	score	bib entry	score
1		5	
2		6	
3		7	
4		8	

                                              AVERAGE:

      b. student demonstrates ability to recognize a relationship between info
      source and their topic in the bibliography as a whole. (see scale on   **Score**:
      accompanying explanatory sheet)

                                 Outcome #1 score total:

2. Learning Outcome #2: **Upon successful completion, students will be able to evaluate sources of information to distinguish between facts and opinions.**

A. The annotation articulates student's reasoning regarding the quality of the source and/or info provided.

    a. Apply these criteria to **each entry** in the annotated bib, and score each entry numerically.

bib entry	score	bib entry	score
1		5	
2		6	
3		7	
4		8	

AVERAGE:

2. student demonstrates their reasoning regarding the quality of the source and/or info provided.in the bibliography as a whole.   **Score**:

B. the annotation notes the point of view and/or bias of information source.
a. Apply these criteria to **each entry** in the annotated bib, and score each entry numerically

bib entry	score	bib entry	score
1		5	
2		6	
3		7	
4		8	

AVERAGE:

2. Student demonstrates ability to identify point of view and/or bias of information source in the bibliography overall..   **Score:**

Outcome #2 score total:

This rubric is to assess students' achievement of the Learning Outcomes for LIB 101, using students final annotated bibliographies as evidence. It was drafted by LIB 101 instructors on 12/11/12.

Source Selection for college essays

Instructions

This exercise asks you to review four sources and then respond to a brief survey.

You are looking for information that supports the following thesis/claim for a college essay you are writing:

Electric cars will become as affordable as conventional cars.

1. Skim and critically evaluate each of the four sources below:

Source A

"The Case for Electricity." Plug In America. n.d. Web. 11 Oct. 2012.

Link: The Case for Electricity

Source B

Lee, Henry and Grant Lovellette. "Will Electric Cars Transform the U.S. Vehicle Market." Discussion Paper 2011-08. Harvard Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, July 2011. Web. 11 Oct. 2012.

Link: Will electric cars transform the U.S. vehicle market?

Source C

U.S. Department of Energy. "Electric Vehicles (EVs)." www.fueleconomy.gov, 2012. Web. 11 Oct. 2012.

Link: Electric vehicles

Source D

Webster, Rona. "Can the Electricity Distribution Network Cope with an Influx of Electric Vehicles?" Journal of Power Sources 80:2 (1999): 217-225. Web. 11 Oct. 2012.

Link:Can the electricity distribution network cope with an influx of electric vehicles?

2. Choose one best source to support the thesis/claim above for a college essay.

3. Complete this [short survey](#) to share your choice and describe why this particular source stands out to you as the best choice over the others.

Submit Your Response:

After selecting a source to support this statement, answer the questions below.

Electric cars will become as affordable as conventional cars.

Which source did you select?

Choose one:

 Source A - "The Case for Electricity"

 Source B - "Will Electric Cars Transform the U.S. Vehicle Market"

 Source C - "Electric Vehicles (EVs)"

 Source D - "Can the electricity distribution network cope with an influx of electric vehicles?"

Why did you select this source?

Name at least three reasons why this source is your first choice.

Why didn't you select the other three sources?

Name at least three reasons why you didn't select the other sources.

If you had a hard time choosing a best source, describe what made it difficult.

Please describe in a few sentences what made choosing the best source difficult.

What course are you currently enrolled in?

 WR 121

 WR 122