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Taking into account the suggestions from the Learning Assessment Council (LAC) regarding our SAC’s need for more direct assessment; the inconclusiveness of our last attempt to accomplish learning assessment through our LIB 101 courses; and suggestions received in the Administrative response to the Library program review, the Library SAC opted to apply for a grant to bring in a consultant to guide our learning assessment process, particularly for program level learning outcomes.

Grant funds were used to hire Deb Gilchrist, Dean of Libraries and Institutional Effectiveness, Pierce College, WA for a day-long workshop with all full-time librarians and part time librarians (with 12+ hours per week). Deb is a co-author with Megan Oakleaf of a nationally recognized white paper on learning assessment in libraries for the National Institute of Learning Outcomes Assessment.

We held the workshop June 1, 2012 at the Rock Creek campus. Attendees in addition to nine full- and part-time librarians included Danny Smith (Library Manager, Access Services), Maria Wagner (Library Manager, Library Technology) and Ray Henry (Library Digital Resources Specialist) as well as Theresa Love (Developmental Writing and Reading, Rock Creek) with Danica Fierman (Student Learning Center coordinator, Rock Creek) as observers. Donna Reed, Library Director, was also present.

Gilchrist focused our attention on developing a common understanding of learning outcome based assessment as the driver for program assessment. Consequently the librarians spent less time pursuing any particular type of data repository tool (investigating this type of tool was originally a goal of the grant request), but we did discuss some of the parameters for the usefulness of such a tool. In the meantime, all relevant documents are created in Google Docs so they can be edited and shared by all interested parties.

As a result of this workshop, the Library SAC has come to a shared understanding about assessable program outcomes. We will begin 2012-2013 with program-level outcomes in an assessment template (see below) which will work well for our SAC. Librarians working this summer will identify methods for how to collect data for the assessments, and the SACC will meet at the beginning of Fall 2012 to approve these. Throughout the rest of the 2012-13 year we will work in small workgroups to gather data for these outcomes and provide a report of results for the SAC’s review. Torie captured the key learning points from the workshop in a Powerpoint file, which was presented for SAC approval at our June Reference team meeting (attached).

The librarians are essentially starting the College Core Outcomes assessment process over from the beginning, in a new and more comprehensive way, in order to accomplish learning assessment for program outcomes with participation of all the librarians. We did not intend to circumvent the CCOR process, but instead, to prepare to participate in learning assessment in an authentic, inclusive, and holistic way. When we proceed through this process we will then be able to tie our program level assessments to the College Core Outcomes assessment effort as well.
### Library Instruction Program Outcomes 2012-2013

#### OUTCOME #1:
Library faculty are able to demonstrate a culture of assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: How will we know we are successful? What will be happening?</th>
<th>Action: What will we do to make this happen?</th>
<th>Assessment: How will you collect information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x% of library faculty will collect data on student achievement of learning outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% data collected by librarians is shared in a database</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OUTCOME #2:
Students care about where their information comes from.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: How will we know we are successful? What</th>
<th>Action: What will we do</th>
<th>Assessment: How will you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be happening?</td>
<td>to make this happen?</td>
<td>collect information?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x% of students understand that information is produced in many ways, and that there are different kinds of information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x% of students will evaluate data critically for credibility and relevance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x% of student select information relevant to their topic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OUTCOME #3:**
(Non-library) Faculty take information literacy seriously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: How will we know we are successful? What will be happening?</th>
<th>Action: What will we do to make this happen?</th>
<th>Assessment: How will you collect information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| x% of IL-related assignments match IL-related CCOGs related to information literacy. | Address Reading & Biology Ask discipline faculty  
- Collect assignments  
- Offer to work on assignments with faculty  
Reading  
- Collect assignments  
- Offer to work on assignments with faculty | |

Frame how you address discipline faculty: we want to frame/develop support for your students, so show me your assignment. “How can we help you?”
Library Instruction Assessment Day

ReCap and next steps
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

• We are asking “How does the library, its services and our instruction look to students?”
• What they perceive is different from what we think we’re doing.
• We should look at student in process, as they engage with library to do research, as well as the end products they create.
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

• It can be overwhelming.
• Remember: Seeing part is better than seeing nothing.
• Build on what you can see right now. Create a culture of willingness to try, and to fail; a willingness to collect data and look at it.

Assess what we value; don’t value what we assess.
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

Deb’s boiled down version of *Assessment-as-Learning*, given that you often have only 50 minutes.

- Know what you’re doing

- Know why you’re doing it

- Know what students are learning as a result

- Change what you’re doing because of the information
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

• ACRL Standards for Libraries in Higher Ed frames the focus on the ultimate impact of a library instruction program:

“The ways in which library users are changed as a result of their contact with the library’s resources and programs.”
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

Deb’s advice for constructing an outcome that addresses “why” and “so what,” naming the end results, final impact.

Program Outcomes Rubric
Outcome expresses what you want the user group to do as a result of your program.
• Verb sets the direction and level of depth
• Clearly identifies the library’s contributions & role.
• language is clear for all community members
• Measurable or Judge-able (observable)
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

Information Literacy (Library instruction) Program Outcomes:
The Program Outcomes should address our constituent groups:

• Students
• Classroom faculty
• Librarians
• Administrators
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

**Outcome:** What will students (faculty/researchers/librarians) do as a result of engaging with the academic library?

**Criteria:** How will we know we are successful? What will be happening?

**Actions:** What will do to make this happen?

**Evidence:** How will we collect information?
### Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Learning outcome:</th>
<th>Classroom Faculty</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Librarians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students care about where their information comes from.</td>
<td>Library and classroom faculty collaborate. OR Faculty take IL outcomes seriously.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Library faculty demonstrate a culture of assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome: Students care about where their information comes from.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Criteria**: How will we know we are successful? What will be happening?  
**Actions**: What will we do to make this happen?  
**Evidence**: How will we collect information?

- $x\%$ of students understand that information is produced in many ways; that there are different sources & kinds of information.
  - $x\%$ of students will evaluate data critically for credibility and relevance
  - $x\%$ of students can articulate what makes information credible
  - $x\%$ of students select info relevant to their topic.
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

Additional/alternative Student outcome of IL Program level outcome:
Students demonstrate critical thinking through information literacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: How will we know we are successful? What will be happening?</th>
<th>Actions: What will do to make this happen?</th>
<th>Evidence: How will we collect information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>students id info need; they ask ‘who would gather this info? In what venue would they put it?’</td>
<td>• intentionally ask all faculty that we teach for about incorporating critical thinking.</td>
<td>• work with instructors to get more papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• analysis of search results -- interpreting the words in the search results, ie recognizing synonyms and related concepts.</td>
<td>• map IL critical thinking to course outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• compare/contrast search strategies</td>
<td>• contribute annual reports to institution demo’ing critical thinking outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• if search strategy didn’t work what to change and why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

Classroom faculty outcome: Library and classroom faculty collaborate. OR Faculty take IL outcomes seriously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria: How will we know we are successful? What will be happening?</th>
<th>Actions: What will do to make this happen?</th>
<th>Evidence: How will we collect information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>its not about the tools</td>
<td>• thinking critically about information</td>
<td>• students are curious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

• Additional/alternative library instruction program outcomes that addresses PCC faculty:

  Outcome: All PCC faculty work together to ensure students meet the Information Literacy goals of individual class sessions, the IL goals of courses, and the IL goals of their academic program.

Additional criteria (How will we know we are successful? What will be happening?)

• class assignments reflect nuanced understanding of discipline specific information sources

• quality of sources
• ability to teach a mindset of evaluation and concrete knowledge that allows students to evaluate effectively.

• Faculty construct assignments that require student to find discipline-specific credible sources.

• Faculty use information literacy in designing assignments.

• faculty design curriculum that requires (teaches) students to find, describe and apply relevant information.

• Faculty design curriculum that weaves concepts and skills of relevance and credibility of information.
Library Instruction Assessment Day: ReCap and next steps

Good work, everybody! Nice Outcomes.

From the work we all did on June 1 with Deb, Pam, Rachel & I drafted Program Outcomes for our instruction program.

(brief pause while we shift to Google docs)