

WML Information Literacy Instruction Assessment 2017-18
Classroom Activity Report – Programmatic
Prepared by Donna Witek, Information Literacy Coordinator

Faculty Librarians:

George Aulisio, Kelly Banyas, Frank Conserette, Kevin Norris, and Donna Witek

Semester: Fall 2017

Course Number and Name: INTD 112: EP Foundations (EP)

Course Instructors (Last Name): Mikesell, Fisher, DeSantis, Reavy, and Conlon-Mazzucca

Date(s) of Guest Information Literacy Instruction:

Session 1: Week of 09/11/2017 and Session 2: Week of 09/18/2017*

*14 information literacy class sessions delivered to 7 sections across two weeks

Time(s) of Guest Information Literacy Instruction:

Various; instruction took place in both 50-minute and 75-minute class sessions

Locations: STT 311, LSC 401, and LSC 403

Number of Students Registered in Course: 69 students total across 7 sections

Summary of research assignment or task

In Fall 2017 this information literacy module consisted of the following:

- Librarian visits class on Day 1 of semester to introduce oneself and briefly explain librarian's role in the course (10 minutes)
- Librarian teaches two information literacy class sessions, 1.5 weeks apart from each other, which involve a shared lesson plan and Library Assignment (i.e., student homework) across all sections
- Between the two information literacy class sessions, librarian grades/assesses student submissions of Library Assignment using a shared rubric, and shares these scores and feedback individually with the students and for the entire class with the course instructor
- Students participate in a "Golden Ticket" research consultation with a librarian in support of their Capstone projects (these meetings are usually 15-30 minutes)
 - In Fall 2017 we had students sign up to visit the Research Services desk using a Doodle Poll

- Students then fill out a “Golden Ticket” slip documenting their meeting with the librarian which is handed in to the course instructor

For shared lesson plans (Sessions 1 and 2), grading rubric, sample “Golden Ticket” slips, and other instructional materials for this module, see attached.

Student learning outcomes for the guest information literacy instruction (at least one, no more than three)

Session 1:

1.A: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction and the Library Assignment they will do as homework, students will strategically explore their Capstone topics through the search process.

1.B: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction and the Library Assignment they will do as homework, students will gather complete citation information including article type for three potential sources on their topics.

1.C: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction and the Library Assignment they will do as homework, students will critically evaluate three potential sources on their topics using the “Five Ws” framework for source evaluation.

Session 2:

2.A: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction, students will demonstrate their understanding of database searching for information about their Capstone topics.

2.B: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction, students will articulate their own understanding of the search process.

2.C: As a result of this guest information literacy instruction, students will receive timely feedback on their work of developing search strategies and applying evaluative criteria to information about their topics. [Note: Not technically a learning outcome but more of an instructional outcome.]

How will you know how students are doing as they work toward meeting these outcomes?

Session 1:

1.A: Successful completion of Qs 1-8 of Library Assignment completed as homework.

1.B: Successful completion of Q 9, Q 11, and Q 13 of Library Assignment completed as homework.

1.C: Successful completion of Q 10, Q 12, and Q 14 of Library Assignment completed as homework.

Session 2:

2.A: Observation of database teaching activity

2.B: Observation of database teaching activity

2.C: Broad feedback given on homework assignment; feedback provided by librarians in comments of their homework submissions (optional for librarians)

Based on your experience teaching this session and any assessment of student work you were able to do, what can you change next time to improve how you teach it? Or, what was successful that you want to be sure to do again the next time you teach it?

CLOSING THE LOOP — Changes from Spring 2017*:

*Note: There is no Classroom Activity Report for this course in Spring 2017 due to overlapping retirements and leaves in the Research & Scholarly Services department.

There were two factors that went into the decision to make changes to the module between Spring 2017 and Fall 2017. 1) There were seven sections of the course running in Fall 2017, which is exceptionally more than had ever run before; and, 2) Those librarians that delivered the module in Spring 2017 informally discussed the benefits of streamlining the module as a result of the assessment we did in Spring.

In response to these factors the changes the Research & Instruction Librarians made for Fall 2017 were:

- We moved the Library Assignment into the Desire2Learn (D2L) learning management system, using its native Quiz application in order to make facilitating and grading the assignment easier.
- We revised the “Golden Ticket” slips to better structure student reflection on their learning during the research consultation and to eliminate questions that are now obsolete (revision attached).
- We changed how “Golden Ticket” appointments were managed, moving from a model where students signed up individually with the librarian assigned to their section (Spring 2017) to a model where students signed up using a shared Doodle Poll for a date and time to visit the Research Services desk and meet with the librarian on duty (Fall 2017).

What follows is an assessment of these changes and the information literacy module as a whole for Fall 2017.

ASSESSMENT OF FALL 2017 INFORMATION LITERACY MODULE:

Library Assignment

65 students completed the Library Assignment out of 69 students enrolled. Librarians assigned to each section scored their submissions using a shared rubric (attached).

Mean Score: 34.58 / 38

Median Score: 35 / 38

Mean Grade: 91%

Median Grade: 92.11%

The highest grade was 100% (n = 9 students) and the lowest grade was 63.16% (n = 2 students).

53 students out of the 65 who submitted assignments scored 85% or higher.

Based on this assessment, it is clear that a high percentage of the students in this course were successful at accomplishing the information literacy tasks asked of them in the Library Assignment; however, based on observations by the librarians during the grading process, content areas that could be better emphasized in our instruction were identified, and decisions were made to better address them in Spring 2018 the next time we teach the module. See **CLOSING THE LOOP** section below for details about these planned changes.

Golden Tickets

The Information Literacy Program Master Schedule reflects that Research & Instruction Librarians staffing the Research Services desk met with **69 students** for “Golden Ticket” research consultations in Fall 2017.

In the Fall 2017 information literacy module, students handed in their completed “Golden Ticket” slips to their course instructors, after which the instructors were requested to send the completed slips to the Information Literacy Coordinator through campus mail.

The total number of received “Golden Ticket” slips from INTD 112 course instructors in Fall 2017 was **35 Golden Ticket slips**.

34 out of 35 of the Golden Ticket slips included answers written by students in response to all three reflective questions (WHAT, WHY, and HOW):

“Reflect on something new you learned about **doing research on your topic** during your consultation with the librarian. Indicate **what** new thing you learned, **why** it is helpful to know when doing research, and **how** this will change how you do research in the future:”

This is evidence that the revised “Golden Ticket” slip was an impactful revision in that it succeeded at better structuring the students’ reflection on their learning during the research consultations. The three scaffolded questions about their learning resulted in more detailed responses than a single open-ended question about what they learned, as

was asked on the previous version of the slip. This is a revision to the slips we plan to retain into the future.

It is also preliminary evidence that a challenge articulated in the Fall 2016 “WML Assessment Activity Report” for this course (quoted below) has been successfully mediated by this revised “Golden Ticket” slip, thus illustrating a successful cycle of **CLOSING THE LOOP** through assessment of this component of the information literacy module and taking action to improve how this module is delivered.

From Fall 2016 “WML Assessment Activity Report” for INTD 112:

“Based on the “Golden Ticket” submissions, some students did not document what they learned about finding information. In the future, the librarians should be sure to emphasize to the students what the question is that they are being asked.”

In the future, a possible assessment project will be to transcribe student answers hand-written on their “Golden Ticket” slips and analyze responses for direct evidence of student learning related to our information literacy student learning outcomes for this course and for the program. Given how time-intensive this transcription and analysis will be, this project will need to wait until we are fully staffed in the Research & Scholarly Services department.

Final Exam

The Library has five questions on the final exam in INTD 112 that we use to assess content knowledge related to the research process. In Fall 2017 three out of five course instructors sent student scores for the five information literacy questions to the Information Literacy Coordinator, resulting in final exam assessment data for **31 students**:

Q1: Which of the following is the best place to find scholarly journal articles?	Number of students who got answer correct:
a. Library Catalog	
b. Credo Reference	
c. Library Databases **	30 / 31 students
d. Library Research Guides	
Q2: The more terms you add to your search, the fewer results you'll get.	Number of students who got answer correct:
a. True **	25 / 31 students
b. False	

Q3: When searching a database, what filter would you use to limit your results so that you get the most current information?	Number of students who got answer correct:
a. Relevance	
b. Date**	30 / 31 students
c. Subject Population	

Q4: CQ Researcher is a database that I would use to find newspaper articles.	Number of students who got answer correct:
a. True	
b. False **	11 / 31 students

Q5: What techniques can you use to capture the citation information for an article you find in a database?	Number of students who got answer correct:
a. Email the article to yourself	
b. Copy & paste the citation into a Word document	
c. Print the article from the database	
d. all of the above**	26 / 31 students

Students did very well on Questions 1 and 3, and moderately well on Questions 2 and 5. This informed our decision to retain these questions in future semesters and to continue to find ways to emphasize the knowledge they are measuring in this information literacy module.

Students did not do as well on Question 4, which was about the Library database CQ Researcher Plus Archive. This database contains just one publication, i.e. *CQ Researcher*, which features expert analysis curated by a scholarly publisher. When teaching the source type in this database, the librarians describe the information accessed through CQ Research Plus Archive as “reports.” Despite this, only about one third of students for whom we have assessment data for this question demonstrated an understanding of the source type this database offers.

As a result of this final exam assessment data as well as librarian observation of student responses to the Library Assignment, the librarians needed to make a decision about whether to redesign the information literacy module to give CQ Researcher Plus Archive a lot more attention or to remove CQ Research Plus Archive from the module entirely. See **CLOSING THE LOOP** below for the decision we made and the rationale why.

Librarian Feedback Survey

At the end of the Fall 2017 semester, the Information Literacy Coordinator created a one-time survey for the librarians who taught the INTD 112 information literacy module that semester. This survey focused on the librarians’ experience and observations as instructors of the module. The goal of the survey was to gather specific feedback on each part of the module to inform, along with student learning assessment data, revisions to the module for Spring 2018 and beyond.

Four librarians completed the survey (the Information Literacy Coordinator recused herself), and five questions were connected to specific changes made to the module in Fall 2017.

Question: Would you have any objections to eliminating CQ Researcher as a featured resource in these sessions and in the Library Assignment?

3 librarians = No

1 librarian = Not in assignment itself but incorporate another way (see **CLOSING THE LOOP** for the decision we made about this)

Question: How did you find using the 5 Ws (Who, What, When, Where, Why) as a framework to teach source evaluation? Please comment on both this approach and the handout created for students about the 5 Ws.

4 librarians = Positive response re: 5 Ws framework

1 librarian gave feedback on the handout that there seemed to be too many bullet points under each W for students to make good use of the framework (see **CLOSING THE LOOP** for how we plan to incorporate this feedback in the future)

Question: Please comment on the use of D2L's quiz feature to administer the Library Assignment. As an instructor how did you find this technology for administering and grading the Library Assignment?

4 librarians = Positive response re: moving Library Assignment into Desire2Learn, which informed the decision to continue to administer the assignment through this platform

Question: We conducted [the Golden Ticket meetings] at the Research Services desk, where students signed up for a date and time to come for this drop-in consultation. Please comment on how you felt this went. Did you experience any challenges with this set-up? Any successes that were particular to this drop-in approach?

4 librarians = Positive feedback on Doodle Poll and meetings at Research Services desk

However, the Information Literacy Coordinator's experience managing the scheduling with this tool was challenging so a change needed to be made (see **CLOSING THE LOOP** below for more on this)

Question: Please share any other comments or feedback about this INTD 112 IL module. In what ways can we make this module better and more sustainable for us as Research & Instruction Librarians?

Positive comment from librarian: "I thought it worked better this semester than previous semesters, despite the fact that there were more sections."

The responses to these five survey questions informed the changes made to the INTD 112 information literacy module for Spring 2018.

CLOSING THE LOOP — Planned changes for Spring 2018:

Based on the above sources of assessment data and the conclusions drawn from them, the following changes were made to the INTD 112 information literacy module for Spring 2018:

- We removed the database CQ Researcher Plus Archive from the Library Assignment.

Rationale: The information literacy student learning outcomes related to these resources are easily met through use of the other two databases featured in the assignment, i.e., ProQuest Central and Academic Search Elite (EBSCO). To expand the module to give CQ Researcher Plus Archive the time and attention needed to give students a complete understanding of this resource would require time that we do not have available to us. The Research & Instruction Librarians decided that we would promote CQ Researcher Plus Archive in the context of the one-on-one “Golden Ticket” research consultations for those topics for which this resource is a good fit, so it will now be introduced at the point-of-need where appropriate

- We simplified the “Evaluating Sources with the Five Ws” handout by revising the bulleted questions underneath each W, streamlining and making them fewer in number.

Rationale: This change was in response to a suggestion received through the Librarian Feedback Survey (see above).

- We changed the format of the Library Assignment questions that asked for citation elements for three possible sources on students’ topics, from a long-response question format to separate fields for each citation element.

Rationale: By requiring students to find and submit each citation element separately, it will better ensure students know both what they are looking for and where to find it in each database. The hope is that this change will also make it easier for the librarians to search for each article while grading the assignment since the citation elements are easier to read and copy/paste in this new question format.

- We eliminated the Doodle Poll for scheduling “Golden Ticket” research consultations and instead returned to a model where students reach out to an assigned librarian to make their appointments within the prescribed time frame.

Rationale: We decided to move away from the Doodle Poll for Spring 2018 because even though the four librarians who completed the Librarian Feedback Survey gave positive feedback on the Doodle Poll as a scheduling method, the Information Literacy Coordinator experienced significant challenges both in terms of time required to manage the scheduling with this free tool as well as glitches with the tool itself when the number of users participating was around 70. Students were signing up twice, and still often missed their meetings. The Information Literacy Coordinator decided that a modified version of having students sign up directly with a librarian was a more reliable method for Spring 2018.

The significant change this time was that more Research & Instruction Librarians were involved in this part of the module, with two librarians assigned to each section of the course in Spring 2018. With three sections running in Spring 2018, this meant six librarians were assigned to around 9 students each for the “Golden Ticket” research consultations.

This is an example of **CLOSING THE LOOP** because a material and logistical concern in past semesters was the time commitment involved in having a single librarian meet with up to 18 students in each section. By sharing the work load among the wider Research & Instruction Librarian team, this concern was mitigated and students would still experience the benefit of meeting one-on-one with a librarian.

WML Information Literacy Program Student Learning Outcomes this information literacy instruction supports

SLO2: Students will gain insight and understanding about diverse sources of information in order to evaluate and use resources appropriately for their information needs.

SLO3: Students will identify the appropriate level of scholarship among publication types (scholarly journals, trade publications, magazines, websites, etc.) in order to critically evaluate the usefulness of the information for their research need.

SLO4: Students will articulate the key elements in their research questions in order to develop and execute a search strategy.

SLO6: Students will properly distinguish between their own ideas and the intellectual property of others in order to ethically use information and demonstrate academic integrity.