I. Mission Statement, Program Goals, Student Learning Outcomes, Curriculum Map, and Multi-year Assessment

A. Mission Statements

1. Library Mission Statement: “The Roger John Voskuyl Library supports the Westmont College mission to foster a culture of scholarship and Christian development. It is committed to collaborate with the College’s constituencies to promote the intellectual, spiritual, and cultural development of students, faculty, and staff. The Library provides access to organized information sources, instruction on gathering, evaluating, and using information in a place, both physical and virtual, for study, research, and the development of skills for life long learning.” [http://library.westmont.edu/libinfomission.php](http://library.westmont.edu/libinfomission.php)

2. Instruction Mission Statement: The new instruction mission statement has been updated to align with our new program learning outcomes. “The mission of the Voskuyl Library Instruction Program is to teach students that research is a process that includes asking good questions, understanding the relationship between publications and access, critically evaluating sources, using the Internet effectively, and ethically acknowledging intellectual property rights.” [http://libguides.westmont.edu/instruction](http://libguides.westmont.edu/instruction)

B. Program Learning Outcomes

The Library Instruction Team has made significant adjustments to our program learning outcomes. These modifications are primarily the result of our new vision for library instruction, and were encouraged in the PRC response to our 2010 annual report. PRC recommended that we decrease the number of program learning outcomes from seven to five or less. We now have four program learning outcomes.

Rather than reduce the seven program learning outcomes by deleting or merging items, we used this opportunity to rewrite them. Although our previous outcomes were commended by PRC to be clear and measurable, we felt that they were too narrowly focused on single skills and were not reflective of our overall intentions for the instruction program.

In response to our dissatisfaction with the outcomes, we developed the Library Instruction Program Content Standards during summer 2011. (Appendix A) This document identifies what we want students to learn each year during their time at Westmont and also serves as our framework for which we can measure student learning. One of the distinctive features of the new Library Instruction Program Content Standards is that it moves the undergraduate researcher from novice level to advanced disciplinary researcher. (Appendix A) Each level is designed to build on knowledge acquired in lower levels and the culmination of all levels is a student who is well versed in discipline specific research skills.

The new program learning outcomes directly reflect the four learning areas of the Library Instruction Program Content Standards: Publications and Access, Source Evaluation, Online Searching, and Citations and Intellectual Property. The general language of the program learning outcomes is elucidated by the specific language of the Library Instruction Content Standards.

Our assessment plan for the new PLOs is covered in IV. Next Steps, A. Assessment.
As the student moves from Novice Researcher to Advanced Disciplinary Researcher, he/she will demonstrate an increasing mastery in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Library PLO</th>
<th>ILO Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publications and Access</td>
<td>Students will analyze different types of publications and how to access them.</td>
<td>Demonstrated substantial knowledge of a field and the mode of inquiry pertinent to that field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Evaluation</td>
<td>Students will evaluate sources based on specific and objective criteria.</td>
<td>Accurately evaluate the strength of evidence in support of a claim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Searching</td>
<td>Students will develop online searching skills by employing advanced techniques to locate sources.</td>
<td>Be able to access, evaluate, use and communicate information effectively and ethnically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citations and Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Students will incorporate sources with respect to intellectual property rights.</td>
<td>Be able to access, evaluate, use and communicate information effectively and ethnically.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Curriculum Map: We will be updating this during this year (2011-2012)

D. Multi-year Assessment Plan: We will be creating the Multi-year Assessment plan this year (2011-2012).

II. Follow up on Action Items identified in 2010 annual assessment report and the PRC response

A. Follow up from 2010 annual assessment report:

1. **Assessment of SLO’s 2 and 3**
   - **Library Response:** See III. 2010-2011 Focus

2. **Liaison librarians collaboration with their assigned departments**
   - **Library Response:** Liaisons promoted research instruction and discussed materials selection and weeding with their departments.
     
     Each liaison structured her work with departments according to the response she received from those departments. Both library instruction and collection development were addressed. Most of the interaction was through email to individuals or face to face discussions. This year there was one instance of a library liaison attending a departmental meeting.

     Instruction sessions were requested by the following departments: Psychology, English, History, Political Science, Communication Studies, Kinesiology, Spanish, Theatre and (these last two requested instruction for the first time). We also experimented with a librarian embedded in a course during May Term. In this case, she was able to give much needed point-of-need help to students in this class. Another opportunity to embed a librarian in a course was explored but, the class was full, so it could not be set up.

     On the subject of book selection, the response of academic departments was varied. A productive method for collection development seemed to be to enlist the help of one interested department faculty member with whom to work. At times that faculty member would solicit input from the others. In several cases (Political Science, Communication Studies, the sciences, Religious Studies, and Kinesiology) a Google Doc. with titles and reviews was circulated to the
department members for input on titles to purchase. The challenge was to involve more individuals than just a single representative.

The statistics for instruction sessions reflect a growth in interest in instruction. The number of sessions as well as participants have steadily increased over the last two years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SAILS Assessment –**

**Library Response:** The SAILS assessment was not administered during 2010-2011. The SAILS assessment was given to a group of first year students at the beginning of the 2011-2012 academic year and will be analyzed for the next annual assessment report.

3. **Statistics**

**Library Response:** We have learned in the PRC response to the 2010 annual assessment report that this information should not be included in an annual assessment report. We will continue to gather statistics on library activity for the 6-year report.

**B. Follow up on action items from the 2010 PRC response. (Appendix B)**

1. **PRC:** “Mission Statement: Your mission statement does not appear on your departmental web page nor is it found in your departmental program review folder.”

   **Library Response:** These have been posted on the library website, [http://library.westmont.edu/libinfomission.php](http://library.westmont.edu/libinfomission.php) (Library Mission Statement) and [http://libguides.westmont.edu/instruction](http://libguides.westmont.edu/instruction) (Instruction Mission Statement), and also in My files\Program Review\Library\Reports.

2. **PRC:** “You seem to have a separate Mission statement for library instruction. Is this intentional? How do the two missions interact?”

   **Library Response:** The consensus of the librarians is that the Instruction Mission Statement above more clearly defines the last sentence in the Library Mission Statement: *The Library provides access to organized information sources, instruction on gathering, evaluating, and using information in a place, both physical and virtual, for study, research, and the development of skills for life long learning.*

   The Library Instruction Mission Statement was rewritten this year to more adequately reflect the breadth we wish to attain with our program.

3. **Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)**

   a. **Too many learning outcomes -**

      **Library Response:** Savannah Kelly, Instructional Services Librarian has addressed this in the new Library Instruction Content Standards Document explained above, which contains four outcomes.

   b. **“You will want to obtain final student work so that you can evaluate students’ appropriateness of their citations.”**

      **Library Response:** This is covered under “Next Steps” below.

   c. **Departmental Library Liaison Meetings**

      **Library Response:** The liaisons held their first meeting of the new
academic year on September 29, 2010, and adopted a new meeting structure that allowed for more flexibility and collaboration. A significant amount of time was spent explaining the new procedures for setting up and evaluating instruction sessions. Librarians were encouraged to work with faculty to develop instruction plans that teach to specific course assignments. To facilitate communication between faculty and the library, Savannah Kelly and college webmaster Greg Smith created an online library instruction request form for faculty that is accessed through the library web site.

By November, the liaisons were deeply involved in the process of spending a $15,000, one-time gift from the Provost to supplement dwindling funds for development of our print monograph collection, both circulating and reference. Criteria and procedures for decision-making on how to allocate the money by department and what to purchase were set up and executed during December - February.

Instruction and assessment continued to be on the agenda, however. During the winter and spring months, liaisons worked together on writing assessment questions that would evaluate student learning outcomes after instruction sessions. The goal was to standardize assessment and allow for more quantitative results.

The department liaisons met regularly summer of 2011 to discuss plans for outreach to their departments for 2011-2012. Savannah Kelly started off by outlining the services planned for this year. Each liaison was to identify two courses in each of her areas for which to propose an instruction session or activity. During July and August the liaisons kept each other apprised of their progress. (Appendix C)

III. 2010-2011 Focus

A. Assessment of the SLO 2 and SLO 3 During the 2010 fall semester, the Library Instruction Team developed six student learning outcomes to measure during a six year assessment cycle. We selected two of the six student learning outcomes as our focus for the 2011 spring semester.

Student Learning Outcome Two: Students will differentiate between book, article, and book chapter references in order to select the most appropriate search tool for locating a full text document.

Student Learning Outcome Three: Students will compare library and non-library search tools—databases, catalogs, web sites—in order to achieve a greater understanding of how information sources are arranged and accessed online and in print.

One of the difficulties we immediately encountered in assessing the student learning outcomes was the lack of systematic instruction programming across the curriculum. Librarians, serving as liaisons to specific departments, created instruction sessions in response to requests from teaching faculty members. As a result, we were not able to target specific student groups but rather the student population was already predetermined by those faculty who asked for library instruction. With these limitations in mind, we proceeded by crafting multiple-choice knowledge based questions. We standardized each question as much as possible while allowing each liaison to switch certain terminology (e.g. database name, research topics) with respect to subject specific instruction sessions. These questions were administered to students at the end of every instruction session in which a liaison taught concepts.
related to SLO 2 or SLO 3. These questions were not administered during instruction sessions that did not address corresponding topics.

There were two questions administered for SLO 2. For the first question, 74.59% (n =122) of respondents answered correctly and 68.29% (n=82) answered correctly on the second question. Three questions were created to measure SLO 3. The responses were as follows: 85.24% (n=122), 96.55% (n=29), and 48.27% (n=29). Sample assessment questions are listed in Appendix D.

The data indicated that students performed quite well on questions measuring SLO 3 skills with the exception of our question comparing Google and database searching. Students often assume they understand the complexities of Internet searching since they are very familiar with the technology, while our data suggest students are not aware of Google’s advantages and limitations. On the other hand, we could interpret these results by suggesting that our teaching sessions did not provide enough clarification on the differences between these two search tools. The students also performed relatively well on the SLO 2 questions.

In addition to the multiple-choice knowledge based questions, librarians often required students to write a 1 Minute Paper at the end of each instruction session. Last spring we determined that the 1 Minute Papers, which indicate what students found most helpful during an instruction session, were the most important data collected all year. The quantitative data from the knowledge based questions did not tell us as much about student learning—or about our teaching methods—as the qualitative data we received from the 1 Minute Papers. Our future direction is to discontinue using the knowledge based questions and to rely on a variation of the 1 Minute Paper which includes pre- and post- testing of student learning.

Last year we also gathered subjective data from each librarian on the courses they taught. All library instructors completed a standardized form (Appendix E) for each of their instruction sessions. This document identified the teaching objectives, classroom activities, key observations, self-reflection, assessment strategies, as well as demographic data. We will continue using this form for the 2011-2012 academic year. We will analyze this subjective data to gauge instructional effectiveness.

B. From Outcomes and Project List document found at the end of the 2009-2010 Annual Assessment Update

Revise credit course AP001 (Project 8) One of our major projects this summer was to develop new curriculum for the library’s APP-001 course, General Research Instruction. This course was a 1-credit online tutorial which had very low enrollment every semester. We decided to completely redesign it by updating the content, changing the name, and teaching it in person rather than as an online tutorial.

The purpose of the General Research Instruction tutorial was to show students how to successfully navigate the library’s resources. Although this information was valuable, we recognized that we were only teaching students part of the research process. We were neglecting to discuss the broader picture of how ideas are created and disseminated among scholars, and how students are invited to enter the conversation of scholarship. We also realized that we wanted students to gain an understanding of how research differs across the disciplines. Therefore, we decided to integrate representative publications, methodologies, and other framework from the Social Sciences, the Humanities, and the Natural Sciences.

With our new emphasis, we changed the title of the course from “General Research
Instruction” to “Research Across the Disciplines.” We also selected new texts for this course: The Craft of Research, published by University of Chicago Press, and They Say, I Say: the moves that matter in academic writing. We added this second text in support of our conviction that academic research and writing are inseparable, and that it is best to teach both processes together.

We have received faculty feedback in support of our updated course, including the suggestion to make it a requirement for all students. We will begin exploring option to integrate this course into the curriculum through a GE requirement, elective or as a companion research lab to a 4 unit course.

IV. Next Steps

A. Assessment - Librarians are challenged with measuring program learning outcomes in ways that do not affect most faculty. Outside of the APP-001 course, Research Across the Disciplines, librarians do not have an opportunity to work with students for an entire semester. Rather we work within the constraints of brief, single instruction sessions. These one-time classes range from 10 minutes to 2 hours, and they are often the only opportunity that a particular group of students will encounter a librarian in the classroom. In addition, every session is unique as they teach based on assignment prompts within a discipline specific context.

This is not to say that students are not learning valuable skills and concepts, but it does present unique challenges to measuring students learning. The current approach is to elicit feedback from students at the end of each instruction session by means of a 1 Minute Paper. Often times, however, the 1 Minute Paper does not provide as much information as the librarians would like to receive. Therefore they have decided to administer specific prompts to students at the end of each instruction session. These prompts will reflect each librarian’s instruction goals for that particular session and the questions will try to identify if students have learned something new.

The librarian’s goals for each session will align with our program learning outcomes. Since it is often difficult to identify how much prior knowledge students have of a particular content area, in order to control our variables, a response will be included that allows students to indicate if they already knew the information. A summary follows and an actual example of the form is provided in the Appendix C.

The assessment tool will take the form of a chart with the following headings:

Left Column: Brief itemized list of student learning outcomes for that instruction session. These goals will align with the program learning outcomes.

Top Row: Student response choices which they can check off as appropriate:
- I knew this already
- I learned this today during the instruction session
- I still do not understand this

B. SAILS assessment given in the fall 2011 to first year students – This needs to be analyzed it to learn the general information literacy preparedness of the first year students. This may lead to a modification of the A La Carte instruction modules. Responsible: liaison librarians; completion date: June 2012.

C. Curriculum Map – The librarians would like more time to generate the curriculum map for the recently realigned program learning outcomes. Responsible: Savannah Kelly and other liaisons; completion date: June 2012.

D. Procure copies of student work (from the PRC Response). Partner with classroom faculty who participate in the library instruction in order to identify student work to evaluate. Responsible: liaison librarians, completion date: June 2013.
E.  **Multi-year assessment plan** – Responsible: liaison librarians, completion date: June 2012.

F.  **Investigate a replacement for the SAILS test.** While the individually scored SAILS assessment is an improvement over the previous cohort comparison test, we would like to find a test that more closely follows the skills that we consider important for our students. Responsible: Savannah; completion date: June 2012.

**Appendices:**

A.  Library Instruction Program Content Standards
B.  PRC Response: 2010 Annual Assessment Update
C.  Liaison Meetings Summary 2010-2011
D.  Spring 2011 SLO 2 and SLO 3 Knowledge-Based Questions
E.  Fall 2011 Instruction – Informal Assessment Form
F.  Sample Assessment Form Political Science 020, Fall 2011