

Program: University Library

Date: May 29, 2014

Completed by: Kevin Seeber

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program’s assessment): Sandy Hudock, Rhonda Gonzales

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You’ll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. Thank you.

**I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.**

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	B. When was this SLO last assessed? <b>Please indicate the semester and year.</b>	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? <b>Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.</b>	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department’s conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
SLO 1. Students identify key services in order to know what the library can provide to them.	Spring 2014	Library Satisfaction Survey	364 students, faculty, and staff who responded to the survey	80% either agree or strongly agree that they feel comfortable in the library	324 (89%) agree or strongly agree that they feel comfortable in the library	We are pleased with this performance.	No changes planned.

SLO 2. Students differentiate research tools in order to make informed and useful decisions about how to gather trustworthy information.	Spring 2014	Student Reflection Papers (Qualitative Assessment)	30 HIST 103 students (fall) 18 HIST 103 students (spring)	85% of students measured are proficient or above (This outcome was not measured quantitatively during the current assessment cycle).	Students largely understood the differences between research tools, though there was confusion about timeliness of obtaining materials from other libraries, as well as questions about how to locate print materials on the shelf.	The library cannot do much to speed up how quickly materials arrive from other libraries, so we need to better inform students of the delay when requesting books from other locations.	Instruction for students requiring print materials will now include a tour of the library's upper floors, when possible (already implemented in Spring 2014). Instruction will also put a greater emphasis on timeliness, so that students will consider this factor when selecting where to search for information.
SLO 3. Students construct search strategies in a variety of search systems in order to manipulate results within an information retrieval system.	Spring 2014	In-Class Direct Assessment (short answer questions)	81 small groups of ENG 102 students (spring)	80% of students measured are proficient or above	49 (60%) of students measured proficient or above	Much of the library's instruction program hinges on students grasping this outcome, so we will need to make improvements.	Instruction of this learning outcome will need to be better integrated into earlier classroom visits, especially in ENG 099 and ENG 101, which will prepare them for this evaluation near the end of ENG 102

SLO 4. Students apply criteria in order to evaluate information sources.	Spring 2014	In-Class Direct Assessments (open ended questions- rubrics attached)	167 small groups of ENG 101 students (fall) 106 small groups of ENG 101 and ENG 102 students (spring)	85% of students measured are proficient or above	225 (82%) of students measured proficient or above 145 (fall) 80 (spring)	This outcome has become increasingly central to our instruction program, and we are mostly pleased with this performance.	Instructional activities will continue to migrate away from using visual cues to evaluate sources, and will instead involve teaching students the critical thinking skills necessary to find reliable information.
SLO 5. Students recognize the economic, legal, and social issues related to the use of another person's words or ideas and are able to cite and use their sources in an ethical and legal manner.	Spring 2014	In-Class Direct Assessment (closed questions)	54 ENG 099 and ENG 101 students (fall) 49 ENG 099 and ENG 102 students (spring)	85% of students measured are proficient or above	89 (86%) of students measured proficient or above 48 (fall) 41 (spring)	We are pleased with this performance.	No changes planned.

Comments: This was the first assessment cycle since the library implemented "Super Search," our new discovery tool. The nature of this search tool places an additional emphasis on SLOs 3 and 4, while diminishing the role of SLO 2, for lower division students. The library will need to enhance our instruction, especially for SLO 3, as students continue to rely on Super Search for their research.

**II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.**

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
SLO 3. Students construct search strategies in a variety of search systems in order to manipulate results within an information retrieval system.	Spring 2013	Develop new activities and assessments for teaching this SLO to coincide with the introduction of Super Search.	Yes	While we successfully developed new means of instruction and assessment regarding this outcome, student results remain low. We will be increasing instruction of this SLO earlier in the semester

Comments:

SCHOLARLY AND POPULAR ARTICLES RUBRIC

	EXEMPLARY	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
1. What is the title of the article? What is the title of the journal, magazine, website, or organization that published it?	Correctly identifies the article title AND journal title for BOTH examples.	Correctly identifies the article title OR journal title for BOTH examples.	Does not correctly identify the article title OR journal title for BOTH examples.
2. What can you tell about the author(s)? Do they have any relevant credentials, such as a degree or professional experience? Why does knowing this matter?	Identifies credentials, or lack thereof, for BOTH authors. Provides rationale for how authors' credentials impact authority/credibility.	Identifies credentials, or lack thereof, for BOTH authors. Does NOT provide rationale for how authors' credentials impact authority/credibility.	Does not identify credentials, or lack thereof, for BOTH authors.
3. How much research went into the article? How can you tell?	Qualifies amount of research for BOTH examples. Provides reasoning based on evidence in the text (e.g. citations, data, interviews).	Qualifies amount of research for BOTH examples. Does NOT provide reasoning based on evidence in the text.	Does NOT qualify amount of research or gives an oversimplified answer (e.g. "a lot").
4. Why did the author(s) write this article?	Identifies "research" or "discovery" for scholarly research AND informing "the general public" for the popular example.	Identifies only a generalized purpose for BOTH articles (e.g. "to tell people about the topic").	Does NOT provide any motive or agency on the part of the authors.
5. What is the style of writing or language used within the article?	Identifies the style of language for BOTH articles and provides examples from the text.	Identifies the style of language for BOTH articles and does NOT provide examples from the text.	Does NOT identify the style of language for BOTH articles.
6. Identify the intended audience of the article. Who would read this?	Identifies researchers within the academic field (e.g. surgeons) for the scholarly source AND "the public" for the popular source.	Identifies generic audiences for BOTH articles (e.g. "scholars," "people interested in the topic").	Does NOT identify an audience for BOTH articles.

ANALYZING SCHOLARLY SOURCES RUBRIC

	EXEMPLARY	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
1. What do you notice about the title of the article? Why do you think they chose this title?	Identifies length or specificity of the article title AND qualifies its use when evaluating the source.	Identifies length or specificity of the article title.	Does NOT identify length or specificity of the article title.
2. What is an abstract? Why is it at the top of the first page?	Defines abstract as a summary of the article text AND qualifies its use when evaluating the source.	Defines abstract as a summary of the article text.	Does NOT correctly define what an abstract is.
3. What can you tell about the author of this article? Who do you think is their audience?	Identifies the author by their credentials AND identifies their audience as others researching in the discipline/field.	Identifies the author by their credentials, AND identifies their audience generically (e.g. "people interested in the topic")	Does NOT identify the author by their credentials OR does not identify the audience.
4. The introduction has several citations, but not many direct quotations. Why is that? Do you know the name for this part of an article?	Identifies paraphrasing AND establishes purpose of a literature review in the article.	Identifies paraphrasing OR establishes purpose of a literature review in the article.	Does NOT identify paraphrasing OR establish purpose of a literature review in the article.
5. What's in the methods section? Why do you think they include this?	Identifies the means of conducting the study AND qualifies its use to other researchers (e.g. replication).	Identifies the style of language for BOTH articles and does NOT provide examples from the text.	Does NOT identify the style of language for BOTH articles.
6. What is included in the results section?	Identifies statistical/data analysis of the experimental results.	Identifies data/statistics, but does NOT connect them with the experiment.	Does NOT identify data/statistics.
7. What is in the discussion section? How does it compare to the results section?	Identifies a narrative which explains the experimental results.	Identifies a narrative but does NOT connect it to the experimental results.	Does NOT identify a narrative.
8. Scholarly sources will always have references at the end of the article. Why are references helpful?	Acknowledges that references establish credibility AND point out related sources.	Acknowledges that references establish credibility OR point out related sources.	Does NOT Acknowledge that references establish credibility OR point out related sources.
9. Why do you think scholarly sources have these different sections clearly labeled with bolded headings?	Identifies the ability to locate relevant sections.	Identifies the ability to skim the article but NOT to locate relevant sections.	Does NOT identify the ability to skim the article.