

Program: __University Library_____

Date report completed: __17 May 2017_____

Completed by: __Jonathan Grunert_____

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program’s assessment): __Sandy Hudock, Elizabeth Christian, Betsy Schippers_____

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

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan. *Note that the SLOs were updated in summer 2016.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	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 that level?	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—Identify library services for study, research, and collaboration	Fall 2016	In-Class Direct Assessment	Five classes (ENG 101), 89 students	85% satisfactory or above	87.5% satisfactory		None planned; this is covered in ENG 101 and 102 library instruction classes.
	Spring 2017	Anonymized assignment papers	Two classes, (HIS 101) 22 students		No quantified results	Students were able to navigate finding and requesting books, with librarian help. (In large part, difficulties that students encountered were due to the changes in the library catalog,	Need to help students become more independent and confident in finding, locating, and requesting materials. Incorporating this more explicitly in general library instruction.

						implemented December 2016.)	
SLO2 — Differentiate and employ various research tools and methods to address complex research questions	Fall 2016	In-Class Direct Assessment	Four classes (ENG 102, ENG 491, ENG 201, BIOL 510) 40 students	85% satisfactory or above	76.9% satisfactory	Students understand the variety of databases and resources they have at their disposal.	Revisit instruction activities to address in class differences in searching across multiple databases. Additionally, plans to change the layout of the Databases A-Z to increase access points and information.
	Spring 2017	In-Class Direct Assessment	Twenty-two classes (ENG 101/102), 421 students		97.1% satisfactory	Students can identify general databases for beginning research.	
SLO 3— Develop and refine search strategies within appropriate information retrieval systems to find meaningful results	Fall 2016	In-Class Direct Assessment	Twenty-one classes (ENG 101/102, PSYCH 241/311, ENG 491, BIOL 510) 394 students	85% satisfactory or above	86.6% satisfactory	Students gained a basic understanding of database content and search limiters.	Revisit instruction activities to address differences in searching across multiple databases by incorporating Google Scholar into ENG 101 classes, and comparisons of general (OneFile and Academic Search Premier) and subject specific databases in ENG 102
	Spring 2017	In-Class Direct Assessment	Twenty classes (ENG 101/102), 385 students		88.6% satisfactory		
SLO 4—Make deliberate and informed choices about when and how to use information	Fall 2016	In-Class Direct Assessment	Seven classes (ENG 101/102, BIOL 510, ENG 201) 110 students	85% satisfactory or above	64.4% satisfactory	The activity distinguishes between original research and review articles.	Revisit instruction in databases, clarifying their purposes and their limitations. Specifically, address the differences between databases, especially demonstrating searching across multiple databases. Focus on both similarities and

							differences of searching, identifying and practicing transferrable skills in library research.
	Spring 2017	Anonymized assignment papers	Two ENG 101 classes / 34 students		No quantified results	Students demonstrated understanding of variable values of databases, depending on both the discipline and the project. No discipline is exclusively siloed into one place; instead, a database can be used for a variety of projects.	Remove some databases from the A-Z list of databases (completed May 2017), as many students wrote about sites that were not truly databases (e.g. government websites). Clarify in instruction what a database is and how to use it.
SLO 5— Recognize the academic, legal, economic, and social factors in the production, access, and use of information	Fall 2016	In-Class Direct Assessment	Ten classes (ENG 101/102, ED 502, ENG 491, BIOL 510), 163 students	85% satisfactory or above	83.4% satisfactory	Students have a basic knowledge of plagiarism	Begin shifting questions and instruction on plagiarism and citation to the Writing Center.
	Spring 2017	In-Class Direct Assessment	One class (ENG 102), 21 students		81.0% satisfactory	Students have a basic knowledge of plagiarism	Modify instruction to specifically address the digital divide, open access, and paywalls.

Comments on part I:

PART II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this 2016-2017 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 1—Identify library services for study, research, and collaboration	Fall 2016, Spring 2017	b. Address Library of Congress system. Modify instruction content. New catalog may allow book records to show floor locations. Continue partnering with faculty to read student papers, and make changes based on emerging themes. Pull reference desk transactions to determine follow up interactions.	Introduced in some (though not all) sections of Composition classes. Focused instead on talking students through LC classification when accompanying them to find a book on upper floors. Continuing to read student papers (when available) to address necessary changes in library.	Continuing work on implementing floor locations for books in new catalog system.
SLO2 —Differentiate and employ various research tools and methods to address complex research questions	Fall 2016, Spring 2017	Introduce Google Scholar in English 101/102. Students will benefit from an earlier introduction and then can be reminded of it in upper level instruction.	Not introduced.	Planning activity for Composition classes that specifically uses Google Scholar in library instruction classes.
SLO 3—Develop and refine search strategies within appropriate information	Fall 2016, Spring 2017	With the composition curriculum change to writing across disciplines, it may be advantageous to visit classes multiple times during the	Yes	All librarians are contacting department chairs to elicit library instruction requests. Generally, instructors do not request multiple visits except in ENG 102 classes, where two visits are regularly requested.

retrieval systems to find meaningful results		various sections: Humanities/Social Science/Sciences/Professional to highlight specific sources. Have a full first session, then appropriate liaison librarians visit for 15-20 minutes. (Specifically addresses ENG 102)		The vision for each ENG 102 section to have a specific subject didn't pan out as expected. Combined with the variety in composition instruction across sections, the recommendations were untenable. Aiming instead to target introductory disciplinary classes (e.g., PSYCH 101).
SLO 4—Make deliberate and informed choices about when and how to use information	Fall 2016, Spring 2017	More discipline-specific activities can be developed for upper level courses.	Yes, with qualifications	Modified existing discipline-specific activities for additional upper-division classes, e.g., walking upper-division Biology students through the process of selecting a database for their individual projects, and identifying the benefits of using the same search terms across multiple databases.
SLO 5—Recognize the academic, legal, economic, and social factors in the production, access, and use of information	Fall 2016, Spring 2017	Create a hands on activity with scenario cards to generate group and class discussion of copyright and intellectual property issues.	No. Instead, we expanded discussion and visibility of Open Access as a manner of addressing intellectual property and access as factors in information use.	Posted signage on copiers indicating copyright code

Comments on part II: With three new librarians beginning in July 2016, Fall 2016 was the first semester in several years with a full slate of full-time librarians in the EROS division of the CSU-Pueblo library. When possible, we reused existing materials, though we incorporated Scholarly Communications into regular instruction, demonstrating it as an integral component of academic research (and to use the knowledge of the new Scholarly Communications librarian). Our plans for AY 2017-18 include a revamping of how we teach library research in Composition classes especially, instructing the concepts of library research rather than showing students how to practically complete an assignment. Additionally, we are introducing a Mastering Library Research course, for graduate students and undergraduates completing theses or other large-scale research projects.