

**Annual Program Assessment Report  
Report Year 2018-19 | Submitted Fall 2019**

**SECTION 1: PROGRAM INFORMATION**

**Program Name** (from the assessment plan): Kathryn A. Martin Library

**Program Assessment Liaison (PAL):** Kim Pittman

**PAL Email:** kpittman@d.umn.edu

**Department Head or Director:** Matt Rosendahl

**Program Type** (mark one):

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Academic Affairs Co-Curricular</b> | <input type="checkbox"/> Student Life Co-Curricular |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CEHSP Undergraduate                              | <input type="checkbox"/> CEHSP Graduate             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CLA Undergraduate                                | <input type="checkbox"/> CLA Graduate               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> LSBE Undergraduate                               | <input type="checkbox"/> LSBE Graduate              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SCSE Undergraduate                               | <input type="checkbox"/> SCSE Graduate              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> SFA Undergraduate                                | <input type="checkbox"/> SFA Graduate               |

\*\*\*\*\*

**Website(s) where Program Learning Outcomes are publicly available:**

<https://lib.d.umn.edu/about/assessment>

<https://lib.d.umn.edu/research-collections/library-instruction>

**Other materials in which the program ensures Program Learning Outcomes are communicated:**

\*\*\*\*\*

**SECTION 2: PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES REPORTED**

*Copy and paste the box of items below for each program learning outcome reported for the year.*

**1. Program Learning Outcome** (number and statement from assessment plan):

LIB 2: Students will evaluate sources based on information need and the context in which the information will be used.

**2. UMD SLO/GLGC primary alignment** (number from assessment plan): SLO 3

**3. Brief description of the assessment measure(s):**

Librarians collected annotated bibliographies from four sections of WRIT 1120: College Writing and seven sections of Advanced Writing, including three sections of WRIT 3140: Advanced Writing - Human Services, two sections of WRIT 3160: Advanced Writing - Social Sciences, and one section each of WRIT 3130: Advanced Writing - Engineering and WRIT 3150: Advanced Writing - Science. Bibliographies were scored using the Criteria and Source Types domains of a rubric (see Appendix A). A rubric score of two or higher was considered proficient.

**4. Data and results summary:**

Total number assessed: 99

Number meeting satisfactory performance: 72

See Appendix B for detailed results.

**5. Interpretations of results**, including the comparison(s) to the performance indicator(s) stated on the assessment plan as well as changes in student performance since the previous report for the learning outcome and program's attributions for the change:

Overall, the percentage proficient for this outcome was slightly below our performance indicator of 75%, dropping from 77.4% in 2016-17 to 74.7% in 2018-19 for the criteria rubric domain and from 79.3% in 2016-17 to 72.6% proficient in 2018-19 for the source types domain. This year's data is likely a more accurate gauge of student performance than the data from 2016-17, because the 2018-19 sample size was larger (99 total bibliographies compared to 53), and included work from students in WRIT 1120: College Writing and a greater variety of WRIT 31XX: Advanced Writing sections.

While the overall percentage of proficient work decreased slightly, average scores were comparable to the previous report on this outcome. Compared to our 2016-17 data, a greater number of bibliographies were scored at the advanced level (11.1% compared to 7.5% for criteria, and 9% compared to 3.7% for source types). This increase in bibliographies scored at the advanced level was accompanied by an even larger increase in bibliographies scored at the beginner level, resulting in a slightly lower overall proficiency rate. While it is possible that some of these scoring differences can be accounted for by differences in the way the rubric was interpreted and applied, scoring was completed by the same set of librarians as in 2016-17, using the same rubric and norming process.

Overall, student work from WRIT 1120 demonstrated a higher proficiency level than work from WRIT 31XX for both the criteria and source type domains of the rubric. This trend of higher performance in WRIT 1120 has appeared in assessment results for multiple information literacy student learning outcomes. One explanation for this difference in performance is that students in WRIT 1120 participate in two-five research-focused sessions per semester, while WRIT 31XX students may only participate in one research session. The challenge of transferring source evaluation skills from a foundational course to a more advanced discipline-specific context may also account for this performance difference.

**6. Recommendations for improvement as informed by the assessment data:**

The data suggests a need for greater focus on source evaluation in both required writing courses, particularly WRIT 31XX. I have already held discussions about this need with Avesa Rockwell, the current Writing Program Administrator. She and I will co-facilitate a workshop on teaching source evaluation for writing instructors in spring 2020 and hold related discussions at Writing Program Committee meetings. Currently, writing instructors teach a variety of source evaluation models and guidelines in their courses. These approaches are not equally effective, and some do not align with librarians' current approach or current information literacy trends. The goal of the workshop and discussions will be to identify a source evaluation model that can be introduced by librarians and reinforced by writing instructors in both WRIT 1120 and 31XX, providing a consistent approach to addressing this important topic. While scoring this year's work, librarians collected examples of both exemplary work and student misconceptions that can be shared with instructors. We can share these examples with students in future instruction sessions and use them to inform our discussions with writing instructors.

This process also helped us identify improvements for this outcome's assessment practices. Based on instructor request, librarians focus on source evaluation in some library sessions, but spend less time on it in others. When we assess this outcome in the future, we will ensure that

writing instructors who request a source evaluation session agree to share their annotated bibliographies with us. We can score these bibliographies separately from bibliographies from other course sections in order to gauge how additional instruction impacts student learning. In order to increase our overall sample size, I will work with Avesa to share additional, strategically-timed reminders with writing instructors about sharing student work with us.

####

**1. Program Learning Outcome** (number and statement from assessment plan):

LIB 3: Students will identify multiple perspectives on a research topic

**2. UMD SLO/GLGC primary alignment** (number from assessment plan): SLO 3

**3. Brief description of the assessment measure(s):**

Librarians collected annotated bibliographies from four sections of WRIT 1120: College Writing and seven sections of Advanced Writing, including three sections of WRIT 3140: Advanced Writing - Human Services, two sections of WRIT 3160: Advanced Writing - Social Sciences, and one section each of WRIT 3130: Advanced Writing - Engineering and WRIT 3150: Advanced Writing - Science. Bibliographies were scored using the Multiple Perspectives domain of a rubric (see Appendix A). A rubric score of two or higher was considered proficient.

**4. Data and results summary:**

Total number assessed: 80

Number meeting satisfactory performance: 76

See Appendix B for detailed results.

**5. Interpretations of results**, including the comparison(s) to the performance indicator(s) stated on the assessment plan as well as changes in student performance since the previous report for the learning outcome and program's attributions for the change:

Performance for this outcome exceeded our performance indicator and was significantly higher this year than when last assessed in 2016-17 (95% proficient overall compared to 81.13%). Student work from WRIT 31XX demonstrated a higher proficiency level than work from WRIT 1120, with a higher percentage of 31XX work scored at the "Advanced" level of the rubric. This year's sample was larger than in 2016-17 (80 bibliographies compared to 53), and included work from students in WRIT 1120: College Writing and a greater variety of WRIT 31XX: Advanced Writing sections. While it is possible that some of the difference in scores can be accounted for by differences in the way the rubric was interpreted and applied, scoring was completed by the same set of librarians as in 2016-17, using the same rubric and norming process.

**6. Recommendations for improvement as informed by the assessment data:**

This data demonstrates a high level of proficiency for this outcome, indicating that no improvements are currently needed.

####

\*\*\*\*\*

### **SECTION 3: ASSESSMENT PROCESSES AND SUMMARY**

*Provide responses to these items collectively for the year's assessment work.*

#### **Description of the Faculty and/or Staff Assessment Review Process:**

A working group of three librarians normed the rubric together over a series of four meetings. Results will be shared and discussed at a meeting of the library's Research & Learning Team on October 2. Results will also be presented and discussed at a library all-staff meeting.

#### **Input/Involvement of Students, Other Stakeholders, and External Sources in Assessment Activities:**

Assessment outcomes, measures, and results are shared and discussed with writing instructors at meetings of the English, Linguistics, & Writing Studies Writing Program Committee. Learning outcomes and assessment reports are publicly available on the library website. Learning outcomes and rubrics were developed based on the [Association of College & Research Libraries Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education](#).

#### **Overall Assessment Summary and Action Plan** (include resources and timeline as applicable):

While these results reflect an encouraging level of performance for outcome LIB 3, the data supports a need for greater emphasis on teaching source evaluation in both required writing classes, particularly WRIT 31XX. Librarians will partner with writing instructors in 2019-20 in order to identify an effective source evaluation model that can be shared with students in both writing classes, allowing librarians and writing instructors to take a consistent approach to this topic. In order to assess these outcomes more effectively, librarians will ensure that writing instructors who request a source evaluation session agree to share their annotated bibliographies with us.

#### **Appendix A: Source Evaluation Rubric**

	<b>Beginner (1)</b>	<b>Developing/Proficient (2)</b>	<b>Advanced (3)</b>
<b>Criteria</b>	Does not apply evaluative criteria or applies criteria that is not relevant	Performs surface-level evaluation, such as relying on basic indicators of authority, including type of publication or author credentials, without asking critical questions or considering context of current information need	Moves beyond surface-level evaluation, consistently critically evaluating source's origins, evidence, context, or suitability for current information need.
<b>Multiple Perspectives</b>	Identifies sources that reflect one perspective	Identifies sources that reflect multiple perspectives on their research topic, but omits some perspectives that could strengthen or inform argument	Identifies sources that reflect a nearly comprehensive range of significant perspectives on their research topic
<b>Source Types</b>	Relies on one type of source, omitting source types that could strengthen or inform argument	Identifies multiple types of sources, but omits some types of sources that could strengthen or inform argument	Identifies a variety of source types that strengthen or inform argument

## Appendix B: Detailed Results

**LIB 2:** *Students will evaluate sources based on information need and the context in which the information will be used.*

	<b>WRIT 1120 - average score</b>	<b>WRIT 31XX - average score</b>	<b>All - average score (2018-19)</b>	<b>All - average score (2016-17)</b>
<b>Criteria</b>	1.93	1.83	1.87	1.87
<b>Source Types</b>	1.85	1.81	1.83	1.85

	<b>WRIT 1120 - % proficient</b>	<b>WRIT 31XX - % proficient</b>	<b>All - % proficient (2018-19)</b>	<b>All - % proficient (2016-17)</b>
<b>Criteria</b>	85%	69%	74.7%	77.4%
<b>Source Types</b>	75%	72.4%	72.6%	79.3%

Criteria

	<b>Score = 1</b>	<b>Score = 2</b>	<b>Score = 3</b>
<b>1120</b>	15%	77.5%	7.5%
<b>31XX</b>	31%	55.2%	13.8%
<b>All</b>	24.2%	63.6%	11.1%

Source Types

	<b>Score = 1</b>	<b>Score = 2</b>	<b>Score = 3</b>
<b>1120</b>	25%	65%	10%
<b>31XX</b>	27.6%	63.8%	8.6%
<b>All</b>	26.2%	63.6%	9%

**LIB 3:** *Students will identify multiple perspectives on a research topic.*

<b>WRIT 1120 - average score</b>	<b>WRIT 31XX - average score</b>	<b>All - average score (2018-19)</b>	<b>All - average score (2016-17)</b>
1.9	2.14	2.08	1.83

<b>WRIT 1120 - % proficient</b>	<b>WRIT 31XX - % proficient</b>	<b>All - % proficient (2018-19)</b>	<b>All - % proficient (2016-17)</b>
86.4%	98.3%	95%	81.1%

	<b>Score = 1</b>	<b>Score = 2</b>	<b>Score = 3</b>
<b>1120</b>	13.6%	81.8%	4.5%
<b>31XX</b>	1.7%	82.8%	15.5%
<b>All</b>	5%	82.5%	12.5%