Engaging Your Community through Assessment
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Our goal for this session ...

“We aim ‘to provide ingredients from which a meal can be created, Rather than to insist on cooking to a recipe’”

Knight cited in Wolf, 2007
Higher education: Turning up the heat ... 

- Bologna Agreement (EU)
- Council of Regional Accrediting Commissions (US)
- National Protocols (Australia)
- Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations - Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents (OCAV) – to be integrated into program review processes by June 2008

Hubball & Gold, 2007
Hubball, Gold, Mighty & Britnell, 2007
The ingredients ...

- Learning-centered curricula
- Constructivist pedagogical theory
- Evidence-based
- Curricular assessment and development framework
- Learning outcomes
- Quality assurance
- Performance indicators
- Action research methodology
- Scholarship of Curriculum Practice (SoCP)

Hubball & Gold, 2007
Wolf, 2007
Hubball, Gold, Mighty & Britnell, 2007
Hughes, 2007
What is it that we want as librarians?

- Explore instructional strategies and share the result

- Move from declarative and procedural knowledge to functioning knowledge (Biggs, 1999)

- Engage in research with faculty about our students

- Collaboratively develop curricula (expanding on the 4 commonplaces – Schwab, 1973, Reid, 2001)
Curricular assessment and development framework

Organizational Structure

Needs Assessment

Learning Context

Planning

Action Research

Process – Impact – Follow-up

Assessment – Programming

Hubball & Burt, cited in Hubball, Gold, Mighty & Britnell, 2007
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How can assessment help us achieve what we want?

- Classroom activity
- Disciplinary context
- Informed pedagogical practice
- Data as snapshot
- Benchmarking
- Standardized tools
- Dialogue with faculty

Embedded information literacy
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What is embedded IL?

Embedded
- Assignment(s) collaboratively developed with instructor. IL stated learning outcomes in instructor's course materials. Session by librarian may or may not have been delivered during class time (e.g., series of walk-in workshops)

Integrated
- Session content tailored to course assignment in consultation with instructor. Session may or may not have been delivered during class time (e.g., series of open workshops available to students). Session may or may not have been optional.

Supplemental
- Generic information literacy instruction; is not tied directly to course outcomes or an assignment. Session may or may not have been optional for students. Session may or may not have been delivered during class time.

ANZILL, p6 ANZIL Framework, 2004
ACRL, 2007
Learning Commons, University of Guelph, n.d.
Category 10: Assessment/Evaluation

Assessment/evaluation of information literacy includes program performance and student outcomes and:

for program evaluation:

• establishes the process of ongoing planning/improvement of the program;

• measures directly progress toward meeting the goals and objectives of the program;

• integrates with course and curriculum assessment as well as institutional evaluations and regional/professional accreditation initiatives; and

• assumes multiple methods and purposes for assessment/evaluation -- formative and summative -- short term and longitudinal;
Category 10: Assessment/Evaluation (cont’d)

Assessment/evaluation of information literacy includes program performance and student outcomes and:

for student outcomes:

• acknowledges differences in learning and teaching styles by using a variety of appropriate outcome measures, such as portfolio assessment, oral defense, quizzes, essays, direct observation, anecdotal, peer and self review, and experience;

• focuses on student performance, knowledge acquisition, and attitude appraisal;

• assesses both process and product;

• includes student-, peer-, and self-evaluation;
IL Program
Assessment/Evaluation

– Re-invention Center http://www.sunysb.edu/Reinventioncenter/
  • Inquiry based, discovery, problem-based, or research-based learning

– Student Engagement
  • NSSE http://nsse.iub.edu/

– Association of American Colleges & Universities
  • Greater Expectations: http://www.aacu-edu.org/gex/index.cfm

– OCAV
  • Undergraduate Degree Level Expectations Online at
    http://blog.uwinnipeg.ca/ilig/archives/Degree%20Level%20Expectations.OC
    AV.%20Jan30.06.doc
IL Program
Assessment/Evaluation

– Council of Ontario Universities
  www.cou.on.ca/content/objects/QPTF%20Report%20March%202006.pdf

– UT A&S Curriculum Review and Renewal

– Peer learning, aka peer assisted learning, supplemental instruction
  • http://www.peerlearning.ac.uk/
  • http://www.umkc.edu/cad/SI/index.htm
How are we teaching and who are we reaching?

- Reflective teaching practices
  - Teaching portfolios
  - Sharing with colleagues and course instructors
  - Evaluation and assessment
  - Student focus groups

- Inventory of outreach & teaching
  - How are you reaching students? How many?
    - Who are current campus partners?
    - Who are potential campus partners?
    - Who will keep these relationships going?
  - As a group where are you teaching?
    - Horizontally and vertically
UTML Instruction
Database (1)
 UTML Instruction Database (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Previous Instruction sessions</th>
<th>Unique Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Times</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Times</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five Times</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 of 55 enrolled students 51% have had previous instruction

Analysis of Participation by UTM Course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANT 100H5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANT 102H5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 110Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 110Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC 239Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGR 117Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 100Y5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSY 100Y5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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National standardized tools

- **iSkills™ (aka Information and Communication Technology (ICT) Literacy Assessment)** developed by the Educational Testing Service. $35.00 US per student. [http://www.ets.org/](http://www.ets.org/)
  Measures all 5 ACRL Standards. Two test options: Core and Advanced. Computerized, task-based assessment in which student complete several tasks of varying length, i.e., not multiple choice. Intended for individual and cohort testing. 75 minutes to complete.

- **Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS)** developed by Kent State University Library and Office of Assessment. It is also endorsed by the Association of Research Libraries. $3.00 US per student (capped at $2,000), but we can also administer ourselves for free. [https://www.projectsails.org/](https://www.projectsails.org/)
  Measures ACRL Standards 1, 2, 3, 5. Paper or Computerized, multiple-choice. Intended for cohort testing only. 45 questions, 35 minutes to complete.

- **Information Literacy Test (ITL)** developed by James Madison University (developed by JMU Libraries and Center for Assessment and Research Studies). [http://www.jmu.edu/icba/prodserv/instruments_ilt.htm](http://www.jmu.edu/icba/prodserv/instruments_ilt.htm)
  Measures ACRL Standards 1, 2, 3, 5. Computerized, multiple-choice. Intended for cohort and individual testing. 60 questions, 50 minutes to complete.

NPEC, 2005
Evaluating the Results

- The relationship between the Core and Advanced score ranges is not clear. Are the two tests on a continuous scale (e.g., with Core representing 100 – 300 and Advanced 400 – 700)?
- The University of Toronto Mississauga norms seem to be consistent with the norms from other institutions, and they all seem to be clustering in the middle.
- Though students received written feedback on their performance within each category, it is unclear how this feedback relates to their aggregate score and how it is derived from the students’ performance on the test (e.g., time taken to perform each task, number of clicks).
- It is unclear if students are being tested on the same variables within each category across all different versions of the test (e.g., the student reports suggest that some students were evaluated on different criteria in certain categories).
- The institution does not receive any granular statistical data (e.g., by performance within each category or by question), and only has access to individual student reports and the aggregate score for each student.
Student Outcomes
Assessment

Tools

• classroom assessment techniques (CATs)
• self-awareness inventory
• in-class pre-/post-assessments
• other examples:

**Types of Assessment**

**Formative Assessment:**
- “the results of which are used for feedback. Students and teachers both need to know how learning is proceeding. Feedback may operate both to improve the learning of individual students, and to improve teaching.”

**Summative Assessment:**
- “the results of which are used to grade students at the end of a unit, or to accredit at the end of a programme.”

Biggs, 1999
You are taking the Background Knowledge quiz containing 5 questions.

Please enter your e-mail before you take the quiz.

Email:

What is an article database?
Please limit your response to 200 characters.

Which article databases have you used before?
- Sociological Abstracts (CSA)
- ERIC (CSA)
- PsycINFO (CSA)
- MEDLINE (OVID)

Which article database do you use most frequently?
- Sociological Abstracts (CSA)
- ERIC (CSA)
After today's Writing Skills Lab on summarizing and paraphrasing HOW EFFECTIVE did you find the learning experience of

Writing a summary of a short academic passage?

- Very little
- Some
- Quite a bit
- Very Much
- Not applicable

Submit

Datasphere, UTM Dept. of Psychology
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online assessment technology</th>
<th>Method 1: Quiz Generator</th>
<th>Method 2: Datasphere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Data collection instrument, - number and type of questions</em></td>
<td>16 multiple choice questions including: demographic, information competency specific, and student perceptions</td>
<td>20 multiple choice questions that were information competency specific,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Time period</em></td>
<td>January – February 2005</td>
<td>February – March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Responses</em></td>
<td>73 responses</td>
<td>820 responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Class size</em></td>
<td>~ 350 students</td>
<td>~ 1300 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Participation rate</em></td>
<td>21% response rate</td>
<td>63% response rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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IL Assessment: Learning & Teaching Activities

2005 – 2007

• 18 assessments ~ 177 questions (14 related to learning activities and 4 teaching activities)
• Separated questions by category, level, topics assessed, performance
• Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome (SOLO) Taxonomy

Biggs, 1999
Further Exploration of Technologies:

**Blackboard:**
- Survey
- Quiz
- ePortfolio

**Classroom Response System (iClicker):**
- Background knowledge probe
- Instructor designed assessments
### Assessment: Some considerations (1)

#### Homegrown systems
- Investigate other options that are available first (e.g., FAST)
- Determine if you have the resources and support to implement and sustain
- Customization to local needs
- Local control over data (format, security)
- Design needs to be flexible enough to accommodate changes (e.g., website)
- Modular approach can help minimize integration problems with other systems (e.g., LMS)

#### Developed elsewhere
- Check if the assessment approach has an established community and research base
- May have limited customization potential
- May not meet local needs (e.g., granularity of data)
- Loss of control over data (Where is data stored? How is it backed up?)
- Is the system standards compliant? (Can you update, share, archive your assessments?)
What should technologies do?

- Minimize impact on Liaison Librarians’ and instructors’ valuable classroom time;
- Match the skills and needs of the Librarian, the students, and the faculty members involved;
- Protect the privacy of those providing information to the project partners;
- Facilitate streamlined collection, storage, and analysis of data;
What should technologies do (cont’d)?

- Align with current institutional technology infrastructure and resources;
- Adapt to the future assessment needs of other Librarians;
- Support interoperability through conformance with established standards;
- Provide flexibility for use in different online learning environments;
- Respect privacy and security of user info.
What do we need to do?

- Be aware of current university climate
- Clarify purpose of assessment
- Determine data that is needed
- Decide how the data will be used
What do we need to do (cont’d)?

• Identify your own resources to accomplish the tasks needed
• Collaborate with potential partners in terms of data collection, analysis, reporting
• Ensure you will have usable format(s) for final results
• Share questions, data, results
Thank you!

Questions?


Learning Commons, University of Guelph, (n.d.). Framework for the design and delivery of learning commons programs and services.


