2018 – 2019/2019 – 2020 General Education Executive Summary

Department: Library   **Date:** 5/5/2020
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Billy Moore
General Education Assessment Plan: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology

Analysis of artifacts:

1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*

Data was analyzed by collecting the quizzes produced by the module. We examined how students answered each question, and whether they got them correct or not. We then observed whethere the student did better on any subsequent viewings, or if they even attempted a second time, as it was not required, but was encouraged. At first the results were tied to a grade in the grade book (5 points) but we have removed that process. There was no rubric as the material was covered in video, and presented in a T/F or multiple choice question with one correct answer. Our hope was that all students would achieve 5/5 scores within one or two viewings, of both videos.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):

Will the students retain literacy skills and concepts if presented in a manner that is easy to follow, with high quality tools?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.

One of the videos clearly had higher grades than the other. We will be looking at the mode of delivery through an app called EdPuzzle. We are rewriting the 2nd video since we can see due to time stamps that it wasn't an issue with the mode of presentation, but maybe a combination of questions and content. Questions 1 and 4 of video two were almost universally missed, so retooling those questions will be in order.

3). INTERPRETATION - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

Because we boiled the content down to the minimum understanding required to function, and immediately asked pertinent questions, the goal was to instill in the students the core concepts needed to move forward with their level of literacy in this area. The results would indicate that they are now at least aware of how to get to materials, indicating a high level of literacy in that specific area. Continuing that literacy will come throughout their chosen program, and reusing these skills over and over.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) The second module appears to not have been met with as much understanding, which is still required for the level of literacy we are aiming for in these modules, so retooling the questions to more accurately point to our desired learning outcomes is necessary.

Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date*: 4/29/20

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Results were shared between the NSO course writer and the Instructional Librarian.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Peter Landrey – NSO course Writer, Billy Moore – Reference and Instruction Librarian

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. ACTION- How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:*

  a. Teaching: It's key that we encourage and continue modules such as these, and that tools like EdPuzzle can combine instructional content, assessment, and data retrieval in a quick manner. Especially in an online, flipped classroom setting asynchronous technological tools like this can be vital to reaching the most students in a way that is engaging and worth while.

  b. *Assignment/course*: New Student Orientation (NSO) and it's undergraduate counterpart First-Year Experience (FYE) are the perfect areas to provide these materials. For credit/points is suggested to get the most feedback, and engagement.

  c. *Program:* All programs should have a base library/information literacy and these tools, once reconfigured sould be made available across our content management system, for first-time users or refresh.

  d. *Assessment:* Continually checking information and data will allow for better written assessment tools, but keeping the questions to a minimum and the format similar should help with engagement and information literacy. The questions as they stand, help reinforce the primary concepts that should be understood. Better written questions can have a larger impact.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* The impact is that the quality of work and comfortability of students at the graduate level rise on all accounts. Another major impact is that there will be a level of understanding that was previously not there, which will help in instructional contact between the course instructor and library staff. A student will have prior-knowledge of basic functions of library services, and will not need to be instructed from ground level up, but can be engaged at a higher level of discourse.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the* **ACTION*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). Because all these materials are made in-house and free, the budget is unaffected. The only paid aspect is the app we use called EdPuzzle, but that is actually paid for by two separate departments for their own means, and is provided as an institutional tool, so it does not impact the library budget in any way.

If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.

What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? The biggest thing would be to assess other areas of library literacy that could be discussed or taught. We would also try and push into a couple classes with online modules, and then compare that with in-person instruction of the same/similar courses. As we look to push various undergrad classes into an online context, this might be the perfect time to assess online-content development and best practice moving forward.

Submitted by: Billy Moore   **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 7/15/2020

Department Director notified – approval/additional action needed:7/15/2020

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na