Rachel Applegate, interim Executive Associate Dean, SLIS, and current Department Chair.
Assessment meeting: Jingfeng Xia, Hsin-Liang Chen, Marilyn Irwin, Barbara Albee, Annette Lamb, Andrea Copeland. (all fulltime faculty).

Process
Context:
- The School of Library and Information Science administers a single program/degree: the Masters of Library Science (MLS). This is an accredited degree of the core School at Bloomington and Indianapolis.
- The MLS degree has 7 specific program outcomes. The program outcomes are named in the data framework below (appendix). (What general outcome are you seeking?)
- Currently, PGPLs are present in concept but are not separately articulated. Because the MLS program goals and objectives are shared with Bloomington, PGPLs will be incorporated into IUPUI-based syllabi, not the goals themselves.
- As of July 1, 2014, the School is a part of the School of Informatics and Computing (a core school), and this unit is the Department of Library and Information Science. We remain accountable for planning and assessment to our professional accreditors (American Library Association, Committee on Accreditation).

2012-2013
- Current assessment requires all students to complete an **electronic portfolio** within which there is a cell representing each program outcome. Students deposit **artifacts** within the cells, and complete a brief reflection on how the artifacts address the outcomes.
- Artifacts are existing coursework, from basic or advanced courses.
- This requirement has applied only to students matriculating from Fall 2011 on. *Only 3 students fell under the requirement AND graduated by Spring 2013.*
- How will you help students learn the goals? There are core/required courses for 5 of the 7 outcomes; 2 are more general in nature. Electives also address these areas at a more advanced level.
- How could you measure: Each faculty member reviewed all artifacts in 2 or 3 areas according to this numeric scale, and made qualitative notes.
  1-Omitted parts of the goal
  2-Included all parts but with poor quality
  3-Included all parts at the level of an introductory course
  4-Showed exceptional creativity and/or advanced knowledge.

- All artifacts were reviewed from all (3) qualifying students, for all program outcomes. In future years with greater volume, random sampling and more selectivity among outcomes will replace looking at all data.
- <u>How would you know i</u>t: All full time faculty (7) have MLS degrees and professional experience, were part of the most recent revision of goal wording, and can recognize the substance and quality needed. Individual faculty are responsible for some area/s but all areas were also reviewed by faculty who do not teach in those areas.

Assessment Findings

The appendix shows data for each outcome in the order of the program. Scale is 1 (worst/deficient) to 4 (excellent/advanced).

Process problem: It was difficult to access student reflections along with the artifacts. The matrix design needs to be adjusted and some evaluation processes improved.

Faculty discussed raw data and their overall impressions.
- All artifacts seemed to be done at an acceptable level of quality.
- Overall, program goals are being achieved, although there are few items representing advanced work.
- Low scores (1) primarily reflected the person not addressing all of the sub-topics in a particular program outcome. *Assist and Educate Users* was the weakest in this regard: "Educate" was poorly represented.

Improvements made / Actions taken

Process: We will explore ways to improve matrix design for evaluation, particularly in the reflection part, to assist students in understanding the relation between goals and demonstration of evidence, and faculty evaluators.

Curriculum/program:
- The instructor for the core course for the Assist and Educate Users requirement (S501) will emphasize the importance of *all* of the outcome, and suggest ways in which "educate" can be represented by S501 work. Faculty in more advanced courses will also draw connections between coursework and program outcomes.
- Based on this data, as well as an alumni survey, faculty (particularly Annette Lamb) have designed a mapping exercise to document where some key information retrieval and technical competencies are introduced, reinforced, and mastered within our prerequisite skills course, core courses, and advanced electives. (Information retrieval, both as a professional skill and as something taught, is important to "Assist and Educate Users."). In future years, faculty will more consciously coordinate sequences of prerequisite, core and advanced courses in other areas as well.
- The department's strategic plan (in preparation, fall 2013), includes review of program outcomes and core course requirements, based upon assessment

data, published research, input from surveys of students, alumni, and employers, and faculty content expertise and professional community connections.

Appendix A: Findings / raw data

Assist and Educate Users (4 reviewers): *2.69 average*
A, 3, OK but needed to connect practice to theory B, 3, OK but had space for improvement in project design C, 3, OK but needed to pay attention to presentation style OVERALL: 3
A, 3. Reasonable; creative use of advocacy presentation to address "assist." Light on 'educate.' B, 3.5 Pathfinder: Creative idea, nice introduction with some wording problems (awkward or incorrect grammar). Thorough and user-centered. C, 3. Nice thoughtful examination of reference work. (and she was correct that the librarian got an answer wrong!) Overall: 3.12
A, 4, Assist & Educate, effective reference observation and interview (score 4); while her PowerPoint demonstrated a good grasp of knowledge but could be presented in a more interesting way (score 3). B, s 4, Assist & Educate, she submitted six items, only a few really dealt directly with this category; excellent paper on traditional literature, presentation on OPAC use, and reference work (score 4); however, her book review and biographical sketch were less effective (score 3). C,   3, Assist & Educate, basic reference observation and interview Overall: 3.66
A,: 1: Analyze and identify divers needs at an introductory level; no evidence to support educating library users; limited analysis of information systems or services, interview observation paper only reports but does not add insightful analysis B, : 1: Pathfinder and PP on Evergreen provide exceptional illustration of the goal educate library users. The Image Search assignment provides an adequate illustration of information systems analysis. No evidence is provided for Identifying and analyzing diverse community of users' needs. C, : 1: The interview/observation paper illustrates an introductory knowledge of analyze and evaluation information systems and services. However, no evidence is provided to support educate users or analyze or identify information needs of diverse communities. Overall: 1

Represent and Organize Information Resources (2): *3.0 average*
A,, Represent & Organize, I determined her to be a 3 (since this is an introductory course), she included 3 exemplars from S504. One is a bit confusing because it was not one of my assignments but a PowerPoint she created with another student. At

first I thought it might be from S503, but it has S504 Cataloging in the opening title page.
B, s, Represent & Organize, 3, final project chosen as ePort entry. It reflects culmination of entire course work in S504.
C, , Represent & Organize, 3, final project chosen as ePort entry. It reflects culmination of entire course work in S504.
OVERALL: 3

A,: 3, all parts at the level of an introductory course and the reflection was clear.
B, s: 1, the attachment is MARC records and no reflection.
C, : 2, the attachment is 5 MARC records and her reflection was clear.
OVERALL: 3

Develop and Manage Collections of Information Resources (3): *3.2*

A,, Develop & Manage, 3 (since this is an introductory course). The entry is an assignment that Drs. Preer and Irwin have used as a final project, an overall collection development policy for a library of the student's choice, incorporating all topics covered in the class.
B, s, Develop & Manage, 3 (Natalie included two entries from a somewhat related course - Readers Advisory) in addition to the S502 final project.)
C, , Develop & Manage, 3 (since this is an introductory course). The entry is an assignment that Drs. Preer and Irwin have used as a final project, an overall collection development policy for a library of the student's choice, incorporating all topics covered in the class.
OVERALL: 3

A,: 3, OK but needed to pay attention to presentation style
B, : 4, Great in meeting program goals
C, : 4: Great in meeting program goals
OVERALL: 3.6

A,: 3: Included all parts for an introductory course- comprehensive in approach but little creative or critical thinking illustrated.
B, : 3: Included all parts for an introductory course- comprehensive in approach but little creative or critical thinking illustrated.
C, : Included all parts for an introductory course- comprehensive in approach but little creative or critical thinking illustrated.
Overall: 3

Use Research Effectively (3): *2.75*

A,: 4: Solid research design (although maybe a bit ambitious) with lit review to support
B, : 3: Evidence presented included all parts, but nothing exceptional
C, : 4: Solid research design (although maybe a bit ambitious) with lit review to support
Overall: 3.66

A,: 3, OK but needed to strengthen research design, e.g. handling of IRB
B, : 3, OK but better to narrow down research topics

C, : 3, OK, but needed to highlight research goals. OVERALL: 3
A,: 2, the attachment is a research report and her reflection was clear. B, s: 1, two attachments and no reflection. C, : 2, 1 attachment from S506 and her reflection was clear. OVERALL: 1.6

Manage and Lead Libraries and Other Information Organizations (4): *3.34*
A,: 3.0. Some parts good, others more descriptive than analytical. Need to emphasize their critical thinking about what they observe. B, s: 3.0. Collection evaluation proposal. At first seemed narrow, but it carefully included all relevant managerial aspects of the project (including purpose, procedure, importance). C, : 4.0 Three forum posts, discussing with reference to literature, controversial topics in library leadership. Overall: 3.33
A, 4, Manage & Lead, excellent library board meeting description, leader interview, and disaster preparedness proposal B, s 3, Manage & Lead, effective resource evaluation plan C, 3, Manage & Lead, it would be useful to have the questions under consideration in order to evaluate these forum postings. Overall: 3.33
A,: 3: Included all parts for an introductory course- comprehensive in approach but little creative or critical thinking illustrated. B, : 3: Included all parts for an introductory course- comprehensive in approach but little creative or critical thinking illustrated. C, : Included all parts for an introductory course- comprehensive in approach but little creative or critical thinking illustrated. OVERALL: 3
A,: 3: Disaster plan is exceptional and illustrates the three aspects of this goal. However, the other two documents, simply reported events rather and included no reflection or synthesis with her own ideas. B, : 4: Illustrates all aspects of the goal with insight and creative thinking. C, : 4: Illustrates all aspects of the goal with reflection and critical thinking. Overall: 3.7

Deploy Information Technologies In Effective and Innovative Ways (3): *3.57*
A,, Deploy Information, 4, entry is of a project which involved writing up experiences from student immersion into a current ILS to perform various library processes. **B, s**, Deploy Information, 4, entries includes links to student assignments created in S533 such as a blog and a Webliography exposing student to current technology. **C,** , Deploy Information, 4, entry involves technology evaluation, the technology – eReaders at a real life library setting.

OVERALL: 4
A,: 4: Glog was cool. Interview demonstrated evaluation. B, : 3: Blog and website development; introductory evidence of evaluation C, : 4: Technology used to develop PowerPoint presentation evaluating eReader devices; solid evidence presented.
OVERALL: 3.7
A,: 3, no reflection, Library Systems class assignments, submission#2 is not suitable. The other 2 submissions are fine. B, s: 3, documentation should be better. Instead of zipped files, a project description is a better alternative. C, : 3, S553 class assignment, basic skills. OVERALL: 3 (except process errors, lack of reflection)

Approach Professional Issues with Understanding (3): *3.33*
A,: 4: Strong ethical references; intellectual freedom & patron confidentiality addressed; funding, digital divide, aging population, literacy, disabilities, multiculturalism; Quotes article on future of public libraries; offers nontraditional use options B, : 3: Evidence presented included all parts, but nothing exceptional. C, : 1 and 3: 1-Lacking evidence on political, ethical, and legal aspects; for 'anticipate emerging trends,' 3: Evidence presented included all parts, but nothing exceptional Overall: 3.3
A,: 3. (Perspectives, essay on future). Thorough review of important ethical issues. Appearance of a laundry list; not much location-specific critical application. B, s: 3.5 (Special topics paper on reader's advisory. Advocacy about NYPL restructuring. Advocacy piece on increasing awareness of a special collection <would have been good for management area>). All show a pervasive user-orientation and systematic review of issues involved. C, : 3. Reasonable descriptions of resources and the future of libraries. Overall: 3.33
A, 4, Approach Prof Issues, nice use of professional references, incorporation of examples, and integration of key library issues. Professionally presented in the form of a speech. B, s 3, Approach Prof Issues, effective plan for marketing and advocacy statement C, 3, Approach Prof Issues, addresses professional issues on a surface level. Overall: 3.33

Process comments:
Chen: .   A web site project should include a text file describing that project with key screen shots.
2.   The web site itself does not provide sufficient learning information unless the student elaborates the experience in the reflection.
3.   Don't attach a word file with a URL. Too redundant.

4.   Several students do not include a reflection in the submission.

Lamb:
I find that more is not better. I recommend that students only include their best work in each category.
I'm concerned that the submissions don't contain a reflection that describe WHY they included the item in the portfolio and WHY they thought it reflected the category.