

ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT

2010-2011

The planning and implementation of program-based assessment at Washburn University is guided by the goal to be able to answer four fundamental questions

- 1) What are we trying to do in terms of student learning?
- 2) How well are we doing?
- 3) Using the answers to questions 1 and 2, how can we improve?
- 4) How are we sharing the knowledge gained with our constituents?

Program student learning objectives are measurable and characterize what we want our students to know, to think and care about, or to be able to do.

Program assessment plans have been developed to include both direct (students demonstrate) and indirect (students or other reflect) measures. To the extent possible, the learning objectives have been linked to the appropriate curriculum (see Matrix of SLOs), and an assessment cycle has been established.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Based on the nature of the curriculum, departments may have multiple annual reports

MISSION (Student learning outcomes should be consistent with department/mission statement)

The Washburn University Libraries are teaching libraries, dedicated to student success and the development of a learning community which effectively, efficiently, and ethically uses information in the 21st century.

Major/Specialization/Concentration Being Assessed

Information Literacy

Assessment Period Covered by this Report

July 2010 – June 2011

SUMMARY

Learning outcomes are assessed using pretests, posttests, and final projects aligned with the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education.

Pretest and posttest questions are reviewed annually and revised as needed based upon assessment results. The same pre/post test questions assessing information literacy will be used in IS 170 (Library Research Strategies) and IS 110 (The Washburn Experience) in Fall 2011.

Submitted by (Kelley A. Weber, Assessment Librarian)

(June 30, 2011)

OUTCOME 1 (State Student Learning Outcome)

The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed.

Outcome 1a: Means of Assessment & Criteria for Success

Outcome 1 was assessed in questions 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 16, and 20 on the 20-question pre/post-test given across 11 sections of **IS-170** in Fall 2010 and five sections in Spring 2011. In **IS-110**, outcome 1 was assessed in questions 2, 4, & 5 on the 24-question pre/post-test given across three sections in Fall 2010. We use a different pre/post-test for IS-110 classes, one that also assesses computer literacy and student success, so there are fewer information literacy questions. The goal is an increase in the percentage correct for each question as well as a percentage rate of 70+% in the overall average of the post-test. In addition, outcome 1 is assessed by the final grades for the course. The goal is to have 70+% of students pass the course with a grade of C or better.

Outcome 1b: Assessment Results

A summary chart of the assessment averages for the pre/post-test, and the final grades across learning outcomes 1, 2, 3 & 5 is attached (learning outcome 4 is assessed through the final project and is detailed separately).

In Fall 2010 **IS-170** classes, the overall averages for the pre/post test scores for outcome 1 rose from 57.2% on the pre-test to 71.2% on the post-test (+14%); in Spring IS-170 classes, the overall average rose from 63.1% on the pre-test to 75.5% on the post-test (+12.4%), for an average for the school year on the post-test of 73.4% - exceeding our 70% benchmark. In addition, 79.9% of IS-170 students in Fall 2010 received a grade of C or better, and 71.1% of IS-170 students in Spring 2011 received a grade of C or better, for an annual average of 75.5%, above our benchmark.

In Fall **IS-110** classes, the overall average for the pre/post test scores for outcome 1 rose from 58.6% on the pre-test to 71.4% on the post-test, an increase of 12.8%. 76.8% of IS-110 students received a grade of C or better. Both assessments exceed our benchmarks. IS-110 classes were not taught in Spring 2011.

Outcome 1c: Use of Results

While the overall average for outcome 1 did go up on the post-test, we did notice two questions for IS-170 that had lower averages on the post-test for one of the two semesters. Although statistically insignificant, question 16 had lower post-test scores in the Fall, and question 5 had a lower post-test score in the Spring. The scores improved when averaged over the entire academic year, but this fluctuation indicates that we should keep an eye on these questions to see if they need to be revised in the future and if we are adequately teaching the concept.

We also noticed that the IS-170 pre/post-test questions are not evenly distributed among the four learning outcomes assessed. Questions assessing learning outcome 1 account for 40%; questions assessing learning outcome 2 account for 40%; questions assessing learning outcome 3 account for 20%; and, questions assessing learning outcome 5 account for 10% (some questions assess more than one learning outcome). We believe that learning outcomes 1 & 2 are the most important for freshmen students, but we plan to more closely evaluate the distribution to ensure we are accurately assessing what is being taught in the classroom.

Outcome 1d: Mechanisms for Sharing Results

The pre/post-tests are given electronically via the Angel Learning Management System and tied to the gradebook so instructors can confirm that each student showed an improvement from pre-test to post-test. The Assistant Dean of Libraries collects the pre/post-test reports generated by Angel each semester and tabulates them into a spreadsheet. She looks for patterns of success for each instructor. The spreadsheet is then shared with all teaching librarians without reference to individual names of instructors. The Assessment Librarian calculates the averages for each question and for each learning outcome. This is also shared with all teaching librarians. The teaching librarians meet once a week during the summer months to discuss these assessments. During Summer 2011 we are evaluating the pre/post-test questions for wording and distribution across outcomes 1, 2, 3, & 5.

Mabee Library has a webpage on Strategic Planning that includes assessment reports.

OUTCOME 2 (State Student Learning Outcome)

The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.

Outcome 2a: Means of Assessment & Criteria for Success

Outcome 2 was assessed in questions 1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 18 on the 20-question pre/post-test given across 11 sections of IS-170 in Fall 2010 and five sections in Spring 2011. In IS-110, outcome 2 was assessed in question 23 on the 24-question pre-test and post-test given across three sections in Fall 2010 (again, there are fewer information literacy assessment questions in the IS-110 pre/post-test). The goal is an increase in the percentage correct for each question as well as a percentage rate of 70+% in the overall average of the post-test. In addition, outcome 2 is assessed by the final grades for the course. The goal is to have 70+% of students pass the course with a grade of C or better.

Outcome 2b: Assessment Results

A summary chart of the assessment averages for the pre/post-test, and the final grades across learning outcomes 1, 2, 3 & 5 is attached (learning outcome 4 is assessed through the final project and is detailed separately).

In Fall **IS-170** classes, the overall averages for the pre/post test scores for outcome 2 rose from 53.0% on the pre-test to 70.0% on the post-test (+17%); in Spring IS-170 classes, the overall average rose from 57.5% on the pre-test to 79.3% on the post-test (+21.8%), for an average for the school year on the post-test of 74.7% - exceeding our 70% benchmark. In addition, 79.9% of IS-170 students in Fall 2010 received a grade of C or better, and 71.1% of IS-170 students in Spring 2011 received a grade of C or better, for an annual average of 75.5%, above our benchmark.

For Fall **IS-110** classes, the overall average for the pre/post test scores for outcome 2 rose from 13.9% on the pre-test to 55.5%. While this doesn't reach our 70+% benchmark, it does represent an increase of 21.5%, a significant jump. 76.8% of IS-110 students received a grade of C or better. Both assessments exceed our benchmarks. IS-110 classes were not taught in Spring 2011.

Outcome 2c: Use of Results

While the overall average for outcome 2 did go up on the post-test, we noticed question 13 had a lower average on the post-test for the Fall semester - a significant drop from 84.9% to 79.7% (-5.2%). The score for this question improved when averaged over the entire academic year, but this fluctuation indicates that we need to revise this question and make sure we are adequately teaching the concept.

Outcome 2d: Mechanisms for Sharing Results

See comments for Outcome 1d.

OUTCOME 3 (State Student Learning Outcome)

The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.

Outcome 3a: Means of Assessment & Criteria for Success

Outcome 3 was assessed in questions 4, 13, 15, and 19 on the 20-question pre/post-test given across 11 sections of IS-170 in Fall 2010 and five sections in Spring 2011. In IS-110, outcome 3 was assessed in questions 3, 7, 13, 22, and 24 on the 24-question pre/post-test given across three sections in Fall 2010 (again, there are fewer information literacy assessment questions in the IS-110 pre/post-test). The goal is an increase in the percentage correct for each question as well as a percentage rate of 70+% in the overall average of the post-test. In addition, outcome 3 is assessed by the final grades for the course. The goal is to have 70+% of students pass the course with a grade of C or better.

Outcome 3b: Assessment Results

A summary chart of the assessment averages for the pre/post-test, and the final grades across learning outcomes 1, 2, 3 & 5 is attached (learning outcome 4 is assessed through the final project and is detailed separately).

In Fall **IS-170** classes, the overall averages for the pre/post test scores for outcome 3 rose from 70.4% on the pre-test to 81.2% on the post-test (+10.9%); in Spring IS-170 classes, the overall average rose from 76.6% on the pre-test to 91.1% on the post-test (+14.5%), for an average for the school year on the post-test of 86.15% - exceeding our 70% benchmark. In addition, 79.9% of IS-170 students in Fall 2010 received a grade of C or better, and 71.1% of IS-170 students in Spring 2011 received a grade of C or better, for an annual average of 75.5%, above our benchmark.

In Fall **IS-110** classes, the overall average for the pre/post test scores for outcome 3 rose from 61.3% on the pre-test to 77.5% (+20.2%), a significant jump. 76.8% of IS-110 students received a grade of C or better. Both assessments exceed our benchmarks. IS-110 classes were not taught in Spring 2011.

Outcome 3c: Use of Results

While the overall average of IS-170 scores for outcome 3 did go up on the post-test, we noticed question 13 and 15 had lower averages on the post-test for the Fall 2010 semester. Assessment of question 13 has already been discussed in outcome 2c, and the drop for question 15 was statistically insignificant (-1.1%), but will be watched for future fluctuations.

We noticed another imbalance across the outcomes for the IS-110 pre/post-test. As previously discussed, the IS-170 test is more heavily weighted towards outcomes 1 and 2, while the IS-110 test is more heavily weighted towards outcomes 1 and 3. We have decided

that the IS-110 test will continue to assess computer literacy and student success in addition to information literacy, but the information literacy portion will be the same as that used in IS-170 beginning Fall 2011. This will create a longer pre/post-test for IS-110 students, but will also create a uniform assessment of information literacy across both classes.

Outcome 3d: Mechanisms for Sharing Results

See comments for outcome 1d.

OUTCOME 4 (State Student Learning Outcome)

The information literate student, individually or as a member of a group, uses information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

Outcome 4a: Means of Assessment & Criteria for Success

Outcome 4 is assessed through the final project and final course grades. The final project is worth 25% of the class grade in all sections. Instructors differed as to what type of final project they used - final projects for 2010/11 included: a research paper, an annotated bibliography, an individual or group presentation, a poster, and a video/podcast. Some gave the students a choice as to which type of project they could turn in, others gave them a specific assignment. All required a correctly formatted (MLA or APA) reference list of scholarly sources.

Outcome 4b: Assessment Results

In Fall **IS-170** classes, 75.2% of students received a grade of C or better on the final project; in Spring IS-170 classes, 69.7% (slightly below our benchmark) of students received a grade of C or better on the final project - for an annual average of 72.5%. In Fall **IS-110** classes, 76.8% of students received a grade of C or better on the final project. IS-110 classes were not taught in Spring 2011.

The pre/post test for **IS-110** includes one question (#9) that assesses outcome 4. Scores for this outcome rose from 71.0% on the pre-test to 81.3% on the post-test (+10.3%), above our benchmark.

79.9% of IS-170 students in Fall 2010 and 71.1% of students in Spring 2011 received a course grade of C or better, for an annual average of 75.5% - above our benchmark. 76.8% of IS-110 students received a course grade of C or better.

Outcome 4c: Use of Results

Four sections of IS-170 in Spring 2011 had unusually low rates of students who received a grade of C or better on their final project (52.6%, 45.5%, 61.9% & 37.5%), and for their final course grade (42.1%, 54.5%, 66.7% & 33.3%). Our master syllabus for IS-170 clearly states that students will receive a grade of F if they do not turn in a final project or if they miss more than four classes. In addition, each instructor makes sure these policies are discussed and understood in class. These sections had very high rates of non-attendance and/or students not completing the final project. Changes to the policies are not being considered as this seems to be an anomaly that we do not expect to see repeated.

Outcome 4d: Mechanisms for Sharing Results

The grades for the final project and the overall course are entered into the gradebook in the Angel Learning Management System. Each semester, instructors send their data (# of students in each section and the # of students who received grades of A-C and D-F) to the Assessment Librarian who calculates the averages. This information is shared with all teaching librarians, without reference to individual names of instructors. The teaching librarians meet once a week during the summer months to discuss these assessments.

Mabee Library has a webpage on Strategic Planning that includes assessment reports.

OUTCOME 5 (State Student Learning Outcome)

The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

Outcome 5a: Means of Assessment & Criteria for Success

Outcome 5 was assessed in questions 8 & 9 on the 20-question pre/post-test given across 11 sections of IS-170 in Fall 2010 and five sections in Spring 2011. In IS-110, outcome 5 was assessed in question 1 on the 24-question pre/post-test given across three sections in Fall 2010 (again, there are fewer information literacy assessment questions in the IS-110 pre/post-test). The goal is an increase in the percentage correct for each question as well as a percentage rate of 70+% in the overall average of the post-test. In addition, outcome 5 is assessed by the final grades for the course. The goal is to have 70+% of students pass the course with a grade of C or better.

Outcome 5b: Assessment Results

A summary chart of the assessment averages for the pre/post-test, and the final grades across learning outcomes 1, 2, 3 & 5 is attached (learning outcome 4 is assessed through the final project and is detailed separately).

In Fall **IS-170** classes, the overall averages for the pre/post test scores for outcome 5 rose from 47.6% on the pre-test to 71.5% on the post-test (+23.9%); in Spring IS-170 classes, the overall average rose from 59.5% on the pre-test to 83.0% on the post-test (+23.5%), for an average for the school year on the post-test of 77.25% - exceeding our 70% benchmark. In addition, 79.9% of IS-170 students in Fall 2010 received a grade of C or better, and 71.1% of IS-170 students in Spring 2011 received a grade of C or better, for an annual average of 75.5%, above our benchmark.

In Fall **IS-110** classes, the overall average for the pre/post test scores for outcome 5 rose from 59.0% on the pre-test to 74.2%, an increase of 15.2%, a significant jump. 71.1% of IS-110 students received a grade of C or better. Both assessments exceed our benchmarks. IS-110 classes were not taught in Spring 2011

Outcome 5c: Use of Results

While only one question assesses outcome 5, it is clear this outcome is being well covered in class and students understand the concept. We are evaluating the need for additional questions for this outcome.

Outcome 5d: Mechanisms for Sharing Results

See comments on outcome 1d.

IS170 - Fall 2010 / Pre-post test analysis

AVERAGES by Learning Outcome

		L.O. 1		L.O. 2		L.O. 3		L.O. 5	
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Question 1	Std. 2			54.4%	70.2%				
Question 2	Std. 2			81.9%	94.3%				
Question 3	Std. 2			35.8%	62.4%				
Question 4	Std. 1, 3	44.8%	74.5%			44.8%	74.5%		
Question 5	Std. 1	88.5%	94.8%						
Question 6	Std. 1	23.9%	62.7%						
Question 7	Std. 1	54.4%	69.7%						
Question 8	Std. 5							46.9%	67.3%
Question 9	Std. 5							48.2%	75.7%
Question 10	Std. 1	53.5%	63.5%						
Question 11	Std. 1	79.5%	85.3%						
Question 12	Std. 2			37.0%	61.7%				
Question 13	Std. 2, 3			84.9%	79.7%	84.9%	79.7%		
Question 14	Std. 2			18.3%	42.8%				
Question 15	Std. 3					93.6%	92.5%		
Question 16	Std. 1	88.6%	86.4%						
Question 17	Std. 2			67.0%	79.2%				
Question 18	Std. 2			46.0%	69.7%				
Question 19	Std. 3					58.2%	78.3%		
Question 20	Std. 1	24.3%	32.7%						
		57.2%	71.2%	53.0%	70.0%	70.4%	81.2%	47.6%	71.5%

IS 170-Spring 2011 Pretest/posttest Analysis

AVERAGES by Learning Objective

		L.O. 1		L.O. 2		L.O. 3		L.O. 5	
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Question 1	Std. 2			52.7%	73.0%				
Question 2	Std. 2			86.4%	100.0%				
Question 3	Std. 2			35.1%	79.8%				
Question 4	Std. 1, 3	59.2%	92.7%			59.2%	92.7%		
Question 5	Std. 1	92.8%	87.3%						
Question 6	Std. 1	47.1%	80.6%						
Question 7	Std. 1	47.8%	71.0%						
Question 8	Std. 5							54.1%	84.8%
Question 9	Std. 5							64.9%	81.1%
Question 10	Std. 1	65.1%	70.8%						
Question 11	Std. 1	74.1%	82.8%						
Question 12	Std. 2			40.5%	88.5%				
Question 13	Std. 2, 3			82.8%	97.8%	82.8%	97.8%		
Question 14	Std. 2			33.2%	46.3%				
Question 15	Std. 3					93.9%	100.0%		
Question 16	Std. 1	83.8%	85.9%						
Question 17	Std. 2			69.5%	84.9%				
Question 18	Std. 2			55.3%	57.4%				
Question 19	Std. 3					70.4%	73.9%		
Question 20	Std. 1	34.9%	33.2%						
		63.1%	75.5%	57.5%	79.3%	76.6%	91.1%	59.5%	83.0%

Fall IS 110 Pre/Post test Item Analysis

AVERAGES by Learning Objective

		L.O. 1		L.O. 2		L.O. 3		L.O. 4		L.O. 5	
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
Question 1	Std. 5									59.0%	74.2%
Question 2	Std. 1	75.0%	66.0%								
Question 3	Std. 3					98.6%	100.0%				
Question 4	Std. 1	45.1%	66.0%								
Question 5	Std. 1	56.0%	77.5%								
Question 6											
Question 7	Std. 1, 3	90.0%	92.3%			90.0%	92.3%				
Question 8											
Question 9	Std. 4							71.0%	81.3%		
Question 10											
Question 11											
Question 12											
Question 13	Std. 3					3.4%	47.3%				
Question 14											
Question 15											
Question 16											
Question 17											
Question 18											
Question 19											
Question 20											
Question 21	Std. 2										
Question 22	Std. 1, 3	27.0%	55.5%			27.0%	55.5%				
Question 23	Std. 2			13.9%	55.5%						
Question 24	Std. 3					87.8%	92.3%				
AVERAGES		58.6%	71.4%	13.9%	55.5%	61.3%	77.5%	71.0%	81.3%	59.0%	74.2%

FINAL GRADES

Fall 2010				Spring 2011				Fall IS170	Fall IS110	Spring
Course	A-C	D-F	Total	Course	A-C	D-F	Total	(A-C)	(A-C)	(A-C)
IS170D	16	5	21	IS170D	13	3	16	76.2%		81.3%
IS170J	12	1	13					92.3%		
IS170E	15	7	22	IS170B	8	11	19	68.2%		42.1%
IS170F	19	3	22	IS170H	6	5	11	86.4%		54.5%
IS 110	19	6	25	IS170	14	7	21		76.0%	66.7%
IS 170	15	3	18	IS 170	8	15	24	83.3%		33.3%
IS 170	16	5	21					76.2%		
IS 170K	11	1	12	IS 170F	5	5	5	91.7%		100.0%
IS170G	8	0	8	IS170C	20	1	21	100.0%		95.2%
IS170C	9	8	17	IS170VA/VB	48	2	50	52.9%		96.0%
IS170VA/VB	61	5	66					92.4%		
IS110D	9	1	10						90.0%	
IS 170B/BC	10	7	17					58.8%		
IS 110B/BC	9	5	14						64.3%	
								79.9%	76.8%	71.1%

FINAL PROJECT GRADES

Fall 2010				Spring 2011				Fall IS170	Fall IS110	Spring
Course	A-C	D-F	Total	Course	A-C	D-F	Total	(A-C)	(A-C)	(A-C)
IS170D	11	10	21	IS170D	11	5	16	52.4%		68.8%
IS170J	11	2	13					84.6%		
IS170E	15	7	22	IS170B	10	9	19	68.2%		52.6%
IS170F	19	3	22	IS170H	5	6	11	86.4%		45.5%
IS 110	19	6	25	IS170	13	8	21		76.0%	61.9%
IS 170	15	3	18	IS 170	9	15	24	83.3%		37.5%
IS 170	16	5	21					76.2%		
IS 170K	10	2	12	IS 170F	5	5	5	83.3%		100.0%
IS170G	8	0	8	IS170C	20	1	21	100.0%		95.2%
IS170C	9	8	17	IS170VA/VB	48	2	50	52.9%		96.0%
IS170VA/VB	61	5	66					92.4%		
IS110D	9	1	10						90.0%	
IS 170B/BC	8	9	17					47.1%		
IS110B/BC	9	5	14						64.3%	
								75.2%	76.8%	69.7%