Library instruction is the primary responsibility of the Research & Instructional Services department, which sees roughly 300 sessions per year. Sessions are taught by four tenure-track faculty, four fixed-term faculty, and three paraprofessionals.

- Fall 2017: New student learning outcomes (SLOs) based on the ACRL Framework for Information Literacy
- Challenges with classroom and program assessment
- Experience with quizzes and customer satisfaction surveys

**TOP-LEVEL RESULTS**

Unfortunately, many students didn’t answer or misunderstood the open-ended questions. These were coded as Level 0 and removed from rest of the rubric analyses presented here.

**WHAT WE LEARNED**

15 instruction sessions assessed
349 worksheets analyzed
7 library instructors implemented
3 out of 5 students had not had library instruction before

**Rubric analysis results**

Our open-ended questions attempted to mirror the research process, which meant our worksheet was evaluating five SLOs at once. Since our teaching focused on just two—SLO 3 and 4—we focused on those results in particular. Here’s what we found:

- **SLO 3**: Identifies relevant source that matches context
  - 3 out of 4 did library research
  - More than half had NOT had library instruction

- **SLO 4**: Constructs an effective search strategy
  - 3 out of 4 did library research
  - More than half had NOT had library instruction

**So, did it work? Yes and no.**

- Captured baseline of student knowledge
- Minimized effort for library instructors
- Closer to program-level assessment
- Misunderstandings by students and instructors
- Non-representative sample
- Limited buy-in
- Made shorter and more focused
- Model ways to implement
- Workshop classes in major

**Context**

Evaluating an Instruction Program with One Assessment Technique

SHARED OUTCOMES, SHARED PRACTICE

METHODOLOGY

1. Most-taught and most-assessed learning outcomes determined.
2. Shared worksheet drafted to assess those outcomes as well as closed-ended responses about levels of library instruction, research experience, and familiarity with content shared in the session.
3. Library instructors tested in spring 2018 and implemented in fall 2018.
4. Rubric developed for each learning outcome based on knowledge practices and dispositions from the Framework.
5. Responses coded using the rubric and analyzed along with closed-ended responses.

**TOP-LEVEL RESULTS**

- SLO 1: Determines initial scope of inquiry
- SLO 2: Describes source types appropriate for context
- SLO 3: Identifies relevant source that matches context
- SLO 4: Constructs effective search strategy
- SLO 5: Explains utility of selected source based on context

**Test worksheet**

Create worksheet

1. SLO 1: Determines initial scope of inquiry
2. SLO 2: Describes source types appropriate for context
3. SLO 3: Identifies relevant source that matches context
4. SLO 4: Constructs effective search strategy
5. SLO 5: Explains utility of selected source based on context

**Evaluate results**

Determine most-assessed outcomes

Individualized and informal assessment is great for teaching practice, but we wanted to know more about our instructional program and whether students were learning what we intended.

That meant we needed to formalize a summative assessment that collected more than just student perceptions and could be used in a variety of classes.

Many instructors were using in-class worksheets, could we create a universal version that would work in all of our classes?
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