

PROPOSAL FORM

The Library Council of Washington is looking for your help in identifying broad priorities and initiatives for the use of federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) funds. These funds are used to meet the statewide and regional needs and opportunities of the library community. Please note that this process will not be used to fund grant requests to individual libraries.

Proposal name

Amount of LSTA funding proposed:

Information Literacy in Washington Community and Technical Colleges (ILWCTC)

\$160,000

Library, group, or person submitting proposal (primary sponsor) Library Media Directors Council LMDC

Library Name, if different Pierce College

Contact Person Debra Gilchrist Title Director, Library Media Center

Address 9401 Farwest Dr. SW

City Lakewood Zip 98498-1999

Telephone (253) 964-6553 Fax ((253)964-6713 Email dgilchrist@pierce.ctc.edu

Library Council of Washington Sponsor (Name of the Library Council of Washington member who has agreed to sponsor this proposal and act as a liaison if this proposal is awarded funds. Locate contact information for Library Council members: <http://www.statelib.wa.gov/libraries/dev/council/members.aspx>)

Dr. Leonor Ingraham-Swets

Other Proposal Sponsors (Names of libraries, groups or individuals involved in developing this proposal, acting in support of this proposal, or endorsing the proposal)

Debra Gilchrist – Pierce College Wai-Fong Lee – Seattle Central Community College

Myra Van Vactor – Bellevue Community College Tim Fuhrman – Big Bend Community College

Mary Ann Goodwin - Spokane Falls Community College Mindy Coslor – Skagit Valley Community College

Mary Carr – Spokane Community College

Dr. Loretta Seppanen – State Board for Community and Technical Colleges

Dr. Sarah Burns – Vice President for Instruction, Pierce College (Instruction Commission Liaison to LMDC)

Sayumi Irey – Chair, CLAMS (College Librarians and Media Specialists of Washington)

Briefly describe the proposal (50 words or less):

Interdisciplinary teams of librarians and faculty from WA two-year colleges (CTC) will collaboratively develop and implement programs that utilize Information Literacy (IL) as both a lifelong skill and an instructional strategy. Participation in the ACRL Immersion program will strengthen IL pedagogies and librarian's teaching. Assessments demonstrating the relationship between IL and student success will be implemented.

Briefly describe why funding of this proposal is important to the Washington library community (50 words or less):
CTC librarians believe that effective pedagogy for lifelong learning requires resource-based learning. The LSTA grant will provide resources that will enable librarians to acquire the skills necessary to transform teaching by integrating Information Literacy throughout the curriculum. New methods of assessment are critical to ensure our place within the higher education agenda.

General Information

Proposal name: **Information Literacy in Washington Community and Technical Colleges**

Which library types are intended as the primary beneficiaries of this proposal? (check all that apply)

- Academic (private and public two-year and four-year academic institutions)
 Public (libraries organized under RCW 27.12)
 School (private and public K-12 schools)
 Special (business and industry, law, medical, other government, tribal, other)
If other, specify: _____

Scope/geographic coverage of the proposal?

- Statewide
 Less than statewide, name the area or region? _____
(name the region or other identifiable area)

The intended beneficiary of the proposal? (check the primary beneficiary)

- Library staff
 Library users or potential library users
 A specific group of staff or users, or a potential user group. Specify the target audience(s): **Students, Librarians and Faculty of Community and Technical Colleges**

Estimated number of persons served by this proposal? 340,000 students, faculty and staff over the period of the grant

Check the Washington LSTA Five-Year Plan goal that best represents the primary purpose of the proposal.

- Washingtonians will have increased physical and remote electronic access to traditional and digital library resources and services in all areas of the state.
 Washingtonians will have increased awareness of the library resources, and services that are available to them.
 Washington libraries will provide enhanced and expanded library services, resources and programs to all segments of their communities.
 Through consulting, training, and collaboration, Washington libraries will have an increased capacity to effectively serve customers.

Proposed 2003 LSTA priority addressed by this proposal? (check the priority that most closely supports the proposal)

- Expanding services for learning and access to information and educational resources in a variety of formats in all types of libraries for individuals of all ages.

Developing library services that provide all users access to information through local, state, regional, national, and international electronic networks

Providing electronic and other linkages among and between all types of libraries;

Developing public and private partnerships with other agencies and community- based organizations

Targeting library services to people of diverse geographic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds, to individuals with disabilities, and to people with limited functional literacy or information skills

Targeting library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library and to underserved urban and rural communities, including children from families with incomes below the poverty level

This project is intended to provide:

A direct service to libraries and/or their customers.

A support service for libraries and their staff.

The use of LSTA funds are intended to support:

A short-term project of one to four years that will cease when LSTA funding ends.

A long-term program that will transition to another funding source after LSTA funding support ceases. The intended long-term funding source for this project is:

The continued funding for this service will come from state allocations distributed through State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and applied at the local campus level.

Anticipated length of time that the proposal will use LSTA funding? 4 (List number of years; note that most projects are from one year to four years in length.)

1. Proposal – What do you want to do and what impact is expected?

- Project description

Information literacy has been a high priority for libraries within the Washington State Community and Technical College System (WCTC). To set the stage for statewide endeavors, the Library Media Directors Council (LMDC) prepared a position statement in 1993 entitled, "Information Competency: an Initiative for Integrated Learning." The position statement educated our leadership and our faculty about information literacy and proposed ways to begin implementation on each of our 34 campuses.

Individual colleges have taken advantage of the opportunities offered by LSTA funds to enhance existing information literacy efforts. Through this project, LMDC will enable librarians in the 34 community and technical colleges in Washington State to play significant roles in infusing information literacy into the curriculum and making it an integral part of the learning process. We will also demonstrate the unique contributions of librarians to the educational process through integrated assessments of student work.

The proposed project will include the following:

1. Survey current information literacy efforts in individual colleges. Review and revise the LMDC position statement to reflect current philosophy and practice;
2. Collaboratively develop case studies on each of the campuses based on the position statement that match those issues and concepts with what is currently happening on our campuses. Pinpoint problems, trends, desires and strategic opportunities;
3. Host a regional workshop of the Information Literacy Immersion Program designed by the Association for College and Research Libraries (ACRL). Workshop leaders will use the case studies as the basis for implementing change. During the workshop, teams of faculty, librarians and library directors will develop an Action Plan for infusing information literacy into the library's instruction program, as well as improve their skills in the areas of information literacy, curriculum development, learning styles, pedagogy, assessment and leadership/management;
4. Based on the Action Plans, provide venues for librarians and faculty in content areas to work on instructional materials involving research and research tools from varying disciplinary perspectives. Workshops and structured development opportunities will allow librarians and faculty to use each other's expertise with a goal of implementing the individual Action Plans;
5. Develop methods to authentically assess information literacy as part of courses so students view the application of information literacy as a natural part of their daily learning and problem solving;
6. Work with faculty in other disciplines to incorporate information literacy as a creative and effective pedagogy.

- Desired outcomes

Individual LMDC member colleges will be able to develop and implement information literacy programs that involve collaborative work between librarians and faculty in the disciplines. Faculty will teach more creatively by using information literacy as pedagogy and libraries will have an opportunity to showcase the direct impact they have on student success with assessments of information literacy within courses. Student information literacy will increase.

2. Analysis – Why do you want to do it?

- Current situation and need

Information literacy is implemented at varying levels in the 34 community colleges in Washington State. Students need skills to progress in a discipline and one way to do this is for them to recognize information structures within disciplines. While this is so, information literacy is not afforded the same significance as the other general objectives so students are frequently unaware of more effective ways of using information resources.

Differences in staffing levels at the colleges have hindered the ability of librarians to go for training, to develop programs for internal library use, or to undertake collaborative efforts with faculty in the disciplines to integrate research and the use of research tools in their classes. This is particularly true in classes that do not traditionally have a research component.

The proposed project will provide funding to train a core group of librarians and faculty colleagues to develop information literacy programs for their colleges. The core group will serve as resource for other librarians and faculty in developing individual, departmental or institution wide efforts of infusing information literacy into the learning process.

The May 12, 2003 issue of the *Seattle Times* states that, “According to state statistics, more than 180,000 full-time-equivalent students attend Washington’s 34 community and technical colleges at any one time. About 37 percent of those are students who intend to move on to four-year schools. The number of transfer students is projected to increase by at least 5 percent each year in the next decade.” As two year colleges are increasingly called upon to meet the higher education needs of an increasing number of people, it is necessary for information literacy plans to be in place to provide the skills for lifelong learning. It is to the advantage of all students to acquire the skills of critical thinking and appreciate alternative or divergent views in the learning process.

The ACRL Institute for Information Literacy Immersion program is the premier information literacy education program for librarians in the world. We will be providing our colleges with the very best opportunity to learn from national experts, thereby providing us with the best chance to implement the changes we desire.

Integrating information literacy and resource-based learning pedagogy into our courses will transform the way we teach and creatively place the library in the center of the instructional process.

- Benefit/impact

A major reason why increasing number of Washington State citizens are attending community and technical colleges is the rising cost of college tuition. As more community college courses are articulated as transfer credits to 4-year institutions, students take advantage of the open-door policy and lower tuition cost. This same open-door policy brings in students with varying skills in the use of information resources. Students enrolled under the auspices of Workforce Development and other worker retraining programs also bring varying levels of knowledge as they are exposed to currently available print and non-print information sources in the library. The

exponential growth of information available to all citizens continues to increase; individuals need to develop effective ways to get what will truly satisfy their information need.

It is important for librarians and faculty to integrate the development of research skills and critical thinking abilities in the various disciplines. Yet, our collaborations have not been as strong as they need to be, and many of our librarians have not moved from teaching bibliographic instruction to teaching information literacy. The project will make it possible for librarians to become more confident teachers, and for librarians and faculty to design modules, assignments, and projects that will progressively expose students to more efficient search strategies. As students learn to take advantage of easy access to information using technology, they will also be aware of their obligations as responsible citizens through proper documentation of information sources.

Libraries have been traditionally viewed in terms of our services, our facilities and our collections, and we have chosen to use statistics such as circulation and gate count to demonstrate our contributions on campus. We need to transition our methods to directly demonstrate the impact we have on student learning and the value we add to student success. Assessing the differences in student work as a result of the information literacy instruction that libraries offer is a key to our future success. Some faculty are discouraged with the amount of Internet use, lack of critical thinking and the degree of plagiarism. Information literacy and resource-based learning provide answers to these instructional issues. Teaching the research process and helping faculty design assignments that assess that process, not just the research product is a critical next step. Using these techniques, we will be able to serve as the key change agents on our campus to transform instruction to reach creative, effective and interesting new heights. We want to position ourselves as leaders of a new type of instruction within our institutions.

- Relationship to LSTA

This project directly addresses 3 of the LSTA priorities and 3 of the Washington 5-year goals. It indirectly supports all of the priorities and goals.

The project will expand services for learning, develop new services that provide all users with enhanced access to information, and foster partnerships between librarians at different community/technical colleges. It will increase awareness of the library resources and services that are available to our citizens. Students in community colleges will learn effective ways to access reliable information, be able to discern varying viewpoints and formulate individual decisions. The community and technical colleges serve the most ethnically, economically and culturally diverse populations in higher education. Their programs extend into the poorest and most isolated communities through carefully sited extended learning campuses and distance learning programs.

Through other LSTA grants, Washingtonians have increased physical and remote electronic access to traditional and digital library resources and services in all areas of the state. Information literacy skills will make students aware of these print and electronic library resources available to them and help them to be more effective and efficient users.

- Risk

While there is risk of non-completion, it is minimal. LMDC is an established working group. The Information Literacy Committee of LMDC will be responsible for the overall management of the project. While member colleges will be invited to take the lead in managing various components, LMDC will take full responsibility for meeting all grant requirements including documentation and fiscal management.

Funding for some components of the project will be competitive. Colleges will submit their proposals where they will indicate their outcomes and timelines for activities and tasks. Library directors will be responsible for ensuring completion of projects and accomplishment of stated outcomes in their individual colleges.

- Sustainability

Initial efforts to define the work plan for the individual colleges will be accomplished using grant funds. LSTA funds will provide the initial impetus for information literacy programs in individual colleges. As the implementation and assessment of the impact of the project on the learning process continues, the systemic change will provide strong rationalization to institutionalize information literacy across the campuses.

To augment state funds, LMDC will pursue other grants that will forward consortial efforts. We currently do a significant amount of instruction, building in some of the sustainability within our current funding structure. Our goal is to transform our work by educating librarians and faculty so information literacy becomes institutional. The grant will get us over the hurdles and allow us to use our current resources to maximize the impact of our instructional efforts

The continued funding for this service will come from state allocations distributed through the State Board for Community and Technical Colleges and applied at the local campus level.

3. Implementation – How should the project be done?

- Project scope/work plan/ essential tasks

General Outline of Activities

1. Conduct a needs assessment by surveying current information literacy efforts.
2. Create an Evaluation Committee to review proposals for funding from individual colleges.
3. Create an Advisory Committee to provide guidance to the project.
4. Solicit proposals from colleges on funding for release time for librarians to do data gathering and initial work with faculty to write the case studies.
5. Strengthen collaborative work between LMDC and CLAMS.
6. Prepare for ACRL Information Literacy Immersion workshop.
7. Conduct ACRL workshop to be offered in 2005.
8. Solicit and evaluate proposals from colleges on funding for release time for participating librarians to develop information literacy plans for individual colleges.
9. Hold Information Literacy workshops for faculty and librarians (regional or statewide)
10. Formulate information literacy plans and create/design assessment tools for individual colleges.
11. Create a revised Information Literacy position statement from LMDC.

- Timeline

A basic timeline for the major steps and activities in the project is included in the attached Work Plan.

- Project staffing

There will be .25 FTE for Project Director from the WA State Library. A Library Director from LMDC will be Project Leader for the grant. The Information Literacy Committee is a standing committee of the LMDC. An Evaluation Committee will be composed of LMDC and CLAMS members to evaluate proposals for funding from individual colleges. An Advisory Council composed of LMDC library directors, college librarians, and a community member will provide advice and comments on grant implementation as well as the various components and activities of the grant.

Individual colleges will provide staffing needs as indicated in the proposals submitted under the Information Literacy LSTA grant.

- Budget

- Release time for a librarian at Pierce Library to be the liaison between the grant components, committees, and LMDC.
- \$50,000 - Cost of 5 full days of workshop, course content, instructors, materials, and space to be paid to ACRL
- Subsidy for the participation of librarians to augment college budgets for librarians to attend the ACRL workshop.
- Release time for librarians and faculty for consultations in designing assignments, teaching, and assessment efforts.
- Workshops for training of faculty and librarians in sharing best practices and newly developed materials.
- Hourly rate for librarians is a reasonable average of current rate in community and technical colleges.
- Funds for Information Literacy Committee, Evaluation Committee, Advisory Group will pay for release time for librarians and faculty involved.

4. Evaluation – How will you determine if the project was successful?

- Assessment/measurement

Outcomes:

1. Authentically assess student's information literacy within courses in order to determine student ability in the context of a course or program, as well as determine specific contributions of the library to overall student success.

Assessment: Spreadsheet for each college indicating distribution of assessments by academic department.

Criteria: 75% of colleges will incorporate authentic assessments. 25% of colleges will incorporate authentic assessments in at least 3 academic and professional/technical departments.

Assessment: Pretests of student knowledge of information literacy concepts before library instruction in selective classes where authentic assessments will be administered; improvement rubric will be distributed to discipline faculty

Criteria: Student performance will improve from pretest to learning assessments by 40%; discipline faculty will indicate student papers and projects demonstrate improvement by at least 2 points on a 5 point rubric as compared to classes where library instruction was not incorporated.

2. Increase the level of knowledge and ability of library faculty and directors in 5 key instructional areas (teaching/pedagogy, learning styles, management/leadership, assessment and information literacy) in order to effectively teach in and manage excellent information literacy programs.

Assessment: Pre and post assessments of information literacy programs using ACRL Best Practices as the rubric.

Criteria: 20% increase in program implementation effectiveness in 50% of the colleges between beginning and end of 4-year grant cycle.

Assessment: Curriculum design evaluation by Immersion workshop leaders.

Criteria: 90% of design plans and work projects will receive at least a 3 on a 5 point rubric; 75% will receive at least a 4.

Assessment: Library faculty self assessments

Criteria: 75% of library faculty participating in the Immersion workshop will indicate at least a 1 point improvement on a 5 point rubric on their own ability, confidence, and understanding of the 5 key areas of the Immersion curriculum; 50% will indicate a 2 point change.

3. Educate faculty teaching in the disciplines about information literacy as both skill and pedagogy in order to establish information literacy and resource-based learning as creative, successful and viable instructional strategies and to transform teaching within many of classrooms.

Assessment: Survey of participant faculty use of resource-based-learning, knowledge of information literacy, use of information literacy and use of integrated assessments.

Criteria : 75% of participating faculty will incorporate resource-based learning or inquiry-based learning as a pedagogical strategy; 75% of participating faculty will indicate an increased understanding of information literacy; 35% of participating faculty will incorporate integrated assessment of information literacy into courses; 35% of faculty will indicate resource-based-learning improves student classroom experience, enhances learning and adds creativity to their teaching.

4. Collaboratively design plans for implementing information literacy on each of our 34 campuses in order to be strategic rather than tactical in our development of information literacy programs.

Assessment: Spreadsheet of implementation and plan development.

Criteria: 25 colleges will develop a plan and 15 will implement 15% of the plan by year 4.

5. Develop data collection and reporting instruments that focus on student learning and retention in threshold courses in order to assist directors in measuring the library's contributions to student achievement.

Assessment: Spreadsheet of instruments; survey of library directors.

Criteria: 75% of library directors will indicate the instruments developed are effective in documenting the instructional and student success and retention dimensions of the library to administrators.

- Deliverables

1. Librarians trained to integrate information literacy into courses and assess the effect on student learning.
2. Information literacy plans for each participating college.
3. New course-related assignments, a pool of model assignments and best practices.
4. Assessment tools and methodologies.
5. Pedagogy techniques for using inquiry based and resource-based learning in the disciplines.
6. Action Plans for the duration of the grant and sustainability efforts after the grant
7. Updated Information Competency position statement from the LMDC. This will include a plan to forward information literacy in the community and technical colleges.
8. Data collection and reporting methods for defining student learning.

- Dissemination and sharing of project results

1. A project website will be developed to not only keep participants informed about the project, but will allow librarians from outside the system to follow the progress. This website will be linked to the WA State Library web site.
2. Project update to the Instruction Commission once a year.
3. Presentations at the spring 2007 ACRL meeting.
4. Joint presentations of librarians and faculty in disciplines at the Statewide Assessment Conference.
5. Journal articles for publication in library and other professional journals

Attachment A. Work Plan

WORK PLAN

Overview of Tasks That Need to Be Accomplished for Successful Project Implementation	Proposed Timeframe for the Completion of Task	Responsible Party for the Completion of Task
<p>Review LMDC position statement on Information Competency LMDC meeting to discuss the project Create LSTA grant Evaluation Committee and Advisory Council</p>	<p>Fall 2003 Winter 2004 Fall 2004</p>	<p>Information Literacy Comm LMDC Information Literacy Comm</p>
<p>Survey current information literacy projects Collate, interpret and report on survey Apply to ACRL for regional immersion program</p>	<p>Winter 2005 Winter 2004 Fall 2005</p>	<p>Information Literacy Comm Information Literacy Comm Information Literacy Comm</p>
<p>Develop web site for the project - linked to the LMDC site</p>	<p>Winter 2005 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>Information Literacy Comm</p>
<p>Small group work among librarians and faculty (within each college/ involving several colleges) Send out Request for Proposals to colleges Review proposals and fund grant requests Work with CLAMS Report writing – Proposal modifications to timeline/tasks</p>	<p>Winter 2004 Spring 2004 Spring 2004 – Spring 2007 Fall 2005 Summer 2005</p>	<p>Information Literacy Comm Evaluation Committee Evaluation Committee LMDC Information Literacy Comm</p>
<p>Hold ACRL Information Literacy Immersion workshop</p>	<p>Fall 2005 – Spring 2006 Summer 2006 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>Information Literacy Comm</p>
<p>Development of Information Literacy Plans for individual colleges Implementation of Information Literacy plans Development of instructional and assessment tools</p>	<p>Fall 2005 – Spring 2007 Fall 2006 – Spring 2007</p>	<p>LMDC libraries LMDC libraries LMDC libraries</p>
<p>Evaluation of information literacy plans Presentation at ACRL conference Publications in library and other professional journals (Note that a WA State Library staff person will be involved in the proposed project either in the role of project liaison or in the role of project manager.)</p>	<p>Fall 2006 – Spring 2007 Spring 2007</p>	<p>Evaluation Committee LMDC LMDC</p>

Attachment B. Budget for FY2004

BUDGET FORM FOR PROJECT/INITIATIVE PROPOSAL USING FISCAL YEAR 2004 FUNDING		
PROPOSAL:		
	FUNDING	
BUDGET CATEGORIES	TOTAL	DESCRIPTION
WSL STAFFING		
Salaries and Wages		
Benefits (Estimate at 25% of salaries and wages if other cost estimates are not available)		
CONTRACTS		
Contracts for Employment or Services	19,860	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Librarian release time for lead library at \$32 per hour • Librarian and faculty release time for creating case studies, info lit plan, etc. 15 hours for each of 34 colleges @\$32 per hour. • Release time for Evaluation Committee, Advisory Group • Web development and Secretarial support
SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT		
Supplies and Materials	700	Supplies and postage
Communications - Telephone, Mail, etc		
Rentals and Leases		
Printing and Copying	300	
Training		
Furnishings and Equipment		
TRAVEL COSTS		
Per Diem, Food and Lodging	300	For committees to hold meetings and consultations
Air Travel		
Auto Mileage (Estimate at \$0.345 per mile)	500	For committees to hold meetings and consultations
Other Transportation Expenses		
GRANT FUNDING		
Grants (Funds to support grant cycles and awards)		
PROPOSAL TOTAL		
Total	\$21,660	

Attachment C. Budget Summary for Additional Project Years (If Needed)

BUDGET SUMMARY FOR PROJECT/INITIATIVE PROPOSAL FISCAL YEAR 2005 (October 1, 2004 through September 30, 2005)		
	FUNDING	
BUDGET CATEGORIES	TOTAL	DESCRIPTION
WSL STAFFING COSTS		
CONTRACTS FOR EMPLOYMENT/SERVICES	25820	Release time and staffing for administration of grant
ACRL workshop	58000	Cost of ACRL workshop and subsidy for participants
SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT	900	Supplies and postage
TRAVEL COSTS	1100	For committees to hold meetings and consultations
GRANT FUNDING		
PROPOSAL TOTAL	\$85,820	
BUDGET SUMMARY FOR PROJECT/INITIATIVE PROPOSAL FISCAL YEAR 2006 (October 1, 2005 through September 30, 2006)		
	FUNDING	
BUDGET CATEGORIES	TOTAL	DESCRIPTION
WSL STAFFING COSTS		
CONTRACTS FOR EMPLOYMENT/SERVICES	24380	Release time for librarians and faculty for workshops and development work and implementation. Staffing for administration of grant
SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT	900	Supplies and postage
TRAVEL COSTS	1625	For committees to hold meetings and consultations
GRANT FUNDING		
PROPOSAL TOTAL	\$26,905	
BUDGET SUMMARY FOR PROJECT/INITIATIVE PROPOSAL FISCAL YEAR 2007 (October 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007)		
	FUNDING	
BUDGET CATEGORIES	TOTAL	DESCRIPTION
WSL STAFFING COSTS		
CONTRACTS FOR EMPLOYMENT/SERVICES	22540	Release time for librarians and faculty for workshops and development work and implementation . Staffing for administration of grant
SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT	700	Supplies and postage
TRAVEL COSTS	2250	For committees to hold meetings and consultations
GRANT FUNDING		
PROPOSAL TOTAL	\$25,490	

Tacoma Community College Library
Background Study
May 26, 2005

I. Background

Tacoma Community College is a public, two-year, associate degree-granting institution that enrolls approximately 20,000 students annually. It comprises a main campus in Tacoma, and an extension campus in Gig Harbor. In addition, TCC provides programs for The Evergreen State College Tacoma, the Washington Corrections Center for Women in Purdy, and the IT Certification campus at the Tacoma Mall.

51% of TCC students have indicated an intent to transfer to a four-year program. 33% are engaged in professional workforce training, and 12% are taking basic skills courses.

45% of students are under 25; 41% are 24-44 and 14% are 45 years old or older. Our ethnic mix is 66% white, 13% African American, 8% Asian/Pacific Islander, 6% Hispanic, 3% Native American/Alaskan Native and 4% unreported.

II. Institutional Environment and Priorities

TCC strategic initiatives for 2005 – 2010 focus on enhancing our learning environment through

- commitment to innovation and excellence
- increased diversity of students, faculty, and staff
- meaningful connections to the Tacoma community
- thoughtful design of campus spaces, and
- intentional dedication of resources to student support services

Related recent initiatives on campus include a push to expand our developmental education resources, including widening the scope of our writing and reading labs. This (may be/is) in response to a steady increase in recent years of incoming students who require developmental classes.

Another recent campaign related to our strategic initiatives and student learning outcomes is an increased focus on incorporating technology into classes. This encompasses use of computers in traditional classes, as well as increasing the number of “web-enhanced,” “hybrid online,” and fully online classes available to TCC students.

In light of these initiatives, both the developmental programs/labs and the distance learning department are obvious partners for the library's information competency program. Conveniently, the labs, distance learning, and the library are all under the aegis of the same Dean.

In addition, since Information & Information Technology is one of TCC's College-wide Student Learning Outcomes (CWSLOs), all faculty are encouraged to incorporate these skills into their curricula. Our campus tends to be very collaborative, both within departments and cross-departmentally. Librarians actively participate on campus committees and projects with other faculty and staff, and the library and its instruction program enjoy very strong support from faculty and administration.

III. Organizational Placement of Library's Instructional Efforts

The library is recognized as a stand-alone instruction program, but it has not developed a comprehensive scheme for assuring/assessing that TCC graduates have attained a certain level of information competency. The library has a description of its program, based on ACRL's *Guidelines for Instruction Programs in Academic Libraries*. This work has not been revisited, however, since its development in 1999-2000. Both staff and circumstances have changed considerably since that time.

All instructional programs on campus, including the library, are currently developing or revisiting their Program Level Learning Outcomes. The learning outcomes, associated College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes and means of assessment will be chosen by the end of fall quarter, 2005-6. Assessments will be made in winter and/or spring of 05-06 and evaluation of the collected evidence will be completed in spring/summer of 06.

As mentioned above, the College recognizes "Information and Information Technology" as one of six College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes. These outcomes are identified on course proposal forms and syllabi (as appropriate). A database indicating which outcomes are taught in which courses has been established and the database has been used to complete a few studies indicating where the outcomes are taught. Unfortunately the database was not designed to record "levels" (such as practiced; practiced & taught; practiced, taught & assessed) and the library is suspicious of the results of one study indicating that an average TCC graduate is exposed to the IIT CWLSO an average of 13 times or in 66% of his or her classes. Even an improved database would only provide tracking of *teaching*. The College does not currently have a method in place for assessing the *attainment* of any of the CWSLO's.

Librarians are encouraged to participate in continuing education opportunities and funding is usually available—especially for local/State conferences and

workshops. Each librarian is usually able to attend one or two off-campus events each year. Insufficient staffing (to cover the duties of absent librarians) makes more frequent attendance difficult. All librarians attend TCC's annual faculty retreat (two days) which usually focuses on some aspect of teaching and learning as well as continuing education events during five campus professional development days. One librarian has recently had extensive training in assessment philosophy and techniques as she serves in a two year position as campus faculty assessment liaison.

IV. Instruction Program Content

The library's instruction program consists of

- Instructional sessions in individual classes (usually one to three sessions per course section)
 - ✓ *254 in 04-05 (four quarters); approximately 6350 students—we estimate that 3810 are unduplicated*
- Two-credit research skills classes linked with nursing classes (six sessions/year)
 - ✓ *04-05 headcount: 114 students*
- One-credit research skills classes linked with The Evergreen State College--Tacoma Writing and Lyceum classes (two sessions/year)
 - ✓ *04-05 one section—22 students*
- Two-credit general research skills classes (1 session/year)
 - ✓ *04-05 12 students*
- Information literacy instruction at the reference desk (daily)
 - ✓ *287 students per open week –this count includes technology literacy questions as well as research related questions*
- Phone and email instruction
 - ✓ *an average of one or two per week*
- Instruction via threaded online discussions in specific classrooms.
 - ✓ *An average of five courses per quarter*
- Information literacy workshops for faculty members (1-3 per year)
 - ✓ *None in 04-05*

Selected Elements

We are most interested in addressing:

1. Sessions in individual courses. Specifically, we believe the campus is moving toward a required "first year experience" course—especially for students who are perceived to be at risk. We have just begun working with the Human Development 101 instructors (HD courses are administered by our Counseling Department) to negotiate our involvement in this course. Our

initial thought is to “own” at least three class sessions per section and to intertwine information competency instruction and library services in as many other ways as is practical. This would begin to address both a weakness and an opportunity listed below.

2. Another strategy we might consider would be to identify other “key” courses, such as English 101 (the only required course for graduation) and persuade the campus to include the required successful completion of an information competency exam in order to pass. Learning opportunities would include workshops and/or online tutorials—similar to the James Madison University model. We believe that this strategy would be difficult to implement if NOT connected to a specific course, although the advent of a student portal presents some possibilities.

3. Workshops/courses/other learning opportunities for faculty members. We can’t imagine that we will ever grow to a size that would allow us to teach every session of every course that does or should address information competency skills and knowledge (nor would we want to!), therefore we must also focus on empowering other faculty members who can incorporate information competency components in their courses.

4. Program Assessment. We wish to develop methods to assess the efficacy of our program, such as aggregate results from an information competency exam or the examination of a sample of student research portfolios.

SWOT ANALYSIS

Strengths:

1. Student-centered librarian-instructors with both good teaching skills *and* awareness of teaching and learning research and practice
2. Library Dean, Library Unit Manager and paraprofessional staff are competent, innovative and supportive of instructional mission
3. Library and librarians are viewed positively by campus community
4. Librarians are involved in nearly every major committee/initiative on campus
5. Campus climate encourages collaboration and innovation
6. “Information & Information Technology” is one of six College-Wide Student Learning Outcomes

Weaknesses:

1. Not enough librarians (4.25 fte). Current work load is on the edge of untenable
2. Insufficient time for planning, professional development—mostly due to above

3. Physical facility is ill-suited to teaching and learning
 - No classroom—librarians must travel to other parts of the campus to teach, particularly if working with electronic resources
 - Much of the reference collection is located in portion of library that we TRY to preserve as a “somewhat quiet” study area, and yet occupying that space is often central to teaching and hands on activity
 - Insufficient space for group work with (or without) computers
 - Most areas very noisy
4. Program is a “patchwork.” There is no control over if or when students are exposed to information competency teaching: they might take a credit course; they might attend one or more sessions taught by librarians within other courses; they might have one or more interactions at the reference desk or use materials from the web site. They might not receive information competency instruction from anyone during their entire experience at TCC
5. Have no effective means of assessment for gauging the acquisition of information competency skills outside of LS credit courses
6. Insufficient materials (print and electronic) due to budget constraints

Opportunities

1. New Campus emphasis on developmental ed and at risk students provides natural partners for library
2. New VP for Academic Affairs understands and supports library’s instructional role
3. Library remodel planned for 05-06, has been delayed, *but* extensive planning was completed and architect is aware of needs
4. College-Wide Program Learning Outcomes Initiative will provide a new avenue for sharing Library instruction program outcomes and means of assessment with the campus community
5. Student portal to come on line sometime in the 05-06 academic year
6. Library Support for Distance Learner proposal will be drafted this summer by Distance Learning Librarian, Distance Learning Coordinator, Dean and member of Academic Technology Committee

Threats

1. Insufficient funding for higher education in Washington State
2. Problems with physical facility and technology drain important time from teaching information competency skills

Shoreline Community College Information Literacy Action Plan 2005-2007

SCC Information Literacy Program Mission Statement and Goals

Shoreline Community College Library/Media Services provides instruction in the use of all formats of information for students, employees and community members. Our mission is to help members of our college community become effective at seeking, using and evaluating information for school, work, and other aspects of their lives.

We strive to help library/media users access the resources available to the college community, promote a sense of independence and responsibility among users, and encourage collaboration across campus to meet these goals. The Library Instruction Program incorporates teaching strategies and methodologies that respond to individual differences in learning including level, style, and culture. Our Goals and Objectives incorporate the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards.

In order to meet this mission, our goals are to:

1. Reach as many of Shoreline Community College's students, employees and community members as possible.
2. Maintain consistency with Shoreline Community College's Strategic Plan, Mission and General Education Outcomes.
3. Adhere to the ACRL Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education**.
4. Review and revise our curriculum and offerings on a consistent basis.
5. Work with faculty in all divisions to integrate information literacy across the curriculum, because helping the campus community become information literate cannot be done alone.
6. Provide measurable outcomes that allow students to demonstrate their mastery of information literacy.
7. Prepare students to be effective information users in their current course activities and throughout their lives.
8. Reinforce previously acquired skills in computer technologies and information access.

Information Literacy Action Plan, 2005-2007

The Library will guide the efforts of the college to implement Information Literacy standards throughout the curriculum and will facilitate access to the resources and acquisition of skills needed for information seeking and life long learning.

Specific Outcomes:

1. Revise Research Across the Curriculum workshop for faculty in spring 2006 to incorporate information literacy general education outcomes.

Success Measures:

- Workshops address how faculty can incorporate and assess for this outcome in their classes
- A minimum of five faculty attend the workshops
- Faculty complete revisions to at least one assignment or other assessment related to information literacy skills

Timeline: Spring 2006

2. Review accumulated class research skills workshop assessments, share results with other library/media faculty and determine how useful this tool is to planning and conducting successful research workshops for classes.

Success Measures

- Discussion of how useful findings are for librarians who teach classes.
- If the findings are useful, incorporate them into suggestions for planning and conducting successful research workshops for classes
- If findings of the existing assessment questionnaire are not useful to librarians, devise a replacement assessment that will be more helpful in planning successful research workshops.

Timeline: Spring 2006

3. Use the following strategies to regain higher enrollment in INFO 150:
 - Work with Gavin in TSS to create a cross-reference from LIB 150 to INFO 150 in the course schedule. ** Completed Fall 2006
 - Resume making presentations to ENG 101 and ESL 100 classes about INFO 150. Either make an in-person visit to each section or provide information about the class to each instructor. Also, advertise the class on the faculty listerv. Completed Winter 2006
 - Try offering INFO 150 on an alternative schedule (offering the class starting week 3 of the quarter) in FALL of 2006.
 - Begin working on possibility of splitting the 5-credit 150 class into a 3-credit research class and a 2 credit advanced online research class, MCO's to be submitted to Curriculum Committee in 2006-07.

Success Measure

- Track enrollment each quarter following these changes

Timeline: Fall 2006/ Winter 2007

4. Revise Online Research Tutorial assessments and incorporate them into Blackboard as a feature that faculty can add to their classrooms. This can eventually be used as one method faculty can assess the information literacy skills of their students.

Success Measure

- Track how many Blackboard faculty include the assessments in their classes.

Timeline: Fall 2006/Winter 2007

5. Work with web services librarian to add instructional handouts to the library website.

Success Measures

- Goal for the initial phase is to have all of the “major” handouts currently on display at Reference online.
This could be incorporated with the “Research Pathways” sites already completed or under construction by current faculty.

Timeline: Winter/Spring 2007

Authentic assessment asks students “to perform real-world tasks that demonstrate meaningful application of essential knowledge and skills” (Jon Mueller, <http://jonathan.mueller.faculty.noctrl.edu/toolbox/whatisit.htm>) Please indicate how your library employs “authentic assessment” to gauge the effectiveness of information literacy instruction:

	Number of Respondents	Percent
a) Authentic assessment is incorporated into every instruction session we offer	4	18.18%
b) Authentic assessment is incorporated in partnership with at least three programs/divisions/departments on campus.	7	31.82%
c) Authentic assessment is occasionally employed by some librarians for some instruction sessions.	11	50.00%
d) We have not incorporated authentic assessment into our instruction efforts.	0	0.00%

**Assessment in the College Library – Spring 2006
Projects
LSTA Grant reporting**

Library Assessment Project

College Name: _____ Clark College _____ **Submitted by:** __Kitty Mackey_____

1. Librarians doing ~~instruction in Assessment Project:~~ _____
Kitty Mackey

2. List the classes/instructors incorporating assessment:
(circle the classes w/ instructors you have not worked with before)

Biology 104, Rebecca Martin
Biology 101, Kathleen Perillo
Women’s Studies 101, Shelley Sendak
Plagiarism online module: various collaborators

3. How many students total were involved in instruction: WS: 57; BIO 104: 36; BIO101: 28; Plagiarism: 245

Assessment Collaborations

(copy this section as needed for each collaboration)

Collaboration #1 – Course: _Women’s Studies 101: Introduction to Women’s Studies_

1. Description of the assignment and outcomes for instruction.

From the instructor’s handout: “In this assignment, you will learn how to evaluate information presented to you on the World Wide Web and Internet. The goal is to come up with solid research exploring both sides of an issue of importance to women, so that you can successfully discuss the issue in all its complexity and be able to argue either side.”

From the librarian’s lesson plan:

In order to use solid research for the Issues Debate project, students will learn how to locate and evaluate information on the open web. To do this well, students need to know, primarily,

- 1) how to evaluate information on open web sites
- 2) how to locate open web sites appropriate to their topic
- 3) how to distinguish between open web site and online versions of print information

To facilitate learning, students will attend one 50-minute library session that includes hands-on practice evaluating web sites.

To demonstrate what they have learned, as part of their project requirements, students will complete one “Web Site Evaluation Checklist” for each of six web sites.

To determine if students have met outcomes, the librarian and faculty will rate the value of the web sites using a collaboratively-designed rubric. Measurement: For 80% of students, 80% of web sites will be credible, OR, students will recognize and articulate criteria that make a site they list untrustworthy.

2. How and what evidence did you gather?

Students completed one “Web Site Evaluation Checklist” for each of six web sites they were required to use. (They also completed a short feedback at the end of the library session.)

3. How did it go? What did students really “get or not get?”

At first glance, the rubric looks like students “got it:”

92% - site is original open web information (outcome #1)

94% - site is credible, or students clearly articulated why it was not (outcome #1)

4. What did the assessment results tell you? Because of the assessment, are you going to change anything?

What the faculty member and I learned quickly is that we failed to make a distinction between *credible* sites and sites and *appropriate* sites. Students can check off boxes on the web site evaluation sheet without having to think much about the site. We learned that we need to norm our rubric criteria. After looking over the sites that students chose, we decided that next time she would have students use a ranking system in addition to a checklist, i.e. students would have to rank sites as good, better, or best, and explain why. The instructor also planned to spend a class session before the library session discussing logic, critical thinking, and statistics.

Although Ms. Sendak has moved on to another school, I am following through with what we learned. I presented this information during Fall Focus on Assessment (Clark College In-Service), and have had several faculty express interest (and two follow through) with doing similar activities in their classes.

5. What feedback did you get from the faculty member you worked with?

The instructor felt that the experience was valuable and worth the time. She said that she enjoyed having a librarian participate in the class (I attended the oral presentations at the end of the quarter).

Collaboration #2 – Course: Biology 104: General Biology

1. Description of the assignment and outcomes for instruction.

The assignment required students to locate a health- or science-related article in a popular magazine and find a corresponding article in a peer-reviewed scientific journal. Students then completed a report that included a comparison of the two articles.

The instructor, Rebecca Martin, provided summary of the assessment for this class for both Winter Quarter 2006 and Spring Quarter 2006.

Outcome for assignment:

Science Outcome: Acquire scientific information from appropriate sources

Also library information literacy outcome: Evaluates quality and usefulness of information

Specific outcomes for instruction session

In order to complete the Article Comparison assignment:

- Students will be able to recognize the difference between popular press articles and primary scientific articles.
- Students will be able to locate articles.

The librarian designed follow-up questions that students completed after they had turned in their assignment.

2. How and what evidence did you gather?

From Rebecca:

Assessment: *Students* were given a list of resources from a web search engine and from an article database (proquest), using the same search terms. Students were asked to identify the 3 sources they would try first from each type of search and why. They were also asked to identify which they would not select and why. Students identified the sources that were scientific articles and were asked to describe their next steps to learn more about the topic. This assessment followed completion of a graded assignment where students found a primary scientific article. The librarians were involved in this instruction. Therefore, this assessment looked at the students' ability to apply what they had learned from the assignment and provided information to both the librarians and the biology instructor.

Adjustments from Winter quarter instruction and assessment:

Based on the results of the winter quarter assessment, changes were made to the type and frequency of instruction provided to the students in general biology. The librarians designed a more applied lab time in the library session. The instructor had students use the computer during conference sessions to compare web sites on a topic and discuss web site reliability as well as locate scientific research articles through the library database. The students also reviewed a primary article in class and identified the key features, including identifying the experimental design and hypothesis for the research from the publication. Expectations for student performance were lowered slightly due to the wide range of skill demonstrated during the pilot assessment in the winter.

Sample size = 36

Criteria:

- #1. 85% of students will appropriately identify unreliable or inappropriate sources
- #2. 70% of students will identify scientific literature accurately
- #3. 85% of students will select relevant sources because of their reliability
- #4. 85% of students will identify sources not to use because of their unreliability
- #5. 85% of students will identify appropriate next steps to research the topic

From Kitty:

Summary of responses to follow-up questions (sample size: 45)

- 33% of students were able to correctly identify three characteristics of a peer-reviewed article; 8% identified two.
- 35% of students were unable to list any characteristics of a peer-reviewed article
- 78% of students indicated "I found a popular article with a reference to a scientific journal article, and I was able to locate the full-text of the article easily."
- 40% of students sought help from a reference librarian to complete the assignment.

3. How did it go? What did students really "get or not get?"

From Rebecca:

Criteria #1. & #3. & #4 [refer to criteria above]. Students identified 6 web pages and 6 articles as reliable consistently from the lists (70% of the selections were the same). During the winter quarter, the selections were more widespread (only 40% were the same). This demonstrates more consistency in

student evaluation of reliable web pages. Students cited reasons for selecting the web sites as reliable based on the presence of key words, the author of the site as a credible professional or known medical research resource. Students selected the articles citing reliability due to the journal name or the authors 100% of the time.

Unreliable sources were identified as ads, poor sources, or not relevant to the search topic 100% of the time.

Criteria #2. Students identified primary scientific literature on the lists they were given. 19% successfully identified all of the sources and an additional 25% were able to identify at least half of the scientific literature. However 42% were not able to identify primary sources or did so incorrectly.

Criteria #5. The students identified the following next steps to researching the topic:

Use new/refined search terms based on the first round of sources	33%
Search the citations of the sources they identified in this exercise	58%
Read the articles they selected off of the lists	9%

The significant change between quarters for this portion of the assessment is the students' recognition that the citations in their sources can be good references for further information.

From Kitty

The responses on the feedback were lower than expected. Only 41% of students could identify two or three characteristics of a peer-reviewed article, far short of Rebecca's criteria #2 (70% of students will identify scientific literature accurately). We may need to look for a better mechanism for administering the feedback questions, or, as Rebecca suggests, these concepts need to be reinforced throughout the quarter.

4. What did the assessment results tell you? Because of the assessment, are you going to change anything?

From Rebecca:

Next steps: Based on the assessment, it appears that students respond well to more consistent instruction on scientific information literacy throughout the quarter. In the spring they demonstrated more consistency in identifying reliable sources from the web and an article database. A weakness remains that, as introductory students, they are not consistently able to identify primary research from a search list. The instructors for this course are currently rethinking how much of a priority this should be for our class and our students.

From Kitty

When asked about the usefulness of the library session and their preference for type of instruction (demo only, demo with hand-on, worksheet, etc) student responses were evenly split. I plan to continue exploring new ways to make these sessions more-student centered while improving on the outcomes.

5. What feedback did you get from the faculty member you worked with?

From Rebecca:

It has been extremely beneficial to work with the librarians on this project. The student gains learning the outcome measured is due, at least in part, to our collaborative effort.

From Kitty

Because Rebecca is so knowledgeable in outcomes assessment, this collaboration has been extremely useful in moving forward with our assessment goals. Rebecca is a role model for incorporating IL assessment into existing assignments.

Collaboration #3 – Course: Biology 101: Environmental Biology

1. Description of the assignment and outcomes for instruction.

Assignment: Teams of 3 or 4 students work together on an environmental topic. Teams will compile a bibliography of 10 credible sources (one must be from a scholarly journal). Teams also prepare an abstract and a group presentation.

In order to provide informative presentations on their topics, students will be able to locate and recognize credible information sources.

To do this well, students need to know:

- how to evaluate information, especially web sites
- how to identify scholarly journal articles
- how to access the library's catalog and databases
- how to locate useful information in the library's reference collection

To facilitate the learning, students will attend two library sessions and work with their group members through the library lab exercise. The librarian provides 10-15 minutes of overview, then the librarian and instructor assist groups individually. The instructor collects the lab exercises and provides feedback to students.

To demonstrate what they have learned, students will turn in a bibliography of sources as part of their group presentation.

To determine if the student has met the outcome:

- the librarian/instructor will evaluate the credibility/usefulness of the sources used in the bibliography
 - For 80% of the students, 90% of the citations will be from credible, relevant sources, including: scholarly journal articles, academic books, relevant newspaper/magazine articles, and web sites.
 - One of the ten sources must be from a scholarly journal
- During the Q&A portion of the group presentations, students will be able to provide source information for one piece of information included in their presentation.
- During conference with the instructor, students will complete a follow-up survey of their research experience.
 - 80% of students will be able to list three criteria for evaluating information
 - 80% of students will be able to list three criteria for distinguishing a research article in a scholarly journal from a popular source.

2. How and what evidence did you gather?

1. Examination of sources in the bibliography.

For this initial assessment, I used a simple rubric to rate the sources. Of the 87 sources listed on 9 bibliographies:

82% (71 sources) credible and appropriate	credible and appropriate
8% (7 sources)	credibility shaky (source highly biased, too brief to be useful, or lacking consistent sources)
10% (9 sources)	not credible and/or not appropriate (flawed web sites, K-12 content, wikipedia)

Only 3 of the nine bibliographies included a research article from a scholarly journal.

2. Results of the follow-up survey

- 46% of students were able to list three criteria for evaluating information. 29% were able to list two criteria. (Total of 75% who could list two or three criteria). 21% failed to list any criteria.
- 14% of students were able to list three criteria for distinguishing a research article in a scholarly journal from a popular source. Another 32% were able to list two criteria. (Total of 48% who could list two or more criteria). 32% failed to list any criteria.

3. How did it go? What did students really “get or not get?”

If you combine the feedback, where only 32% of students could identify characteristics of a research article in a scholarly journal, with the knowledge that only one-third of the bibliographies included a research article, it's obvious that this is an area that continues to need work, pedagogically.

That 82% of students used credible and appropriate web sites may indicate that students recognize credible information even if they cannot (or for some reason, are unwilling) to articulate criteria. Because of the topics involved, students relied heavily on government web sites (many were from the EPA) which they may recognize as being “automatically” credible.

4. What did the assessment results tell you? Because of the assessment, are you going to change anything?

The librarian and the instructor need to come up with a strategy for helping students locate a research article. Students meet in the library for two lab sessions, so the opportunity exists. Also, I would like for us to collaborate on a single rubric that would meet both our assessment needs. Ideally, the rubric would serve as the instructor's grading sheet that she could then share with me (and I would not go through the bibliographies separately).

5. What feedback did you get from the faculty member you worked with?

Kathleen is on sabbatical this quarter and next, but we have collaborated on the library sessions for several years; this is the first time I have formally assessed the Information outcomes.

Collaboration #4 – Web-Based Tutorial – Plagiarism

1. Description of the assignment and outcomes for instruction.

Plagiarism: What Clark College Students need to Know is a web-based, interactive tutorial that includes a quiz. The module is based on the English Department Statement on Plagiarism and was developed as a result of discussions and collaborations in four Soup-and-Seminars (faculty seminars) conducted during Fall 2005. For the seminar presentations and follow-up work, Librarian Kitty Mackey collaborated with English Instructor Joe Pitkin, VP of Instruction Ray Korpi, and then-VP of Student Affairs Ted Broussard. The module was developed with the support of an Information Literacy grant from the Library Media Directors Council of Washington State.

The module was introduced during Fall 2006 in-service and has generated considerable faculty support. As of October 10, 2006, 36 faculty have been added to the “email quiz results” page. Because the “ethical use of information” is one of the library's outcomes, we maintain a database of emailed results.

Outcomes identified in the module are:

students will be able to identify

2. How and what evidence did you gather?

At the end of week 3, 245 students had taken the quiz and scored as follows:

14/14 (100%) -- 27 students (11%)

13/14 (93%) -- 48 students (20%)

12/14 (86%) -- 68 students (28%)

11/14 (79%) -- 49 students (20%)

3. How did it go? What did students really “get or not get?”

As with any online module, it's difficult to assess real learning. Also, students have the option of re-taking the quiz as many times as they choose before submitting a final score. More collaborative assessment with course instructors will be required to determine whether or not the module has an impact on the incidence of plagiarism.

4. What did the assessment results tell you? Because of the assessment, are you going to change anything?

Although we have not articulated specific measurements for this module yet, my initial expectation would be to see 80% of students score 80% or above. Initial scores are close – 78% have score 79% or above. It's interesting to note that even though students have the option of re-taking the quiz as many times as they want to improve their score, only 11% settled for a perfect score.

5. What feedback did you get from the faculty member you worked with?

The plagiarism module is a work in progress. Several faculty have already suggested improvements, some of which I've incorporated, others that will have to wait until breaks between quarters (when the tutorial is offline). One way to track student learning will be to administer a pre-test, and to follow up (collaborating with the instructor) with an authentic assessment at the end of the quarter.

We also plan to do usability testing for the module during Winter Quarter (our traditional collaboration with GRCP 210 students.)

Overall Learning

1. Give an example from one of your collaborations of something you are going to improve based on the feedback you received (faculty, peer, student work).

Plagiarism module:

- Build in more interactivity
- Build in an opportunity for a pre-test
- Collaborate with instructors to give students a hands-on, written follow-up assessment at the end of the quarter.

Biology 101 and 104 students

- Explore strategies for helping students learn how to distinguish primary/ research articles in scholarly journals

Women's Studies

- Explore strategies and activities that provide students with practice evaluating web sites.

2. How did these activities contribute or connect to your Action Plan?

- Outcome #2. Teach innovatively and collaboratively in order to increase student learning and success
 - Indicator: Provide effective, student-centered instruction to discipline classes and LIBR 105.
 - Activity: Develop assessment tools for 2 sessions per quarter.
 - Activity: Library faculty use active learning techniques.
 - Activity: Library faculty craft effective lesson plans.
- Outcome #5. Assess information outcomes established by the Instruction Department in order to achieve teaching excellence
 - Indicator: Design and incorporate integrated assessments into discipline courses

Next Steps for the Grant:

These are grant deliverables we are working towards this year. Please keep these things in mind as you plan and give me a sense of where you are and where you could be.

1. Are you currently incorporating authentic assessments in at least 3 academic and professional/technical departments (one of the grant benchmarks)? Can you over this next year?

Current authentic assessments:

- Biology 101
- Biology 104

Proposed for Winter 2006:

- Continue work with Plagiarism: collaborate with faculty from two departments. Students will work through Plagiarism module early in the quarter, then complete an authentic assessment at the end of the quarter. *Suggested departments: English 102* (Winter 06 instructors: Kate Scrivener, Sandy Woodward, Lynn Nolan, Geneva Chao, Elizabeth Doneley), **Alcohol and Chemical Dependency** (Marcia Roi)
- Women's Studies (Dian Ulner) Given a list of sources and a scenario, students will be able to identify and rank from most → least credible. (proposed)

draf

2. Pre-Tests/Post Tests: The Grant indicates that “student performance will improve from pretest to learning assessments by 40%; discipline faculty will indicate student papers and projects demonstrate improvement by at least 2 points on a 5 point rubric as compared to classes where library instruction was not incorporated.”

If you are continuing these assessment collaborat[draft]g new ones, can you build in pre/post testing?

We are currently not doing any pre-post testing. This is a goal for Winter 2006 or Spring 2006.

Can you get data from the same classes that are not receiving instruction?

We can but try.

- 3. Documenting Assessment Instruments: The Grant says that 75% of Library Directors will indicate the instruments developed are effective in documenting the instructional and student success and retention dimensions of the library to administrators.**

Are you creating assessment instruments that can used to demonstrate these things within your library and your college environment?

Assessment instruments to date:

- Plagiarism quiz
- TILT quizzes
- Biology 104: ProQuest/Google article evaluating and ranking (Rebecca Martin's)
- Biology 101: Bibliography

Goals:

- Plagiarism authentic assessments
- Source credibilty authentic assessment