

# City University of Seattle Library & LRC Assessment Project

2014-15 Assessment in Action participant



This project is part of the program [“Assessment in Action: Academic Libraries and Student Success”](#) which is undertaken by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) in partnership with the Association for Institutional Research and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

The program, a cornerstone of ACRL's Value of Academic Libraries initiative, is made possible by the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

## AiA program focuses on library value and impact on student learning

In 2014-15, the City University of Seattle (CityU) Library was selected to participate in a yearlong national Assessment in Action (AiA) training program created to build knowledge about and awareness of library value and contribution to student learning. Each participating library assembled a team consisting of librarians and at least two members from other departments at their institutions. Each team conceived of and carried out a library assessment project tied to their institutional mission. The program culminated with team leaders' presentation of their projects during a poster session at the 2015 American Library Association conference in June 2015.

## CityU library assessment project team members

- Carlyne Begin, MLS, Librarian, Library & Learning Resource Center
- Kelly Flores, Ed.D., Dean and Professor, School of Applied Leadership
- Mary Mara, MLIS, Director of Library Services, Library & Learning Resource Center
- Tammy Salman, MLIS, Associate Director of Instruction, Library & Learning Resource Center [team leader]
- Susan Seymour, Ph.D., Director, Office of Institutional Effectiveness

## Steps in the library assessment project

- Define our central question.
- Identify connection to academic model and assessment strategy.
- Develop sub-questions and hypotheses to guide the project.
- Define levels of library instruction.
- Identify a process for determining the number of times students click on library-created instructional content in Blackboard LMS.
- Pull mastery-level Learning Goal 3B Information Literacy rubric scores.
- Analyze data and determine results/conclusions.

## Project linked to CityU academic model and assessment strategy

City University Learning Goals (CULGs) represent the critical competencies necessary to be successful in today's workforce. In addition to program learning outcomes that demonstrate knowledge and skills for an area of study, CityU students are expected to demonstrate mastery of the Learning Goals upon graduation. These learning goals are practiced extensively across the curriculum and within the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards.

Specifically, our project is linked to:

- **CityU Learning Goal 3:** CityU graduates demonstrate critical thinking and information literacy. "CityU graduates are able to think critically and to reflect upon their own work and the larger context in which it takes place. They are able to find, access, evaluate, and use information in order to solve problems. They consider the complex implications of actions they take and decisions they make."
- **Assessment Strategy Core Theme 1:** Deliver high quality, relevant education.  
*Objective A: CityU supports the achievement of student learning outcomes.*

**About the secondary rubrics:** CityU has eight secondary rubrics which measure university learning goals. Each academic program has mapped a set of courses to each of the learning goals at the introductory (I), practice (P), and mastery (M) levels. In 2014-15, the university piloted secondary rubrics, starting with a handful of programs which assessed students at the mastery level. As the university builds out its assessment efforts, all academic programs are expected to assess students at the I and P levels as well.

## Levels of library instruction

**LEVEL 3:** Levels 1 and 2 PLUS direct instruction by a librarian, whether in-person or online via synchronous or asynchronous methods.

**LEVEL 2:** Level 1 PLUS library-developed supplemental instructional materials.

**LEVEL 1:** All Blackboard courses have a library web link and liaison librarian contact information.

## Questions which guided our project

**Central question:** What can the library learn about the impact of its instruction program on student learning by participating in the university's Comprehensive Assessment Strategy?

**Other questions we asked, but which require more data in order to answer:**

**Q1:** Do students in courses with Level 3 instruction score higher on the university's Information Literacy Rubric than students with Level 2 instruction?

**Q2:** Do students in courses with Level 2 instruction have higher scores on the CULG 3B Information Literacy Rubric than students with Level 1 library instruction?

**Q3:** Do students in courses with Level 3 instruction access library-created materials more times than students in courses with Level 2 instruction?

**We hypothesized that:**

**H<sub>1</sub>** Students in courses with Level 3 library instruction will have higher CULG 3B rubric scores than students in courses with Level 2 library instruction.

**H<sub>2</sub>** Students in courses with Level 2 library instruction will have higher CULG 3B rubric scores than students in courses with Level 1 library instruction.

**H<sub>3</sub>** Students in courses with Level 3 library instruction will access library-created instructional materials more times than students in courses with Level 2 library instruction.

**H<sub>0</sub>** Library instruction has no effect on students' CULG 3B Information Literacy Rubric scores or on the number of times students access library-created instructional materials.

**As a result of this assessment project:**

- We generated baseline data and processes for assessing the library's instruction program.
- The library has established a method for collecting data which shows use of library-developed instructional content.
- We strengthened collaboration with I.T., Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and School of Applied Leadership faculty.
- We developed a better understanding of assessment methods.
- The library's instruction team is more aware that their efforts have some impact on students – it is still to be determined what that impact is, but we can see that students are clicking on the content we embed in their courses.
- We have identified potential gaps in instructional coverage.
- We hope to begin deeper conversations about the library's value and impact on student learning.

Moving forward, we plan to:

- Share our preliminary results and what we learned with our stakeholders.
- Collect / analyze a year's worth of click data and IL rubric scores to assess students' progress at I, P, M levels.
- Identify relationships among IL rubric scores, student clicks, library instruction.
- Assess project scalability and revise processes for efficiency.