

Detailed Assessment Report
2010-2011 Library and Information Science BA

Mission / Purpose

The purpose of the undergraduate library and information science major (B.A.) is to educate students for careers in the information fields; in libraries the B.A. is a paraprofessional degree. The program supports the mission of the college and the university through provision of curriculum designed to serve the needs of the students while nurturing opportunities that create a vigorous region, engage students, promote discourse, and enhance quality of life. The curriculum prepares future information specialists for roles that include modeling and valuing collaboration, effective communication, information based problem-solving, an appreciation of and respect for diversity, recognition and sensitivity to standards of ethical conduct and how to organize, access and evaluate print and non-print information resources in a variety of settings.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Recognize and utilize appropriate information resources

Students demonstrate fundamental abilities in recognizing, evaluating and utilizing appropriate reference resources to resolve information problems by locating specific reference tools, in print or online, that offer information relevant to the question.

Related Measure:

M 1: Evaluating and using reference tools

Students conduct reference searching activities to identify and evaluate reference resources to resolve reference questions. They report complete information on the reference interview, types of reference, types of questions, encyclopedias, dictionaries, etc. The activities are assessed by completion of the tasks and strategies reported.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:

80% of students will identify viable search strategies, appropriate potential reference resources to access the information.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Not Met

Fall 2010: Due to a change of faculty and syllabus error student search strategies were not assessed against the rubric. Students reported their findings on a discussion board, but were not evaluated on these.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

For full information, see the *Action Plan Detail* section of this report.

Revised LIS 401 Reference syllabus and rubrics

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011

For fall 2011 the syllabus for the LIS 401 Reference Resources course has been revised and the searching exercises relate to an ...

M 2: Source evaluation annotated bibliography

Students create an annotated bibliography to demonstrate their ability to evaluate reference resources and present the information.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:

85% of students will complete the annotated bibliography achieving superior or satisfactory assessment as measured by the appropriate rubric 1) grammar and spelling 2) bibliographic citation 3) on source selection and source justification, 4) detail of description

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Fall 2010: 100% (10/10) students submitting the assignment achieved excellent ranking as compared to the rubric. NOTE: Related assessment course, LIS 401 only offered in fall.

SLO 2: Demonstrate written and oral communication skills in context

Students write policies or analyses for hypothetical library situations that demonstrate writing skills as well as address specific elements of assignments with clarity and appropriate citation support.

Related Measure:

M 3: Demonstrate essential writing skills: Collection Development

A collection development policy for an hypothetical library that is 1) free of typos, punctuation errors, spelling errors, and grammatical errors 2) clear and logically arranged 3) incorporates varied, interesting, appropriate vocabulary and sentence structure 4) written in third-person, objective, gender-free style. (LIS 411)

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:

Target 80% of assessed student writing assignments are rated as satisfactory based on the writing rubric with at least 5% of those rated as excellent as compared to the writing rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Spring 2011: 94% (17 of 18) students achieved an excellent rating on the writing aspects of the rubric, with 1 (6%) student needing improvement.

M 4: Demonstrate advanced writing skills: Scholarly Paper

Students research and write a 4,000 to 4,500 word scholarly paper as part of the capstone (LIS 489 Practicum) experience. The paper includes scholarly sources as well as information gathered on-site and from organizational documents and Web sites. The paper is assessed based upon content, appropriate use of research with documentation and consistent citation of sources, compliance with the standard research formats (Introduction, Literature Review, Methodology, Discussion), language has few errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling and usage, and word choice aids clarity, vividness, and credibility.

Source of Evidence: Capstone course assignments measuring mastery

Target:

95% of students will achieve satisfactory as compared to the writing rubric for the LIS 489 scholarly paper.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Fall 2010: 100% (5 of 5) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based upon the writing rubric for the LIS 489 scholarly paper. Spring 2011: 100% (5 of 5) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based upon the writing rubric for the LIS 489 scholarly paper. Summer 2011: 100% (3 of 3) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based upon the writing rubric for the LIS 489 scholarly paper.

M 5:Oral presentation

Students make an oral presentation to a group of students and faculty in the capstone course (LIS 489 Practicum). The presentation is assessed for content, organization, language, verbal and nonverbal delivery, as well as the quality of the supporting PowerPoint Presentation or other mediation.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:

90% of students should achieve satisfactory on the oral presentation based on the associated rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Fall 2010: 100% (5 of 5) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based on the oral presentation rubric. Spring 2011: 100% (5 of 5) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based on the oral presentation rubric. Summer 2011: 100% (3 of 3) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based on the oral presentation rubric.

SLO 3:Demonstrate and articulate basic philosophy of the field.

Students demonstrate an understanding of the key philosophies of the field through written assignments on specific topics and participation in practicum experiences.

Related Measure:

M 6:Collection development policy

Students design collection development policy including all the elements of the associated rubrics with clarity and appropriate citation support. Rubrics are found in LIS 411.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:

80% of students will achieve satisfactory ranking on all of the elements of the collection development policy rubrics.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Spring 2011: 89% (16 of 18) students achieved excellent or satisfactory rankings on the overall rubric with 11% (2 of 18) needing improvement. 89% (16 of 18) achieved satisfactory or excellent on the content aspects rubrics, with 1 student (6%) ranking needs improvement and 1 (6%) student's assessment on content rating not acceptable. Overall, students performed well on this assignment..

M 7:Library Bill of Rights Challenges

Students summarize an actual challenge or attempt to censor library materials (or restrict access) and explain how sections of the Library Bill of Rights relate to the challenge (Evaluation of Library

Collections, Censorship and Recommendations for Challenged Materials).

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:

80% of students will achieve a satisfactory ranking compared to the rubric with 5% achieving superior ranking.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Spring 2011: 83% (15 of 18) students achieved satisfactory or superior ranking based on the rubric for the Censorship/Collection development essay. 78% (14 of 18) students achieved superior ranking as compared to the rubric and 1 of 18 (6%) ranked satisfactory. 11% (2 of 18) were ranked as needing improvement and 6% (1 of 18) was ranked as unacceptable.

M 8:Capstone Experiences

Students cooperatively design a practicum experience with a library or information entity. The experience is specific to the location and individual. The site supervisor monitors and reports on student achievement of the agreed upon tasks at midpoint and end of the experience. The site supervisor reports via an agreed upon rubric to the faculty supervisor. The student maintains a reflective journal that is submitted to the faculty supervisor weekly. The student is assessed based on the practicum agreement parameters, the rubrics the site supervisor uses for assessment, and the ranking rubric for the self-reflective journal.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:

90% of students should achieve a satisfactory ranking based on the combined rubrics of the practicum.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Fall 2010: 100% (5 of 5) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based upon the cumulative practicum rubrics. Spring 2011: 100% (5 of 5) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based upon the cumulative practicum rubrics. Summer 2011: 100% (3 of 3) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based upon the cumulative practicum rubrics.

SLO 4:Technology competency

Students employ current technology tools appropriate to the library field.

Related Measure:

M 5:Oral presentation

Students make an oral presentation to a group of students and faculty in the capstone course (LIS 489 Practicum). The presentation is assessed for content, organization, language, verbal and nonverbal delivery, as well as the quality of the supporting PowerPoint Presentation or other mediation.

Source of Evidence: Presentation, either individual or group

Target:

90% of students should achieve a satisfactory rating for the PowerPoint Presentation associated with their oral presentation based on the Audio Visual/PowerPoint rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Fall 2010: 100% (5 of 5) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based upon the Presentation Rubric Spring 2011: 100% (5 of 5) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based upon the Presentation Rubric Summer 2011: 100% (3 of 3) practicum students achieved satisfactory rankings based upon the Presentation Rubric.

M 9:Technology projects

Students create a technology portfolio of appropriate and acceptable artifacts in the Media Utilization course (LIS 416). Individual element rubrics yield an overall portfolio assessment, students demonstrate ability to create and present lesson plans for teaching various technologies, provide detailed instructions with examples for setting up or installing software or equipment, produce Power Points with specified elements.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

Target:

90% of students will achieve satisfactory ranking based on the portfolio evaluation rubric.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Summer 2010: 93% (14 of 15) students achieved a satisfactory ranking against the rubric for the portfolio. 7% (1 of 15) rated as unacceptable. (Summer is the only time this course has been taught in this cycle.)

M 10:Webpage evaluation and webquest

Students evaluate websites/pages, identify a topic of study and create a WebQuest of internet-based activities for students to follow to gather information and carry out activities. The student's WebQuest is presented in a webpage format and is assessed against rubrics for webpage design and assignment criteria satisfaction.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:

90% of student WebQuest/webpages will be satisfactory compared to the rubrics of webpage evaluation and assignment criteria.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Summer 2010: 100% (15 of 15) students WebQuest/webpages were rated as satisfactory assessed against the webpage evaluations and the assignment criteria. This assessment is in a course only offered in summer.

SLO 5:Organization and cataloging skills

Students apply the rules of description and subject cataloging to create basic catalog records in electronic format demonstrating an understanding of the basic principles of organization of information as they relate to cataloging and classification. Students further demonstrate these skills by being assessed on bibliographic entries they create that are employed in tasks that are not specific to cataloging.

Related Measure:

M 11:Cataloging exercises

Students complete 10 exercises, each designed to assess students' basic understanding of the information in bibliographic records and present correct bibliographic description with the appropriate printed and online tools in cataloging and classification. The exercises require students to inspect and compare multiple sources of bibliographic records for copy cataloging; compare and contrast sources and are assessed based on completeness and correctness of punctuation, capitalization, MARC coding, and/or content placement in the record.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:

75% of submitted cataloging exercise assignments will rank as satisfactory based on the quality of punctuation, capitalization, MARC coding, and/or content placement.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Fall 2010: 92% (11 of 12) student exercises were ranked as satisfactory compared to the rubrics. 1 (8%) needed improvement. (Fall was on the only time offered in this cycle.)

M 12:Bibliographic applications

Students demonstrate ability to create and interpret bibliographic entries in collection management tasks of selection and weeding.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:

75% of students will achieve satisfactory ratings as compared to the appropriate rubrics for accurate interpretation and completion of bibliographic records in collection management tasks.

Findings (2010-2011) - Target: Met

Spring 2011: 78% (14 of 18) students achieved satisfactory rating against the collection selection assessment rubric dealing with bibliographic content. 22% (4 of 18) rated needing improvement. 83% (15 of 18) students achieved satisfactory ratings against the collection weeding assessment rubric dealing with bibliographic content. 6%(1 of 18) rated needing improvement. 11% (2 of 18) rated as unacceptable.

Action Plan Detail for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

identify and correct writing problems

The overall writing assessment reflect a writing shortcoming noted in other areas. Though 92% acceptable (60/65) it is less than target, the target may be unrealistic, but it has been met before. More faculty will be referred for QEP training, and graduate assistants will be made available to assist undergraduates with writing concerns.

Established in Cycle: 2008-2009

Implementation Status: Finished

Priority: High

Implementation Description: identify faculty to apply to QEP training, begin training GAs to assist and establish an open chat-room for GA and students to meet

Projected Completion Date: 09/30/2009
Responsible Person/Group: curriculum committee

Review implementation of assessment

Annotated bibliography task must be included in 401 course requirements, an omission of this task occurred in the 07-08 cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: fall 2008
Responsible Person/Group: Curriculum chair/ 401 instructor

Revise Assessment target description

Base target goal on submitted assignments, not student enrollment.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Finished
Priority: High
Implementation Description: Revise target for 2010-2011
Responsible Person/Group: LIS 401 instructors/director

Revised LIS 401 Reference syllabus and rubrics

For fall 2011 the syllabus for the LIS 401 Reference Resources course has been revised and the searching exercises relate to an assessment strategy and rubric. Additional assessment approaches are being designed and piloted in fall 2010 for implementation in the next course offering.

Established in Cycle: 2010-2011
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Evaluating and using reference tools | **Outcome/Objective:** Recognize and utilize appropriate information resources

Implementation Description: Syllabus is being redesigned, and verified with the curriculum committee and director.

Projected Completion Date: 08/22/2011

Responsible Person/Group: Instructor, curriculum committee and director.

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What specifically did your assessments show regarding proven strengths or progress you made on outcomes/objectives?

Student performance remained strong; all but one target was met. The exception was an assessment that was not handled properly in the class and no data was collected, as a result of a change in faculty and miscommunication; the issue has been resolved. The exit survey, which was determined to be a failed process, was not used in this cycle, as recommended by the WEAVE reviewing council. Progress continued in student performance relative to writing. The school rewrote the general writing rubric to be more in line with the QEP model; faculty agreed to using this unified writing rubric model in the previous cycle and in the 2010-2011 cycle changed the assessment from an overall assessment of all

writing assignments together, to assessment on specific writing tasks at different stages in the program. Students in the earlier portion of the program will not have had as much writing experience as at the end of the program. Having the same expectations of the entering student as the exiting student by summing all of the writing assessments together was skewing results and not assessing the developmental nature of this skill. In the 2010-2011 cycle two direct writing assessments were used: one in LIS 411 which is usually the second or third junior level LIS taken, and in LIS 489 the capstone, usually the last course taken. Though writing is a component of all course assessment consideration, these two were determined to be appropriate benchmarks. Targeting 80% satisfactory rating as compared to the writing rubric, the LIS 411 group had 89% (16 of 18) rated as satisfactory or excellent and 11% (2 of 18) rated as needing improvement. Targeting 95% satisfactory rating as compared to the writing rubrics in LIS 489, each of the three semesters 100% of the students (fall 5 of 5, spring 5 of 5, summer 3 of 3) rated excellent on the rubric for writing a scholarly paper.

What specifically did your assessments show regarding any outcomes/objectives that will require continued attention?

Continuing review of all of the rubrics employed in the courses is necessary, and a renewed emphasis on details. Improved detail description for the students as well as the assessors will make this process more useful. All the assessments need continued attention to adjust for the findings each cycle.

Annual Report Section Responses

Program Summary

The purpose of the undergraduate library and information science major (B.A.) is to educate students for careers in the information fields; in libraries the B.A. is a paraprofessional degree. The program supports the mission of the college and the university through provision of curriculum designed to serve the needs of the students while nurturing opportunities that create a vigorous region, engage students, promote discourse, and enhance quality of life. The curriculum prepares future information specialists for roles that include modeling and valuing collaboration, effective communication, information based problem-solving, an appreciation of and respect for diversity, recognition and sensitivity to standards of ethical conduct and how to organize, access and evaluate print and non-print information resources in a variety of settings. The Library and Information Science BA program at Southern Miss is a relatively small program serving several constituencies: school libraries' need for certified media specialists, public and academic paraprofessional needs, and general information services personnel interests. Interest in the field of librarianship and information studies varies and is reflected in dramatic changes in LIS enrollment and degree production. Skills developed in the LIS BA are applicable in a variety of venues including general office, information industry, management, and information organization. The LIS program has attracted some increased interest because most of our courses are offered online. However, these courses are specific to the field of library science and require real-time chat meetings to ensure student/faculty interaction and proper socialization into the field. Students who are not prepared to be challenged to learn the service side of research and reference, or cannot grasp concepts of organization and classification, are not likely to remain in the program, regardless of the vehicle of delivery. The LIS program provides a service course, LIS 201 Introduction to Information Literacy. This course is an option in the GEC computer competency selections. While introducing students to basic computer skills, concepts of information literacy and research tools are also elements in the course. Our own students are required to take this course as a preparation for far more detailed instruction in technology, information literacy, reference and research.

Continuous Improvement Initiatives

We will continue to send faculty to QEP training and work on devising a better tutorial system for students to have guidance about grammar and basic English language skills.

Closing the Loop

A recurring issue has been the identification of student writing problems and determining the remedies. The issue identified in the 2008-2009 cycle has been dealt with by sending more faculty to QEP training and adopting a unified writing rubric across the school. Attempting to train our GAs to act as volunteer writing tutors was a good idea, but ineffective when the students do not make use of the GAs' assistance. All faculty within the school are expected to grade assignments for grammar, spelling, and clarity. The rubric has allowed more consistent assessment of student writing and aided in identifying the most common errors. Problems that have been identified: inferior previous grammar training with no support from outside of the program, inattention to details and instructions, and failure to review materials after writing. Students need additional grammar support; grammar should be graded in all courses outside of the program as well as within the program. Students need to be given guidance about the importance of following instructions and editing after writing. Specific assessment points have been instituted rather than an overall general writing assessment. Faculty report some improvement in writing once students are made aware that they will be graded on basic writing skills as well as the importance of using standard English. Reflective writing is permitted in a number of courses, but structured writing is required in virtually all courses. Two key assessment points, one early in the student's program and one at the end are used to measure improvement. A new action plan will be developed during the 2011-2012 year to attempt to further address these issues. A problem with a course assignment, the annotated bibliography task, had been omitted from its course and we had to ensure it be included in the 401 course requirements. (An omission of this task occurred in the 2007-2008 cycle and it was corrected.) However, in fall 2010 a different set of assessment points was not collected. So one problem was corrected but the underlying problem in the system that allowed it to happen has not been dealt with yet, so the curriculum committee and the director will have to design a foolproof method for ensuring the faculty are collecting all the data as appropriate. For the 2010-2011 year, a modification to how we report our assessment data involved reporting results based upon submitted assignments rather than on student enrollment. This was put in place to address the issue of some undergraduate students who stop attending or submitting assignments long before they go through the process of formally dropping the course. Being more aware of changes in a student's course work submission has also aided us in more quickly reporting students via Eagle Alert. Allowing students to withdraw through SOAR should help to eliminate the students who remain on the class roster long after they stop participating and attending; this will also improve the accuracy and reliability of data collected.