Information Literacy Learning Community Meeting September 29, 2016

DRAFT ACTION ITEMS
Building 35-319b
10:10 am - 11:00 am
~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

CSM - Beth Chance; Programs & Planning - Mary Pedersen, Jack Phelan, Bruno Giberti; Katie Tool; Kennedy Library - Adriana Popescu; Katherine O’Claire; Kaila Bussert;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Items &amp; Context</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Prior Assessment</td>
<td>Katherine O’Claire and Kaila Bussert will revisit the prior assessments. Jack Phelan will sit with Bruno Giberti and Mary Pedersen to find if the prior assessments worth revisiting.</td>
<td>Katherine O’Claire, Kaila Bussert and Jack Phelan.</td>
<td>October 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Level of Assessment</td>
<td>Katherine O’Claire will talk with Josh Machamer and Brenda Helmbrecht for discipline specific guidelines. Jack Phelan will talk with Katie Tool for course lists, size, schedules etc.</td>
<td>Jack Phelan and Katherine O’Claire</td>
<td>October 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Library Assessment Conference</td>
<td>Katherine O’Claire will be attending the conference and bring her experience back. She will meet Megan Oakleaf there. She request’s Jack Phelan to inform Megan Oakleaf about her being present at the conference.</td>
<td>Katherine O’Claire and Jack Phelan</td>
<td>During and before Library Assessment Conference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEETING NOTES

1. Discussion: Roadmap for Fall
   • Deliverables
     a. Level of assessment
        ▪ (Targeting upper division GE?)
        • (Katherine O.) Lower division courses were used in the past which was used as a skill survey. This time, foundational level courses should be included. We should include upper division courses. Lower level courses are easily reachable. We already worked with the lower level instructors in all six colleges and with students from all majors. A1 and A3 courses should be used. Senior projects are all across the campus. So upper division GE courses will be the most applicable option, specifically, courses which are writing intensive. I think we need to investigate which courses should be selected. We can talk with Josh Machamer and Brenda Helmbrecht, based on their experience they can give us guidelines which can be more discipline specific.
• (Jack P.) Katie Tool can be a good resource to talk for course lists, size, schedules etc.
• (Katherine O.) We can collect artifacts from both upper and lower division classes, to understand general characteristics and different components of the artifacts. When looking for assignments we should offer flexibility to the Instructors but at the same time, a general characteristic has to be developed so that different assignments are comparable and consistent. If we can develop some form of characteristics that can provide consistency on the assignments from different classes to decrease the instructor-to-instructor variability.

b. Identifying methods/instruments
• 2 Direct, 1 Indirect
• Signature assignments, CLA+, NSSE (including the IL module)
  • (Jack P.) Information literacy module has been submitted for the upcoming NSSE. We will have results to share with Beth Chance.
  • (Katherine O.) NSSE exam is in March, 2017. Data collection will happen in academic year 2017-18, fall 2017 and winter 2018 to be specific. We are not going to have everything prescriptive for the instructors.
  • (Beth C.) How long do you think the students need to work on the artifacts that we need?
  • (Katherine O.) We should communicate with the instructors and ask if they are willing to share the assignments.
  • (Adriana P.) How connected are we with the instructors?
  • (Katherine O.) College librarians will be useful in that respect.
  • (Jack P.) Dawn Janke can be a great resource for reaching out to the instructors, Katie Tool will be a great resource as well.
  • (Katherine O.) Once we get the assignments we can get back and see what works what does not. We should not put a constraint on selection. Artifacts which can be useful are research memos, log, dairy, etc.

• Reflection component
  • (Kaila B.) A digital form of research methodology has been developed by the Library.

• Prior assessment?
  • (Jack P.) Is there any plan or intention to connect this assessment to the prior assessment or any connecting thread that should be visited? Can I say that we do not need to see a follow-up to the previous assessment?
  • (Katherine O.) The previous assessment was scenario based, they were assessing Lifelong learning. I don’t want WASC to say, the current report does not reflect connection with what has been done in 2010. There are weaknesses and strengths. I don’t see using the prior assessments brings any advantage. Maybe we can have a look at and draw theme. We really did not get something worth looking.

c. Rubric design & strategy
• (Jack P.) When do we need the rubric to be designed?
• (Katherine O.) Rubric should come before the signature assignments. Deciding for sure that we will work with GE, we can use previous instruments to see if anything worth, it will be easy to run a search. A signature assignment can be a research notebook.

d. Research questions and hypotheses
(Jack P.) Is it too late to discuss potential Research questions and hypothesis as scheduled for our last Fall quarter meeting on December 1?

2. Consultation
   - Statistics – needs
     - Guidance with developing research questions
     - Assistance in formulating hypotheses
     - Ensuring methodological soundness
     - Sample size requirements
       - (Jack P.) When dealing with classes with 240 students, WASC advised score 60 assignments. If a course has 20 students, we should go and capture that course.
       - (Beth C.) How many can be scored?
       - (Jack P.) That is why when we got class of 250 students, we randomly selected 60 assignments for validity, reliability.
       - (Katherine O.) My philosophy is to get as much as we can and then randomly select a subset of the collection.
   - Capturing demographic information
     - (Beth C.) Do we have partnerships with upper level classes?
     - (Jack P.) What demographic information should we call for?
     - (Katherine O.) AP credits.
     - (Jack P.) We are now requesting standard data from IR when we compile data: Gender, IRM, 1st Gen, Cumulative Cal Poly GPA, etc.
     - (Katherine O.) Also EAA and if the students have taken A1-A3 courses and library instructions. The capabilities of the students are related to library instruction.
     - (Beth C.) A separate survey can steal some questions from NSSE.
   - IL Assessment/Rubrics
     - Library Assessment Conference
       - Katherine will be attending the conference and bring her experience back. Will see Megan Oakleaf there.
     - Megan Oakleaf’s visit

3. Tasks for next meeting - 10/13
   - Katherine and Kaila will revisit the prior assessments.
   - Jack will sit with Bruno Giberti and Mary to find if the prior assessments worth revisiting.
   - Kaila and Katherine will look at Upper Level GE courses.
Fall 2016 Meeting Schedule

Thursday 09/29 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b – Fall Roadmap

Thursday 10/13 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b – Level of Assessment, Assessment Instruments

Thursday 11/10 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b – Rubric Planning & Design

Thursday 12/01 10:10am to 11:00am 35-319b – Research Questions and Hypothesis