

UW Madison Information School
Annual Assessment Report Academic Year
2016-2017

Date: Aug 29, 2017

For distribution

INTRODUCTION

This report is a record of the School's experience with this assessment process over the past academic year. The University of Wisconsin—Madison Information School (iSchool) employs a process for continual program assessment and improvement centered on iSchool's performance in terms of achieving program level student learning outcomes. These program level learning outcomes were created and are annually revisited by the faculty.

Assessment activities are primarily run through the iSchool Assessment Committee which includes both faculty and student members. The chair of the Assessment Committee (currently the Director) ensures that assessment data collection activities take place throughout the year and organizes the data from various sources. The Assessment Committee discusses interim results of data analysis during the spring and summer. The full faculty discuss the draft annual report at the annual August retreat. The Assessment Committee and faculty then propose changes to the program, and changes to assessment methodologies based on discussions of the data.

Assessment tools used during the 2016-2017 academic year included:

- a direct assessment of 89 graduating student portfolios,
- an online survey of 68 graduates,
- 30 exit interviews with graduates,
- A survey of student performance from all practica completed during the year.
- A focus group of international students
- A focus group with student organization leaders

At the August 2016 retreat, the faculty/staff identified the following target areas for improvement for the 2016-2017 year, based on the data in last year's report:

- Revision of PLOs in light of new learning outcome requirements from the University of Wisconsin-Madison graduate school (ongoing)
- More instructors include assignments requiring preparation of e-portfolio justification statements in class (ongoing)
- create new 1 credit career/e-portfolio class (accomplished)
- rename e-portfolio as "learning portfolio" to distinguish from professional portfolio (ongoing)

Noteworthy assessment and program improvement activities during the year included:

- consideration of revision of program level learning outcomes in light of curricular changes and program goals
- improve information for international applicants and international students
- investigation of "warm lead" tracking in admissions
- beginning of admissions process task force to redesign process in light of new campus system
- redesign of program website to increase usability and smart phone access
- project to diversify practicum placement opportunities in new concentration areas
- providing more information to students about resources to cope with stress and critical incidents
- workshop for staff and faculty on title IX and hate and bias reporting

- creation of visiting international scholar memorandum of understanding to clarify faculty and administrative staff roles regarding international visitors
- renumbering of technology courses so that number indicates level of difficulty

STUDENT PORTFOLIOS – DIRECT MEASURE

The iSchool assessed graduating student portfolios representing August 2016, December 2016 and May 2017 graduates in two phases:

1. Objective evaluation occurred *prior to graduation* in order to ensure that all students meet the portfolio requirement for graduation. This evaluation focuses on ensuring students meet graduation requirements and quantitative analysis of references to program level learning outcomes.
2. Subjective evaluation occurred after graduation but before the end of the academic contract year. This analysis focuses on qualitative direct measures of the degree to which portfolios show evidence of having met program level learning outcomes

Step 1: Objective Evaluation

This evaluation, completed by the portfolio manager and the Associate Director, ensures students meet the portfolio graduation requirement. Students missing portfolio elements were given ample warning and support in order to quickly finish and meet minimum portfolio criteria.

Step 2: Subjective evaluation

Portfolio review committees met and scored portfolios. 52 portfolios were from campus program students and 12 portfolios were from online program students (total N = 64)

The 2017 portfolio review committee consisted of:

Kristin Eschenfelder, Sunny Kim, Mei Zhang (PhD student), Cat Smith, Anna Palmer, Meredith Lowe, Bronwen Masemann, Rebekah Willett, Michele Besant, Allison Kaplan, Mark Jochem (MA student), Alan Rubel

Reviewers reviewed the degree to which each portfolio demonstrated each of the 12 program level learning outcomes. Each portfolio therefore had 12 points of review. Reviewers gave either a pass or fail grade on each of the 12 points of review.

Review members then met in teams to resolve difficult cases. After a period of discussion the committee again met as a whole to identify learning outcomes that seemed especially problematic for the student body as a whole and to make suggestions for changes to the process.

Scoring: Scorers were instructed to look at each artifact and the justification statement associated with each artifact. Both had to provide evidence of having achieved one or more learning outcomes. Scorers were instructed to use a scoring instruction sheet (see appendix) that gave the artifact slightly more weight than the justification statement in assigning a final score. Each learning outcome could be given one of four scores: satisfactory, leaning satisfactory, leaning unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory.

- The iSchool had set an ideal goal that 85% of portfolios would provide satisfactory evidence of each learning outcome, showing excellent achievement. The iSchool **met this goal for six learning outcomes**.
- **All twelve program level learning outcomes showed at least 80% showed satisfactory evidence**, showing satisfactory achievement. No learning goal fell below 80% and seven PLOs show improvements from the prior academic year.

The six PLOs falling between 80 and 90 percent include:

- 1a: Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information.
- 2a: Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.
- 2b: Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.
- 3a: Students organize and describe print and digital information resources.
- 3c: Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.
- 4d: Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.

Table 1 compares the 2016-2017 portfolio scores with scores from the prior academic year

Table 1: Portfolio Assessment scoring 2016-2017

Learning Outcome	Combined satisfactory and very satisfactory		Combined satisfactory and very satisfactory	
	# 2016 (N=63)	% 2016	# 2017 (N=64)	%2017
1a: Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information.	50	79	54	84.4
1b: Students apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, reading, and information use.	55	87	58	90.6
2a: Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.	55	87	53	82.8
2b: Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.	54	86	54	84.4
3a: Students organize and describe print and digital information resources for use by others	57	90	55	85.9
3b: Students select and evaluate print and digital information resources for use by others.	59	94	64	100
3c: Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.	45	71	56	87.5
3d: Students understand and use appropriate information technologies.	58	92	61	95.3
4a: Students evaluate, problem solve and think critically, both individually and in teams.	58	92	62	96.9
4b: Students demonstrate good oral and written communication skills.	61	97	62	96.9
4c: Students participate in extracurricular activities in the field.	56	89	60	93.8
4d: Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.	56	89	57	89.1

Table 2 compares 2017 distance program graduate portfolios with those of all students together.

Learning Outcome	Combined satisfactory and very satisfactory		Combined satisfactory and very satisfactory	
	# 2017 Distance only (N=12)	% 2017 Distance	# 2017 all students (N=64)	% 2017 all students
1a: Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information.	11	92	54	84.4
1b: Students apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, reading, and information use.	10	83	58	90.6
2a: Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.	11	92	53	82.8
2b: Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.	10	83	54	84.4
3a: Students organize and describe print and digital information resources for use by others	10	83	55	85.9
3b: Students select and evaluate print and digital information resources for use by others.	12	100	64	100
3c: Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.	9	75	56	87.5
3d: Students understand and use appropriate information technologies.	11	92	61	95.3
4a: Students evaluate, problem solve and think critically, both individually and in teams.	12	100	62	96.9
4b: Students demonstrate good oral and written communication skills.	12	100	62	96.9
4c: Students participate in extracurricular activities in the field.	10	83	60	93.8
4d: Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.	12	100	57	89.1

Comparing the distance cohort to all students is difficult given the small N of distance students. A difference of one student makes a substantial difference in the percentage. Three differences are noted below, and we will track trends in these differences over time:

- A smaller percent of distance program students demonstrated mastery of PLO 3c “Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.” (75% vs 87.5% overall) and 1b “apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, reading and information use” (83 vs 90.6% overall).
- Distance students scored higher on PLOs 1a “apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information” and 2a “evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.” (92 vs 84% overall and 92 vs 82.8% overall).
- Distance students also were less likely to demonstrate 4c “Extracurricular activities.” This is not surprising because many distance students work full time, are older with families, and have less flexible time.

Portfolio Assessment Committee Comments

The committee urged a more thorough overhaul of the PLOs. As part of that it suggested clarifying:

- whether or not the practicum could count as an extracurricular activity for 4c,
- what it means by “diversity,”
- whether organizational policies (e.g., collection development policy, HR policy) count for 2a,
- Clarify 1a and 1b - the committee noted it was particularly difficult to judge the justification statements and artifacts associated with 1a.

The committee pointed out problems created by PLOs that refer to processes (e.g., “critical thinking” “organize and describe”) and artifacts that only show end results. When examining the end result, it is not possible to judge the degree to which a student engaged in the process. This is particularly difficult with group projects.

The committee suggested the following additions/modifications to PLOs:

- consider a PLO on planning, assessment, evaluation
- consider a PLO on preparation for lifelong learning

GRADUATES SURVEY – INDIRECT MEASURE

The Graduates Survey was fielded during April of 2017. It was sent to 89 students who qualified as December 2-16, May 2017 and August 2017 graduates. It was completed by 68 students for an overall response rate of 76%. Campus students had an 80% response rate and online students had a 64% response rate.

2017 Upcoming Graduates Survey Responses

In order to get an understanding of the career aspirations of the respondents, the survey asked respondents to choose the specialization with which they most identified.

Specialization Area	% Total Respondents	% Campus Respondents	% Online Respondents
academic libraries	23	26	13
archives/records	13	18	--
public libraries	26	20	47
UX/info tech	8	8	7
children/youth	15	12	27
school library	--	00	--
Data/information management	5	4	7
Organization of Information	5	6	--

This section continues by describing the 2016-2017 data associated with each program level learning outcome.

The goal is to have 85% or more of all students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared.

The measures for all students that fell below 85%:

Measures related to 2a: Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.

- I could explain to an elected official, dean or board member why support of information and cultural heritage organizations is important (84% all students, 86% campus, 75% distance)

Distance students were less confident than campus students regarding this measure. Cross tab analysis of concentration area and confidence level show no particular pattern across concentration areas. Longitudinal analysis shows a high fluctuation rate over the years.

Measures related to PLO 3a. Students organize and describe print and digital information resources

Measures related to 3a continue to be a challenge and the school did not meet its target for two measures:

- I could refer to standards or rules to create metadata for a book or webpage or digital image (63% all, 60% campus, 75% online) (Note: Data for this measure has fluctuated over the years as faculty have changed question wording. The highest rated question has been “I could refer to appropriate sources to create basic descriptions of non-book information item” with a 90% confidence rate.
- I could create Dublin Core metadata with the help of Dublin Core documentation (63% all, 57% campus, 80% online) This score is similar to the 2016 score for a similar question.
- I could interpret a catalog/metadata record for a patron who did not understand it (86% all, 88% campus, 81% online)

Online students were more confident than campus students for the two metadata questions, but less confident regarding the interpretation of catalog records. Cross tab analysis of concentration area shows that students in the youth concentration, the academic libraries concentration were less confident than other concentration areas.

- 6 of 10 (60%) students identifying as youth concentration rated themselves low
- 7 of 15 (46%) students identifying as academic libraries concentration rated themselves low

From past exit interviews we know that one reason for the lower scores is simply, **time gone by**. Students who did not take advanced coursework addressing this area do not remember content from the required org class taken during their first semester. Other students suggested that they did not get **enough hands on practice in the 602 introductory course** to feel confident without having taking further coursework.

Suggestions:

- Incorporating basic organizational exercises into youth and academic library classes
- Requiring an additional course with significant organization of information content (e.g., metadata or cataloging or digital curation/collections)
- Other?

Measures of 3d: Students understand and use appropriate information technologies.

- I could assess different information technologies in terms of how they could help solve specific organizational problems (84% all, 80% campus, 100% online)

Campus students were less confident of this measure than online students. Cross tab analysis of concentration area and confidence level show no pattern. Students rated themselves more confident on other measures of 3D. This scored lower than the similar 2016 measure “To teach myself new technologies and software relevant for my job, using widely available resources” which faculty decided was too easy.

Measure of 4A: Students evaluate, problem solve and think critically, both individually and in teams.

- Assess the effectiveness of a program or service in your organization (82% all, 76% campus, 100% online).

76% of campus students rated themselves as prepared while 100% of online students rated themselves as prepared. Cross tab analysis by concentration area showed no pattern. The faculty aspire to a higher percentage for this measure as all students must now complete an assessment plan as part of the required class 603.

Related to PLO 4b. Students demonstrate good oral and written communication skills.

- Measure of 4B: Give an 8 minute presentation at a professional conference (80% overall, 78% campus, 88% online)
- Measure of 4B: I can write a persuasive memo to a supervisor in order to influence a management decision (77% overall, 75% campus, 88% online)

Online students were more confident of their communication skills than campus students. Cross tab analysis of concentration area show that youth and technology concentration students were more likely to rate their confidence lower for the persuasive memo measure:

- 2 of 5 (40%) technology students
- 3 of 10 (30%) youth students

Comments:

- The technology track includes a higher concentration of international students who may be less confident in their English language communication skills.
- This score is lower than the prior year’s score with the same question working

Measure of 4D. Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.

Measure: I am prepared to be an advocate within the profession (87% overall, 82% campus, 100% online)

Online students were more confident in their advocacy preparation than campus students. The 2017 score is similar to the 2016 score.

OUTCOME 1A. STUDENTS APPLY KEY CONCEPTS WITH RESPECT TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POWER, KNOWLEDGE, AND INFORMATION.

Measure: I could explain how labeling and vocabulary issues influence use of information resources.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	94
Campus students	92
Distance students	100

OUTCOME 1B. STUDENTS APPLY KEY CONCEPTS WITH RESPECT TO THEORIES AND PRACTICES OF LITERACIES, READING, AND INFORMATION USE.

Measure: I could design programs and services to meet the information needs of a given user group.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	89

Campus students	86
Distance students	100

Measure: I could meet the information needs of patrons with varying levels of information literacy

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	95
Campus students	94
Distance students	100

OUTCOME 2A. STUDENTS EVALUATE AND DEBATE INFORMATION POLICY AND ETHICS ISSUES APPLICABLE IN LOCAL, NATIONAL OR GLOBAL CONTEXTS.

Measure: I could explain to an elected official, dean or board member why support of information and cultural heritage organizations is important.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	84
Campus students	86
Distance students	75

OUTCOME 2B. STUDENTS APPLY CORE ETHICAL PRINCIPLES TO PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE.

Measure: I can assess professional ethical issues related to my work.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	94
Campus students	92
Distance students	100

Measure: I could address concerns of a patron who is offended by the content in a collection.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	95
Campus students	94
Distance students	100

OUTCOME 3A. STUDENTS ORGANIZE AND DESCRIBE PRINT AND DIGITAL INFORMATION RESOURCES.

Measure: to describe some basic approaches for organizing information

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	90
Campus students	86
Distance students	100

Measure: I could refer to standards or rules to create metadata for a book or webpage or digital image.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	63
Campus students	60
Distance students	75

Measure: create Dublin Core metadata with the help of Dublin Core documentation

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	63
Campus students	57
Distance students	80

Measure: *I could catalog print information resources using FRBR/RDA (advanced cataloging skill – not part of student learning outcomes for all students)

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	32
Campus students	28
Distance students	44

OUTCOME 3B. STUDENTS SELECT AND EVALUATE PRINT AND DIGITAL INFORMATION RESOURCES.

Measure: select appropriate materials for a collection following a collection development policy (LIS 450)

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	89
Campus students	86
Distance students	100

Measure: interpret a catalog/metadata record for a patron who did not understand it?

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	86
Campus students	88
Distance students	81

Measure: to explain the basics of how web search engines work (e.g., Google) to a person outside the field.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared

All students	93
Campus students	90
Distance students	100

(I) Measure: I understand how the structure and controlled vocabularies of subscription databases or online catalogs shape how one searches for information?

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	91
Campus students	90
Distance students	94

OUTCOME 3C. STUDENTS ANALYZE INFORMATION NEEDS OF DIVERSE INDIVIDUALS AND COMMUNITIES.

Measure: I could understand and respond to the information needs of diverse social, economic and cultural communities

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	94
Campus students	92
Distance students	100

OUTCOME 3D. STUDENTS UNDERSTAND AND USE APPROPRIATE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES.

Measure: To assess different information technologies in terms of how they could help solve specific organizational problems.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	84
Campus students	80
Distance students	100

Old measure: To teach myself new technologies and software relevant for my job, using widely available resources.
- 100%

Measure: I could develop a small relational database for my organization.* (advanced question not included in program level student learning outcomes)

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	57
Campus students	50
Distance students	81

Measure: to refer to appropriate resources in order to create a hyperlink in HTML code.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	93
Campus students	90
Distance students	100

OUTCOME 4A. STUDENTS EVALUATE, PROBLEM SOLVE AND THINK CRITICALLY, BOTH INDIVIDUALLY AND IN TEAMS.

Measure: assess the effectiveness of a program or service in your organization.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	82
Campus students	76
Distance students	100

OUTCOME 4B. STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE GOOD ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATION SKILLS.

Measure: Give an 8 minute presentation at a professional conference.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	80
Campus students	78
Distance students	88

Old measure: I can give an effective fifteen minute oral presentation (94%)

Measure: I can write a persuasive memo to a supervisor in order to influence a management decision.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	77
Campus students	74
Distance students	88

Old Measure: I can communicate effectively in writing - routinely 100%

OUTCOME 4C. STUDENTS PARTICIPATE IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES IN THE FIELD.

Measure: While at the iSchool, I had a job relevant to the career I hope to pursue.

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	84
Campus students	82
Distance students	88

Measure: I was a member of a student group

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	56
Campus students	71
Distance students	7

Measure: I attended one or more professional conferences while a student at the iSchool (local, regional, national or international)

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	67
Campus students	68
Distance students	63

Measure: I presented at one or more workshops or conferences while a student at the iSchool

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	35
Campus students	42
Distance students	13

OUTCOME 4D. STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE INNOVATION AND SKILLS NECESSARY FOR LEADERSHIP.

Measure: I am prepared to be an advocate within the profession

Student population	Percent students answering moderately or very well prepared
All students	87
Campus students	82
Distance students	100

Measure: lead a team or a working group

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	93
Campus students	90
Distance students	100

Measure: While a student at the iSchool, I played a leadership role in (select all that apply)

	% campus students answering yes	Percent distance students answering yes
Student club or organization	50	0
Professional organization (local, regional, national)	6	18
Community organization	13	14
Recreational group	6	0
Other (answers included current job, church)	2	32

Work based project or team (paid work)	44	5
None of the above	29	32

Measure: While an iSchool student, how many hours did you volunteer, or work an unpaid position, relevant to the career you wish to pursue?

Student population	Percent students answering 21 or more hours
All students	34
Campus students	38
Distance students	19

LIS 620 PRACTICUM

The iSchool asked closed ended survey questions, open ended survey questions and exit interview questions related to the LIS 620 practicum experience.

Survey Measure: My 620 practicum placement was helpful to my professional development

Student population	Percent students answering agree or strongly agree
All students	87
Campus students	85
Distance students	93

Cross tab analysis of concentration area and rating of 620 experience show no particular pattern. Most students are very satisfied with their practicum experiences. Challenges include: fitting in the practicum for students who work full time, a desire to have more paid practica experiences, dissatisfaction with the classroom component of the experience.

Exit interviews

The iSchool asked about students experiences with the practicum in exit interviews. Some themes included:

- Desire for quicker feedback of placements after preference form turned in
- Concerns that duties in some placements wasn't challenging enough

Ideas:

Change the form employers use to create practicum to ask if the practicum is paid or not in order to encourage more people to consider payment.

CAREER SERVICES

While a student at the iSchool, I experienced career services related activities or information as part of (select all that apply):

Location where student experienced career services:	% All Students	% Campus Students	% Online Students
1 credit e-portfolio/job search class spring 2017	13	14	25
620/826 field practicum classroom component	35	35	36
Other iSchool class	7	4	18
iSchool sponsored event (webinar, brownbag, etc)	7	8	5
Student group sponsored event (webinar, brownbag etc)	9	11	0
UW Writing Center	6	5	8
L&S Career Services	3	3	3
Other	2	2	3
I did not participate in any career services activities	0	0	0
iSchool Career Services Wiki (Toolkit) includes recordings of past events	17	17	18

Other included: faculty advising and personal interest/initiative.

The school began adding career services material to 620/826 in 2016-2017, so not all student benefited from the inclusion. Some graduates completed their 620/826 requirement before inclusion of career services material in the class portion of the experience.

We also asked graduates to provide open ended comments to help us understand use or lack of use of career services. Themes included:

- Challenge of attending career services events due to busy work schedules (and lack of knowledge of recording of the events)
- Hesitancy of seeking career services help
- Communication/coordination difficulties with setting up appointments

E-PORTFOLIO

The iSchool gathered data about the e-portfolio in the Graduates Survey and in exit interviews.

Graduates Survey

Data from the Graduates Survey show that the iSchool continues to make improvements in providing support for completion of the e-portfolio. The percent of students who strongly agreed that they had sufficient support rose from 15 to 39%. The number who disagreed fell from 9 to 3 %.

One major improvement in the 2016-2017 year was the one credit e-portfolio/job search class.

Measure: The iSchool provided sufficient support for me to fulfill my portfolio requirement.

Answer	% of Students Responding	
	2017	2016
	% all students	% all students
Strongly agree	39	15
Agree	44	56

Neither agree nor disagree	14	21
Disagree	3	9
Strongly disagree	0	1

Not surprisingly, of the 22 students who completed the 1 credit e-portfolio/job hunt class felt very supported with 96% agreeing.

The percent of students who believed the portfolio helped them remember and reflect on accomplishments remained similar to 2016 but showed more polarity. A higher percentage of students strongly agreed, but a higher percentage of students strongly disagreed.

Measure: Creating my e-portfolio helped me remember and reflect on what I have accomplished while I was a student.

Answer	% of Students Responding	
	2017	2016
	% all students	% all students
Strongly agree	24	19
Agree	35	37
Neither agree nor disagree	21	23
Disagree	9	15
Strongly disagree	10	6

Interestingly, the data on utility of the portfolio for reflection changes only slightly when one looks only at the 22 students who completed the 1 credit e-portfolio/job hunt class. Of those students, 27% strongly agree, 36% agree, 23% neither agree nor disagree, 9% disagree and 5% strongly disagree.

An open ended question invited students to provide more information about their experiences with the e-portfolio. Themes included:

- Some students continue to have the expectation that the portfolio should be a professional portfolio and subsequently feel frustration about its requirements and format. More work is needed in framing the purpose of the portfolio to change these expectations.
- Helpfulness of the 1 credit class in preparing the e-portfolio
- Frustration that breadth requirement necessitates inclusion of work the student does not consider their “best work.”

Exit interviews

The iSchool asked about students experiences with the portfolio in exit interviews.

Praise:

- It provided a good opportunity to go back and revisit previous assignments and projects to reflect on the things I have learned.
- Overall, I felt it was helpful as a means of job and interview preparation.

Suggestions for improvement:

- Update instructional videos to fit better with new template.

- Integrate portfolio statements into more course work. For example “Liked that RW had us work on for 15 minutes one day--gave me jump start” and “What I especially like is when instructors have assignments that require you to write a justification for an artifact created in their class.”
- Update examples to new template.

Other issues:

- Some students still perceive that the portfolio should display their best work, regardless of topic, rather than serving as evidence of breadth.
- Some part time student who started the program more than two years ago continued to experience confusion created by transition from old to new portfolio template.
- Some students still hearing message that the portfolio can be used as a professional portfolio “It is frustrating that it’s framed like its for us”

PRACTICUM SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE – DIRECT MEASURE

The iSchool asks each practicum supervisor to fill out a survey about their students’ work performance at the end of the practicum experience. This evaluation is a direct measure of student performance at professional activities during the practicum.

This data is based on supervisor responses submitted via an online questionnaires for the 2016-2017 academic year representing the field experiences of 78 students.

Note: The survey did not “force answers” to questions meaning that supervisors could skip questions and still submit the survey. Not all supervisors answered all questions.

Overall practicum supervisors scored program students very well.

- 100% of students met or exceeded supervisor expectations
- Daily Tasks: 100% received positive scores
- Teamwork: 90% of students received positive score
- 98% of supervisors would recommend their student for a job opening in their organization.

Outcome data for Goal 3: Techniques and Technologies

Outcome 3a. Students organize and describe print and digital information resources.

Outcome 3b. Students search for, select and evaluate print and digital information resources.

Outcome 3c. Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.

Measure: How well did the student meet your expectations?

Percent supervisors rating	%
Exceeds expectations	72
Meets expectations	28
Short of expectations	0
Not applicable	0
Total satisfactory or above	100

Measure: Please rate the quality of the student’s work in terms of daily tasks (e.g. reference, cataloging, collection management, digitization, instruction, etc.)

Percent supervisors rating	%
Exceeds expectations	83
Satisfactory	17
Unsatisfactory	0
Not applicable	0
Total satisfactory or above	100

Measure: Please rate the quality of the student's work in terms of specific projects (e.g. weeding, acquisitions, guides, etc.).

Percent supervisors rating	%
Exceeds expectations	79
Satisfactory	21
Unsatisfactory	0
Not applicable	0
Total satisfactory or above	100

Measure: If I were an administrator and there was an appropriate level job in my organization, I would recommend this student.

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	76
Agree	22
Disagree	2
No basis for judgement	0
Total agree	98

Outcome data for Goal 4: Professionalism

Outcome 4a Students participate effectively as team members to solve problems

Measures: The student worked effectively as a team member during the course of this placement.

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	70
Agree	20
Disagree	0
No basis for judgment	10
Total agree	90

4d. Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.

Measure: The student worked independently to accomplish goals during the course of this placement.

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	76
Agree	22
Disagree	0
No basis for judgement	2
Total agree	98

Measure: *The student demonstrated innovation and skills necessary for leadership during the course of this placement.*

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	53
Agree	35
Disagree	2
No basis for judgement	10
Total agree	88

Outcome 4b. Students demonstrate good oral and written communication skills

Measure: *The student displayed the communications skills needed to be an effective professional during the course of this placement.*

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	69
Agree	27
Disagree	0
Total satisfactory or above	96

OTHER ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES:

Bootcamp:

Assessment of the 2016 online program bootcamp was done via a student survey and informal feedback. Based on this data, the iSchool made the following changes for the 2017 year: advertise assignments earlier in the week, allow more time in class to discuss readings, more gluten free food options, more casual networking time with peers.

Assessment Committee:

In the 2016-2017 year the Assessment Committee undertook three special projects:

1. The committee analyzed the placement survey data (see 2016 placement report).
2. The committee did a formative analysis of how the school handles information about students who inquire about the program via email, phone or other means. Findings indicate school staff do not regularly save the names or contact information for students that make inquiries. The committee discussed several possibilities for improving retention of this information, but did not come up with a completely satisfactory solution that would be convenient for staff to implement. The committee chose to wait until fall 2017 to see if the campus would make a customer relationship management system (CRM) available for use.
3. The committee investigated the learning outcomes of other LIS programs, compared them to new UW Graduate School suggested learning outcomes, and made recommendations for revision of the iSchool MA program learning outcomes. A task force worked during summer 2017 to propose new learning outcomes for the August 2017 retreat.

Student Org Leaders Lunches: The Director met with student organizational leaders in the spring 2017 to get feedback on how the changes to the MA curriculum have gone, and get suggestions about how to communicate the school name change.

Suggestions:

- Make an email announcement to continuing students in the summer
- For new/continuing students explain what names they might see/hear around campus
- Help answer the question “how should I refer to the school when speaking to different audiences?”
- News item: Make it celebratory and thank people
- Admitted students: email in summer, new students blog, virtual advising, orientation

International Student Reception: The Student Services Coordinator, Director and Associate Director met with the current international students in the MA program to get input on how to improve the experiences of international students, and how to more effectively recruit international students. The following themes emerged:

- Things to emphasize: campus reputation, diversity of concentrations available, program flexibility, school ranking, social stuff not as relevant but strong international community, choices with assignments, pictures of students in classes, that % of intl students in total student body is not too high but not too low.
- Suggestions:
 - Need to get incoming student info under a .edu address because otherwise it may be blocked in China;
 - Better advertisement of face to face versions of popular courses via the course forecast due the restriction on international students taking online courses (1 per semester);
 - Obtain STEM-OPT status for MA program to facilitate training VISA.
 - Facilitate international admitted student networking over the summer,
 - creation of peer “buddy” program with US students,
 - create employment information about past international grads (employment rate, where working), advertise accept rate for international students,
 - would like to take more CS courses, information retrieval, search technologies, stats/R;
 - describe how the school can help intl. students get relevant campus jobs;
 - need someone to explain commonly used US cultural terms like “diversity” and “digital humanities”

APPENDIX – ISCHOOL PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES AUGUST 2016

Goal 1 Theory and history

- 1a. Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information.
- 1b. Students apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, reading, and information use *of others*.

Goal 2 Information ethics and policy

- 2a. Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.
- 2b. Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.

Goal 3 Techniques and technologies

- 3a. Students organize and describe print and digital information resources.
- 3b. Students search for, select and evaluate print and digital information resources *for others*.
- 3c. Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.
- 3d. Students understand and use appropriate information technologies.

Goal 4. Professionalism and leadership

- 4a. Students evaluate, problem solve and think critically, both individually and in teams
- 4b. Students demonstrate good oral and written communication skills.
- 4c. Students participate in extracurricular activities in the field.
- 4d. Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.

