

UW Madison Information School
Annual Assessment Report Academic Year
2017-2018

Date: Aug 2018

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 learning outcomes are revisited annually by the faculty and were updated in the 2017-2018 year.

Assessment activities are primarily run through the iSchool Assessment Committee which includes both faculty and student members. The chair of the Assessment Committee 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 2017-2018 academic year included:

- A direct assessment of graduating students' portfolios,
- An online survey of upcoming graduates,
- 18 exit interviews with upcoming graduates,
- A survey of student performance from all practica completed during the year.
- A focus group with student organization leaders
- A climate survey of all current students (online and face to face program)

Noteworthy assessment and program improvement activities during the 2017-2018 year included:

- Revision and approval of program level learning outcomes (PLOs)
- Fielding of a climate survey to all students
- Staff led redesign of admissions process
- Assessment of curriculum against ALA learning competencies
- Decision to include metadata assignments in youth and academic libraries class to increase student confidence with metadata in those specializations.
- Updating all course prerequisites
- Updating youth course titles and descriptions
- Migration of career services materials to university netid login platform

STUDENT PORTFOLIOS – DIRECT MEASURE

The iSchool assessed graduating student portfolios representing August 2018, December 2017 and May 2018 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 72 portfolios.

The 2018 portfolio review committee consisted of: Kristin Eschenfelder, Sunny Kim, Dorothea Salo, Askar Safipour (PhD student and portfolio manager), Mei Zhang, Anna Palmer, Meredith Lowe, Bronwen Masemann, Rebekah Willett, Michele Besant, Allison Kaplan, Reginold Royston and four MA students Heng Peng, Emily Huffman, Sarah Lange and Sarah Hangden. MA students were paired with faculty/staff mentors for review purposes.

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 nine learning outcomes**.
- **All twelve program level learning outcomes showed at least 80% showed satisfactory evidence**, showing satisfactory achievement and several were quite close to the 85% target.

The three PLOs falling below the 85 percent target include:

- 1a: Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information (83%)
- 2a: Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts. (81%)
- 2b: Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice. (83%)

Table 1 compares the 2017-2018 portfolio scores with scores from the prior academic year

Table 1: Portfolio Assessment scoring 2016-2017

Program Learning Outcome	Combined satisfactory and very satisfactory		Combined satisfactory and very satisfactory	
	# 2018 (N=72)	% 2018	# 2017 (N=64)	%2017
1a: Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information.	60	83	54	84
1b: Students apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, reading, and information use.	63	88	58	91
2a: Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.	58	81	53	83
2b: Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.	60	83	54	84
3a: Students organize and describe print and digital information resources for use by others	66	92	55	86
3b: Students select and evaluate print and digital information resources for use by others.	66	92	64	100
3c: Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.	64	89	56	88
3d: Students understand and use appropriate information technologies.	64	89	61	95
4a: Students evaluate, problem solve and think critically, both individually and in teams.	66	91	62	97
4b: Students demonstrate good oral and written communication skills.	68	94	62	97
4c: Students participate in extracurricular activities in the field.	66	91	60	94
4d: Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.	61	85	57	89

Portfolio Assessment Committee Comments

Because the faculty had already voted to modify the PLOs, the committee did not suggest any changes to the current wording. Debate continued around:

- 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,

GRADUATES SURVEY – INDIRECT MEASURE

The Graduates Survey was fielded during April of 2018. It was sent to 75 students who qualified as December 2017, May 2018 and August 2018 graduates (20 online/55 campus). It was completed by 43 students (13 online/30 campus) for an overall response rate of 57%. This year’s overall response rate to the graduates survey

was lower than past years possibly due to the fact that the school had fielded the student climate survey just the month before. Campus students had a 54% response rate and online students had a 65% response rate.

2018 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	8	6	2
archives/records	5	5	--
public libraries	11	5	6
UX/info tech	1	1	--
children/youth	3	3	--
school library	--	--	--
Data/information management	6	4	2
Organization of Information	5	4	1
Other	--	--	--

This section continues by describing the 2017-2018 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 3b: Select and Evaluate Print and Digital Information Resources

- Measure: to explain the basics of how web search engines work (e.g., Google) to a person outside the field. (77% all students, 70% campus, 92% distance)

This finding was a surprise. In the past this measure has garnered much higher levels of confidence among students and the curriculum that addresses this area has not changed significantly (93% confident in 2017). We will measure it again next year to see if this is a fluke caused by our lower response rate or a trend.

- understand how the structure and controlled vocabularies of subscription databases or online catalogs shape how one searches for information (81% all, 83% campus, 80% online)

This finding was a surprise. In the past this measure has garnered much higher levels of confidence among students and the curriculum that addresses this area has not changed significantly (91% confident in 2017). We will measure it again next year to see if this is a fluke caused by our lower response rate or a trend.

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 again for two measures:

- I could refer to standards or rules to create metadata for a book or webpage or digital image (56% all, 67% campus, 31% online). This score is lower than the 2017 scores for this question.
- I could create Dublin Core metadata with the help of Dublin Core documentation (56% all, 62% campus, 53% online). This score is lower than the 2017 scores for this question.

Past assessments show a lower than target level of confidence in metadata skills and knowledge. 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 (LIS 602) taken during their first semester.

To address this question of memory and metadata knowledge, this year we collected data on what percent of students took an advanced class that addressed metadata. Data show that 40% of campus and 46% of online respondents did NOT take a second class that addressed metadata (beyond the required LIS 602).

Question: I have completed the following courses (check all that apply)

Course	% Campus Students Respondents	% Online Students Respondents
Metadata	27	23
Cataloging	27	38
Digital Curation and Collections	27	8
Arrangement and Description (campus only)	7	--
Art Librarianship (campus only)	10	--
I did not take any of the above courses	40	46

The 2017 data had suggested that students identifying with the academic and youth concentrations were less likely to feel confident with metadata, but in 2018, the public libraries students were less likely to be confident. In 2018 the majority of academic libraries students were confident or very confident (5 of 8). Youth students continued to be less confident. The 2018 data also show that 7 of 11 public library students rated themselves as minimally prepared or not prepared to create metadata and 6 of 11 were not prepared to apply Dublin Core.

The assessment committee recommended two strategies to increase metadata confidence

- Incorporating Dublin Core into youth, academic and public library classes
- Fielding a 1 credit metadata basic course
- Creating an “org tier” requiring students to take one additional course with significant organization of information content (e.g., metadata or cataloging or digital curation/collections or arrangement/description)

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, 92% online).

This score is similar to the 2017 scores for this measure, and falls below the target.

- to refer to appropriate resources in order to create a hyperlink in HTML code (77% all, 77% campus, 77% distance).

This score was a surprise, as past years’ measures have shown a much higher level of confidence. For example the 2017 scores show 93% confidence. We will measure it again next year to see if this is a fluke caused by our lower response rate or a trend.

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 of responding students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	91
Campus students	87
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 of responding students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	91
Campus students	83
Distance students	92

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	93
Campus students	90
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	93
Campus students	90
Distance students	100

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

Measure: I can apply professional ethics to my work.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	98
Campus students	97
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	91
Campus students	90
Distance students	92

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	88
Campus students	90
Distance students	85

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	56
Campus students	67
Distance students	31

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	56
Campus students	62
Distance students	53

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	30
Campus students	30
Distance students	31

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

Measure: select appropriate materials for a collection following a collection development policy

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

All students	88
Campus students	90
Distance students	85

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	88
Campus students	87
Distance students	92

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	77
Campus students	70
Distance students	92

Measure: 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	81
Campus students	83
Distance students	80

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	97
Campus students	97
Distance students	100

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

Measure: To teach myself myself new technologies and software relevant for your job, using widely available resources.

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

All students	100
Campus students	100
Distance students	100

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	92

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	60
Campus students	62
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	77
Campus students	77
Distance students	77

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	93
Campus students	90
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	86
Campus students	83
Distance students	92

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	91
Campus students	90
Distance students	92

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

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

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	60
Campus students	70
Distance students	39

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

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	30
Campus students	33
Distance students	23

Measure: As an iSchool student, I was made aware of the need for continuous professional development and life long learning in the information professions

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	98
Campus students	97
Distance students	100

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

Measure: I am prepared to be an advocate for the values of the profession

Student population	Percent students answering moderately or very well prepared
All students	95
Campus students	93
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	98
Campus students	97
Distance students	100

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

	% campus students answering yes	% distance students answering yes
Student club or organization	77	0
Professional organization (local, regional, national)	67	31
Community organization	20	23
Recreational group	17	0
Volunteer/service activities	47	54

MENTORSHIP AND ADVISING

As part of a UW-Madison Graduate School data effort, the iSchool asked closed ended survey related to mentorship and advising.

Measure: Which of the following people have you considered a mentor during your time as an iSchool student? (select all that apply)

	% campus students answering yes	% distance students answering yes
My academic advisor	70	23
Another iSchool staff member	43	7
Another faculty or staff member at UW-Madison	20	--
Practicum supervisor	50	38
Work supervisor	70	46
Co-worker	7	23
Another student	33	46
Someone else	3	--
I did not have a relationship with a mentor during my time as an iSchool student	10	15

Measure: How helpful was your academic advisor in helping you decide on courses?

	% Campus Students	% Online Students	% All students
Very helpful	47	69	53
Somewhat helpful	37	7	28
Not very helpful	17	23	19

Not at all helpful	--	--	--
--------------------	----	----	----

CAREER SERVICES

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

Location where student experienced career services:	% Campus Students	% Online Students	% All Students
E-portfolio/job search class	30	31	30
Field practicum class	90	85	88
Other iSchool class	47	38	44
iSchool sponsored event (webinar, brownbag, etc)	20	15	19
Student group sponsored event (webinar, brownbag etc)	27	--	19
UW Writing Center	13	7	38
L&S Career Services (aka "SuccessWorks")	10	7	31
Online iSchool Career Services Resources	40	31	37
I did not participate in any career services activities	--	15	4
Other	6	--	4

Other included: faculty advising and personal interest/initiative.

As seen above, most students get exposure to career services through the required Field Practicum class. The school began adding career services material to this class in 2016-2017, so it is possible that some part time students completed the class before it was added.

The school expects to see the percent of students using "online iSchool career services resources" rise with the transition of these materials to a netid based system in fall 2017.

As shown below, all but a small number of online students were aware of how to participate in career services. Open ended comments from online students asked for more access to student group led career programming. Another expressed preference for career services materials built into classes because busy work/family obligations made it hard to find time for other activities.

If you did not participate in career services, what prevented you from doing so? (check all that apply)

	# Campus Students (N=30)	# Online Students (N=13)
I was not aware of how to participate in career services	--	2
It was not important for me to participate in career services	--	1
I did not feel comfortable participating in career services	--	--
I did not have time to participate in career services	--	--

E-PORTFOLIO

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

Graduates Survey

Data show that the percent of students who agree or strongly agree that the iSchool provides sufficient support for completion of the e-portfolio has leveled out to around 80. The percent of students who strongly agreed or agreed that they had sufficient support was 81 percent in 2018 and 83 percent in 2017. Only 4% disagreed.

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

Answer	% of Students Responding		
	2018	2017	2016
	% all students	% all students	% all students
Strongly agree	23	39	15
Agree	58	44	56
Neither agree nor disagree	14	14	21
Disagree	4	3	9
Strongly disagree	0	0	1

14 of the survey respondents had completed the e-portfolio/job search class (10 campus, 4 online). 13 of those students agreed or strongly agreed. The remaining student neither agreed nor disagreed.

As shown below, sixty one percent of students agreed or strongly agreed that the portfolio helped them remember and reflect on their accomplishments. This is slightly higher than 2017 (59%) and 2016 (56%). The percent of students who disagreed rose from 21% from 9% in 2017. But the percent that strongly disagreed fell from 10 to 4 percent.

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

Answer	% of Students Responding		
	2018	2017	2016
	% all students	% all students	% all students
Strongly agree	12	24	19
Agree	49	35	37
Neither agree nor disagree	14	21	23
Disagree	21	9	15
Strongly disagree	4	10	6

Of the 14 of the survey respondents had completed the e-portfolio/job search class (10 campus, 4 online), 12 students agreed that the e-portfolio was helpful and 2 disagreed.

As shown below, online students were much more positive about the e-portfolio experience. Ninety-two percent of online students agreed or strongly agreed that the e-portfolio helped them remember and reflect. In comparison, only 47% of campus students agreed or strongly agreed.

Creating my e-portfolio helped me remember and reflect on what I have accomplished while I was a student.	% Campus Students responding	% Online Students responding
Strongly agree	10	15
Agree	37	77
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	20	0

Disagree	27	7
Strongly Disagree	6	0

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

- Desire for more advance notice of due date
- Perception that different faculty have different expectations for artifacts and statements
- Inclusion of information about how the e-portfolios are assessed on the e-portfolio site
- Frustration that the portfolio is more for the program than for the student
- Need to update examples
- Desire for an asynchronous option for the 1 credit e-portfolio/job search class

Positive comments included:

- “I appreciate that the iSchool provides it for us as a resource for reflection”
- Creating the eportfolio helped me consider further the learning aspects of the many projects and papers I created.”

Exit interviews

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

Praise:

- “Nice way to keep track of everything and remind you that you got something out of library school. WordPress was very intuitive.”
- “I do appreciate how easy it was to submit it and get feedback. [Portfolio manager] was really great about that.”
- “I liked that I had to spend time thinking about and organizing what I'd done over 2 years. Experience of writing up reflections was useful for me. Platform easy. Nice having template.”

Suggestions for improvement:

- “The language used in the learning outcomes and the justification statements is not how I would talk about this in professional work, peer to peer”
- “incorporate the write up of the justification statement as part of the assignment that meets that learning outcome. Ex. Broadband Paper is worth 20 points, make 2-5 of the points the writing of the justification statement.”
- “I liked it when professors had us do one as an assignment.”

Other issues:

- Some students will always be frustrated that they have to do it.
- Some students would strongly prefer a professional portfolio.

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 2017-2018 academic year representing the field experiences of 66 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: 100% of students received positive score
- 99% of supervisors would recommend their student for a job opening in their organization.

Questions relating to overall satisfaction of students

Measure: How well did the student meet your expectations?

Percent supervisors rating	%
Exceeds expectations	74
Meets expectations	26
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 (work requiring regularized tasks)

Percent supervisors rating	%
Exceeds expectations	78
Satisfactory	22
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 (work not requiring regularized tasks).

Percent supervisors rating	%
Exceeds expectations	80
Satisfactory	20
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	87
Agree	12
Disagree	0
No basis for judgement	1

Total agree	99
--------------------	-----------

Questions relating to overall professional behavior of student (Related to Goal 4: Professionalism)

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

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

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	73
Agree	18
Disagree	0
No basis for judgment	0
Total agree	100

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

[Outcome 4d. Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.]

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	90
Agree	10
Disagree	0
No basis for judgment	0
Total agree	100

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

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	54
Agree	38
Disagree	0
No basis for judgment	8
Total agree	92

Measure: *The student displayed a professional attitude and demeanor during the course of this placement.*

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	85
Agree	15
Disagree	0
No basis for judgment	0
Total agree	100

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

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

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	77
Agree	22

Disagree	0
No basis for judgement	1
Total satisfactory or above	99

OTHER ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES:

Bootcamp:

Assessment of the 2017 online program bootcamp was done via a student survey and informal feedback. Based on this data, the iSchool made the following changes for the 2018 year:

- Shorter days
- More work time during the day
- Host more meals in the department so students have time to work in teams.

Assessment Committee Special Projects:

In the 2017-2018 year the Assessment Committee undertook three special projects:

1. Analyzing the placement survey data (see 2017 placement report).
2. Updating e-portfolio materials to match the new program level learning outcomes
3. Updating the graduates survey with questions from a UW Madison Graduate School survey

Student Org Leaders Lunches:

The Director met with student organizational leaders in the fall 2017 to get feedback on faculty ideas about a new MS program and also to get suggestions on how to reduce student confusion regarding the roll-out of new MA program level learning outcomes.

Spring Student Meeting and Student Town Hall:

The Student Services Coordinator and Director met with a group of students that requested a meeting about face to face vs online course offerings. The Director also invited all current students in the MA program via a face to face and web accessible meeting to get feedback on the spring climate survey and get suggestions on several desired areas of improvement. Topics of discussion included:

A. Avoiding online courses –

Campus students at both meetings expressed dissatisfaction with the number of online courses they felt they were obligated to take to complete the program. They suggested the following in order to allow them to better plan to avoid online courses.

- Extend course forecast to two years
- Try to identify common course paths and schedule a pathway of face to face courses for full time students across two years (e.g., academic libraries, public libraries).

- Strengthen language on website to make it clearer that students should expect to take several online courses as part of their degree. Some students at the special meeting interpreted the current language to mean online courses were just an option; (underway)

Based on the student input from the two meetings, we also asked two exit interview questions to campus students about taking online courses. We asked:

1. When you chose the in-person program, were you aware you would also be enrolling in online classes?
2. Do you remember any specific instances where you realized you would need to take a course online instead of in person in order to meet requirements?

In response to question one, most, but not all, students stated they were aware they would likely take “one or two” online classes when they chose to come to the program (9 aware, 5 not aware). Of those that were aware, they did not know that all summer courses were online and that some courses were only offered online. While some students stated they strongly preferred face to face classes, other students noted they appreciated the flexibility of online classes.

Answers to question two described the scenarios in which students had to take more online courses than they would have wished, for example “needed to take X online in order to meet the requirements in the timeframe acceptable to me.” “Kept looking for in-person section of class I needed and it wasn’t there. Very confused, told specifically to take that class and it wasn’t clear it was only being offered online.” “Not to meet requirements, I sometimes I chose online specifically to fit into my schedule” “

- B. How to get more students more experience with metadata.
 - In terms of the current 3 credit metadata course, students suggested removing the word “XML” from the title as they believed the word was a deterrent for some students.
 - Suggestion to include more metadata exercises in specialization class
 - Open to a one credit class “metadata bootcamp” class for those who do not wish to commit 3 credits
- C. Climate survey: In discussing the results of the climate survey with students we asked for more information about survey results related to ageism and religious macroaggressions.
 - The students suggested that data related to age-based macroaggressions stemmed from negative comments about older people and IT skills. They felt that staff and students sometimes said things that suggested that older people who have a lower level of IT literacy.
 - The students suggested that data related to religion-based macroaggressions stemmed from derogatory comments about practicing Christians.

APPENDIX – ISCHOOL PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES PRIOR TO AUGUST 2018

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.

APPENDIX – NEW ISCHOOL PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES AS OF AUGUST 2018

1. Students demonstrate understanding of societal, legal, policy or ethical information issues.
2. Students apply principles of information organization.
3. Students apply appropriate research methodologies for inquiry or decision making.
4. Students demonstrate understanding of professional competencies important for management of information organizations.
5. Students demonstrate competency with information technologies important to the information professions.
6. Students apply theory to professional practice.
7. Students demonstrate understanding of issues surrounding marginalized communities and information.