

UW Madison Information School  
Annual Assessment Report Academic Year  
2018-2019

Approved: August 26, 2019

## 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 2018-2019 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 2018-2019 academic year included:

- Direct assessment of graduating students' portfolios,
- Direct assessment of students' exhibition of desired outcomes in practicum experiences by their supervisors
- Indirect assessment through an online survey of upcoming graduates,
- Indirect assessment based on 22 exit interviews with upcoming graduates conducted by staff and an additional 12 "self-serve" exit interviews done through an online form for students who preferred to not meet with a staff member.

Bootcamp: Assessment of the 2018 online program bootcamp was done via a web student survey and informal feedback. It included questions about the perceived usefulness of activities, whether activities were too long, too short or about right, how students found out about the online program (used for marketing decisions), and satisfaction with content from the bootcamp meetings. Based on this data, the iSchool made the following changes for the 2018 year:

- Introductory definitions in 602
- Stress need to bring laptop to bootcamp
- Made daily activities end earlier, leaving more free time in the evenings for study and socializing

Assessment Committee Special Projects:

In the 2018-2019 year the Assessment Committee undertook updating e-portfolio materials to match the new program level learning outcomes and developing an employer's survey to field in fall 2019.

Student Org Leaders Lunches:

The Director, Student Services Coordinator and Public Services Librarian met with student organization leaders in January of 2019. In the meeting, students gave input into a potential iSchool Code of Conduct and the iSchool library laptop check out policy.

Town Hall Meeting:

The Director held a Town Hall meeting with students in April of 2019. She presented information and answered questions from students about the iSchool's participation in the Future of Wisconsin Computing/Wisconsin in the Information Age collaborative with Computer Science and Statistics.

Noteworthy assessment and program improvement activities during the 2018-2019 year included:

- Updating of e-portfolio site and training materials to reflect new PLOs

## STUDENT PORTFOLIOS – DIRECT MEASURE

---

The iSchool assessed graduating student portfolios representing August 2018, December 2018 and May 2019 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 76 portfolios in May 2019

The 2019 portfolio review committee consisted of the following members:

Faculty/staff: Sunny Kim, Anna Palmer, Meredith Lowe, Michele Besant, Allison Caffrey, Deb Shapiro, Emily Shultz, Jonathan Senchyne.

PhD students (future faculty) Askar Safipour and Xiaofei Wei

MA student representatives: Morgan Witte and Hanz Olsen - MA students were paired for review purposes.

Students could choose to submit portfolios that addressed either the retired 12 PLOs, or the newer 7 PLOs. Most students chose the newer 7 PLOs, but this report includes both sets of data. Reviewers reviewed the degree to which each portfolio demonstrated each of the program level learning outcomes. Reviewers gave either a pass or fail grade on each PLO.

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.

Results: The iSchool had set an ideal goal that 85% of portfolios would provide satisfactory evidence of each learning outcome, showing excellent achievement. In the new learning outcomes, the graduating cohort met this goal but for one learning outcome. Students scored 83% for “Students apply theory to professional practice.”

Graduates met this goal for all but one “old” learning outcomes: Only 76% of graduates scored satisfactory for “1b: Students apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, reading, and information use.” This was down from 88% of graduates in 2018.

Table 1 summarizes the data for the new learning outcomes for the 2018-2019 graduating cohort.

New Program Learning Outcome	Combined satisfactory and very satisfactory	
	# 2019 (N=48)	% 2019
Students demonstrate understanding of societal, legal, policy or ethical information issues.	43	90
Students apply principles of information organization.	43	90
Students apply appropriate research methodologies for inquiry or decision-making.	46	96
Students demonstrate understanding of professional competencies important for management of information organizations.	45	94
Students demonstrate competency with information technologies important to the information professions.	42	88
Students apply theory to professional practice.	40	<b>83</b>
Students demonstrate understanding of issues surrounding marginalized communities and information.	41	85

Table 2 compares the old learning outcome scores with from the 2018-2019 cohort with scores from the prior year’s cohort.

Retired Program Learning Outcome	Combined satisfactory and very satisfactory		Combined satisfactory and very satisfactory	
	# 2019 (N=25)	% 2019	# 2018 (N=72)	% 2018
1a: Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information.	22	88	60	83
1b: Students apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, reading, and information use.	19	<b>76</b>	63	88
2a: Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.	25	100	58	81
2b: Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.	23	92	60	83
3a: Students organize and describe print and digital information resources for use by others	23	92	66	92
3b: Students select and evaluate print and digital information resources for use by others.	24	96	66	92

3c: Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.	22	88	64	89
3d: Students understand and use appropriate information technologies.	23	92	64	89
4a: Students evaluate, problem solve and think critically, both individually and in teams.	25	100	66	91
4b: Students demonstrate good oral and written communication skills.	24	96	68	94
4c: Students participate in extracurricular activities in the field.	24	96	66	91
4d: Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.	23	92	61	85

### **Portfolio Assessment Committee Comments**

Because the faculty had recently modified the PLOs to better fit with UW Graduate School model learning outcomes, the committee did not suggest any changes to the current wording.

## **GRADUATES SURVEY – INDIRECT MEASURE**

---

The chair of the Assessment Committee fielded the Graduates Survey during April of 2019. It was sent to 81 students who qualified as December 2018, May 2019 and August 2019 graduates (61 on campus possible and 20 online possible respondents). 53 students completed the survey including 40 campus and 13 online students. The overall response rate was 77% with a 74% campus response rate and a 90% online student response rate. Not all respondents answered all questions.

### **2019 Graduates Cohort 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.

<b>With which of the following concentrations do you most identify? (choose only one)</b>	<b>On-campus student (N=40)</b>	<b>Online/Distance student (N=13)</b>	<b>Total COUNT</b>
<b>public libraries</b>	8	6	14
<b>archives</b>	14	0	14
<b>academic libraries</b>	8	2	10
<b>children/youth</b>	4	1	5
<b>Other</b>	3	1	4
<b>DIA: information or data management</b>	0	2	2
<b>school library</b>	1	1	2

<b>info tech/UX</b>	1	0	1
<b>organization of information</b>	1	0	1
	40	13	53

“Other” answers included medical libraries, cybersecurity and general libraries/archives/museums.

## RESULTS BY LEARNING OUTCOME

This section continues by describing the 2018-2019 data from skill and competency measures 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.

There were three areas of measures for which less than 85% of students described themselves as prepared or very well prepared: metadata, collection development and technology.

- **METADATA:** Two metadata measures:
  - I could refer to standards or rules to create metadata for a book or webpage or digital image. (75% overall, 77% campus, 71% online) While this measure is below the target, it shows improvement from the prior year’s results of 56% overall)
    - Pivot table analysis shows that students affiliating with the Youth concentrations scored their preparation lower than other concentrations. For example, 43% of Youth respondents rated themselves not prepared at all and 38% of public library respondents rated themselves as just minimally prepared.
  - I could create Dublin Core metadata with the help of Dublin Core documentation (66% overall, 68% campus, 59% online) While this measure is below the target, it shows improvement from the prior year’s results of 56% overall)
    - Pivot table analysis shows a similar pattern with students identifying as Youth or Public Libraries rating their abilities low.
- **COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT:** I could select appropriate materials for a collection following a collection development policy (83% overall, 81% campus, 88% online) The below target overall response for this measure is unexpected as there has been no curriculum or instructor change in this area and the overall results typically fall above 85%.
  - Pivot table analysis shows that students affiliating with the DIA (data & information analytics) and archive concentrations tended to score their preparation lower than other concentrations.
- **TECHNOLOGY:** Two technology measures:
  - I could explain the basics of how web search engines work (e.g., Google) to a person outside the field. (88% overall 83% campus, 100% online) While this campus result is below the target, it shows improvement from the prior year’s results of 77% overall)
  - I could refer to appropriate resources in order to create a hyperlink in HTML code (63% overall, 54% campus, 82% online) This result is a decline from the 2018 response of 77% overall.
    - Note that all sections of 602 currently contain an exercise requiring students to create a hyperlink in HTML code.
  - Pivot table analysis shows that students affiliating with the Youth concentration (but not School Library) tended to score their preparation lower than other concentrations.

## OUTCOME 1 STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE UNDERSTANDING OF SOCIETAL, LEGAL, POLICY OR ETHICAL INFORMATION ISSUES

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	94
Campus students	96
Distance students	88

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	98
Distance students	100

## **OUTCOME 2 STUDENTS APPLY PRINCIPLES OF INFORMATION ORGANIZATION.**

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	92
Campus students	89
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	<b>75</b>
Campus students	77
Distance students	71

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	<b>66</b>
Campus students	68
Distance students	59

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	45
Campus students	38

Distance students	65
-------------------	----

In past assessments, and the current data, graduates do not meet the target confidence level for measures associated with metadata applications. From past exit interviews we know that one reason for the lower scores is simply, **time gone by**. All students learn about metadata in the required first semester course LIS 602 Information: Organization and Search. But, those who do not take a second class that addresses metadata may not remember content from the required class (LIS 602) taken during their first semester.

To address this question of memory and metadata knowledge, we collect data on what percent of students took a second class that addressed metadata. Data from 2019 show that most campus and online respondents now take a second class that addressed metadata (beyond the required LIS 602). This is an improvement from earlier year's class population figures.

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

Course	% Campus Students Respondents	% Online Students Respondents	% All Students
Metadata	24	14	22
Cataloging	20	33	23
Digital Curation and Collections	19	14	18
Arrangement and Description (campus only)	23	--	19
Art Librarianship (campus only)	3	--	2
I did not take any of the above courses	13	33	17

**OUTCOME 3. STUDENTS APPLY APPROPRIATE RESEARCH METHODOLOGIES FOR INQUIRY OR DECISION-MAKING.**

Measure: I can 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	94
Campus students	94
Distance students	94

**OUTCOME 4. STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE UNDERSTANDING OF PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCIES IMPORTANT FOR MANAGEMENT OF INFORMATION ORGANIZATIONS.**

Measure: I could describe some basic approaches for organizing information

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	97
Campus students	96
Distance students	100

Measure: I could 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	<b>83</b>
Campus students	<b>81</b>
Distance students	88

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	94
Campus students	98
Distance students	82

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	94
Campus students	96
Distance students	88

Measure: I can give an 8 minute presentation at a professional conference.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	88
Campus students	85
Distance students	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	88
Campus students	85
Distance students	94

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	87
Distance students	100

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	98
Campus students	98
Distance students	100

Measure: I can lead a team or a working group

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	97
Campus students	96
Distance students	100

**OUTCOME 5. STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE COMPETENCY WITH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES IMPORTANT TO THE INFORMATION PROFESSIONS.**

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	88
Campus students	<b>83</b>
Distance students	100

Measure: To teach myself yourself 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	88
Campus students	87
Distance students	88

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	42
Campus students	36
Distance students	59

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	<b>63</b>
Campus students	<b>54</b>
Distance students	<b>82</b>

### **OUTCOME 6: STUDENTS APPLY THEORY TO PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE**

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	94
Campus students	94
Distance students	94

Measure: I could 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	89
Campus students	87
Distance students	94

### **OUTCOME 7. STUDENTS DEMONSTRATE UNDERSTANDING OF ISSUES SURROUNDING MARGINALIZED COMMUNITIES AND INFORMATION**

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	92
Campus students	92
Distance students	94

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

### **Other Questions: Professional Involvement**

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	76
Campus students	74
Distance students	81

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

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	23
Campus students	20
Distance students	31

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

	% campus students answering yes	% online students answering yes
Student club or organization	67	0
Professional organization (local, regional, national)	52	78
Volunteer/Service Activity	25	11
Recreational group	15	6
Community Organization	13	11
Other	2	17

Other included elected office and an internship

## MENTORSHIP AND ADVISING

---

The iSchool asked questions related to mentorship and advising in both the Graduates Survey and in exit interviews.

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

	% all students answering yes	% campus students answering yes	% online students answering yes
Work supervisor	64	69	50
Practicum supervisor	53	54	50
Academic advisor	51	48	61
Another student	33	35	28
Another iSchool staff member	27	29	22
Co-worker	26	25	28
Another faculty or staff member at UW Madison	24	29	11
Someone else	6	4	11

I did not have a relationship with a mentor during my time as an iSchool student	3	2	6
--	---	---	---

Other answers included former students and a professional society liason to a student chapter.

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

	% Campus Students	% Online Students	% All students
Very helpful	38	71	47
Somewhat helpful	43	12	34
Not very helpful	13	12	13
Not at all helpful	6	6	6

## 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
Field Practicum class (620)	83	61	77
E-portfolio/job search class	46	28	41
Other iSchool class	44	22	38
iSchool sponsored event (webinar, brownbag, etc)	13	6	11
Student group sponsored event (webinar, brownbag etc)	33	0	24
UW Writing Center	8	0	6
SuccessWorks (Campus career services)	17	6	14
Online iSchool Career Services Resources	17	17	17
I did not participate in any career services activities	2	11	5
Other	2	11	5

Other included: an internship and bootcamp.

All students get exposure to career services through:

- The required introductory course LIS 601 – modules on career planning were put into 601 based feedback from students in prior 620 classes, who said that the career content was helpful, but that they needed it much earlier in their program. As part of their assignment the students are required to use the Career Toolkit in 601.
- The required Field Practicum class LIS 620. All students take this class and are exposed to the basics of career services.

Due to low attendance of iSchool sponsored career service events, iSchool Career Services began shifting programming to venues with guaranteed student attendance including the LIS 620 (practicum class), the 1 credit Job Hunt/E-Portfolio class, Bootcamp, and new student orientation. Career Services also coordinates additional events with student groups whose membership basis tends to better ensure attendance.

The iSchool completed transition of the “online iSchool career services resources” to a more accessible netid based system in fall 2017. Further, it redesigned the online services to better reflect the student perspective. We had expected to see a rise in the percent of students who describe using these online materials, but we did not. In fact, the percent reporting using the materials (17%) is lower than prior years when the system was more difficult to access. The result is particularly confusing given that all sections of 620 require students to make use of the Online iSchool Career Services Resources in order to complete assignments. Future reports should continue to track this question to see if this is a blip or a trend.

All in all, only a small number of students claimed they did not participate in career services in some way (despite all having taken LIS 620 and its career services content.) (2% of campus and 11% of online students).

As shown below, of the small number who did not participate in career services, the survey invited them to explain why. Respondents (N=5 students) chose a variety of reasons including it not being important to them (one student explained they already had a job), not having time, and not being aware.

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

	# All Students (N=5 responses)
I was not aware of how to participate in career services	1
It was not important for me to participate in career services	2
I did not feel comfortable participating in career services	0
I did not have time to participate in career services	1
Other	1

## E-PORTFOLIO

---

2019 was the first year the iSchool offered students the chance to use a streamlined set of program level learning outcomes and a simplified portfolio template; however, about a quarter of graduates opted to stay with the older learning outcomes and the older portfolio template. We were interested in to what degree the streamlined system could increase student satisfaction.

The percent of students who strongly agreed or agreed that they had sufficient support for 2019 was 68%, which was down from 81% in 2018, and 83% in 2017.

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

Answer	2019	2018	2017
	% all students	% all students	% all students
Strongly agree	31	23	39
Agree	37	58	44
Neither agree nor disagree	24	14	14
Disagree	8	4	3

We ran analysis of those 2019 graduates who took the 1 credit e-portfolio/job hunt prep class. 43% of campus grads took the class while 23% of online grads took it. Of students who completed the class, 80% believed that the iSchool had provided sufficient support. Of those who did not take the class, 60% believed the iSchool provided

sufficient support.

As shown below, only 51% of students overall agreed or strongly agreed that the portfolio helped them remember and reflect on their accomplishments. This is lower than 2018 (61%) and 2017 (59%). In 2019, more students rated themselves as “neither agree nor disagree” than prior years, and the percent of students who disagreed or strongly disagreed was 14%, a fall from a total of 25% in 2018. But the percent that strongly disagreed rose from 4 to 10 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		
	2019	2018	2017
	% all students	% all students	% all students
Strongly agree	12	12	24
Agree	39	49	35
Neither agree nor disagree	35	14	21
Disagree	4	21	9
Strongly disagree	10	4	10

The difference in e-portfolio perceived helpfulness was stark between online and campus students. Online students were much more positive about the e-portfolio experience. 84% agreed or strongly agreed that it was helpful, and no online students disagreed. In comparison, only 42% 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	% Online Students
Strongly agree	3	42
Agree	39	42
Neither Agree Nor Disagree	41	17
Disagree	5	0
Strongly Disagree	13	0

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

- Desire for more help material on the e-portfolio website
- Seen as more helpful to the school than to the student completing it
- Not all advisors remind students

Positive comments included:

- “I stayed on top of my portfolio and it really helped me to feel prepared for graduation”
- Appreciated that a TA was available to help
- I appreciated the e-portfolio class, as it helped me understand the requirements and aims of the e-portfolio so that I could finish it successfully. I also appreciate the new, more streamlined portfolio requirements.

### Exit interviews

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

*Praise:*

- “I also found it valuable that my advisor was open to reviewing my portfolio progress and offer feedback at anytime throughout the duration of the program.”
- Praise for the 1 credit class “I appreciated the 1cr course that helped me prepare for the e-portfolio. During the course, I had someone who can guide the prep.” “I took the e-portfolio course, which was a great motivator to get the e-portfolio done early and to receive timely feedback on it.”
- “The best part of the portfolio is that assignments were mapped in the syllabus to help identify assignments for the criteria...it was nice to go back and review assignments and classes as I prepared the portfolio”

*Suggestions for improvement:*

- Portfolio website: Need to finish updates with the new PLO material; Could be easier to use
- Let students know that their portfolio has been approved for graduation purposes
- Believed they would get feedback if turned in early. But they did not.
- “I felt there was too much emphasis on specific wording and format. It seemed subjective to the reader as to whether the specific wording fit the criteria. I spent more effort making sure the wording fit a subjective standard than I did reflecting on my past work and experiences.”
- Require students to work on it earlier
- “Better clarification about expectations regarding variety of artifact types, amount of solo work vs. group work, etc. would have led me to make different choices about my artifacts earlier on.”

*Other*

- “I like the updates [new PLOs], even though they’re more vague - this makes the writing very frustrating, but more assignments apply.”
- Transition issues “I’m part of the class that switched from the old PLOs to the new ones, and also new template for the portfolio. It was a little hard to go back to older classes and align my work with new PLOs

---

## 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 120 hour 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 2018-2019 academic year, including the summer of 2018, representing the field experiences of 72 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.

### Practicum Supervisor questions relating to overall satisfaction of students

*Measure: How well did the student meet your expectations?*

<b>Percent supervisors rating</b>	<b>%</b>
Exceeds expectations	57
Meets expectations	42
Short of expectations	<b>1</b>
Not applicable	<b>0</b>
<b>Total satisfactory or above</b>	<b>100</b>

Measure: *Please rate the quality of the student’s work in terms of daily tasks (work requiring regularized tasks)*

<b>Percent supervisors rating</b>	<b>%</b>
Exceeds expectations	66
Satisfactory	34
Unsatisfactory	<b>0</b>
Not applicable	<b>0</b>
<b>Total satisfactory or above</b>	<b>100</b>

Measure: Please rate the quality of the student's work in terms of specific projects (work not requiring regularized tasks).

<b>Percent supervisors rating</b>	<b>%</b>
Exceeds expectations	78
Satisfactory	28
Unsatisfactory	1
Not applicable	0
<b>Total satisfactory or above</b>	<b>100</b>

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

<b>Percent supervisors rating</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	79
Agree	20
Disagree	1
No basis for judgement	0
<b>Total agree</b>	<b>99</b>

**Practicum supervisor questions relating to overall professional behavior of student related to PLO 4 "Students demonstrate understanding of professional competencies important for management of information organizations" and to PLO 6 "Students apply theory to professional practice"**

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

<b>Percent supervisors rating</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	74
Agree	20
Disagree	0
No basis for judgment	6
<b>Total agree</b>	<b>100</b>

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

<b>Percent supervisors rating</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	81
Agree	14
Disagree	<b>3</b>
No basis for judgement	<b>0</b>
<b>Total agree</b>	<b>100</b>

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

<b>Percent supervisors rating</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	41
Agree	51
Disagree	0
No basis for judgement	5
<b>Total agree</b>	<b>97</b>

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

<b>Percent supervisors rating</b>	<b>%</b>
Strongly Agree	76
Agree	23
Disagree	1
No basis for judgement	0
<b>Total agree</b>	<b>100</b>

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

Percent supervisors rating	%
Strongly Agree	76
Agree	21
Disagree	2
No basis for judgement	0
<b>Total satisfactory or above</b>	<b>100</b>

Measure: *In which of the following areas did your student exhibit unsatisfactory communications skills? (mark all that apply)*

Only 5 supervisors chose to answer this question.

<b>Area of unsatisfactory communications</b>	<b># supervisors</b>
Public speaking	1
Coordinating with peers and supervisors	1
Contributing in meetings or teams	0
Shyness with coworkers or public	1
Written work for public	0
Not applicable or I have no knowledge	0
Other	2 included "telling effective story" and "asking questions to clarify tasks"
Disagree	2
No basis for judgement	0
<b>Total satisfactory or above</b>	<b>100</b>

## OTHER ASSESSMENT TOPICS:

---

### **One-credit classes:**

Feedback from exit interviews suggests that some students have found the workload for 1 credit courses burdensome. To address this issue, the iSchool is prepping advisors to more strongly warn students about the increased workload and also to encourage instructors to assess whether their course may exceed the one credit hour workload level.

### **Online courses for campus students:**

The exit interview asked campus program students whether they knew they would likely take some online courses as part of their campus-based program. Results were mixed. Most reported that they knew they would likely take online classes, but that they took more online classes than they expected. Many however, did not see this as problematic as it provided flexibility in balancing school with working. But, some campus students reported were not aware they would likely be taking online classes and expressed disappointment that face to face courses were not available in the semester they preferred.

Suggested improvements: (1) Making it clear that all summer courses are online. (2) Creating a bread and butter librarianship plan that can be done all face to face. (3) Course forecast helpful.

### **Practica Placement Experiences**

The exit interview asked students about the experience by which they were matched with a practica site. Most students report that the process worked for them. Students report frustration navigating the list of possible practica sites.

One new practica challenge is that as the number of students interested in UX has grown, the iSchool has experienced challenges finding sufficient UX related practica. Further, new practica supervisors may not yet have realistic expectations about incoming students skills and capacities. And, UX interested students may not be aware of the need to prepare their skill set in order to obtain a UX practica.

## APPENDIX – AUGUST 2018 ISCHOOL PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

---

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.