SLIS Annual Assessment Report Academic Year 2014-2015

Approved by the SLIS faculty August 18, 2015

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 School of Library and Information Studies employs a process for continual program assessment and improvement centered on SLIS's performance in terms of achieving program level student learning outcomes. These program level learning outcomes were created and are annually re-supported by the faculty.

Assessment activities are primarily run through the SLIS 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, changes to assessment methodologies based on discussions of the data.

Assessment tools used during the 2014-2015 academic year included:

- a direct assessment of 71 student portfolios by a team of faculty and students,
- an online survey of 73 graduates,
- 22 exit interviews with graduates, and
- A survey of student performance from 71 practica completed during the year.

2014-2015 assessment achievements include:

- Improvement in measures of support provided for completion of the e-portfolio
- Collection of data about the degree to which students are aware of the Career Wiki
- Inclusion of MA and PHD students on the e-portfolio assessment team to better include stakeholders in program assessment
- Assessment of forms for faculty and students
- Assessment of the student awards process
- Collecting and analyzing formative data from stakeholders for the curriculum revision

At the August 2015 retreat, the faculty/staff identified the following target areas for improvement for the 2015-2016 year, based on the data in this report:

- More formative data collection related to curriculum revision
  - Redesign of required courses in light of learning outcome data
- Consideration of revision of e-portfolio to reduce burden and increase value to students

STUDENT PORTFOLIOS – DIRECT MEASURE

SLIS assessed 71 student portfolios representing December 2014, May and August 2015 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 ensures students meet the portfolio graduation requirement and provides quantitative data. Completed portfolios had to meet the following minimum requirements:

*   At least 5 artifacts
*   A final reflective statement
*   Use of all SLIS learning outcome tags at least once
*   A justification statement for each artifact posted explaining how the artifact demonstrated the tagged learning outcomes

    Students missing portfolio elements were given ample warning and support in order to quickly finish and meet minimum portfolio criteria.

One goal of the analysis was to determine which learning outcomes students demonstrated most and least often. One might argue that SLIS should provide more support for students to gain mastery in and demonstrate lesser used outcomes

Step 2: Subjective evaluation

Portfolio review committees met and scored portfolios representing December, May and August graduates.

The main May review committee consisted of: Ely (1st year student), Eschenfelder (faculty), Glasser(1st year student) Griffin (1st year student) Kaplan (academic staff), Kim (faculty), Lowe (academic staff), Palmer (academic staff), Rubel (faculty), Masemann(academic staff), Salo (academic staff), Senchyne (faculty), Shapiro (academic staff), Kaitlin Springmier (1st year student), Zhang (PhD student) The smaller August review committee consisted of Besant, Gottleib-Miller and Zhang.

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.

- SLIS had set a goal that ideally at least 90% of portfolios would provide satisfactory evidence of each learning outcome. **SLIS met this goal for six learning outcomes**.
- Of the remaining learning outcomes, five were above 80%, showing moderate achievement.
- One learning goal fell slightly below 80%:
  - **(79%) 2a. Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.**

Table 1 compares the 2014-2015 academic year portfolio scores with scores from the prior academic year (2013-2104). No significant changes in curriculum or teaching assignments were made between the two years that would explain the change in the scores. Instructions for the portfolio, and support for portfolio completion increased between the two years.

In most cases, percentage scores are similar across the two years.

Notable Improvements:

3b "Students select and evaluate print and digital information resources" – The data from 2015 (96%) show improvement from 2014 (88%). One explanation for the increase is improved e-portfolio instructions and examples.

Notable Declines:

3c "Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities" – The data show a decline from 2014 (96%) to 86% in 2015. One possible explanation is more rigorous scoring in which scorers looked specifically for evidence of socio-economic-cultural-sexuality-ableness diversity.

Table 1: Portfolio Assessment scoring

Learning Outcome	Combined Satisfactory and Leaning Satisfactory		
	# (N=78) 2015	% 2015	% 2014 comparison
1a: Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information.	65	83	85
1b: Students apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, reading, and information use.	65	83	83
2a: Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics issues applicable in local, national or global contexts.	65	83	79
2b: Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.	69	88	90

3a: Students organize and describe print and digital information resources.	72	92	90
3b: Students select and evaluate print and digital information resources.	75	96	88
3c: Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.	67	86	96
3d: Students understand and use appropriate information technologies.	72	92	92
4a: Students evaluate, problem solve and think critically, both individually and in teams.	76	97	98
4b: Students demonstrate good oral and written communication skills.	76	97	92
4c: Students participate in extracurricular activities in the field.	71	91	85
4d: Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.	69	88	83

Portfolio Assessment Committee Comments

Justification statements: The review committee was unsatisfied with the uneven quality of student justification statements provided for the artifacts.

1b: Literacies: The committee was unhappy with a small number of portfolios that interpreted this LO to discuss their own literacies rather than others' literacies.

2b: Ethical principles: The committee was unhappy with a small number of portfolios that used the example of "good citation practices" as an example of ethical principles.

3b: Selection/evaluate: The committee was unhappy with a small number of portfolios that referred to students own selection practices for class papers as demonstrating mastery of selection/evaluation practices.

3c: Diversity: committee members again complained that students are too liberal in what they count as diverse (e.g., elementary and high school teachers = diversity). Proposal to change wording of 3c to require "racial, ethnic, cultural, sexuality, ability or socio-economic diversity."

4c: Extracurricular: Does a course requirement count? Does paid work count as extracurricular activity? The committee suggested improving the instructions for extracurriculars without an artifact to require a longer justification statement.

4d: Leadership: Committee members complained about examples where students merely stated that they had a group project without describing what they did to be a leader within the group project. Mere presence of a group project doesn't demonstrate leadership. The committee felt that mere membership in a student group should not qualify as leadership.

Level of effort: The student committee members felt students did not put much effort into the portfolio because it was not part of a graded class. This could contribute to the lower scores.

Suggestions from the committee:

- Ask instructors to require students to write justification statements as abstracts for assignments – especially in 450, 451, 551.

- Consider annotations related to each LO that include suggestions and "do not include" items.
- Revise LO 3c to read "Students analyze information needs of diverse *racial, ethnic, cultural, ability or socio-economic* individuals and communities"
- Revise LO 1b to read "Students apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, readings, and information use *to better understand the information behaviors of others*"
- Revise LO 3b to read "Students select and evaluate print and digital information resources *for others.*"

GRADUATES SURVEY – INDIRECT MEASURE

The Graduates Survey was fielded during April and May of 2015. It was sent to 88 students who qualified as December, May and August graduates. It was completed by 73 students for a response rate of 83%. Of the 73 total survey respondents, 63 were on campus students (84% response rate) and 10 were online students (77% response rate).

<u>2015 Upcoming Graduates Survey Responses</u>

In order to get an understanding of the career aspirations of the respondents, they survey asked respondents to choose the specialization with which they most identified. The majority chose academic libraries (27%), followed by public libraries (24%), archives (16%) and children/youth (12%). The online program contains a higher percent of public libraries students (50%), followed by academic libraries and children/youth (both 20%).

Specialization Area	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents (All students)	Percent of Respondents (online students)
academic libraries	20	27	20
public libraries	18	24	50
archives/records	12	16	--
children/youth	9	12	20
info tech	7	9	--
info management	4	5	10
school library	--	--	--
other	4	5	--
Total	74	100	

This section continues by describing the 2015 data associated with each program level learning outcome.

The SLIS goal is to have 85% or more of the student body describe themselves as moderately or very well prepared.   The measures that fell below 85% include the following:

- 61% - Measure: refer to documentation in order to create basic Dublin Core metadata for a digital item (PLO 3a "Students organize and describe print and digital information resources.")
- 75% - Measure: to refer to appropriate resources in order to create a hyperlink in HTML code. (PLO 3d "3d. Students understand and use appropriate information technologies.")
- 79% - Measure: assess the effectiveness of a program or service in your organization. (PLO 4a. "Students evaluate, problem solve and think critically, both individually and in teams.")
- 82% - Measure: I could address concerns of a patron who is offended by the content in a collection. (PLO 2b. "Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.")
- 82% - Measure: I could to refer to standards or rules to create basic descriptions of information resources (e.g., book, CD-ROM, web page). (PLO 3a "Students organize and describe print and digital information resources.")

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

Measure: I can explain information and knowledge as tools to empower communities.

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

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	88
Campus students	88
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	85
Campus students	85

Distance students	90

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	89
Campus students	87
Distance students	100

Measure: I could explain why patron privacy is important.

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

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	88
Campus students	85
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	86
Campus students	82
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	95
Campus students	93
Distance students	100

Measure: I could to refer to standards or rules to create basic descriptions of information resources (e.g., book, CD-ROM, web page).

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	82
Campus students	79
Distance students	90

Given that SLIS did not meet its 85% confidence goal related to this measure, we asked each exit interview participant why they thought that students responded in this way. Common themes included:

Time gone by: For students who did not pursue advanced coursework in organization of information, they simply forgot the information they learned in their first semester. As one described, "students don't remember course content from 3 years ago, but ideas may come back to them in work setting"

Question unclear: Wasn't sure what this meant; question densely worded; does the question mean physical descriptions? Bibliographical? Subject? Not sure if this was talking about MARC or a research guide or what. What does "a basic description" mean? Putting it in MARC, or the basic description in LInkcat? Or is it like a summary of the contents of a book?

Not enough practice in 551: Didn't have much experience with this in her coursework; 551 was doesn't prepare you to create metadata because class was not very hands on; had few opportunities to practice this. Experiences are isolated and formulaic and only give people a baseline knowledge; she had a hard time in 551 and didn't retain stuff.

A Cataloging Thing: Assumed that one had to know cataloging in order to answer this question; assumed this was only for people who had taken cataloging.

Other students testified they did feel confident due to work done in more advanced courses (beyond 551) or work.

Measure: refer to documentation in order to create basic Dublin Core metadata for a digital item.

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

All students	61
Campus students	61
Distance students	80

Given that SLIS did not meet its 85% confidence goal related to this measure, we asked each exit interview participant why they thought that students responded in this way. Common themes included:

Question wording was confusing. Students suggested several alternative wordings that they believed would have resulted in a higher score including "refer to document to direct me to create a Dublin Core record" "Create DC metadata with the help of documentation" "find the right source to help you prepare DC record"

551 problems: Don't remember doing this in 551; only mentioned in 551; only on a quiz in 551 no hands on

"There is no *basic* DC" There is so much flexibility in DC that it is a bit intimidating, hard to know if you are doing it right;   The word "basic" might mess it up as there is no basic DC.

Other students described projects in more advanced classes in which they practiced metadata skills.

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	29
Campus students	24
Distance students	60

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	91
Campus students	89
Distance students	100

Measure: explain to a patron how to search a vendor database or catalog.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	99

Campus students	98
Distance students	100

Measure: to explain the basics of how web search engines work to a person outside the field.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	96
Campus students	95
Distance students	100

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

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	88
Campus students	86
Distance students	100

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

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	97
Campus students	97
Distance students	100

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	87
Campus students	85
Distance students	90

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	93
Distance students	100

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

Measure: To teach myself new technologies and software relevant for my 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: 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	46
Campus students	43
Distance students	60

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	75
Campus students	74
Distance students	70

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	79
Campus students	74
Distance students	100

Measure: I can function effectively as a team member to solve problems

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

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

Measure: I can give an effective fifteen minute oral presentation

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

Measure: I can communicate effectively in writing

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

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

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

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	86
Campus students	84
Distance students	100

Measure: I helped organize one or more professional events or projects while a student at SLIS

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	59
Campus students	63
Distance students	40

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

Student population	Percent students answering yes
All students	38
Campus students	42
Distance students	20

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 yes
All students	93
Campus students	92
Distance students	100

Measure: I can lead a team.

Student population	Percent students describing themselves as moderately or very well prepared
All students	92
Campus students	90
Distance students	100

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

	Percent students answering yes (all students)	Percent students answering yes (online students)
Student club or organization	40	--
Professional organization (local, regional, national)	14	10
Community organization	12	20
Recreational group	4	--
Other	10	20
Work based project or team (paid work)	62	50
None of the above	21	40

LIS 620 PRACTICUM

SLIS 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
Campus students	87
Distance students	90

Survey Measure: The in-class portion of the LIS 620 class was helpful to my professional development

Student population	Percent students answering agree or strongly agree
Campus students	36
Distance students	80

As seen in the data above, many on-campus students do not see the in class portion of 620 as valuable. Online students are more appreciative of the class part of the experience

When asked to name valuable elements of the in class portion of 620, students mentioned the following:

- Guest speakers (leadership guest speaker particularly noted)
- poster sessions/presentation at end was fun;
- watching the videos on job hunting,
- information on interviewing;
- journaling very helpful;
- liked talking with other students about the challenges they experienced;
- e-portfolio video;
- liked final synthesizing paper and have used language from it in a cover letter;
- flash talk;

Given the low scores for the in class portion of 620 among campus students, in exit interviews, SLIS asked campus students to reflect on what aspects of the in class portion of 620 were valuable and not valuable.

- Some students complained about lack of clear goals for their classroom portion experience - Students "weren't sure why they were there."
- Some felt the in class portion requires too much work on top of their field placement commitments. As one student asked "Are we trying to get on the job experience or write some more papers?" Many saw the work required in the classroom portion is "busywork."

- Students disagreed about the value of many activities in 620. Some people liked the weekly articles, others did not. Some people liked the required reflection, others did not. Some like sharing experiences with other students, and others found listening to others tedious.

Other suggestions for improvement included: more on resumes, practice interviews; more scaffolding for the cover letter exercise, more examples to work from; would like more critique of resume/cover letter; help translating the practicum experience into lines on a resume; make students sign up for the CareerWiki and watch a canned video as part of a 620 assignment; create small peer group accountability within the larger class; journaling doesn't work as well for experiences where you do the same activity (e.g., cataloging) each week – they suggested an alternative assignment for some practica.

CAREER SERVICES

SLIS asked closed ended survey questions, open ended survey questions and exit interview questions related to the Career Services and particularly the online resource the "Career Service Wiki" which contains videos of past career services events and worksheets and tutorials and links to a curated set of career websites.

The number of SLIS Career Services, L&S Career Services, or Writing Center events I attended or viewed online was:

Number of Career Services Events Attended or Viewed at a Later Time	% of Campus Students	% of Online Students
None	13	50
1-2	40	30
3-4	32	20
More than 5	15	--

Below please find an image of the SLIS Career Services wiki which provides online careers services resources to current students and alumni. Before seeing this picture, to what extent were you aware of the SLIS Career Services wiki? (Note: The survey showed students a screenshot of the CareerWiki to jog their memories)

Answer (choose one)	% Campus Student	% Online Student
I knew about the wiki and used it	29	20
I knew about the wiki but have not used it.	29	30
I didn't know about the wiki	31	30
I'm not sure if I knew about the wiki	15	20

Open ended comments related to the career services questions suggested that students simply had forgotten the wiki existed, could not remember their passwords to the wiki, could not find the link to the wiki. Students are introduced to the wiki at numerous events, but evidence suggests they simply do not remember it exists. As one responded noted: "Someone mentioned the wiki but I had no idea what it was for or where to find it."

Suggestions:

- Post messages about resources on the Career Wiki on the SLIS Facebook page during job-hunting season. "Need help with ____? Click here for example _____on the CareerWiki"
- Inclusion of more LIS specific resources.
- Greater use of the SLIS Librarian as backup for the Student Services Coordinator in the busy spring job season.
- More interview practice opportunities – perhaps in 620

E-PORTFOLIO

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

Graduates Survey

Data from the Graduates Survey show that SLIS has made improvements in providing support for completion of the e-portfolio. The percent of students who felt SLIS provided sufficient support increased dramatically from 2014 (13%) to 2015 (64%).

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

	% of Students Responding	
Answer	2014	2015
Strongly agree	6	15
Agree	7	49
Neither agree nor disagree	26	26
Disagree	48	9
Strongly disagree	13	1

At the same time, the percent of students who believed the portfolio was helpful to them rose from 13 to 32%. Unfortunately, the percent of students who do not feel the preparation of the portfolio was helpful to them remains about the same (about 40% combining the bottom two categories). But, the percent that strongly disagreed fell from 24 to 16 percent. SLIS must take further measures to make portfolio preparation useful to students at the time of graduation.

Measure: the preparation of my SLIS e-portfolio was helpful to me.

	% of Students Responding	
Answer	2014	2015
Strongly agree	2	1
Agree	13	32
Neither agree nor disagree	50	22

Disagree	11	28
Strongly disagree	24	16

The survey invited open ended comments to help SLIS understand students' experiences with the e-portfolio.

E-portfolio is helpful themes:

- Self-assessment "working on the e-portfolio helped me have a better grasp on which skills I needed to develop"
- Remembering accomplishments "It was nice to look back on my assignments and realize how much I have learned and accomplished"
- Preparing for job interviews "a valuable way to synthesize my experience in the program and it definitely helped me revisit the objectives of SLIS in a very positive way that helped prep me for job interviews" "developing a concise understanding of my proficiencies in the profession, which is increasingly helpful in my job search."

E-portfolio is not helpful themes:

- Took too much time and get no credit
- Won't be useful to show employers
- Not enough scaffolding in terms of interim due dates and check ins
- Instructions not yet clear enough

Do portfolio in 620?

In exit interviews, SLIS asked students about an idea to require completion of a portion of the e-portfolio as part of the LIS 620 class. Students thought of reasons why it would be good and they also thought of potential problems.

Pro: Would give it more meaning, provide more direction. Fits well with the mission of 620. Would facilitate getting feedback. Could reduce stress by getting some work out of the way. Could reduce stress by enforcing intermediate deadlines.

Con: Summer might be too early to work on the portfolio because one could only do 2-3 artifacts. They might not be people's final artifacts and therefore you could cause redundant work. You would need to grade it or people wouldn't do it. Is it a good idea to pile on more work in a 620 that already has too much work in it? E-portfolio isn't career oriented so won't fit well in 620.

General e-portfolio comments:

- Students suggested the 820 portfolio was more helpful for job seeking than the main e-portfolio.
- Student suggested that e-portfolio due date for Dec and August grads be advertised more in advance.
- Students asked for further clarification of instructions.

PRACTICUM SUPERVISOR QUESTIONNAIRE – DIRECT MEASURE

SLIS asks each practicum supervisor to fill out a survey about their students' work performance at the end of the practicum experience.

This data is based on supervisor responses submitted via an online questionnaires for the summer 2014, fall 2014 and spring 2015 terms representing the field experiences of 60 students.

Overall practicum supervisors scored SLIS students very well. In all areas of assessment, 90% of more of students achieved positive scores. The lowest scoring areas included:

- Daily Tasks: 93% received positive scores
- Teamwork: 90% of students received positive score

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: *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	Summer 2014 N=27	Fall 2014 N=22	Spring 2015 N=23	Total for Year N=72
Exceeds expectations	14	15	17	46
Satisfactory	9	7	5	21
Not applicable	**4**		1	**5**
Total satisfactory or above				**93%**

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

Percent supervisors rating	Summer 2014 N= 27	Fall 2014 N=22	Spring 2015 N=23	Total for Year N=72
Exceeds expectations	20	17	18	55
Satisfactory	7	4	4	15
Not applicable		1	1	2
Total satisfactory or above				**97%**

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	Summer 2014 N=26	Fall 2014 N=22	Spring 2015 N=23	Total for Year N=71
Agree	23	18	18	59
Somewhat agree		2	3	5
No basis for judgment	3	2	2	7
Total agree				**90%**

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

Percent supervisors rating	Summer 2014 N=26	Fall 2014 N=22	Spring 2015 N=23	Total for Year N=71
Agree	22	19	20	61
Somewhat agree	4	3	2	9
Total agree				**99%**

Measure: *The student displayed initiative during the course of this placement.*

Percent supervisors rating	Summer 2014 N=26	Fall 2014 N=22	Spring 2015 N=23	Total for Year N=71
Agree	18	16	15	49
Somewhat agree	8	5	7	20
Disagree		1	1	2
Total agree				**97%**

Measure: *The student exhibited professionalism during the course of this placement.*

Percent supervisors rating	Summer 2014 N= 26	Fall 2014 N=22	**Spring 2015 N=23**	**Total for Year N=71**
Agree	24	20	21	65
Somewhat agree	2	2	1	5
Total agree				**99%**

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

Percent supervisors rating	Summer 2014 N=27	Fall 2014 N=22	Spring 2015 N=23	**Total for Year N=71**
Agree	23	16	19	58
Somewhat agree	4	4	3	11
Disagree		2	1	3
Total agree				**97%**

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	Summer 2014 N= 26	Fall 2014 N=22	Spring 2015 N=23	**Total for Year N=71**
Agree	20	15	17	52
Somewhat agree	6	7	5	18
Total satisfactory or above				**97%**

OTHER: DATA FROM MA PROGRAM CURRICULAR REDESIGN STAKEHOLDER SURVEYS

The Assessment Committee also analyzed formative data collected from stakeholders about an upcoming SLIS curriculum revision.

Advisory Board meeting:

In spring 2014, the Advisory Board reviewed the rationale for the potential curriculum revision, addition of research methods as a requirement and reduction in overall program credit hours. The Board was supportive of the ideas and encouraged further consideration of:

- Self-credentialing within the program

- Explore connections between management and assessment
- Importance of "life changing" electives

<u>Alumni reception:</u>

SLIS collected data from alumni at the alumni reception at the Wisconsin Library Association Conference in fall 2014 via a paper survey form. The survey included two open ended questions. Alumni were encouraged to write down any competency/skill areas that came to mind.

Question 1 "What competencies should a forward thinking library program prioritize?"

Question 2 "Some students are interested in applying their 21st Century librarian skills in settings outside of libraries and archives. What competencies should SLIS emphasize to support their career goals and interests?"

The below table summarizes the data. The first column includes the number of alumni mentioning a particular competency area for the library program. The second column indicates the number of alumni mentioning a particular competency in relation to settings outside of libraries and archives.

The most mentioned competency areas included technology, management, outreach/partnerships/networking, communications, and strategic planning/trend analysis.

WLA Reception Alumni Survey

Competency Area	Skills to Emphasize in Library Program	Skills Needed in Settings Outside of Libraries
Technology	**17**	**15**
Management	**12**	**7**
Budgeting	1	1
Grant writing	3	0
Supervision	6	1
Outreach/partnerships/networking	**16**	**7**
Communications	**8**	**6**
Strategic planning& trend analysis	6	6
Assessment for decision-making	6	3
Marketing	6	4
Org of info	4	5
Project management	4	1
Change management/flexibility	4	1
Fundraising	4	0
Customer service	3	1
Instruction	2	3
Diverse populations/languages	3	1
User needs/behaviors	1	3
Knowledge Management	1	1

Students:

Student Org Leaders Lunch: SLIS collected input from students in the fall semester at the annual SLIS Student Org Leaders lunch. The SLIS Director and the SLIS Librarian had a luncheon with student leaders in which they reviewed potential curriculum changes and solicited feedback.

SLIS Town Hall: In March of 2015, the SLIS Director invited all students to attend a SLIS Town Hall which would focus on potential curricular changes. The Town Hall was webcasted and also recorded so that as many students could participate as possible. During the meeting a note taker took notes on student comments.

The Town Hall gave an overview of the University budget cut situation, but primarily focused on specific questions (see below) related to possible changes to the curriculum:

In addition, SLIS fielded a Town Hall web feedback form to which students could submit answers to the same questions as those asked at the Town Hall. Six users submitted comments on the form (see appendix)

Summary of Feedback:

Q1. SLIS is considering reducing the number of required credits from 42 to 39 or 36 credits. Given no other changes to program requirements, what do you see as the pros and cons of a reduction in the number of required credit hours? *Answers were mixed – no consensus.*

Q2. One idea under consideration is requiring all students to take a 3 credit course in "Evaluation/Assessment/Research Methods" What do you see as the pros and cons of this idea? *Most students responded positively.*

Q3. What other things do you think the curriculum committee should consider when making decisions about a new MA curriculum for SLIS? (e.g., portfolio, capstone, thesis, merging classes, more required classes, fewer required classes etc.) *The two most common themes from the face to face session and the feedback form included reforming of the tier 1 courses, and increasing the value of e-portfolio experience for students.*

OTHER: OTHER ASSESSMENT PROJECTS

Forms: In the 2014-2015 year the Assessment Committee undertook a special project to review and improve SLIS forms including the student "Authorization to Enroll" form and the faculty/staff "Travel Authorization" form.

Awards: In the 2014-2015 year the Assessment Committee reviewed the student awards process and made the following suggestions: (1) Change the names of the awards on the webpage to emphasize the product more than the name of the honoree – completed; (2) Create electronic submission system – completed.

APPENDIX – SLIS PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES AUGUST 2015

Change approved for 1b and 3b as indicated below. Changes to the wording of 3c still under debate.

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.* (modified)

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* (modified).
- 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 PORTFOLIO SCORING MATERIALS 2015

May 2015

E-portfolio review sheet

Reviewer initials_____

Portfolio Name_____

Learning Outcome	Check one only per learning outcome			
	Satisfactory	Leaning Satisfactory	Leaning Unsatisfactory	Unsatisfactory
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.				
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.				
3b. Students select and evaluate print and digital information resources.				
3c. Students analyze information needs of diverse individuals and communities.				
3d. Students understand and use appropriate information technologies.				
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.				

Comments (please note learning outcome number)

Learning Outcome Review Instruction Sheet 2015

In deciding whether a given portfolio demonstrates learning outcome _____, you should look at:

- The artifacts tagged with learning outcome _____
- Justification statements associated with those artifacts

(1) Determine first if *at least one* artifact demonstrates the learning outcome in satisfactory way.

> There may be multiple artifacts tagged for a given learning outcome. You only need one to demonstrate satisfactory evidence.

(2) Then, you should determine if *at least one* associated justification statement explains how the artifact demonstrates the learning outcome in a satisfactory way.

> There may be multiple justification statements associated with a given learning outcome. You only need one to demonstrate satisfactory evidence.

This grid may be helpful in guiding decision making:

	Artifact Demonstrates Learning Outcome	Artifact Does Not Demonstrate Learning Outcome
Justification Statement Explains Link to Learning Outcome	*Satisfactory*	*Uncertain – leaning Unsatisfactory*
Justification Statement Does Not Explain Link to Learning Outcome	*Uncertain – leaning Satisfactory*	*Unsatisfactory*