



Planning and Evaluation Tracking

College Year: 2008-2009

Division of: Academic Affairs
Department of: AC Library

Person Responsible: Lou Ann Seabourn
Person Responsible: Mark Hanna

Purpose Statement:

Our purpose is to

- empower our patrons to be self-sufficient information consumers and to possess critical evaluation skills;
- create a physical environment that encourages personal study, collaboration, and networking, and inspires creative and academic growth; and
- provide seamless access to the best information and tools customized for each patron.

Goal Statements	Objectives/Outcomes (including assessment tools and standards)	Results	Use of Results (including improvements and revisions)
1. Students taking core courses will be information literate on selected standards from the Association of College and Research Libraries' (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards.	1. After taking a pre-test on one or more information literacy competencies, participating students will improve their scores on the post-test by at least 40 percent, and students will average at least 70 percent correct on the post-test.	<u>[2008-2009]</u> Fall 2008 Pre-Instruction Assessment average: 35% Post-instruction Assessment average: 82% % Improvement: <u>134%</u> # of students: 435	<u>[2008-2009]</u> Fall 2008 ▪ <u>Analysis</u> Second assessment scores have stayed fairly stable instead of improving significantly. The percentage improvement has gone up as we have fine-tuned the first assessment to more accurately reflect the students' level of knowledge. To improve second assessment scores, we need to improve productivity in the area of implementing needed

changes faster and more efficiently.

▪ **Plan of action**

The new learning management system, Angel, offers opportunities to improve our results. Hopefully, learning to operate Angel and creating online assessments will enable us to make the following improvements:

(1) To quickly identify questions being missed disproportionately so we can clarify wording or change teaching methods.

(2) To improve grading efficiency so we can implement needed changes faster.

(3) To improve accuracy by reducing unauthorized collaboration. (Angel can construct different assessments from a question bank and can change the order of multiple-choice options.)

[2007-2008]

Fall 2007

Pre-Instruction Assessment
average: **56**
Post-instruction Assessment
average: **78**

[2007-2008]

▪ **Analysis**

We formed several subjective impressions during the year that we need to test:

% Improvement: 47%
of students: **290**

Spring 2008

Pre-Instruction Assessment
average: **47**
Post-Instruction Assessment
average: **89**
% Improvement: 91%
of students: **233**

Summer 2008

Pre-Instruction Assessment
average: **58**
Post-Instruction Assessment
average: **85**
% Improvement: 47%
of students: **11**

[2006-2007]

Fall 2006

Pre-Instruction Assessment
average: **55.4**
Post-Instruction Assessment
average: **75.9**
% Improvement: 37%
of students: **194**

Spring 2007

Pre-Instruction Assessment
average: **57.0**
Post-Instruction Assessment
average: **82.2**
% Improvement: 44%
of students: **334**

Summer 2007

(1) Active learning (including hands-on computer activities) may improve assessment results, and

(2) Showing fewer resources in more depth may allow more reinforcement of the specific information literacy competencies being taught.

▪ **Plan of action**

(1) Gather data to compare assessment results with active learning as the variable being tested. (Hands-on computer training will be considered an active learning activity for our purposes.)

(2) Gather data to compare assessment results when fewer databases are shown in more depth (with more student practice) versus when more databases are shown in less depth (with less student practice).

Pre-Instruction Assessment
average: **31.5**
Post-Instruction Assessment
average: **78.0**
% Improvement: **148%**
of students: **76**

[2005-2006]

1.

IA = Pre-Tests Avg. % correct
(Initial Assessment)

FA = Post-Tests Avg. % correct
(Follow-up Assessment)

PI = Avg. Percent Improvement

Fall 2005 Results (n=509)

IA = 53%

FA = 66%

PI = 24%

of students: 509

Spring 2006 Results (n=372)

IA = 72%

FA = 90%

PI = 25%

of students: 372

Summer 2006 Results (n=20)

IA = 48%

FA = 77%

PI = 59%

of students: 20

The formula used to calculate
the PI was as follows:

$$((FA-IA)/IA)*100 = PI$$

2. Print and electronic collections will be relevant and useful to students, faculty, and staff, especially for programs which require discipline accreditation.

2. After analysis of discipline accredited course readings, assignments, and accreditation criteria, technical services staff will update purchasing procedures to change the collection development focus via a phase in process for immediate program accreditation providing 100% of required readings either in the electronic and/or print collections by September as verified by subsequent mapping.

[2007-2008]

2. Continued application to nursing collections – 2007-08 with addition of Dental Hygiene

Nursing

Updated = 48

Current titles = 267 (<5yrs)

Use of collection = yearly
circulation increased by 188 transactions

Dental Hygiene

Updated = 7

Current total = 70 (<10yrs)

Use of collection = yearly
circulation increased by 2 transactions

[2006-2007]

2. Pilot with Nursing
Collections - Summer 2007

Existing titles = 235

Discarded (> 5yr) = 96

Updated = 31

Current titles = 170 (<5yrs)

[2007-2008]

2 .

Analysis

Nursing-

Mapping against inventory and program accreditation criteria plus input from faculty assured 100% compliance

Dental-

Using the same inputs, the dental holdings were updated with the following exceptions:
6 titles > 1998 retained because content is still applicable,
15 titles identified for replacement in 2008-09

Some discrepancies in reports and subsequent collection totals identified and corrected using Dental Hygiene collection. Some revisions are still needed to spreadsheet that calculates and documents circulation statistics.

Staff position that monitored

course curricula requirements
no longer active.

Plan of action

Correct discrepancies in
reports for Nursing collection.

Standardize reports for
remaining accredited
collections for consistent data
recovery collections starting
with Surgical Tech.

Incorporate search of course
syllabi for required readings
into Acquisition duties

3. Increase access to print collections for distance learners through conversion to electronic format.

3. By attending a series of informative sessions by library staff, faculty who place materials on Reserve will give permission to digitize & place on the Internet all their authored material as recorded by a conversion log.

[2007-2008]

3. 0 conversions

[2006-2007]

3. 0 conversions

[2007-2008]

3. Analysis

It was not feasible for personnel with expertise needed to present the reserve project to the faculty groups to reschedule time.

Faculty contacted are not interested in placing their personal course content online.

Other projects such as the Googles document database that provides information to remote site staff serving our students would be a more profitable use of staff time.

Plan of action

Close goal concerning reserve room dealing with faculty member content and concentrate on what the library can deliver via the website or databases.

Continue transferring reference titles from print to electronic format starting with 5 titles identified for 09 budget year.



revised 8/1/05