

Report on Assessment of Program Learning Goals

June, 2017; modified 9/17 for web

Program Name: Master of Information
Program Director: Lilia Pavlovsky, PhD
Department Chair: Ross Todd, PhD
Date: June, 2017

Link to Program Learning Goals: Still in draft form, but evolving:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bX9d3kZkBXLOWiowaLZ6iXLxzmjyF4T24LOqpH9pd_Q/edit?usp=sharing

Program Learning Goals last reviewed: May 2017

Syllabi for Fall 2016 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Syllabi for Spring 2017 semester: Collected/Uploaded Syllabi Not collected

Indirect Assessment Survey conducted: Yes No

- If yes, please attach executive summary of survey results
- If no, how was general feedback about the program collected?

How: Every student must register and complete the ePortfolio capstone (17:610:503). In this class they are asked to fill out a [form/rubric](#) that lists 6 curricular criteria/outcomes defined by our accrediting institution, The American Libraries Association. This is a zero credit course that a student must earn a “pass” grade in order to graduate so response rate is 100%. Students reflect on their learning experiences in relation to the criteria presented and submit artifacts, documents and experiences (internships, etc) that support their reflection on how (and where within the program) they acquired the competencies. Most recently, after the revision of the Program Learning Goals began, it was recommended that we link the program learning goals to the accreditation competencies (see this [document](#) -- still a work in progress but used in this past evaluation).

Survey results: This is not a survey but a separate document that each student fills out. I have 48 assessment portfolio documents and the data is then transferred to a spreadsheet. For more information and examples of results:

See report:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fW4gLbLHmVAkn8AY7oR8MPuPfiX0zUB1Q8vYba0Kqpg/edit?usp=sharing>

Direct Assessment Method (of at least one program learning goal)

- If direct assessment was conducted please indicate brief summary of the approach to data collection/analysis and attach documentation/rubric(s) as needed.
- If no direct assessment was conducted please provide rationale (e.g. Program Learning Goals revised during Academic year; Program participating in accreditation process; Methodology in development (please indicate status).

Report on Assessment of Program Learning Goals

June, 2017; modified 9/17 for web

This [rubric](#) is used to examine and evaluate the student work as it was presented in relation to the respective Program Goals and ALA standards. In almost 100% of the cases where evidence was presented there was a direct correlation. In some cases no evidence was available (e.g. the response was “internship” or other experiential learning process) the student typically explained “why” that experience was relevant to the standard or goal. The student was not able to see the learning goal for this iteration, only the ALA standard because the learning goals were not inserted until after the semester began. For future courses the learning goals and standards will be aligned.

See report:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fW4gLbLHmVAkn8AY7oR8MPuPfiX0zUB1Q8vYba0Kgpg/edit?usp=sharing>

Direct Assessment Results

- Please provide a brief overview of the results (e.g. What did you discover?, Did the results align with the indirect survey results?).

Mostly I discovered that students vision of a standard or goal is directly related to their pathway in the program. And yes, the results aligned with the indirect responses. An LIS student might have selected a digital story or an accomplishment in 550 to show that they have mastered a secondary technology (production of digital stories) or a basic website created from scratch. A much more technologically saavy Data Science student project would be very different in that it would entail much more complex coding, retrieval and analysis of data. Both objectives and outcomes correlate not only to the program goals but to the student’s career goals: One might be headed for reference work at a public library or wanting to become a school media specialist while the other is looking for positions in data analytics and programming (more back end operational/analytical). The program was able to be flexible enough to fulfill both student’s goals in terms of their work and accomplishments.

As an “aside” note, one of the most interesting responses in many of the categories (esp. Category 6) was that students typically wrote “all courses did x” but these 2 courses are the ones I want to highlight. Interpretively speaking this means that the standards; criteria and goals permeate a large portion of the curriculum and the results are not as “siloeed” as they once were. So, for instance, 550 (Information technologies) is a course that was always referenced in the 3rd standard related to technology competency. This year, it was also mentioned but students would also list their reference; searching; social informatics; and other classes. More information can be found in the report.

See report:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/10wRmF2ltwBE9W3IUz1CTT-BXaDU5tUxok2oEp1gjXAw/edit?usp=sharing>

Close the Loop Activities

Report on Assessment of Program Learning Goals

June, 2017; modified 9/17 for web

- Please provide an indication of modification/refinement of pedagogy, curriculum, assessment tool, and/or learning goals based on assessment results.

I discuss this in the report but the last 2 questions have been critical in our recent program transition from MLIS to MI:

b. List and discuss 3 things that you feel our program does best.

c. List and discuss 3 things that you feel our program could improve upon

Most of the time, there are issue “cluster” in the responses to the second query related to program improvement. And, when I hear something mentioned more than 5 or 6 times then it’s time to think about what is going on and what we can do to fix something. There are basically 2 burning issues right now:

- 1) Quality of online courses
- 2) Consistency in online teaching
- 3) Development of stronger online professional/networking communities.

More discussion of this is located on the report:

See report:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fW4gLbLHmVAkn8AY7oR8MPuPfiX0zUB1Q8vYba0Kgpg/edit?usp=sharing>

- What is your plan for next year? (e.g. focus on particular goals, change assessment method/rubric).

My plan is to continue to improve this instrument because it is a very useful tool for decision making and will be invaluable for the reaccreditation process. I need to pull the information together longitudinally because it will show a 7 year record of program evaluation and response. These data are catalysts for change.

CRITICAL: ALL OUR DATA IS HOUSED IN ECOLLEGE. ECOLLEGE IS DISSOLVING AND DATA NEEDS TO BE MOVED

Additional Information

- What challenges/difficulties did you face in this process?
 - Staffing. There is no support for this process and one person cannot do it all.
- If there are other items related to program evaluation or student learning that you would like to share please do so.
 - If this is important then there should be some visible indication of support for the process.