Project Director: Rhonda Huisman, Assistant Librarian, University Library

Instructional Services Committee members:

- Katie Emery, Assistant Librarian, University Library
- Meagan Lacy, Assistant Librarian, University Library
- Sonja Staum, Full Librarian, Herron Library
- Graduate student: Dr. Julie Frye, IUB School of Education/Curriculum & Instruction

Department/Division and School

   University Library, UL 2102 B

    755 W. Michigan St. Indianapolis, IN 46202

Phone: 317-274-0978

Fax: 317-278-2300

E-mail: rhuisman@iupui.edu

Project Title

   "Library Instruction: An Environmental Scan"

Project Dates

   May 1, 2012—April 30th, 2013

Scope and Purpose:

Historically University Library has not systematically gathered data and/or report results showing faculty collaboration, student learning, or adherence to campus-wide assessment and evaluation initiatives. Librarians, both broadly as a profession and here at University Library, generally rely on anecdotal or rhetorical pseudo-evidence that our students are doing well, and engage in small, controlled assessment efforts based on formative and more recently, summative evaluations, including portfolios, annotated bibliographies, and research papers, utilizing rubrics as the scoring or evaluation instruments (Oakleaf, 2012). Certainly, the trend over the last ten years includes planning documentation, particularly in ARL libraries reported that in 2010, 92% had strategic plan foundations such as visions, values, and goals, and many had made significant efforts towards library assessment programs (Bowlby, 2011; Oakleaf, 2012). A thorough environmental scan of the instructional setting will gather the necessary documentation and data needed to evaluate the setting, staffing, collections, documents, instruction, standards, mission, and goals of the University Library. The primary objective of this analysis is to minimize the randomness of evidence used in decision-making, and to alert leaders to developments and issues that may affect the organization as a whole; the library is an integral part of the Indiana University system, and our ability to be flexible, change with the needs of the learner, and support the faculty by recognizing trends is essential to pro-active planning.

Through the environmental scan, there will be additional evidence through documentation and data, which can also be used for accreditation purposes, housed in a centralized and transparent framework in an online platform. Marketing, programming, and services will be shaped around demonstration, data, and discussion, rather than around speculative and anecdotal information.

Summary of overall project accomplishments

Objective 1: *To engage both University Library faculty and staff in the responsibility, development, and accountability for the Information Literacy Program and instructional/outreach activities*.

a. *Internal and External Partners:* Through the use of the "Analyzing Your Instructional Environment: A workbook" (2011) from the Association of College and Research Libraries *(ACRL),* the Instructional Services Committee was able to determine the seven areas of professional competencies, benchmarks, and characteristics deemed to be essential parts of an instructional program at an academic library. Each section of the workbook provided detailed questions, data points, and other criteria that academic librarians and administration could consider in planning, engagement, and evaluation of teaching and assessing information literacy and library skills for all levels of students at a higher education institution. The committee chose to use each section of the workbook and determined that much of the data and documentation could be collected or allocated to other organizations or departments on campus, such as IMIR *(Information Management and Institutional Research)* or University College. The current reporting Association of Research Libraries *(ARL)* and IPEDS *(Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System),* NSSE *(National Survey of Student Engagement),* and other national data repositories that University could yield answers to various portions of the document. Examples include Section II "Learner Characteristics" (student demographics) and Section IV

"Resources for Library Instruction and Information Literacy" (staffing, facilities, technology, and support).

b. *Actions and Evidence:*
It was evident that while much of this data is readily available, it is not indexed or analyzed from multiple sources either internally or externally related to library instruction; having a systematic way to collect the data and answer specific questions, as in the workbook, aided in organizing and looking at the not only the demographics of who University Library is currently serving, but also where to find this data in the future.

Objective 2: *To involve other campus entities in the understanding of the University Library mission and instructional goals, including the relevant IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning, and exposure to the professional information literacy standards at the national level.*

a. *Internal and External Partners:* In the planning phases of this project, it was determined that in order to have discussions and connections across the campus about information literacy, we would contact Kate Thedwall, Coordinator for Gateway to Graduation Programs in University College, about the Information Literacy Community of Practice. This is a faculty-driven group who has a vested interest in information literacy skills, student engagement, and high-impact practices. The members of our committee applied to be a part of this group, and we proceeded to have many meetings over the last year, collaborating on a variety of projects and communicating with them the needs of this study. The faculty agreed to pilot several of the early surveys we created, and we organized an information literacy workshop held in February, 2013.

b. *Actions and Evidence:* In addition to working with the community of practice, the project director met with Trudy Banta (Professor of Higher Education and Senior Advisor to the Chancellor for Academic Planning and Evaluation) and members of the Information Management and Institutional Research team to develop and revise questions to be included on both the student (spring) and faculty (fall) surveys. Survey questions were developed based on information literacy standards aligned with the ACRL (*Association of College and Research Libraries*) as well as the Principles of Undergraduate Learning (*PULs*). The faculty questions focused on collaboration with librarians, learning outcomes, and use of library services, and student questions concentrated on student gains in information literacy skills. This data will be collected and analyzed over the next few years, considering skills, services, and instruction.

Data Collection and Analysis

Purpose

Although all of the subject librarian liaisons teach information literacy in the classroom, there is no centralized information literacy program at the University library, and there is no instruction coordinator beyond the purview of the associate dean of teaching, learning, and research. For this reason, librarians have largely had to take an entrepreneurial attitude toward outreach and instruction and have had to actively seek opportunities to provide library instruction. Consequently, it is very difficult to ascertain what other librarians are teaching and assessing in the classroom and to provide consistent service. Thus, the purpose of this environmental scan, and for gathering this data, is to provide a foundation on which

to form a more intentional information literacy instruction program at IUPUI, and engage in deeper, meaningful conversations about student learning outcomes and goals at the class, course, and departmental levels.

Method

Because the "Analyzing Your Instructional Environment" workbook is designed for academic libraries with a centralized instruction program already in place, the committee necessarily had to adapt this document to reflect the situation at the University Library. Consequently, committee members perused each section and revised questions for relevancy. For example, Section III "Current Library Instruction" was modified from an intense, curriculum mapping exercise to an online survey in which librarians self-reported their instructional sessions and assessment activities related to all levels (100-400, and graduate level). In this survey, librarians could also report teaching and assessment for workshops and other types of instruction. However, at the very least they were required to submit data on at least four separate classroom instruction scenarios. This modification from curriculum mapping to targeted surveying was appropriate given the fact that librarians do not provide instruction in every course offered by their departments and not every course has a research component that necessitates library instruction. Tracking such courses for information literacy standards would be a nugatory exercise. Still, to obtain a more holistic picture of information literacy on campus—one that includes the perspective of not only librarians, but also that of students and faculty—the committee worked with the IUPUI Institutional Research Office to revise and expand existing satisfaction surveys to gather information about their perceptions of information literacy. Specifically, the surveys asked faculty to report whether or not their students made gains in certain information literacy competencies and asked students to self-assess whether or not they made gains in certain information literacy competencies.

Participants

Again, instruction librarians were asked to fill out one survey for one class (per level), recalling their experience for the fall 2012 semester only. University Library employs 23 subject liaisons, who cover 62 areas of study (departments and schools) across the IUPUI campus. Because many liaisons cover multiple subject areas, our return rate varies depending on level of instruction (e.g. 100 Level courses, N=20 (86%), 300/400 Level Courses, N=16 (69%), etc.). Additionally, not all liaisons answered surveys for each level of instruction, as they may not participate in teaching a graduate course, but may focus more heavily on first year or capstone (300-400 level courses). Therefore, our return rate is approximately 41.8%, which is significantly higher than typical survey response rate expectations. But, because not all liaisons were considered eligible for each survey, nor were they required to answer surveys for each course level, it is difficult if not impossible to give a definitive number. It is significant that the most surveys returned were at the 100 level, due to the inclusion of subject liaisons in the University College courses (UCOL) and Themed Learning Communities (TLCs), as well as school or department learning communities. This also represented the highest numbers of multiple class visits (78.9%), as well as the highest percentage of teaching and assessing all of the performance indicators, across all standards.

Because we intended to distribute a similar survey to faculty, a pilot survey was distributed to IUPUI's Information Literacy Community of Practice. However, because these pilot participants reported that completing the survey was both onerous and burdensome, and because faculty and students would not

have a strong incentive to complete our surveys, we decided not to distribute the faculty or student versions of the surveys to the IUPUI campus. Instead, we choose to revise and draw upon existing satisfaction surveys, assuming that would help us improve response rates. In addition to surveying students, faculty, and librarians, we also held focus groups in which faculty, students, and librarians could discuss their perceptions of information literacy and instruction. However, because of poor attendance, the data generated from these meetings is of limited use.

Finally, several other people were involved with the collection of data for this environmental scan as well. They include: the University Library Administration (Sections I, IV, V, and VI of the workbook), the University Institutional Research Office (Section II), and the IUPUI Information Literacy Community of Practice (Section III). These sections mostly include statistical and demographic data that can be used to compare and benchmark the University Library's instruction program against national guidelines.

Analysis

There were many points of data and research that the committee gathered throughout the year, but one of the most compelling was the instruction and assessment self-study that was completed by the librarians who serve as liaisons to schools and departments. For example, this data showed that 77.2% of University Library liaisons who participated in the survey teach and 48.1% assess ACRL Information Literacy Standard 1, Performance Indicator 1, Outcome E: "[The student] identifies key concepts and terms that describe the information need." This is reflective of several of the PULs, in areas such as core communication (1), critical thinking (2), and integration and application of knowledge (3). The data also showed that only 4.9% of the librarians surveyed taught and assessed students at the 200-level. In other words, this data has helped us identify the University Library's strengths and opportunities for further growth and discussion on assessing student learning. With this evidence, we can be more deliberate and strategic as we make decisions to reshape our information literacy instruction program.

Findings

It is too soon to comment on findings since we are still in the process of collecting data from the student and faculty satisfaction surveys. However, we anticipate that these findings will provide further insight into the needs and expectations of faculty and students with regard to information literacy and that this information can be used to more appropriately guide the library's marketing strategy, programming, and services. The student survey was piloted in the spring semester (2013) and is currently being analyzed (See Appendix). The faculty survey with information literacy questions will be piloted in fall 2013.

Obstacles and Challenges

Throughout this year-long process, the project director and committee members were faced with a few challenges in collecting the appropriate data, using the ACRL workbook, and time constraints.

- Modifications to the "Analyzing Your Instructional Environment" workbook were made to reflect the current campus culture and mission. As this was simply a template and not an official document for the professional organization (ACRL) in terms of accreditation, we needed to

- adapt and adjust sections to meet our needs, and justify time spent on those sections that would yield information or participation that led to a desired outcome.
- Graduate student support was difficult to find, and we were not able to hire a candidate for the entire grant period. We did find a very commendable graduate student who was able to fulfill most of our needs, but this delayed some of the collection and analysis phase.
- The amount of time and personnel needed to complete this project was often straining to the project director and committee members. In reflection, taking smaller portions or specific questions that the workbook addressed to narrow the scope might have given the committee sufficient answers, and would allow for deeper examination.

Further Discussion

In summary, one of the project's primary goals was to collect meaningful data about the work the librarians do in the classroom environment from across the IUPUI campus (students, faculty, and staff) that would inform the library in its efforts to develop and articulate a thoughtful programmatic approach to instructional practices embedded in the curriculum, and, aligned with the campus teaching and learning mission. A parallel and significant priority was to ensure project activities were aligned and conversant with the best practices from the field on a national level. The results of this year-long project review indicates a strong need for further in-depth focus and deliberate activity in the primary areas below in order to move the library's strategic instructional activities toward the proactive, meaningful information literacy program it seeks to provide to the students across the IUPUI campus.

- ➢ Participate in a systematic review of instruction through a curricular approach
- ➢ Gauge the understanding, use, and engagement with information literacy competencies, standards, and resources
- ➢ Continue to collaborate with IMIR on piloting faculty and student surveys
- ➢ Focus on professional development, continuous improvement strategies in teaching, assessing, and promoting information literacy across campus, and particularly amongst subject librarians.
- ➢ Provide support and structure for data collection, storage, and dissemination

Dissemination

The evaluation and results of these findings will be added to the library's improved information literacy website, based on the NILOA transparency framework: http://www.ulib.iupui.edu/research/infolit

By making this information more visible to other campus entities, we hope to involve them in the understanding of the University Library mission and instructional goals. In addition, the project director and Instructional Services committee members have already written about this experience and presented at several conferences:

- "The A-Team: Making a Plan Come Together Across Campus."
  ARL Library Assessment Conference.
  Charlottesville, VA (October, **2012**)
  (Proceedings to be published in 2013)
- "A Scanner Darkly: Retooling the Tools for Environmental Scans"

ACRL Annual Conference, 2013
Indianapolis, IN (**2013**)
IUPUI Scholarworks: https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/3271

- "Now You See It: Transparency in Instruction and Assessment"
ACRL Annual Conference, 2013
Indianapolis, IN (**2013**)
IUPUI Scholarworks: https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/handle/1805/3270

The committee intends to write additional articles on this experience, including reflection and best practices using the workbook, professional standards in libraries in higher education, and methods of self-reporting of teaching and assessment activities in information literacy instructional programs. In addition, the work and collaboration that was done with the Information Literacy Community of Practice has been accepted for publication as a chapter in *Information Literacy—Not Just for Librarians: Issues in Assessment, Teaching, and Application*,(D 'Angelo, Jamieson, Maid, & Walker, Eds.) to be published in 2014.

The committee wishes to express their gratitude to the PRAC committee for their continued support in this project.

Respectfully submitted,

Rhonda Huisman, Assistant Librarian, Project Director

Katie Emery, Assistant Librarian

Meagan Lacy, Assistant Librarian

Sonja Staum, Full Librarian   *June 1, 2013*

References

Association of College and Research Libraries. (2011). *Analyzing your instructional environment: A*

       workbook. Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/acrl/aboutacrl/directoryofleadership/sections/is

       /iswebsite/projpubs/aie

Bowlby, R. (2011). *Living the future: Organizational performance assessment.* Association of Research

       Libraries. Retrieved from http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/publications/bowlby-

       organizational-performance-assessment-5-31-11.pdf

Oakleaf, M. (2012). *Are they learning? Are we? Learning outcomes and the academic library.*

       Proceedings of the 2012 Library Assessment Conference (ARL), Baltimore, MD., p.15-37.

APPENDIX: STUDENT SURVEY, INFORMATION LITERACY PILOT QUESTIONS, SPRING 2013

During your time as a student at IUPUI, which of the following have you experienced?

1 = "I have experience this" 0 = "I have not experienced this"

Visited the library	0	1
Attended a class taught by a librarian	0	1
Attended a library workshop	0	1
Made an appointment with a librarian	0	1
Found needed materials or information in the library or on the library website	0	1
Used library resources for academic work	0	1
Successfully completed an assignment with assistance from a librarian or use of library resources	0	1

How effectively can you perform the following information literacy/library skills?

1 = Not at all Effective; 2 = Somewhat Effective; 3 = Effective; 4 = Very Effective

Identify and use basic library resources	1	2	3	4
Differentiate between scholarly and popular information	1	2	3	4
Use appropriate techniques to more precisely search many different forms of information	1	2	3	4
Evaluate and select relevant information for a given assignment, including subject-specific or multi-disciplinary databases	1	2	3	4
Construct citations according to a specified style guide	1	2	3	4
Find and navigate library research guides	1	2	3	4
Find contact information for a subject librarian	1	2	3	4
Differentiate between original (primary) and secondary sources of information	1	2	3	4
Expand research strategies for a comprehensive search of databases and other library resources	1	2	3	4
Construct discipline-specific citation information for use in writing, researching, or locating resources (e.g. books or articles)	1	2	3	4
Locate and use appropriate subject-specific reference materials	1	2	3	4

How helpful have the following been in helping you develop library research/ information literacy skills?

4 point scale: 1 = Not helpful, 2 = Somewhat helpful, 3 = Helpful, 4 = Very helpful

Librarian	1	2	3	4
Faculty	1	2	3	4
Peers	1	2	3	4
University Writing Center	1	2	3	4
Self-instruction	1	2	3	4