

1-1-2020

USFSM Information Literacy Instruction Sessions Assessment 2019-2020

USF Libraries

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/usf_lda_data

Scholar Commons Citation

USF Libraries, "USFSM Information Literacy Instruction Sessions Assessment 2019-2020" (2020). *All Assessment Data*. 79.

https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/usf_lda_data/79

This USF Sarasota-Manatee Library is brought to you for free and open access by the USF Libraries Data and Assessment at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Assessment Data by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Library Assessment & Impact

1. First Name: Jessica Last Name: Szempruch
2. Email Address: jszempru@sar.usf.edu
3. Campus: Sarasota Library Unit: Sarasota Department: Library Services/Information Commons
4. Title of Assessment [name of project or course-include prefix and number]:

Information Literacy Instruction Sessions Assessment

5. Assessment Category: ___Collections X Services ___Facilities/Equipment
6. Assessment Time Period: June 2019 – March 2020
7. Audience/Population: Students – undergraduate and graduate
8. What is the purpose of the assessment? [max: 500 words]
Please address the following points as appropriate:
 - a) What problem are you trying to solve?
 - b) What service or function are you trying to improve?
 - c) What criteria demonstrate success?
 - d) What is the anticipated impact?

I collect data on all of the information literacy instruction sessions I provide. This data is used to track and plan improvements upon said instruction sessions. My data collection focuses on who comprises the audience of the sessions; what information they are learning; and their overall feedback from the lessons.

Reflection on this data allows me to make improvements to my instruction, guides updates and enhancements to existing learning objects, and shows where gaps in coverage exist. Comparing year to year data allows me to recognize growth, patterns, and strengthening faculty relationships.

I hypothesize that over time, students who receive information literacy instruction in their classes will have more academic success, which will lead to higher retention and timely graduation rates.

9. Please check off any PBF or Preeminence metrics to which this activity correlates:

	PBF metrics
	Percent of Bachelor's graduates employed or continuing education
	Median wages of graduates employed full time
	Average cost to students
X	Four-year graduation rate
X	Academic progress rate
	Bachelor's degrees awarded in areas of strategic emphasis
	University access rate
	Graduate degrees awarded in areas of strategic emphasis
	Percent of BAs awarded without excess hours
X	Six-year graduation rate

	Preeminence Metrics
	Average GPA and SAT score
	Top 50 rankings
	Freshman retention rate
	Four-year graduation rate
	National Academy memberships
	Science and engineering research expenditures
	Non-Medical science and engineering research expenditures
	Disciplines ranked in top 100 for research expenditures
	Utility Patents awarded
	Doctoral degrees awarded annually
	Number of post-docs appointed
	Endowment size

10. Assessment Methodology and Data Points:

Recorded in LibInsights: date/time; course number; college/school; department; faculty name; librarian instructor; session request date; instruction topics; how session was scheduled; prep time; attendance; audience composition; feedback; success of session; instruction time; guides created

11. Schedule/plan:

Statistics are created and maintained on an on-going basis. Immediately following each session, entries are recorded in LibInsights. Statistics are reviewed on a regular basis for trends and outliers.

12. Expected outcomes:

I expect that by continually recording and evaluating data from instruction sessions, I can continue to develop and provide meaningful, high quality instruction. Statistics will allow me to identify trends, make improvements, and uncover new potential to reach even more students across majors and levels. Ultimately, quality instruction will lead to enhanced student outcomes.

[Post-assessment]

Discussion of Findings/Results:

- a) What did the data show? (summarize statistics, if applicable)
- b) What did you learn?
- c) Applicability/usage?
- d) If you did the assessment again, what would you change?

June 2019 – March 2020

One librarian (Jessica Szempruch) completed 30 (thirty) information literacy sessions.

- 1,900 minutes (31.66 hours) of active, in-class instruction
- 87% of these sessions took place in September 2019 (33.33%), January 2020 (36.67%), and February 2020 (16.67%).
- Attendance: 600 students; 95% undergraduates, 5% graduates
- College distribution: 80% College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences; 10% College of Science and Math; 6.67% College of Business; 3.33% College of Hospitality and Technology Leadership
 - Note: CLASS represents a majority of general education courses which are a primary focus area
- Most common topics covered: Library skills; citing sources; resources in a subject
- Overall impressions show successful sessions with thoughtful user interactions throughout.

Plan for improvement/next steps:

- Data shows a low number of sessions in graduate level courses. Efforts to outreach to graduate faculty will be increased.
- Data shows lower numbers of sessions from non-CLASS courses. Part of this is due to a majority of general education courses being housed by that college. However, efforts to outreach to underrepresented colleges/majors will be increased.
- Paper feedback forms gathered from student participants are difficult and time-consuming to process when understaffed. A digital feedback form will be utilized in FY2021 in order to streamline collection of important qualitative data.

Assessment results (attach summary document/file with raw data):

[Raw data](#)