Information Literacy Committee
Minutes: Nov. 15, 2013

Present: Dana Antonucci-Durgan, Campus Head Librarian - East; Penny Bealle; Jennifer Farquhar, Chair; Susan Lieberthal, Campus Head Librarian, Ammerman; Lisa Melendez, Bruce Seger

1. Review and clarification of Oct. 18, 2013 Minutes
   • Standard 1 should read “at what proficiency did the student focus the topic (remove” identify and”)
   • Standard 2 should read “subject specific retrieval tools” (add “retrieval”)
   • 100-level rubric had two standards listed under Standard 2. Because there was overlap between the two, it was decided that relevancy was the key standard to assess. As such, Standard 3 (as written in minutes) should be part of Standard 2 and “select assignment appropriate information sources” is to be removed.
   • Standard 3: remove last part of guiding question (“not on the appropriate number of sources”) to match revised wording for standard.

Other corrections/points:
• LILA rubric will include note on the omission of Standard 4 for 200-level assessment
• Penny noted that Montauket should be written as Montaukett and “What is a citation?” was an example used within Ask a Librarian

Oct. 18 minutes were approved with changes.

2a. Closing the Assessment Loop
   • Jenny distributed an updated rubric with above-stated omissions and changes.
   • Middle States wants to see how, based on assessment, we are closing the loop and making changes. At present, we are one year out from COL assessment and one semester out from I100-level assessment.
   • Discussion regarding findings from COL assessment, particularly students’ difficulties with evaluating material. Jenny believes we need a uniform way to address this and Penny suggested bringing assignments to next meeting to discuss. Ideas included how to make the evaluative component a larger part of COL library session; what parts of session/worksheet may not need as much attention; and moving the evaluative part to a more prominent
position in the session/worksheet. Dana suggested we set priority and redesign around that goal.

- All agreed that any changes on worksheet should be minor until discovery tool is in place and that upcoming semester be used to talk about how to expand evaluative part and close assessment loop.
- Memo will be sent out to all librarians re the shift away from busy work and toward critical thinking/evaluation in COL. Memo will also ask for input and priorities. Dana asked whether critical thinking at this level might be too lofty. Penny feels it must be included. Lisa added that students also have trouble formulating topics and this could address critical thinking as well.
- Bruce expressed concern over objectively assessing evaluative pieces. Jenny noted that an expansion of the evaluative section that is broken down properly (vs. the big blank box it is now), might actually be easier to assess.
- Penny noted that the assessment also showed citations to be problematic.

2b. Presenting Data to Faculty
- Jenny shared with Prof. Schrier the results for his class that participated in the assessment. Chart and memo could be used a test run for sharing results with other participating faculty. Chart shows how a particular class did, not the bigger picture of assessment results from all classes. Could be used by faculty to identify problem areas.
- Discussion about preparing same for all faculty whose classes participated in 100-level assessment.
- Bruce brought up faculty concerns about this being some sort of back door assessment of them. Penny suggested send OPIE analysis and offering to generate more specifics for those interested.
- Dana asked if future assessments could look at timing of instruction in relationship to assignment deadline. Susan likes idea of visiting class for a few minutes as deadline for assignment gets closer to address outstanding questions, information needs. Dana asked about including this visit as part of future assessment to show how we are closing the loop.
- Penny expressed concern about logistics of this and infringing on professor’s classroom time.
- Jenny suggested sending IE analysis of 100 level assessment to all faculty with thanks and note to contact us if they have additional questions. Note should come from committee or
instructing librarian and mention upcoming spring assessment of 200-level courses in case they are interested in participating.

3. **Preparing for 200-level assessment**
   - Jenny distributed new rubric with adjustments. Caroline Burns believes that we won’t need to do a second norming as it is very similar to previous rubric. Caroline will double check this with Chris Shults.
   - Penny asked about norming new librarian, Susan Wood. Jenny will ask Caroline.
   - Jenny also explained norming process for Dana.
   - Jenny asked how reaching out to 200-level instructors to participate in assessment is going. Sample size should be at least 10 classes across the three campuses. So far, it looks like:
     - East: biology; psychology; and English
     - Ammerman: American Sign Language; Psychology, and English
     - Grant: Philosophy, African-American Studies, Nursing and Psychology.

4. **New Business**
   - Dana involved in writing up annual assessment of learning outcomes and asked what percentage should be considered successful? 70%? Jenny asked if there is a standard and about the expected criteria for success. Dana will contact Caroline Burns and also send document to Jenny.