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HOW DID I DO?
STUDENT AND PEER EVALUATION OF LIBRARY INFORMATION LITERACY INSTRUCTION

Susan Vega García and Kris Stacy-Bates
Iowa State University Library
Session Overview

- Assessment of IL instruction
- Changing our library culture
- Course-related instruction: Student evaluations
  - Developing & implementing process
  - Tools used
  - How data are used / What we are gaining
- Credit-bearing course: Peer evaluations
  - Developing & implementing process
  - How data are used / What we are gaining
Which best describes your library?

1. Public library  20%
2. Community college library  20%
3. Private college / private university library  20%
4. Public university library  20%
5. Other / NA  20%
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ISU Instruction overview

Instruction Programs: Students / Attendees
FY09-FY14
Which IL instruction delivery reaches the most students at your library?

1. One-shot / Course-related instruction
2. Credit-bearing IL course
3. Online IL tutorials
4. Other method
5. Don’t know
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Assessment of CRI

- **Skeptics**
  - “The one-hour stand…. Are we evaluating an ineffective instructional medium?”
    - Patrick Ragains, 1997

- **Assessment Beneficial**
  - but is it always done?
    - Time it takes
    - “Do they **really** learn?”
    - “I already **know** I’m a good teacher.”
    - What to ask / What to do with the results
    - Fear of evaluation
At my library, CRI assessment is...

1. required for all sessions
2. encouraged and often done
3. encouraged but rarely done
4. not being done at all
5. don’t know
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Changing library culture

WHERE WE WERE (pre-2011)

- Closed door approach to CRI
- Little to no CRI assessment
- No accountability for reporting to anyone
- No compelling reason ever to assess

WHERE WE WANTED TO GO

- Desire to know effectiveness of our CRI
- Program-wide analysis of how we were doing
- Analysis of student learning & attitudes toward CRI
- Standardized & centralized approach
- Online survey tool
CRI: Inventing the process

- **What & How to assess**
  - Student Self-Professed Learning Outcomes
  - Student Attitudes toward Effectiveness of instructor & session
  - Forced choice 4-point Likert scale

- **Created standardized questions**
  - Keep it brief & clear
  - Produce one form for everyone
  - Make form accessible

- **Ensuring participation & good return**
  - Monitor follow-through / participation
  - Distribute & collect during session

- **Recorded data & producing reports**
  - Feedback for librarians
  - Use for building portfolios
  - Use for professional development & teaching improvement

**Transparency:** Consensus & buy-in

Same process used for workshops & seminars
What are our questions?

1. Demographic / rank

2. Name two things you learned from this session that you didn’t know before.

3. What one unanswered question do you have, if any?

4. Overall, this instruction session was effective in advancing my learning.

5. Overall, the librarian was an effective teacher for this instruction session.

Q4 and Q5 use “forced choice” Likert scale (Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree) with no middle ground.
What we are learning from students

**PLUS**
- Students like CRI
- What do they say they are learning?
  - Subject-focused databases
  - Course LibGuide
  - Library website & discovery tool use
  - Search techniques

**DELTA**
- Redundencies
- General awareness learning outcomes
What we are learning from process

PLUS
- Easy to assess
- Value & role of CRI
- The New Normal

DELTA
- Large course challenge
- Curriculum mapping
- Scale

% CRI Sessions Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRI Evaluation Sources


What is Library 160?

1. A library celebration planned for 2018, the 160th anniversary of the founding of Iowa State University.

2. A hybrid, credit-bearing, information literacy course taken by all* ISU undergraduates. (*some test-out and transfer credit allowed)

3. I’m not sure, but I’m guessing it’s 4 times more than Library 40.
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Where we were two years ago with Peer Evaluation of Teaching (PET)

- Instructors could ask their peers to give feedback on their teaching – if they thought of it or even wanted it.

- Some very brief and informal feedback in Library 160.

- No formal guidance for PET was provided at the library level.

- Online course elements were not considered.
Why we changed that picture

- University-level mandate.
- Teaching improvement and professional development for all 160 instructors.
- Online classroom evaluation placed equal to face-to-face classroom assessment.
- Developed a process to assess online teaching separately from online course design.
Where we are now with Peer Evaluation of Teaching (PET)

- Instructors of Library 160 will go through PET at least as often as every 3 years.
- Forms, procedures, and guidelines written.
- Both the face-to-face and online classroom settings of Library 160 are evaluated.
- Some instructors have already been evaluated.
Some more about ISU Library PET

- Instructor and evaluator discuss the evaluation twice -- pre-observation and post-observation.
- Evaluator writes a culminating letter.
- Letter at least partly based on an observation form.
- Observer aims for objectivity.
- Letter shared with instructor’s supervisor and the Head of Instruction.
Do you do PET at your library?

1. Yes, with a formal process or requirement involved
2. Yes, informally
3. No, not that I’m aware of
4. This question does not apply to my situation
5. You let pets in the library? We don’t!
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Example questions from guidelines for Pre- & Post-Evaluation meetings

- **Pre:**
  - What do you hope to achieve in this session to help students learn / be engaged?
  - Anything specific you’d like me to pay attention to during observation? Strengths? Challenges? Trying something new?
  - Any particular teaching techniques or strategies you’ll be using?

- **Post:**
  - For specific things instructor wanted observer to focus on, how did those go?
  - For online observations, discuss technology / tool use
  - Tell the library instructor what you saw as her/his teaching strengths
  - In a supportive and positive manner, discuss any areas for potential improvement
What do we evaluate in the face-to-face classroom?

- Individual Delivery
- Session Organization & Content
- Technology Use & Presentation Aids
- Student Engagement & Instructor Rapport
What can we evaluate in the online classroom?

- Section Customization
- Communication
- Online Learner Support
- Online Teaching Activity
How is ISU Library 160 PET progressing?

- 2 of 16 instructors formally evaluated.
- 3 evaluators have written at least one formal letter.
- Training more evaluators – 8 so far.
- Instructors really appreciate feedback.
- Instructors are starting to invite others to attend their course-related instruction sessions as well—still an informal process.
What are we gaining from PET?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Level</th>
<th>Programmatic Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of strengths</td>
<td>Culture of assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of areas to improve</td>
<td>Teaching improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement to try new things</td>
<td>Peer-to-peer training and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving more thought to teaching strategies</td>
<td>Open conversations on teaching &amp; learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material for portfolios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assess our session on assessment!

I now feel confident that I can implement teaching assessment.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree
5. N/A

Note: This interactive audience response slide has been deactivated for archiving purposes. svg 5.2.2017
Sources that helped us develop our PET process


- California State University, Chico. Rubric for Online Instruction. Available online: http://www.csuchico.edu/roi/the_rubric.shtml


- University Library, University of Illinois – Urbana-Champaign. Documenting Your Teaching: Peer Review: Checklist of Procedures for Peer Review of Librarian’s Class; Guidelines for Reviewers; Classroom Observation – Instructions for Classroom Observation Form, and Classroom Observation Form; Guidelines for Peer Review Report. Available online: http://www.uic.edu/depts/lib/staff/commwork/teaching/index


Questions?

Susan A. Vega García

- savega@iastate.edu

Kris Stacy-Bates

- kksb@iastate.edu

Thank you!