

To: Dean Wendy Holliday

From: Nicole Beatty, Chair of Teaching and Information Services, Stewart Library

Date: Dec. 8, 2020

Re: Department Response to Program Review

Teaching and Information Services Response to Suggestions made by the Program Review Team

Introductory Statement:

Faculty members of the Teaching and Information Services Department, in the Stewart Library, have written this response to the suggestions provided by members of the Program Review Team. The team consisted of Dr. Louise Moulding, Professor of Teacher Education at Weber State University, Dr. Richard Price, Professor of Political Science, at Weber State University, Melissa Bowles-Terry, Head of Educational Initiatives Lied Library, University of Nevada Las Vegas, and Kacy Lundstrom, Head of Learning & Engagement Services Merrill-Crazier Library, University of Utah. We appreciate their insights and their willingness to contribute to the success of our program.

Response to Overall Findings:

The Review team found that overall librarians are innovative and dedicated to students. They also believe that our identities are defined by teaching information literacy. While that is part of our identities as librarians, it is not the only thing that defines us. We also work to build library collections; help to work out search strategies for research questions; answer reference questions; and serve as liaisons to each college at the university. However, since this review only focuses on our teaching role, it seems reasonable that the Review Team would not focus on our whole identities as librarians.

Response to Program Strengths:

Curriculum

Overall, the team found that our Information Literacy program is strong in terms of course offerings and is aligned with national standards. We agree with this statement. They also pointed out that our curriculum is “complicated” due to having subject-specific information literacy courses, concurrent enrollment information literacy courses, ENGL 2010/LIBS 1704 integrated courses, and LIBS 1704 information literacy courses. We see these as different paths students can take to meet the information literacy requirement. The learning outcomes

remain the same for each course. The differences lie in tools, methods, and/or citations styles emphasized in by the specific disciplines.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

In examining assessment and student learning outcomes, the Review Team found that students are meeting learning outcomes and standards. We find this statement to be true. However, we are continuing to work on ways to assess our curriculum which will be addressed in the response to the program challenges.

Faculty

Findings from the review indicate that library faculty are committed to student learning and well-respected by our university partners. We believe that information literacy aids in student success and we are dedicated to this idea inside and outside the classroom. We are fortunate to have so many supporters among our university partners.

Program Support

While the review team finds that administrative support is “adequate,” several members of the faculty disagree with this statement. University department chairs typically have administrative assistants. The Teaching and Information Services Department does not have a dedicated position that functions in this capacity. We do not deny that the support that comes from the staff in the Library’s Administration Office is helpful and we are grateful for it, but they simply cannot put as much time into the Teaching and Information Services Department due to their responsibilities to the whole library. Additionally, we have relied on our Exam Coordinator to work with advisors, help with scheduling courses, and work with Banner. While she should be celebrated, her job is changing into the liaison to concurrent enrollment and may not have as much time to devote to these activities.

Relationships to External Communities

As noted, the team found that we have strong partnerships around campus, and we agree with this assessment. They mentioned that we may want to do more outreach to faculty and meet them at the New Faculty Retreat. The library has a faculty member who is on the Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Committee, who attends the New Faculty Retreat every year. However, we will continue to look for new partnerships and collaborations.

Responses to Program Challenges:

Mission

The Review Team stated that the Teaching and Information Services Department does not have a mission statement. Currently, this is true. While this department was being formed, we were working on creating library-wide [mission and vision statements](#). While some of us thought those statements covered all departments in the library, we are happy to come up with a department

specific statement. As we work through restructuring our teaching program, we are also collectively working on what our priorities are as a department. It is our goal to use these priorities to create a mission statement by the end of March 2021.

Curriculum

Findings from the review indicate “inconsistencies” in our course offerings. While the team was not specific, we think this means that some disciplines have subject-specific information literacy courses, while there are none offered for other disciplines. There are several reasons for having some subject specific courses. These classes were developed on an “as needed” basis due to faculty feedback and not all disciplines have wanted to pursue this pathway to teaching information literacy. In the case of the Health Sciences information literacy course, this class was created in response to an accreditation requirement for the Nursing program. Not all disciplines have an information literacy accreditation requirement. Additionally, some colleges, like the College of Arts and Humanities, are composed of many different disciplines. A blanket Arts and Humanities information literacy course would not be able to adequately cover each discipline because of the differences in search tools and research methodologies. While creating such courses would be exciting, there is only one Arts and Humanities Librarian for eight disciplines (including film studies). Even if each course were offered each semester, that would be an 8:8 teaching load. Unfortunately, we just do not have adequate staffing to accommodate such course development. However, what we have done is worked to develop a separate course offering that integrates ENGL 2010 and LIBS 1704. While developing courses for each discipline cannot be accomplished, we can reach many students by integrating two courses that are university requirements.

However, the review team felt there are inconsistencies in the outcomes for the ENGL 2010/LIBS 1704 integrated courses. This was true during the two-year pilot period for these courses. In collaboration with the Department of English, we created a course called ENGL 2015: College Writing and Research. This course has combined learning outcomes that are consistent. Please see Appendix A for the chart outlining how the outcomes have been integrated. These outcomes will be used in every integrated course, including those taught in concurrent enrollment. The team also mentions that the integrated courses are an “area of concern” among faculty. This is true. Part of the issue is that some library faculty have been partnering with English faculty throughout the pilot period and have had more time to develop integrated courses that are more stable than those who have just started teaching the course. The other part of this issue is that partnerships change depending on who is available to teach the English part of the class. Even if you get one class integrated, we may have a new partner who does things differently the next semester. This is chaotic, but in developing ENGL 2015, we have a consistent course shell that collaborators can pull from and we think this may help address this problem.

Because some faculty feel as though they do not have an equal partnership in the integration process, we have written a Memorandum of Understanding (see Appendix B), that addresses these disparities and outlines what an ideal collaboration should include.

While our identities as faculty have been partially defined by teaching information literacy, especially under a system where the definition of faculty does not include all aspects of librarianship, that does not mean we cannot learn and grow from powerful collaborations. None of us want to be the “keepers of information literacy,” some of us are just in different places in the process of teaching the integrated courses.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

The program review report notes that “assessment and evaluation seem to be a work in progress.” We wholeheartedly agree with this statement. We are working on making assessment fit both what we do (which is changing as we transition to a more integrated model), and how we teach the subject specific courses and LIBS 1704 courses, as well. We are investigating backwards design, the theory in which the General Education Learning Outcomes are based, and how assessment ties in with it. We would like to do more assessment with the Signature Assignments for our courses and less with Pre/Post exams. We feel this is a more holistic approach which can include not only demonstration of skills outlined in our learning outcomes but also student reflection. As a department, we plan on developing a new plan for assessment in the Spring of 2021 with implementation by Fall of 2021.

Additionally, the review team noted that assessment from our pre/post tests showed that Standard B: Find Information Effectively: Demonstrate how information is organized; use Boolean Logic and other search strategies to effectively use library catalogs, article databases, and Internet search engines was not met for all semesters of data submitted for 2016 and 2017. This is accurate, it was met for both summer semesters in 2016 and 2017. It was not met in the Fall of 2016 and the Spring of 2017. However, they are correct that there was no specific plan outlined in the self-study to address this issue because we no longer have Standard B. When we changed our learning outcomes to align with the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Frameworks for Information Literacy for Higher Education, we went from teaching Standard B to OUTCOME 1: RESEARCH AS AN EXPLORATORY PROCESS The research process involves using tools and techniques to address information needs while understanding that the research process is often iterative and non-linear. The learning Indicators include the following:

- understand information needs,
- determine the appropriate scope of a project, and formulate focused research questions or thesis statements accordingly
- match information needs with search strategies and search tools
- understand that the research process is often iterative and non-linear.

However, our data is incomplete in terms of seeing how this new outcome was met because as a department we voted to move from using the pre/post tests for assessment to assessing signature assignments and were just beginning to work on a rubric for this when the pandemic hit. Our plan is to build a rubric to measure our outcomes, similar to the one used by the

General Education Improvement and Assessment Committee (GEIAC) to assess signature assignments to measure the GELOs. Since the pandemic hit, our department has been working on the integration piece of our curriculum. This means that coming up with a new way of assessing our courses got derailed due to the work it took to get the department to unanimously vote to add ENGL 2015: College Writing and Research to our curriculum. Since this course was in a precarious situation during the program review, we decided to postpone creating a rubric until we could iron out our curriculum. We plan having discussions regarding assessment of signature assignments this Spring and develop a rubric based on our discussions. We hope to have the rubric in place by Fall of 2021.

Academic Advising

We agree with the review team that academic advising is not part of the program and does not need to be added.

Faculty

The Program Review Team noted that the sustainability of our workloads is questionable. We agree and have taken some steps to alleviate some of these issues. These steps include hiring student assistants to help with the reference desk which provided each librarian with five hours per week to devote to other duties and opportunities. Additionally, in collaborating with the Department on English on ENGL 2015, we will have less ENGL 2010 one-shot instruction sessions which will also help make our workloads more sustainable. A one-shot instruction session is a library instruction session that takes place during one class session where the instructors bring their students to the library for information literacy instruction. We were doing roughly 30-40 of these sessions a semester. We will continue to seek out opportunities to create a more sustainable workload.

While it was unclear to the team if we could hire additional faculty or adjuncts to help with our courses, it states in the self-study that we did hire five adjuncts. Additionally, we feel that we have made great strides in creating solutions to help with the bottleneck that was happening in LIBS 1704. We created and are teaching the ENGL 2010/LIBS 1704 courses, which will help students in terms of time to completion because they can satisfy both requirements with one course. We are also offering Concurrent Enrollment integrated courses so students can complete these requirements before ever coming to Weber State. However, we agree that the training of new instructors for two semesters may inhibit efforts to reduce the bottleneck and are happy to look into a more efficient way to provide training.

While we do communicate with college advisors regarding the information literacy requirement and work to help students with transfer articulations, a more robust effort could be made to communicate with general education advisors to help get students into information literacy courses earlier in their programs of study.

Areas where the Program did not meet the Standards

The Review Team is correct, we do not currently have a departmental mission statement but will be working on this during the Spring semester of 2021. We also do not do academic advising as the Teaching and Information Services Department houses information literacy courses only and Weber State does not have a Library School where students study to become librarians.

Suggested changes for meeting the Standards

It is recommended that we create a mission statement and clarify our goals with regards to general education and subject areas. We have been working on restructuring our approach to teaching information literacy. In doing so, we are starting to talk about our priorities as a department and believe that our mission statement will come from these discussions. We plan on having a concrete mission statement that clearly outlines our goals by March 2021. Additionally, we have been seeking ways to create a more sustainable workload (see Faculty section).

Response to Additional Recommendations

The review team recommended looking for sources of funding to support the collaboration between English faculty and Library faculty. Our Dean, Wendy Holliday has been working on this and we have obtained additional funding from Continuing Education to assist with the planning of ENGL 2015 integrated courses. Additionally, we have a course shell for this integrated course which should help address the issue of partnerships starting from scratch. While we do not expect that every collaboration will be married to the course shell, it provides each group with a starting point which we did not have in the past. While we do partner with several campus entities, we will work to find ways to share the ownership of information literacy and create new collaborations. As outlined in the Faculty section, we have explored things to give up and will continue to do so to make our program more sustainable. In proposing ENGL 2015, we have given the one credit to English in order to make a four-credit class that meets both the ENGL 2010 and LIBS 1704 requirements. While we still teach LIBS 1704 and the subject specific courses that are one credit, it begins to address the recommendation made by the review team. As we work towards a more integrated model of instruction, our roles will change but we are still learning how our roles will be re-envisioned. As we develop a departmental mission statement that clearly articulates our goals as a department, we will discuss and address our group identity. In doing so, we will start to figure out what sharing the ownership of information literacy means and what we can do with the new opportunities that come with this instruction model. While we do have tentative timelines for some of the goals outlined in our response, we will make sure we move slowly and reflect on what we can do instead of what we have done in the past/are doing now and what support we will need going forward.

Appendix A:

Appendix A: Table and Rationale for the integration of ENGL 2010 and LIBS 1704 Learning Outcomes in ENGL 2015

ENGL 2010 Learning Outcomes	LIBS 1704 Learning Outcomes	ENGL 2015 Integrated Learning Outcomes
<p>OUTCOME 1: Identify connections between and among texts and their ideas.</p>	<p>OUTCOME 1: RESEARCH AS AN EXPLORATORY PROCESS</p> <p>The research process involves using tools and techniques to address information needs while understanding that the research process is often iterative and non-linear.</p> <p>Learning Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · understand information needs, determine the appropriate scope of a project, and formulate focused research questions or thesis statements accordingly · match information needs with search strategies and search tools 	<p>LO1: Use research tools and effective research strategies to locate and evaluate information for their academic writing needs</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <p>This outcome combines LIBS 1704 learning outcomes 1 and 3 because it addresses using research tools (search tools) and research strategies (search strategies) to locate information. Students will need to evaluate the information in order to apply them to their writing needs.</p>

- **understand that the research process is often iterative and non-linear**

OUTCOME 2: Compose writing that is structurally coherent and unified

OUTCOME 2: SCHOLARSHIP AS COMMUNICATION

Scholarly communication is a conversation between creators of information with a variety of backgrounds and perspectives.

Learning Indicators:

- identify and describe the characteristics of various resource types and formats, recognizing their value and contribution to scholarly communication
- recognize that a given scholarly work may not represent the sole or majority perspective on an issue
- recognize the value of information literacy outside the academic setting

LO2: Compose structurally coherent and well-focused writing assignments that demonstrate control of syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling

Rationale:

By combining ENGL 2010 learning outcomes 2, 3, and 4, LO2 addresses composing structurally coherent writing which includes creating a clear thesis or main point as well as allows students to demonstrate control over syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.

OUTCOME 3: Compose writing assignments with a clear thesis or main idea

OUTCOME 3: CRITICALLY EVALUATE INFORMATION

It is important to evaluate the quality of all information based on its context.

Learning Indicators:

- **define different types of authority, such as subject expertise or special experience, and use research tools and indicators to evaluate the credibility of authors and sources**
- **recognize that authoritative content may be packaged formally or informally, may include sources of all media types, and may be perceived differently based on the format, but all sources should be critically evaluated**

LO3: Paraphrase, summarize, synthesize, and use sources ethically to support their arguments

Rationale: LO3 integrates ENGL 2010 outcomes 1, 5, 6, 7 by asking students to analyze texts and make connections to their own ideas. These connections address LIBS 1704 outcome 2 because students not only understand that scholarship is a conversation between authors with varying perspectives, but they also situate themselves within that conversation. This is where ENGL 2010 learning outcome 7 comes into play as students use this conversation to inform and make effective arguments supported by evidence. In supporting their arguments, students learn to paraphrase, summarize, and use sources appropriately, which refers to ENGL 2010 learning outcome 5. By learning how to correctly cite sources in *MLA* or *APA* formats, ENGL 2010 learning outcome 6 is employed. Because proper citation addresses the ethical use of information, LIBS 1704 learning outcome 4 is also covered.

<p>OUTCOME 4: Control such surface features as syntax, grammar, punctuation, and spelling.</p>	<p>OUTCOME 4: ETHICAL USE OF INFORMATION</p> <p>Legal and ethical standards are important to the dissemination, retention, and study of information sources.</p> <p>Learning Indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · identify different types of plagiarism and avoid them through proper attribution and citation · articulate the purpose and characteristics of ethical and legal issues surrounding the use of information, such as copyright, fair use, open access, Creative Commons, and the public domain 	
<p>OUTCOME 5: Paraphrase, summarize, and use sources appropriately.</p>		
<p>OUTCOME 6: Use MLA and/or APA citation method correctly.</p>		

OUTCOME 7: Make and support an effective argument		
--	--	--

Appendix B:

Appendix B:

**Memorandum of Understanding
Between Library Faculty and Instructors of ENGL 2010**

Subject

This MOU defines and clarifies the relationship between parties for the support of a single four-credit class, which will achieve learning outcomes for both the required information literacy course (LIBS 1704 or LIBS 1504) and ENGL 2010.

Full Description

Library faculty have been teaching the Information Literacy General Education Core requirement as a one-credit course. It has had a variety of formats, including as a test (LIBS 1504), a general information literacy (IL) course (LIBS 1704), and as discipline-specific information literacy courses in Education (LIBS 2604), Business (LIBS 2704), Social Science (LIBS 2804), and Health (LIBS 2904). This MOU is designed to identify conditions enabling ENGL 2010 and LIBS 1704 faculty to co-design and facilitate the integration and teaching of LIBS 1704 content in a 4-credit ENGL 2010/Information Literacy course. ENGL 2010 and LIBS 1704 instructors will be paired as teaching teams for the assessment, evaluation, and delivery of English and IL content to assure that both English and IL student learning outcomes are being fulfilled in the new course. Both

instructors in the team will play an active role in teaching the course, and the general division of content to be delivered and assessed in the course will be mutually agreed upon by the English and Library faculty involved in the integration, co-design, and teaching of the course.

Terms

ENGL 2010 faculty (full-time or adjunct) interested in teaching the IL-integrated ENGL 2010 course agree to the following conditions:

- Complete training on designing and teaching IL at least one semester before the proposed class is scheduled. The training will include an introduction to IL learning outcomes and best practices for collaboration with a librarian on shared learning outcomes, teaching responsibilities, assignment design, and assessment protocols.**
- Collaborate with their assigned library teaching partner to create a common syllabus and teaching plan.**
 - The syllabus must have details about the integrated ENGL-IL learning activities, assessments, and evaluations so that the librarians can make an informed decision about whether IL outcomes will be adequately assessed and are likely to be achieved.**
 - The role of the librarian as a co-teacher must be clearly outlined, with responsibilities for facilitating learning activities, assessment, and providing instruction and feedback outside of class time.**
 - The syllabus should include a schedule with a minimum of eight contact hours, or reasonable equivalent for a fully online environment, for library faculty co-teachers to teach and interact with students.**
- Syllabus must be mutually agreed upon by the co-teaching faculty no later than three weeks before the class is to start.**
- ENGL 2010 instructors will retain control over non-IL-related course content and delivery.**
- A disagreement between library faculty and ENGL 2010 instructors about the status of a course proposal will be resolved by appeal to the Chair of Teaching and Information Services in the Library and the Chair of the English Department.**

The Library and its faculty agree to the following conditions:

- **Library faculty assigned to teach an IL-integrated section of ENGL 2010 will complete training on designing and teaching the integrated course at least one semester before the proposed class is scheduled. The training will include an overview of ENGL 2010 learning outcomes and best practices for collaboration with ENGL 2010 instructors on shared learning outcomes, teaching responsibilities, assignment design, and assessment protocols.**
- **Library faculty will retain control over non-English-related IL course content.**
- **The Library faculty will proportionally reduce the offering of LIBS 1504 and 1704 relative to the number of approved IL-integrated ENGL 2010 sections in a given semester to ensure demand for the 4-credit ENGL 2010 class, unless there is a significant waitlist for LIBS 1504 and 1704 that would create a barrier to student completion.**
- **Librarians will work collaboratively with the ENGL 2010 instructors in designing an IL component that fits within the course goals.**
- **The Library will retain no SCHs from ENGL 2010 courses, which will all flow to the English department. The Library will use an internal agreement, approved by the entire library faculty, for determining equitable load and overload determinations for teaching standalone LIBS 1704 and integrated ENGL 2010/LIBS 1704 sections.**
- **Recognize the Library faculty who develop and teach the training course and/or co-design and co-teach with ENGL 2010 faculty instructors in an IL-integrated ENGL 2010 for purposes of Library faculty promotion and tenure.**

MOU Duration

This memorandum will be valid for a minimum of five-years beginning January 1, 2021, unless unforeseen circumstances arise, at which time it may be terminated by agreement of both parties. The agreement will be reviewed on an annual basis thereafter.

Parties

Wendy Holliday

**Dean of the Library
English**

Hal Crimmel

Chair, Department of

Signatures

Wendy Holliday

Hal Crimmel

11/3/2020

11/3/2020

Date

Date