

Program Review Evaluation Team Report

Reviewers

Louise Moulding, Professor Teacher Education, Weber State University

Richard Price, Assoc. Professor Political Science and Philosophy, Weber State University

Melissa Bowles-Terry, Head of Educational Initiatives Lied Library, University of Nevada Las Vegas

Kacy Lundstrom, Head of Learning & Engagement Services Merrill-Crazier Library, University of Utah

Overview/introductory Statement

Based on the program self-study and site visit, the evaluation team finds evidence that the Teaching and Information Services Department has met significant challenges with innovative ideas. Librarians clearly care about their work. Their identities as teachers of information literacy are very important to them. Overall, we saw faculty who are dedicated, focused on students, and forward-thinking.

Program strengths (please reference Standard where appropriate)

Curriculum

- The curriculum is complicated by the fact that information literacy courses are delivered in a variety of ways: LIBS courses, subject-specific library courses, English 2010 integrated courses, and an exam that is about to be discontinued. This integration effort also involves English 2020 Concurrent Enrollment instructors in local high schools. It is, however, a robust curriculum that relies on national standards. They work with instructional designers to build online curriculum.

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

- Assessment of student learning was measured using grades from LIBS courses, pre-post exams, or the competency examination. Interpretation of the results was supported with course evaluation ratings and comments. By and large, the evidence shows that students are meeting learning outcome standards.

Faculty

- Library faculty are clearly dedicated to student learning. They are perceived as experts and good collaborators on campus according to faculty and partners.

Program Support

- Administrative support is adequate according to the faculty and staff.

Relationships with External Communities

- Relationships with external communities appear to be strong and developing reasonably well in the difficult world of the pandemic. Some partners suggested that the library is a “hidden gem.” The library is perceived in a very positive light by those who currently work with faculty and staff, but there may be additional opportunities with folks who do not yet know about library services and expertise. Within the university this may be about reaching faculty earlier, such as during the new faculty retreat, to draw partnerships with faculty and departments together.

- Based on interviews, both Concurrent Enrollment and English instructors feel positive about the potential of the integration, despite acknowledging the potential for growth.

Results of Previous Program Reviews

No previous review

Program challenges (please reference Standard where appropriate)

Mission

- The department has not yet created a mission statement. This may be hindering the development of a clear path forward while working on modes of delivery of course content and partnerships.

Curriculum

- We note that there are some inconsistencies in LIB courses offered via subject (e.g. health sciences requesting a lot of courses and others not having any options). Concurrent Enrollment courses intended to integrate English 2010 and LIBS outcomes seemed to have a number of inconsistencies as well (may have been partly pandemic-related.)
- The integration of library courses with English 2010 is clearly a current area of concern for many faculty. We heard from some that integrating is a good solution to scalability/sustainability issues, but from others that the process has been rushed and that library faculty do not feel like equal partners in the integration. If there is a major shift towards the English 2010 integration, how does it affect the identity of library faculty (some seem to hold pretty tightly to their identity as instructors of a credited course) and how will it impact morale and buy-in for an alternate model?

Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment

- Assessment and evaluation seem to be a work in progress for the department. The chair reports that they have spent a couple of recent meetings discussing assessment and measuring outcomes.
- Student outcomes based on the pre-post test showed that students were meeting the standard for each of the programs' outcomes across courses, with the exception of *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.* For all courses, this standard was not met for the three semesters included in the self-study. The plan presented to address this issue is not specific.

Academic Advising

- Advising is not an element of the program and probably does not need to be added.

Faculty

- The sustainability of for-credit workloads, particularly in light of other opportunities and collaborations is questionable.

- It was unclear if additional faculty members or recruitment of adjuncts could be used to ease the pressure of enrollment.
- The training of new instructors is two semesters, which may inhibit some of the bottlenecks in enrollment.
- While the library does not do advising themselves they should work on strengthening communication to general education advisors as well as potentially department advisors on communicating the need for LIB class earlier in the program of study.

Areas where the program did not meet the Standards

- Standard A Mission is not met for the simple reason that it doesn't exist.
- Standard D is not met but may be irrelevant for this department.

Recommendations for change – suggested changes for meeting Standards

- Establish a mission for the program. Clarify your goals/mission in regards to general education and subject areas with a mind towards sustainability and equity across both.

Additional recommendations and comments from the review team

The suggestions here are primarily about the integration of library and English courses as this is the innovative initiative for helping all WSU students meet the requirements.

- Look for sources of funding (such as RSPG) to support the collaboration with English for integrating LIBS content
- Build a scaffold to make the English integration easier so each and every partnership is not starting from scratch
- Librarians and instructors could consider partnering more, sharing expertise, rather than owning information literacy
- Explore what librarians will give up
- Consider re-visualizing librarian's roles in the library integration with English 2010; focused sessions with librarians, high collaboration at curricular level, perhaps less "ownership" of the credit (seems unsustainable).
- Move slowly. Discuss personal and group identity. If you shift away from sole ownership of for-credit IL, what does this allow you to do instead? What support do you need to do that?