



**ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	University Libraries
Department	University Libraries
Program	University Libraries / Information Literacy
Reporting for Academic Year	2016-2017
Last 5-Year Review	<a href="#">2011-2012</a>
Next 5-Year Review	<a href="#">2019-2020</a>
Department Chair	Kyzyl Fenno-Smith
Date Submitted	October 20, 2017

**I. SELF-STUDY** (suggested length of 1-3 pages)

**A. Five-Year Review Planning Goals**

*Present your planning goals from your last 5-year plan.*

1. Continue developing online content for LIBY credit courses.
2. Continue developing assessments for LIBY credit courses.
3. Develop additional Information Literacy curricula and materials for transfer, returning, & graduate students; including collaborative curricular development for Upper Division General Education Information Literacy designated (D4) courses in the Sciences and Social Sciences.
4. Develop curricular maps for Information Literacy in disciplines and majors.
5. Assess block enrollment.
6. Assess course offerings on a continual basis based on the fact that enrollment will remain steady or grow with overall student enrollment.
7. Complete tenure track searches successfully.
8. Assess the effectiveness of information literacy instruction by all faculty members, including part-time lecturers.
9. Acquire more laptops and/or computer lab(s) for instructional sessions.
10. Continue faculty professional development through monetary and time support for research and conference attendance and continue departmental workshops on information literacy.

**B. Progress Toward Five-Year Review Planning Goals**

*Report on your progress toward achievement of the 5-Year Plan. Include discussion of problems reaching each goal, revised goals, and any new initiatives taken with respect to each goal.*

1. Library faculty continues to develop online tutorials and materials for LIBY credit courses, has implemented LibGuides, and continues to increase the robustness of our online services and support resources. Tutorials have been revised to reflect changes due to implementation of the CSU-wide library catalog, along with the usual updating of material to maintain currency.
2. Library faculty has continued to use the pre/post test and the reflective essay for assessment.
3. Library faculty is currently discussing how to provide more information literacy instruction for

transfer and upper division students, especially with the upcoming change to semesters. Marketing online modules and tutorials may be one way to provide more instruction even if it is not possible to offer credit courses at these levels.

4. Library faculty has developed an overall curricular map for information literacy mapping to the ILOs and is working on additional curricular maps for the change to semesters.

5. Library faculty is in communication with GE about block enrollment. So far, enrollments have been consistent, although the increasing enrollment numbers have strained the information literacy credit courses. The faculty is also discussing with GE potential issues surrounding enrollment with the change to semesters and moving the information literacy course to the second (sophomore) year.

6. The Chair and the Instruction Coordinator continually monitor which courses need to be offered.

7. There was a successful search for a library faculty member in 2016-2017 and the successful hire began July 2017.

8. Library faculty has expanded its ongoing assessment of instruction and continues to offer training/orientation workshops for adjunct faculty.

9. There are two laptop carts for instructional use; however, it has not been possible to acquire needed additional laptops or computer lab space.

10. The library faculty are actively involved in professional development on campus and at statewide and national conferences.

### C. Program Changes and Needs

*Report on changes and emerging needs not already discussed above. Include any changes related to SB1440, significant events which have occurred or are imminent, program demand projections, notable changes in resources, retirements/new hires, curricular changes, honors received, etc., and their implications for attaining program goals. Organize your discussion using the following subheadings.*

**Overview:** The main two drivers of program changes and needs are: increasing student enrollment and imminent conversion to semesters. Increasing student enrollments puts pressure on all facets of library services and resources, including the instruction program. The library faculty is in discussions about the most effective, sustainable ways to continue to supporting our students' success especially with the move to semesters. As the credit courses will move to the sophomore (second year) in semesters, the emerging need is to ensure that curriculum, including revised assessments, are in place for the beginning of AY 2018-2019.

**Curriculum:** Library faculty has selected and implemented the reflective essay assignment for programmatic assessment. The curriculum continues to evolve to incorporate new sources of information as well as changing information practices in the academy and society at large.

**Students:** Since the library works with all students in all departments, as enrollment increases, so do the demands on the library.

**Faculty:** An additional library faculty member was added AY 2017-18. The library does not have an approved faculty search for AY 2017-18. An additional library faculty member retired and is participating in the FERP program as of AY 2017-18, bringing the total of retired faculty members actively participating in FERP to two. Since faculty numbers have stayed

relatively flat between new hires and retirements, there has been a need for additional adjunct faculty as well as more time for the Curriculum and Instruction Committee to mentor and support these adjunct faculty members, especially new hires, with increased enrollments as noted above.

**Staff:** Retirement of Head of Access Services; internal promotion for vacant Head of Access Services (position not backfilled).

**Resources:** Provisioning resources, especially in terms of online access to databases and full-text journal articles, continues to be an ongoing challenge and need for the library. As subscription prices rise and changes to the curriculum necessitate more access to research journals and other resources, the library had to make difficult decisions on what to keep and what to cut when there are no budget increases to cover these increased costs.

**Assessment:** Assessment of the information literacy program continues and, as noted previously, the change to semesters means changes to the assessment of the credit courses. The faculty is working on assessments for semesters to be implemented in Fall 2018.

**Other:** The major program modification, as with all departments, is the coming conversion to semesters as has been discussed above. (*e.g., major program modifications*)

## II. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (*suggested length of 1-2 pages*)

### A. Program Learning Outcomes (PLO)

*List all your PLO in this box. Indicate for each PLO its alignment with one or more institutional learning outcomes (ILO). For example: "PLO 1. Apply advanced computer science theory to computation problems (ILO 2 & 6)."*

Note: As the Information Literacy Program consists of two credit courses, we have Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) instead of PLOs.

SLO 1: Determine the Extent of Information Needed (ILO 1 & 6)

SLO 2: Access the Needed Information (ILO 1 & 6)

SLO 3: Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically (ILO 1, 3, & 6)

SLO 4: Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose (ILO 2, 4, & 6)

SLO 5: Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally and Understands that there are ethical, legal, and socio-economic issues surrounding information and information technology (ILO 3, 4, 5, & 6)

### B. Program Learning Outcome(s) Assessed

*List the PLO(s) assessed. Provide a brief background on your program's history of assessing the PLO(s) (e.g., annually, first time, part of other assessments, etc.)*

Annually for the past five years the Library Faculty have assessed student learning on one of the following five SLO's via normed assessment/examination of student reflective essays submitted at the end of each term for LIBY 1210: Introduction to Information Literacy.

In 2016-2017, the Library Faculty assessed student learning related to SLO 5: “Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally and Understands that there are ethical, legal, and socio-economic issues surrounding information and information technology.” SLO 5 was the focus of the faculty’s essay assessment. The pre/post test (described in further detail below) collected student learning information about all five SLOs.

### C. Summary of Assessment Process

*Summarize your assessment process briefly using the following sub-headings.*

**Instrument(s):** *(include if new or old instrument, how developed, description of content)* The library instruction committee assessed SLO 5 with a pre/post test and a reflective essay. Versions of the pre/post test have been in use for more than ten years. That survey instrument (20 multiple-choice questions) was developed by members of the Library Curriculum and Instruction Committee, with questions related to each of the five SLO’s. The reflective essay emerged in consultation between the Library Faculty and CEAS faculty member Prof. Barbara Storm. In conversation with Prof. Storm ca. 2010, the Library faculty members began assigning LIBY 1210 students a reflective essay in which each student discussed their learning in the course. Since 2012, the Library CIC has assessed those essays each quarter in terms of student learning for one of the five SLO’s. Each AY focuses on one of the SLO’s.

**Sampling Procedure:** For the reflective essay assessment, essays were selected using a random number generator to determine the first essay to select, after which we selected every 11th essay (number also selected by random number generator). Each selected essay was read and scored by members of the instruction committee with a tie-breaker if the scores differed. A total of 200 essays from fall, winter, and spring quarters were assessed.

**Sample Characteristics:** Anonymized copies of student reflective essays are collected from all sections of LIBY 1210, a required course for all first-time freshmen students. Characteristics of the selected sample of essays should reflect the general characteristics of each year’s freshmen population.

**Data Collection:** *(include when, who, and how collected)* The library instruction committee assessed both via pre/post tests and with a reflective essay. The pre/post test results, in aggregate, and just those questions that relate to SLO 5, are summarized below. For the reflective essay assessment, essays were selected using a random number generator to determine the first essay to select, after which we selected every 11th essay (number also selected by random number generator). Each essay was read and scored by all four members of the instruction committee with a tie-breaker if the scores differed. A total of 200 essays from fall, winter, and spring quarters were assessed.

**Data Analysis:** The pre/post test scores for the questions that relate to SLO 5 reflect an average percent of change of +2.57%. This overall positive result reflects an improvement in the answers to three out of the four related questions, but shows room for improvement related to instruction around academic dishonesty.

## D. Summary of Assessment Results

Summarize your assessment results briefly using the following sub-headings.

### Main Findings:

**Table 1.** Pre/Post Test: Overall results for LIBY 1210/1551 courses in Fall 2016, Winter 2017, and Spring 2017.

	Fall LIBY 1210	Winter LIBY 1210	Spring LIBY 1210	Fall LIBY 1551	Winter LIBY 1551
1551					
Pre-test	59.92%	61.64%	60.23%	63.50%	65.30%
Post-test	64.24%	64.21%	61.87%	66.30%	65.70%
% Change	4.31%	2.56%	1.63%	2.80%	0.40%

**Table 2.** Pre/Post Test: Results for questions related to SLO 5

	Fall LIBY 1210	Winter LIBY 1210	Spring LIBY 1210	Fall LIBY 1551	Winter LIBY 1551
1551					
Pre-test	66.48%	61.64%	65.65%	69.90%	74.70%
Post-test	69.58%	64.21%	67.60%	67.50%	68.70%
% Change	3.10%	2.56%	1.95%	-2.40%	-6.00%

### Discussion of Pre/Post Test Results:

Slight decrease in Fall and Winter LIBY 1551 classes may be due to the small sample size rather than any statistical significance.

**Table 3.** Results from Reflective Essay Assessment in Fall 2016, Winter 2017 and Spring 2017 Quarters showing the number of essays that were evaluated at each level (A-D) of the assessment rubric for SLO 5.

A: 19 essays      B: 67 essays      C: 91 essays      D: 23 essays

### Discussion of Essay Assessment Results:

Forty-three percent of students demonstrated full or adequate mastery (A & B) of SLO 5: Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally. More opportunities may be needed for students to practice in order to have improved mastery of this SLO; however, students may also increase their ability throughout their time at the university.

**Recommendations for Program Improvement:** The Library Faculty, headed by the Library Instruction and Curriculum Committee, are continuing to plan for semesters; beginning in Fall 2018, the required information literacy course will move from the freshman to sophomore level. The course SLOs are in the process of being updated and revised to better reflect the semester curriculum, with a particular focus for a student at the sophomore level. Assessments and the signature assignment will be reviewed and updated to align with the revised SLOs; this

is tasked to the Instruction Committee to be completed in Spring, 2018.

**Next Step(s) for Closing the Loop:** The Library Instruction and Curriculum Committee hosted a “closing the loop” discussion with the Library Faculty in May 2017. The faculty reviewed student performance on the pre/post test and well as themes related to SLO 5 that emerged from the assessment of the reflective essay during the Fall 2016 and Winter 2017 quarters. The faculty discussed areas of needed improvement, including improvement to the assessment instruments. The Library Instruction and Curriculum Committee is hosting five SLO-specific meetings in AY 2017-2018 to discuss specific pedagogical strategies to improve student learning for each SLO. The Committee will be devoting time during Spring Quarter 2018 on revising our assessment instruments to align them to our revised SLOs (for the new semester-length courses).

**Other Reflections:** N/A

#### E. **Assessment Plans for Next Year**

*Summarize your assessment plans for the next year, including the PLO(s) you plan to assess, any revisions to the program assessment plan presented in your last five-year plan self-study, and any other relevant information.*

In AY 2017-18, we plan to assess student learning via continuing use of the pre/post test and the student reflective essays. This past year we assessed SLO 5, and for the current academic year (AY 2017-18), we will be focusing on assessing SLO 1: Determine the Extent of Information Needed.

### III. **DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM DATA & RESOURCE REQUESTS**

*Each program should provide a one-page discussion of the program data available through CAPR. This discussion should include an analysis of trends and areas of concern. Programs should also include in this discussion requests for additional resources including space and tenure-track hires. Resource requests must be supported by reference to CAPR data only. Requests for tenure-track hires should indicate the area and rank that the program is requesting to hire. If a program is not requesting resources in that year, indicate that no resources are requested.*

#### A. **Discussion of Trends & Reflections**

##### **Notable Trends:**

*Summarize and discuss any notable trends occurring in your program over the past 3-5 years based on program statistics (1-2 paragraphs). You may include 1-2 pages of supplemental information as appendices to this report (e.g., graphs and tables).*

Trends in pedagogy by Library Faculty have been strongly influenced by ongoing conversations via conferences, listservs, and research into both Information Literacy and the scholarship of teaching and learning. Notably, we have embraced and integrated active learning in both face-to-face instruction and online sessions. Most of our credit course sessions are hybrid and include, e.g., various small group activity for hands-on learning of evaluation of

sources, comprehension and application of citation practice, effective use of databases and search engines. Attention to instruction design has drawn several faculty to receive funding for training in the Quality Matters program.

These matters (active learning and instructional design) also influence our approach to course-integrated Information Literacy sessions, which are one or more integrated sessions done in classes outside of the library. Particularly effective learning results from multiple points of contact by a Library faculty member with students in a specific course in another discipline. Ideally this is accomplished via several visits by the Library faculty member to the classroom over a given term. Other modes of embedding the library faculty member include required consultations by students with the library subject specialist, and active participation in a BlackBoard course. For instance, a library subject specialist might be added to the course as a TA for the purposes of providing research support resources via a Library Help folder or monitoring a discussion board specifically for questions related to research assistance.

We are also seeing an increase in the number of course embedded instruction sessions (see: Table 8) across the campus. These sessions are taught exclusively by tenured and tenure-track librarians. We anticipate these numbers will continue to grow on the semester system, as some of our librarians are working with their liaison departments to further integrate information literacy into the semester curriculum across all colleges. The Library Faculty also continue to see steady traffic for reference interactions and research consultations, both on and off the reference desk (see: Table 9).

### **Reflections on Trends and Program Statistics:**

*Provide your reflections on the trends discussed above and statistics and supplemental information presented in this report.*

Multiple points of contact among Library faculty members, teaching colleagues in other departments and students in those departments build relationships that are at the heart of scholarship. The effectiveness for student success emerges because the students experience development of knowledge in context of community. This community is a blended one of face to face support and use of online, print, and other resources. These connections yield stronger retention rates and prepare students for life after earning their degrees, in accord with all six of the CSUEB ILO's.

## **B. Request for Resources** *(suggested length of 1 page)*

### 1. Request for Tenure-Track Hires (See Appendices for Works Cited)

#### 1) First Year Student Success Librarian

This position will focus on the success of first year students and new transfer students at CSUEB. The University Libraries support the success of all students on campus, and the library faculty works with students directly through research and reference consultations, information literacy courses, and course-embedded instruction. Research has shown that libraries directly impact student success (Soria, Fransen, & Nackerud, 2014; Thorpe,

Lukes, & Bever, 2016) and student retention (Haddow, 2012; Knapp, Rowland, & Charles, 2014; Mezick, 2007; Soria, Fransen, & Nackerud, 2014). This position will further build relationships with both academic and non-academic units across campus in order to raise awareness about the various ways that the library can serve as an essential partner in facilitating the success of undergraduate students.

This position comes at a critical time at the University and in the California State University system. The CSU System recently launched [Graduation Initiative 2025](#), with the goal of reducing student time to graduation and closing the achievement gap between URM and non-URM students. Concurrently, the East Bay campus is working on the transition to a semester-based academic calendar for Fall 2018. With the transition to semesters, the library will shift its required information literacy course from the freshmen level to the sophomore level, moving this important direct contact with all first year students until their second (or higher) year. This position can interact with first year students to establish strong student awareness and engagement with the library and its services in the first year to help ensure their retention and success and prepare them for a strong second year experience in their library course and related research courses. By hiring a librarian whose focus will be on student success, the library will be fully involved with activities and departments directly related to student success and student retention on campus, such as EOP, Summer Bridge, and the EXCEL program. In addition, this position will be expected to meet all requirements for tenure-track faculty, including instruction, research, and service, with assigned liaison duties.

## 2) Data Librarian

According to Thompson & Kellam (2016) “data service has become a critically important topic for academic libraries.” With the abundance of data, including quantitative, qualitative, GIS, and humanities, available from governmental agencies, non-governmental organizations, scientific communities, businesses, and social enterprises, more expertise is needed in preserving, curating and retrieving such data from within the institution and also facilitating retrieval of data sets from beyond the institution. As Tenopir (2014) notes, academic libraries are beginning to formulate ideas for capturing this service need in the form of a dedicated “Data Librarian” position. For faculty in many disciplines access to data sets is becoming more crucial for research. For students being data literate is becoming more important for achieving success in college, graduate school, and in their careers.

Hiring a Data Librarian at CSU East Bay will allow this institution to better meet the needs of faculty and students engaging in data-driven research. This position will provide leadership for campus and library initiatives around data, as well as provide a designated librarian with expertise in the area of managing research data and data plans, which has become an increasingly important element of academic scholarship.

## 2. Request for Other Resources

As referenced in our 5-Year Plan (I.B.9.), the library currently has two laptop carts which serve as a mobile computer lab for library instruction. These are enough to generally satisfy a single library class, however when there are concurrent sessions we do not have

enough laptops for multiple classes to have access to them. We would like to request an additional two laptop carts with 32 laptops for students to use in library instruction.

**Appendices: Statistics, Etc.**

**Statistics for IL courses offered in Fall 2016, Winter 2017, and Spring 2017 Quarters**

	LIBY 1210	LIBY 1551
Fall 2016	22	2
Winter 2017	22	2
Spring 2017	19	2
Totals	63	6

Table 4. Total number of sections taught in Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters. AY Total: 69 sections

	LIBY 1210	LIBY 1551
Fall 2016	7	0
Winter 2017	9	0
Spring 2017	11	0
Totals	27	0

Table 5. Number of sections taught by tenure/tenure-track library faculty. AY Total: 27  
Note: Some faculty had assigned time/release time for grants and other campus activities, which resulted in fewer sections being taught by tenure/tenure-track faculty.

	LIBY 1210	LIBY 1551
Fall 2016	15	2
Winter 2017	13	2
Spring 2017	8	2
Totals	42	6

Table 6. Number of sections taught by adjuncts. AY Total: 48

	LIBY 1210	LIBY 1551	Combined Totals
Fall 2016	553	59	612
Winter 2017	595	56	651
Spring 2017	401	60	461
Totals	1549	175	1724

Table 7. Total number of students enrolled in Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters.

**Statistics for course integrated instruction taught in Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Winter 2017, and Spring 2017 Quarters.**

	Number of Sessions	Number of Students
Summer 2016	4	84
Fall 2016	41	1268
Winter 2017	27	682
Spring 2017	27	585
Totals	99	2619

Table 8. Number of course integrated instruction sessions taught by tenure/tenure-track library faculty and the number of students reached via this instruction in AY 2016-17.

## Reference Desk Statistics for Summer 2016, Fall 2016, Winter 2017, and Spring 2017 Quarters.

	Summer 2016	Fall 2016	Winter 2017	Spring 2017	Total
Reference Transactions	454	1624	1249	1281	4608

Table 9. Number of reference transactions in AY 2016-17. Each column includes the number of reference transactions by librarians at both the Hayward and Concord campuses.

### Works Cited in Request for Tenure-Track Hires

- Haddow, G. (2013). Academic library use and student retention: A quantitative analysis. *Library & Information Science Research*, 35(2), 127-136.
- Knapp, A. J., Rowland, J. N., & Charles, P. E. (2014). Retaining students by embedding librarians into undergraduate research experiences. *Reference Services Review*, 42(1), pp. 129–147. doi: 10.1108/rsr-02-2013-0012.
- Mezick, E. M. (2007). Return on investment: Libraries and student retention. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 33(5), 561-566. doi: 10.1016/j.acalib.2007.05.002.
- Soria, K. M., Fransen, J., Nackerud, S. (2014). Stacks, serials, search engines, and students' success: First-year undergraduate students' library use, academic achievement, and retention. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(1), 84-91. doi: 10.1016/j.acalib.2013.12.002.
- Tenopir, C., Sandusky, R. J., Allard, S., & Birch, B. (2014). Research data management services in academic research libraries and perceptions of librarians. *Library & Information Science Research*, 36(2), 84–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lisr.2013.11.003>
- Thompson, K., & Kellam, L. (2016). *Databrarianship: The academic data librarian in theory and practice*. Chicago, Ill.: ACRL.
- Thorpe, A., Lukes, R., Bever, D. J., & He, Y. (2016). The impact of the academic library on student success: Connecting the dots. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 16(2), 373-392.