UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Everyday Evidence to Assess Teaching and Learning: A Programmatic
Assessment of Library Instruction

Permalink

ISBN

Authors

Johnson, Matthew Weirick
Brasseur, Michelle
Hagan, Monica
et al.

Publication Date

2023-11-01

Everyday Evidence to Assess Teaching and Learning:

A Programmatic Assessment of Library Instruction

Matthew Weirick Johnson, Michelle Brasseur, Monica Hagan, Diane Mizrachi, and Jimmy Zavala

During the 2020–2021 academic year, we initiated a programmatic approach to the assessment of teaching and learning occurring in instruction sessions at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA), offered by staff throughout the Library. The authors are members of the Teaching and Learning Functional Team (TLFT), part of a matrixed structure in the User Engagement division of the UCLA Library. The TLFT's assessment subteam sought to more programmatically assess instruction across the Library and leverage analysis to improve student learning outcomes instead of relying on individual library staff members to assess instruction alone or to solicit responses to our shared feedback forms.

UCLA is a Tier 1 public research university serving approximately 31,600 undergraduates and 14,300 graduate and professional students in 2020–21 (UCLA Academic Planning and Budget, n.d.). The Library system functions as "one Library with many physical locations," and the User Engagement division uses a matrix-style organization where each

worker is a member of a location- or discipline-based unit as well as a functional team (UCLA Library, n.d.). Library instruction is led by TLFT within the User Engagement division, a team that includes librarians from across the campus library branches. Faculty may request library instruction directly from their subject librarian or through a generic online form. Library staff regularly teach more than 400 course-integrated instruction sessions annually during UCLA's four, 10-week academic quarters.

The TLFT subteam engaged in an assessment of library instruction sessions involving a research component taught by librarians and staff spanning the entire 2020–2021 academic year. While assessment of individual library sessions, through instructor and student feedback surveys, had been done for years, typically using SurveyMonkey, systematic assessment across all Library units had not been done for some time. The TLFT felt it important to restart this project in the fall of 2020 while we were migrating statistics platforms and our feedback surveys to LibInsight and LibWizard respectively. We saw an opportunity to leverage these tools. Additionally, this work began amidst the COVID-19 pandemic, when instruction was primarily occurring remotely. For the academic year in question, instruction at UCLA was almost entirely remote, except for select classes and programs, as the return to in-person instruction did not occur until fall 2021 (at the start of the 2021–2022 academic year).

We've considered three basic focuses of library session assessment:
- students' retention of learning after a session,
- library instructor effectiveness, and
- how well the students applied what they learned in the session to their research paper or project.

Previously, the UCLA Library used short surveys and quizzes immediately after a session to assess the first two questions. This allowed us to gather a large amount of data over time but ultimately proved unsatisfactory. The students usually provided competent responses but, we wondered, did they really internalize the lesson? Could they apply the principles when performing research? Reactions to the librarian instructor were generally uninformative as well. A comment like, "Matthew was great!" may provide a feel-good moment but is not a helpful critique. Ultimately, nothing developed from the data.

One method for assessing students' application of the lessons is to analyze their project bibliographies and check their appropriate integration of scholarly and relevant sources (e.g., Lantz et al., 2016). This is very time-consuming, however, and not a sustainable model for the Library. We therefore decided to ask the course instructors for their impressions on how the library session impacted their students' work.

The TLFT subteam applied key elements of the EBLIP Framework: articulate (examine our experiences with instruction and instructional assessment), assemble (look at survey data from the current and previous quarters), assess (apply the data to our subteam's charge), agree (make recommendations based on the data), and adapt (edit our survey documents and identify the need for more data over time).

Articulate

The assessment subteam developed the following initial questions to guide its process:

- What did students learn from their library instruction session?
- How did the session impact students' research projects; i.e., did students apply what they learned in the session to their projects?
- How engaged were the students in the presentation?
- Did the presenter meet students' accessibility needs?

When our project began, the UCLA Library was gathering instructional statistics through a homegrown tool called Summary of Instructional Activity (SIA). Library staff used SIA to record instructional interactions, including the number of learners served, department and course number (if applicable), type of learner (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, staff, faculty), subject of the course or presentation, and topics covered from the Library's Core Competencies for Research and Information Literacy at UCLA, which is a set of seven competencies that "provide a foundation for teaching and evaluating research skills and information literacy" (UCLA Library User Engagement Teaching and Learning Functional Team, 2019). In the middle of 2020, the Library transitioned to using LibInsight to track, analyze, and report this information. In the midst of these significant changes in terms of data collection across the Library, our subteam was curious about how we could better leverage the instruction data collected to improve our instruction program or what insights we might be able to garner from the data we were collecting.

In order to collect the data, individual library instructors were responsible for asking course instructors to complete the Instructor Feedback Survey and provide the Student Feedback Survey at the end of their instruction sessions. As a result, the response rates for both surveys were low, as this process created technical debt and repetition for each instructor and may often have been forgotten or overlooked though we have no data specifically about the level of use among library staff (i.e., we didn't track when surveys were sent by individual library staff members to either instructors or students in order to calculate the non-response rate).

In this period of change, as we moved to new systems, we considered the challenges and opportunities for assessing our instruction program. The Teaching and Learning Functional Team formed an assessment subteam, which was charged to identify assessment practices for library instruction that instructors might employ to provide people with a better idea of what is possible and how to go about doing assessment, including using the Core Competencies and using the rubric in the Core Competencies to determine information literacy competency from student work. The subteam explored ways to gather data programmatically and analyze and assess data more systematically. At the start of our project, there was also no existing effort to analyze the data available from either the surveys or the statistics-gathering mechanism nor was there an effort to apply the data and analysis to programmatic change. The assessment subteam identified three primary needs for supporting our systematic assessment:

- update the language of the Instructor Feedback Survey,
- expand our data collection approach, and
- develop new methods for analyzing the resulting data.

Assemble

The subteam's use of evidence and its assessment process follows Koufogiannakis and Brettle's (2016) framework for evidence-based library and information practice (EBLIP): research evidence, local evidence, and professional knowledge.

TABLE 12.1
EVIDENCE BY TYPE ACCORDING TO THE EBLIP MODEL

Type of Evidence from Koufogiannakis & Brettle (2016) EBLIP Framework	Specific Evidence Used
Research evidence	An informal review of the literature on instruction assessment
	Library scholarship of teaching and learning
	ACRL *Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education*
	SAA-ACRL/RBMS Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy
Local evidence	Past data from surveys at UCLA Library
	Statistics on library instruction
	UCLA Library Core Competencies
Professional knowledge	Previous experiences from assessment subteam members

Research Evidence

Existing tools for measuring student learning and information literacy skills needed for academic research and global citizenship were consulted in the creation of both surveys used in our project, including the Core Competencies, which are based on the ACRL Framework. These questions in the survey are key to determining which topics were covered and learning objectives obtained, according to the interpretation of course instructors and library staff.

Local Evidence

Instructional assessment at UCLA Library has taken two primary and consistent forms over the years: statistics gathered regarding the delivery of instruction and surveys (one for instructors and one for students) about the effectiveness of instruction. These two assessment approaches have been broadly consistent, though the tools, methods, and outreach have shifted. As we moved from system to system and iterated on our process, we considered the challenges and opportunities that pervaded our approaches across tools.

The subteam opted to gather information from instructors and survey course instructors at the end of the quarter rather than the students immediately after each session because it was felt that the instructors would be in a better position to address the above questions. The survey was based on an earlier version developed by UCLA librarians. The final survey consisted of 10 questions, with six questions focused on specific feedback, including areas for improvement, and was edited and updated throughout the following quarters to improve effectiveness.

One of the significant opportunities for our assessment subteam was in leveraging our existing data to expand data collection. In particular, we redesigned our Instructor Feedback Survey in LibWizard and then solicited responses using email addresses entered as part of our regular statistics gathering in LibInsight. We noticed and lamented the low response rate of our Instructor Feedback Survey and identified this as an opportunity to get the survey in front of more instructors.

We also wanted to send out the survey programmatically to all instructors with whom we had worked. We decided to survey at the end of each quarter. End-of-term surveys could be sent in a batch within a timeframe that would allow instructors to remember and reflect on instructional delivery as well as the impact of library instruction on final coursework.

To do this, a report is run in LibInsight at the end of each quarter to find all instances of course-integrated instruction by a library staff member. These records include the name of the course, date of the session, and the instructor email. After exporting this information into Microsoft Excel, we're able to write a mail-merge email in Microsoft Word that leverages the connected fields. In essence, we can refer to the specific course, the library staff member who worked with them, and date of instruction (if desired). Then, we are able to use Microsoft Outlook to send an email directly to each instructor from the Lead for Teaching and Learning's email address asking for survey completion. An example of this communication is included in Appendix 12A.

Through this process, we can leverage existing data from library staff members in order to gather additional data from course instructors with whom we've partnered throughout a quarter. While we've been able to gather considerably more responses (see Table 12.2 below) from instructors than in the past, our response rate remains low.

TABLE 12.2
INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK SURVEY RESPONSE RATES BEFORE AND AFTER THE TLFT ASSESSMENT SUBTEAM INITIATED PROGRAMMATIC ASSESSMENT PRACTICES

Quarter	Number of Responses
Fall 2019	4
Winter 2020	10
Spring 2020	3
Academic year 2019–2020	17
TLFT Assessment Subteam begins programmatic assessment	
Fall 2020	21 (425% increase from fall 2019)
Winter 2021	23 (130% increase from winter 2020)
Spring 2021	12 (300% increase from spring 2020)
Academic Year 2020-2021	56 (329% increase from AY 2019–2020)

As more data have been gathered, the survey design has improved to better address questions about the instruction program and to help instructors better understand what we're asking. We ask questions about the topics covered, effectiveness of delivery, accessibility, etc., as shown by our current survey, included as Appendix 12B.

Throughout our project, we have iteratively improved the survey. For example, we've refined our language around accessibility to clarify our intent (e.g., "Did this instruction session meet your and your learners' accessibility needs? Why or why not?" was changed to "Did this instruction session meet your and/or your learners' needs? Why or why not? (Consider information resources discussed or shared, students' accessibility needs, virtual or physical space used, presentation, instruction activities, etc.))" Because instructors interpreted the term accessibility differently, the new phrasing provides examples to consider and helps to clarify. We've reworded library jargon that may have been confusing for instructors, including multiple iterations of questions relating to the Core Competencies and information literacy concepts, removing phrases like Boolean operators and terms like "truncation."

After receiving responses from the Instructor Feedback Survey, the assessment subteam begins the process of analyzing the qualitative and quantitative data both from LibInsight (data from library staff) and LibWizard (data from instructors). Following the data analysis, we write and disseminate a report, including recommendations, to all library staff via a library-wide mailing list.

Similarly, in the process of migrating our statistics-gathering instrument from SIA to LibInsight, data collection was adjusted in an attempt to streamline entry. For instance, the library team managing the migration between systems removed information about the location of sessions and time spent developing a session after consulting with different teams about what information they needed to collect and report. We also learned that LibInsight lacked the capability of creating a database of UCLA instructors as we'd previously had with SIA. As a result, emails sent to course instructors soliciting responses to our feedback survey were less individualized and therefore, perhaps, more easily ignored. To mitigate this, we encouraged individual library staff members to make instructors aware that they will receive the survey at the end of the quarter and to follow up with instructors with a more personal message after the survey is sent out.

Professional Knowledge

Based on our own experiences as instruction librarians, as well as discussions with colleagues locally and at other institutions, a piece of professional knowledge that informed the planning and execution of this project included the philosophy that "students don't know what they don't know." With that in mind, our time and energy were best served by attempting to measure, through the Instructor Feedback Survey, what course instructors found to be the learning objectives addressed and their interpretation of how well these objectives were met by the library instructor. Similarly, library staff were asked to report which of the Core Competencies were addressed in each instruction session.

Future projects for this team will explore avenues for measuring exactly what students learned, retained, and what additional information literacy needs they still possess, answering the question of "What don't students know?"

Our professional knowledge of the pitfalls of using library jargon and research-specific language, including phrases like Boolean operators and truncation, and variations in the meaning of phrases like "primary sources" among different disciplines, also informed the changes we made to survey language, outlined above.

Assess

Since our focus was primarily on our local context and learning more about the challenges and opportunities for assessment of library instruction at UCLA, local evidence was the most useful for our team in answering our questions and for developing our ongoing process of data collection, analysis, and reporting. Specifically, it was important to understand what data we were collecting and had historically been collecting and to consider ways of leveraging that data. Based on our review, we were able to make some suggested modifications to the data collection methods, though we primarily had control over updating our Instructor Feedback Survey. Using data from this survey iteratively, we were able to improve the questions and create an instrument that better assessed the aspects of library instruction we were interested in.

To *assess* the data from the Instructor Feedback Survey, the subteam was subdivided into qualitative and quantitative teams. The quantitative team generally completed their analysis first, providing this information to the qualitative team to inform their analysis. The subteam was interested in assessing the response rate from our programmatic assessment approach, the impact of instruction on student learning as evidenced by course assessments, and the perception of student engagement during the presentation. Additionally, we wanted instructors to identify which information literacy and research skill/s they felt were addressed during the instruction session to compare to the Core Competencies that library instructors identified as covered in the same session.

We received a 38% response return rate from instructors (21 viable survey responses out of 55 surveys emailed) and, for the most part, the data from the survey were positive. Instructors expressed that the instruction sessions had a "significantly positive effect" or "positive effect" on students' work quality. Furthermore, instructors rated instruction sessions as "very engaging" or "engaging". Based on this feedback, it appears that the instruction sessions met the needs of instructors. While the subteam found it great to hear positive things about our work, we found there was very little constructive criticism or critical feedback in the initial data that could inform changes in our instruction program or professional development opportunities for library instructors. The primarily positive feedback could also demonstrate response bias, especially if instructors share only positive comments because they're worried about who might be reading their responses. As a result, we added a question for subsequent quarters requesting feedback from instructors about ways in which we could improve instruction.

Survey data were also used to identify which skill sets instructors believed were covered in instruction sessions. There were three top skill sets instructors identified (from a pre-selected list, included in our survey example as Appendix 12B):

- recognize and become familiar with key catalog(s), database(s), and website(s) used for research (23.3%);
- develop strategic search capabilities (21.9%); and
- locate primary and secondary sources (20.5%).

The remaining skill sets all received less than 10%.

We also looked at which topics the library instructors thought they discussed in sessions, as related to the UCLA Library Core Competencies. The data were retrieved from the LibInsight statistics that all library instructors complete after teaching a session. The majority of library instructors selected the following option: to gather and organize information and data (24.7%). The top three answers in the data from both instructors and library instructors revolve around developing search strategies and evaluating resources used for research; hence, one can conclude that the primary focus of the instruction sessions from both the instructor and presenter perspectives reflects how to search for and analyze resources.

Given our low response rate, there has been concern about non-response bias as well. Our survey data may not likely be a representative sample of the instructors with whom we've worked throughout the quarter, and the non-represented instructors may have different thoughts and opinions about library instruction. Our sample is already limited as well by incorrectly entered statistics, including missing contact information for course instructors. Moving forward, further staff training about accurately entering statistics in LibInsight and continued efforts to reach instructors to complete the feedback survey may help improve the integrity of our sample.

Agree

After compiling and analyzing the data and evidence, we developed a quarterly written report detailing and summarizing all collected data, analyses, and recommendations. This report was sent out to all library staff via our quarterly newsletter, *The TLFT Mic-Drop*, and shared with leadership on the User Engagement Leadership Council. Moving forward, we also plan to share our reports in our institutional data repository, the Data Lake.

As mentioned in the previous section, the responses from instructors were overwhelmingly positive and provided little critical feedback to inform changes for our instruction program. Our response rates and data from two of the survey questions are included in Table 12.3 below for reference. Based on this data and the needs we see in our community based on our professional knowledge, we developed several recommendations.

Based on data from our assessment efforts outline above, ongoing work will include determining the feasibility and viability of the following potential projects:

1. Conducting a campus-wide survey of course instructors to determine their library instruction needs.
2. Conducting a campus-wide survey of students to determine information literacy and research skills.

TABLE 12.3

A BRIEF REPORT OF DATA FROM THE INSTRUCTOR FEEDBACK SURVEY IN FALL AND WINTER 2020–2021.

		Fall 2020	Winter 2021
Response Rate		21 out of 55 (38%)	23 out of 55 (42%)
Effect on Student Work Quality (Question 8—See Appendix 12B)	Significantly Positive Effect	15 (71%)	13 (57%)
	Positive Effect	6 (29%)	9 (39%)
	No Effect	0	1 (4%)
Presentation Engagement (Question 11—See Appendix 12B)	Very Engaging	12 (57%)	17 (74%)
	Engaging	9 (43%)	4 (17%)
	Not Very Engaging	0	2 (9%)

3. Exploring options for sharing assessment tools among library instructors.
4. Identifying potential collaborators and opportunities for data sharing with other Library teams and units.
5. Encouraging increased communication between library instructors and course instructors in an effort to increase response rate and identify opportunities for improvement.

We've agreed on this list as potential projects through consensus and with feedback from stakeholders as we've shared reports. We continue to talk through the best approaches and avenues based on our capacities, strengths, and opportunities. In many ways, our assessment process and the data collected, analyzed, and reported on have led us to consider future avenues for expanding assessment efforts and seeking answers to the questions we have about our instruction program. Recommendations above are presented by the team as much, if not more so, in response to data we do not have available as what we do. Many questions remain. By dedicating time and building a community of practice around instructional assessment, we've identified new possibilities and approaches. We hope to continue to build a strong assessment program for teaching and learning and to further our own knowledge and expertise around instructional assessment.

University-Wide Information Literacy and Research Skills Survey

As a result of our programmatic efforts across the Library, our team identified a need for greater assessment of information literacy and research skills across the university to establish a baseline and better understand where students are in their research journeys. These data, coupled with our instructional assessment data outlined throughout this chapter, will set the stage for ongoing assessment of the Library's impact on student learning and success longitudinally as well as provide opportunities for benchmarking and

goal-setting related to the improvement of information literacy and research skills across campus. This also presents a strategic opportunity to advocate for library resources and engagement in advanced research skills for students at an R1 university.

Continuity and Longitudinal Analysis

Relatedly, our subteam identified a need for continuity and longitudinal data collection and research to better understand and *assess* the Library's impact on teaching, student learning, and student success. We are working to make our data available in a centralized repository for the Library and continuing our process of data collection and analysis to grow our available data set and provide a more robust analysis over time. For continuity, the TLFT has developed regular processes for collecting, analyzing, and sharing data related to teaching, learning, and library instruction. The processes and procedures assist with ensuring continuity in the assessment program over time, affording us future opportunities for a more longitudinal assessment of the data collected.

Adapt

Our project, still ongoing, has involved revising TLFT's assessment process. One of the key takeaways from the project has been the iterative nature of assessment. TLFT has taken opportunities to reflect on what works and what doesn't, both for library instruction and for assessment of instruction at the UCLA Library. Based on what we learned throughout our assessment, we identified several recommendations for improving our survey and its administration. These outcomes and recommendations will be relevant to any library that provides instruction and assesses its instruction program.

The Instructor Feedback Survey was created prior to the formation of this assessment subteam but was not widely used. At the outset of this project, the Library's instructional surveys were created in Survey Monkey and were used to collect feedback from instructors and students regarding instructional effectiveness and student and instructor satisfaction. As a result of some technical issues and requirements (e.g., the need for multiple accounts, limited access to review, and analyze data), the TLFT transitioned these instructional surveys to LibWizard in 2019. With LibWizard, library staff can review any of the survey data, including any responses about their own instruction, and the team administering the surveys can review and analyze the data more broadly. Leveraging reporting data in LibInsight submitted by library staff, our subteam programmatically administered the survey to gain additional insights from course instructors. In the past year of survey administration, we've noticed opportunities to improve our survey questions, update statistics gathering and assessment forms to more holistically represent our instruction program, and future opportunities for other assessment approaches and methods to continue building out our view of the instruction program.

In our fall 2020 report, recommendations centered around increasing response rates, asking for suggestions for improvement from faculty, privacy issues for library instructors, survey formatting and language changes for clarity (specifically around accessibility) to course instructors, and consistency in data comparison (specifically for the question

about skills addressed). In the winter 2021 report, we recommended developing a generic pre-test to assess students' prior knowledge related to the Library, research, and information literacy skills, identify opportunities to highlight the good work of library instructors, and provide additional library staff training about recording instruction statistics.

Course instructors and library instructors often describe the aspects of information literacy in different ways. For example, on the Instructor Feedback Survey, we ask, "Which of the following skills do you feel were addressed in the library instruction session(s)?" For staff in our statistics gathering form, we ask them to select session focuses from a list of the Library's Core Competencies. Both questions were derived from the UCLA Library Core Competencies, which are based on the ACRL Framework, and, through iterations, we've tried to remove library jargon from the version of the Instructor Feedback Survey. For example, one of the responses for "Which of the following skills do you feel were addressed in the library instruction session(s)?" was "Use search strategies (e.g., Boolean operators, truncation) to locate a wide variety of sources and explore diverse perspectives." We shortened the response options and aligned them directly with the Core Competencies that library instructors see when entering their statistics. The closest options now are simply, "Investigate diverse sources of information and perspectives" and "Gather and organize information."

At the start, we made general comparisons and combinations to help make sense of the data and allow for some comparison. However, this interpretation of the data was a temporary fix, as the subteam met to discuss how to edit the summer 2021 iteration of the Instructor Feedback Survey to better align the options between that survey and our internal statistics gathering form in LibInsight. The fall 2021 quarter data are currently under review, but the process will not require so much adjusting on the part of the subteam. Through the iterative process of reviewing our assessment and discussing it as a subteam, we've been able to streamline processes and limit taxing or redundant work (e.g., we've coordinated statistics reminders with other teams in the Library, we leverage our data to send the feedback survey all at once via mail merge, and we work together to analyze and report on the data to give a snapshot for leaders and administrators without everyone needing to run separate reports). As we continue, we look for ways to adapt and improve our processes and remove as much redundant work or technical debt as possible. As we settle into our process, we're able to provide more opportunities for this kind of streamlining to avoid extensive time costs.

Additionally, in order to more holistically represent the entire UCLA Library and encourage more people to participate in our centralized statistics gathering, we successfully advocated for the addition of two primary source literacy sessions focusing on our internal LibInsight form: (1) find and use primary sources (e.g., developing a search strategy, defining primary sources) and (2) analyze and evaluate primary sources (e.g., hands-on activity of close reading primary sources through observations, contextualizing, and inferences). Similarly, we've added primary source-related options for the Instructor Feedback Survey. This allows us to better represent our colleagues who work heavily with primary sources, such as those in Library Special Collections, and may streamline their reporting processes. We are continuing to consider ways to better represent all of the teaching and learning work being done across the Library in our assessment work.

Who Are We Missing?

As we consider other opportunities for assessment and data gathering, we are also looking at ways to reach instructors who haven't engaged with the Library. To this end, we hope to gather information about why instructors do or don't work with us and to understand what factors or additional services might help us to better leverage the Library and our instructional programs in the support of instructors across campus.

Finally, we've recognized from the beginning, but lamented throughout the process, that we lack specific information from students about their learning. We've continued to think about additional opportunities to assess student learning and success and incorporate them into our regular assessment practices and procedures. As we continue to streamline our work with the Instructor Feedback Survey, we hope to make time and space for additional assessment of students, keeping in mind that some assessment is too time-consuming and labor-intensive for our subteam to take on without additional resources and staff and may be outside of the scope of our team's mission and goals.

Lessons Learned and Recommendations

Based on our prior work and the improvements made through an iterative approach to our assessment of instructor feedback on library instruction sessions, we summarize a set of lessons learned and recommendations below.

Find Ways to Increase Survey Participation

One of our recommendations moving forward is to increase the response rate from faculty. As noted earlier, the subteam received a 38% return rate. Faculty receive an email at the end of the quarter asking them to complete the survey; hence, a strategy that can be applied to increase faculty participation is to send more than one email reminder to faculty to complete the survey. Moreover, being aware of timing and when to send email reminders to faculty is important to consider. Is it better to remind faculty right after an instruction session has taken place, or to wait some time after the instruction session? We hope to catch them sometime after they've evaluated students' final papers or projects and before they've moved on to planning for the next quarter.

Re-evaluating the survey to ensure that questions are clear and framed in a way that welcomes faculty to complete the survey can also result in more participation. This includes using language that faculty can understand to avoid any confusion. Furthermore, being aware of the length of the survey in order to not overwhelm faculty can make a difference.

Identify Important Events or Changes that Inform Your Evidence

COVID-19 restrictions were first implemented at UCLA in March 2020 when we, like librarians worldwide, had to quickly adjust our instruction modes from primarily in-person to exclusively remote learning. We began this instruction assessment program in fall 2020 and continued it throughout the academic year of 2020–2021, when all learning was held remotely. In-person instruction began again in fall 2021, but students, faculty, and staff have had to be ready to revert to remote learning at any time, depending on the situation and trends of the pandemic. We are, therefore, assessing different instructional modes, in-person and remote, during a time of general heightened anxiety and uncertainties. We find it is too early to come to conclusions about the overall effectiveness of our library instruction and know it is important to continue gathering data over time, especially once we settle into whatever our new normal will be to truly understand the impact and effectiveness of our program.

Know What You're Assessing

While our assessment process has been useful and has helped us further use existing data and collect additional data from instructors, much of the data gathered is still related to instructors' satisfaction with library instruction and their library presenter and their perceptions of student learning. However, we've noticed a need for further data showing the impact of library instruction on student learning. We may even be able to compare this data with instructors' perceptions to see if there is alignment among library staff intentions, instructors' perception of impact, and the actual impact on student learning.

Be Mindful of Time and Resource Limitations

One of the major limitations of this project was the amount of time each subteam member could dedicate to its fulfillment. As there is currently no staff member whose position is dedicated solely to library instruction assessment, we devised assessment strategies that would meet our goals of measuring the impact of our library instruction on students' work in a manner that would be effective but not demand a disproportionate amount of time. No member of this subteam could dedicate more than a few hours a week to this project. Therefore, we settled on surveying faculty instructors for their impressions based on the students' final product—that is, on the quality of their research paper or project.

Translate Library Jargon for Your Audience

When creating a survey instrument for academic course instructors, it is best to avoid library jargon as much as possible. It is also ideal to plan in advance any internal tools,

such as existing information literacy guidelines for your department or organization, with which you might wish to compare your findings. In that case, it may be beneficial to adapt the course instructor survey's language to non-library jargon while mapping it to the internal tool.

Rather than asking course instructors what topics were discussed in the library instruction session (e.g., evaluation of sources, search strategies, etc.), future survey questions may focus on what students learned compared to desired learning outcomes (e.g., students will be able to locate five academic sources relevant to their assignment). There could be a formal process (related to the Instruction Request Form, perhaps) that encourages library instructors to discuss learning outcomes (based on the Core Competencies) directly with instructors before the session to ensure that both parties are on the same page.

APPENDIX 12A
UCLA LIBRARY REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK ON LIBRARY INSTRUCTION, FALL 2021

Subject: UCLA Library Request for Feedback on Library Instruction, Fall 2021

Dear UCLA Instructor:

I hope that your fall quarter is wrapping up, and you're able to enjoy the winter break!

As instruction ends for the fall quarter, the UCLA Library is hoping to gather information about the impact of library instruction on your teaching and your students, especially now that you're able to see the impact on student work at the end of the quarter. We're reaching out to you because «Instructor_Name» provided a library instruction session or sessions this past quarter for «Course_Name». If you could please take a moment to complete our brief Instructor Feedback Survey (https://ucla.libwizard.com/f/instructor), we would be very appreciative of your insights and encourage you to critically evaluate the session and presenter.

Thank you in advance and have a great break!

Best,

Matt

APPENDIX 12B:

Appendix B
Instructor Feedback Survey Fall 2021

1. UCLA Library Presenter (Please check all that apply): (required)

☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ Jimmy Zavala ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ Matt Johnson ☐ Student Instructor
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ Diane Mizrachi ☐ Michelle Brasseur ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ Monica Hagan ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████
☐ ██████   ☐ ██████

2. Your first and last name (optional):

[   ]

3. Your email address (optional):

[   ]

4. Course name (e.g., English Composition 3 - Section 7) (required)

[   ]

5. Course level (pick one): (required)

○ Undergraduate

○ Graduate

○ Other

6. Number of students: (required)

7. How long was/were the library instruction session(s)? (required)

- ⬤ 1 to 10 minutes
- ⬤ 11 to 30 minutes
- ⬤ 31 to 45 minutes
- ⬤ Over 46 minutes
- ⬤ Comments:

8. What effect did the UCLA Library's engagement with your course have on the quality of your students' work?
(required)

- ◯ Significantly positive effect on student work
- ◯ Positive effect on student work
- ◯ No effect on student work
- ⬤ Negative effect on student work
- ◯ Significantly negative effect on student work
- ◯ Comments / additional information

9. Which of the following skills do you feel were addressed in the library instruction session(s)? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Identify a research goal, scope (narrow or broad), and plan to meet the assignment needs
- ☐ Use search strategies (e.g., Boolean operators, truncation) to locate a wide variety of sources and explore diverse perspectives
- ☐ Locate articles, books, and/or data using Library databases, catalogs and resources
- ☐ Evaluate sources for quality and appropriateness to the assignment (e.g., peer review) and synthesize the sources (e.g., literature review, annotated bibliography)
- ☐ Cite sources (including using Zotero) and identify scholarly communication practices
- ☐ Identify methods for sharing or publishing created works (e.g., writing for a scholarly journal, a newspaper, or a blog)
- ☐ Reflect on the research process used and articulate future changes to the research process
- ☐ Find & use primary sources; understand the difference between primary & secondary sources

10. What other knowledge or skills did your students gain as a result of the UCLA library's engagement with your course?

Instructor Feedback Survey Fall 2021

11. Thinking back to the class session, how would you characterize the presentation? (required)

Very engaging

Engaging

Not very engaging

Not at all engaging

12. Did this instruction session meet your learners' needs and the learning objectives you had for the class session? Why or why not? (Consider information resources discussed or shared, students' accessibility needs, virtual or physical space used, the presentation, instructional activities, etc.)

13. What suggestions do you have to help us improve our library instruction sessions?

14. Please share any additional comments, feedback, or concerns you have about your session.

References

Koufogiannakis, D., & Brettle, A. (Eds.). (2016). *Being evidence based in library and information practice.* (U.S. edition). Neal-Schuman.

Lantz, C., Insua, G. M., Armstrong, A. R., & Pho, A. (2016). Student bibliographies: Charting research skills over time. *Reference Services Review*, *44*(3), 253–265. https://doi.org/10.1108/RSR-12-2015-0053

UCLA Academic Planning and Budget. (n.d.). *Common data set 2020-2021*. University of California, Los Angeles. Retrieved February 11, 2022, from https://apb.ucla.edu/file/e873e0bd-3b08-498b-8674-1dd36dd0d028

UCLA Library. (n.d.). *About the UCLA Library*. University of California Regents. Retrieved February 11, 2022, from https://www.library.ucla.edu/

UCLA Library User Engagement Teaching and Learning Functional Team. (2019). *Research and information literacy at UCLA: The Core Competencies*. Retrieved February 11, 2022, from https://escholarship.org/uc/uclalib_il