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**Executive Summary**

Overall, the mission of the Library Instruction Team is to critically look at the instructional methods used at Tidewater Community College Library and make appropriate recommendations as to how information literacy instruction can be improved at the college. The members of the Library Instruction Team include Joy Yaeger, chair and Chesapeake representative; Heather Fitzgerald, post-chair and Virginia Beach representative; Olivia Reinauer, Portsmouth representative; Stephanie Fair, Norfolk representative; and Elizabeth Vihnanek, Virginia Beach representative. Throughout FY2015-2016, LIT has taken the key information from the General Education Assessment for information literacy and has applied this information in the development of standardized learning outcomes, the assessment cycle, and the assessment data analysis.

The Library Instruction Team has also strived to expand the areas of library instruction in regards to online learning, dual enrollment, and underserved disciplines. The recommendations from the extensive research done during this fiscal year will then be directly applied at each campus library to ensure that Tidewater Community College Library is continually improving the level of support offered for information literacy instruction at Tidewater Community College.
**Library Instruction – FY 2015-2016 Assessment Action Plan**  
*Tidewater Community College Libraries*  
*Closing the Loop*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Instruction Team Charge:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop, promote, and support effective teaching practices in library instruction; conduct formal assessment of library instruction; recommend actions to Library Management based on instruction assessment results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Action 1 | Ongoing Assessment Cycle  
(Assess in the Spring. Analyze in the Summer. Make Changes for Fall.) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
<td>The general education assessment of information literacy revealed that students scored lowest in evaluation of information and ethical use of information, based on the Information Literacy Rubric. Information Literacy classes will address these deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Accountability** | All librarians and library instructors are responsible for the collection of assessment data.  
The Library Instruction Team is responsible for developing assessment tools, analyzing data, and reporting results in an official document. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 2</th>
<th>Library instructors will participate in the <em>TCC Libraries Learning Community</em> contributing reflections about active learning and classroom assessment techniques (CATs). Consequently, they will apply effective techniques and strategies to improve student learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
<td>This action provides evidence of LIT's willingness to incorporate effective pedagogical approaches into library instruction sessions. It is also evidence that LIT is approaching library instruction with a dynamic and innovative mindset. Finally, it is further evidence of TCC Library's commitment to continuous improvement and reflective practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Accountability** | All librarians and library instructors are responsible for incorporating active learning into library instruction.  
Beginning in Fall 2015, librarians will submit reflections to the effective teaching repository *TCC Libraries Learning Community* on Blackboard at the end of each semester. |
| Action 3 | The Library Instruction Team will maintain the Blackboard effective teaching repository entitled *TCC Libraries Learning Community* for sharing effective pedagogy and “best practices” related to information literacy instruction. |
| Rationale | This repository is evidence of TCC Library’s commitment to continuous improvement and reflective practice. |
| Accountability | The Library Instruction Team will create new discussion board prompts for reflection and monitor the site for organization and overall effectiveness. All librarians are responsible for adding content to the repository each semester. (Beginning Fall 2015) |

| Action 4 | The Library Instruction Team will review data on library instruction at all campuses to identify underserved courses and disciplines. |
| Rationale | Analyzing college library instruction data will allow library instructors to see where to target future library instruction outreach. |
| Accountability | The Library Instruction Team will make recommendations to campus librarians for improving library instruction support college-wide. |

<p>| Action 5 | The Library Instruction Team will create an inventory of library instructional support for online learning. |
| Rationale | An inventory of library instructional support for online learning will identify current strengths and weaknesses and will assist librarians in planning future support services. |
| Accountability | The Library Instruction Team will make recommendations for increasing online learning support by investigating tools and resources and collaborating with the LibGuides and Website Team (LAW). All librarians will be responsible for implementing recommendations and maintaining resources. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action 6</th>
<th>TCC Libraries provide instructional support for Dual Enrollment courses; librarians explore and use effective models of library instruction and make recommendations for improving support for Dual Enrollment courses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>An inventory of library instructional support for dual enrollment will identify current strengths and weaknesses and will assist librarians in planning future support services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Accountability | The Library Instruction Team will make recommendations for supporting dual enrollment by identifying the current dual enrollment courses offered and looking for flexible ways of offering support for dual enrollment students and instructors.  
All librarians will be responsible for implementing recommendations and maintaining resources. |
Analysis of Spring 2016 Instruction Assessment

Section 1: Background of Library instruction assessment at TCC

During the assessment process, the Library Instruction Team has continually strived to align the assessment process with the results of the Tidewater Community College General Education Assessment scores and rubric design. The 2013 and 2014 scores from the General Education Assessment process for information literacy communicated that the critical evaluation of resources and the ethical uses of information are the two lowest scored areas on the rubric.

In the beginning of assessment at Tidewater Community College Library, instructors focused on doing a post-test at the end of sessions to gauge student learning. However, it soon became evident to library instructors that it was necessary to assess the prior knowledge of students to track improvement.

To support the development of information literacy at the college, the Library Instruction Team used two surveys to assess the student learning of ENG 111 and SDV classes. During 2013, the assessment tool of a pre and post-test was implemented college-wide. The Spring 2013 SDV survey focused on library services and access of information, while the ENG 111 survey asked questions aimed at determining if students could evaluate sources critically. The committee repeated the assessment in the fall to gather more data and identify gaps in student learning. Due to changes in staffing and rotating membership on the Library Instruction Committee, another assessment was not conducted until Spring of 2015.

In the 2015 round of assessment, LIT worked on developing a pre and post-test that once again focused on the critical evaluation of resources and the ethical uses of information. Only ENG 111 and SDV classes were assessed by library instructors. The assessment for SDV featured a screen shot of the Occupational Outlook Handbook and asked, “Is the below resource credible? Why or why not?” It became evident when the team was analyzing the data that the screen shot possibly influenced students to answer with authority as an evaluative factor. In the ENG 111 assessment, students were given a multiple choice survey design and asked, “Which of the following statement(s) are true?” As the team was analyzing and coding the data, it was apparent that the familiar multiple choice set-up that tends to have standardized testing clichés and strategies attached, may not serve the purpose of the survey successfully.

The Library Instruction Team was able to discern a great amount of information from both surveys about the level of student understanding related to the critical evaluation of resources and ethical uses of information. However, the team retained key pieces of information about survey design and applied these improvements to the 2016 assessment cycle.
Section 1a: 2016 Survey Design Process

**Introduction:**

The survey design process for assessing the critical evaluation of resources in SDV classes involved several stages to arrive at the most successful design for student engagement. It was decided by LIT to focus solely on assessing the critical evaluation of resources with the SDV classes. When looking at the process from last year, the team had the goal of building on the knowledge of coding with evaluative factors for data analysis, but also designing a survey that would be the most relevant to the students. To succeed in this process, the team did a series of test surveys to sample SDV classes and gauge the relevance and design of the survey. The team carefully looked at the engagement of the students in pre and post-test responses, the level of understanding the students showed with the wording of the questions, and the amount of correctly answered questions. The final assessment tool for SDV features this question: “What criteria should you use to evaluate a source?” It is an open writing response question that directly relates to the key factors students are taught for source evaluation (Authority, Reliability, Relevancy, Currency, Accuracy, and Purpose/Bias). The team changed the design of the survey slightly by asking for the students’ computer numbers. This change gave the team the ability to do one-to-one matching of data for the pre-test and post-test and reduce the chances of skewed data.

During the 2015 round of assessment, the team assessed only ENG 111 classes. However, given that different campuses have varied numbers for ENG 111 instruction, the team expanded the assessment to ENG 111/112 courses and CST 100 classes in order to look at the ethical uses of information. For the ENG 111/112 and CST 100 survey, the team went through the same vetting process of conducting test surveys with student groups to find the most relevant layout and wording. In the testing process, the team discovered that it was beneficial to have a different format for the pre and post-test for ethical uses of information. The question asked was “What should you do to avoid plagiarism?” Originally, the team had an open written response box for the pre and post-test, but it was shown in the trial assessments that students did not participate in the post-test. Consequently, the team changed the format of the post-test to a multiple selection of criteria design with the same question, and the post-test response rate increased.

For both the SDV and ENG/CST assessment tools, the instruction of the librarians was designed around the new learning outcomes that the Library Instruction Team recently updated during the Fiscal Year 2015-2016. The learning outcomes were directly linked to the college’s Information Literacy Rubric. Below are the new standardized learning outcomes that were followed for instruction.

**SDV**

1. **Student demonstrates knowledge of at least two evaluative factors for analyzing research.** *(Critical Evaluation of Sources)*

   Suggested ways to address this outcome:
1) Explain website evaluation with resources such as Virginia Career View.
2) Have students analyze the purpose and application of information in Occupational Outlook Handbook.
3) Demonstrate article evaluation using Academic Search Complete.

2) **Student is aware of a variety of resources available to support academic assignments.**
   (Access to Information)

Suggested ways to address outcomes:
   1) Demonstrate searching for information in the Library Catalog.
   2) Explain benefits of using multiple search terms to conduct searches.
   3) Demonstrate Virginia Education Wizard.

To look for multiple active learning methods to address these outcomes, consult the posted lesson plans in the TCC Library Learning Community.

**ENG 111/112 and CST 100**

1) **Student analyzes information sources to find appropriate scholarly resources for assignments.**
   (Critical Evaluation of Sources)

Suggested ways to address this outcome:
   1) Demonstrate databases as necessary (ie. For ENG 111; You may choose Academic Search Complete, Opposing Viewpoints etc.).
   2) Explain popular v. scholarly articles.
   3) Define peer-reviewed.
   4) List the factors to evaluate sources (ie. author, date, publisher, content, etc.).
   5) Mention how to apply evaluative factors to a source.
   6) Compare information from a general website to that in a database.

2) **Student identifies at least one way to avoid plagiarism.**
   (Ethical Use of Information)

Suggested ways to address this outcome:
   1) Mention citation features in databases.
   2) Show Citation LibGuide.
   3) Define plagiarism.
   4) Explain use of information (ethically, legally).

To look for multiple active learning methods to address these outcomes, consult the posted lesson plans in the TCC Library Learning Community.
Section 1b: 2016 Data Analysis and Results

Coding the Data:

When coding the data from the assessment of the SDV classes, the Library Instruction Team found that having consistency in the definitions of the evaluative factors was crucial, and that the team would need to carefully collaborate about all answers that did not clearly follow the definitions to ensure that the data was being coded similarly by each campus representative. Careful minutes were taken to record the definitions of factors, and the team met to discuss any discrepancies with coding.

Evaluative Factors and Definitions:
- **Authority**: Author, sponsor, or publisher
- **Reliability**: Library sources, recommendations, previous knowledge of source
- **Relevance**: Meets information need
- **Currency**: Date, timeliness
- **Accuracy**: Truthfulness, correctness of content, references
- **Other**: Other evaluative factor

The information the team decided on for coding decisions is recorded below:

- **SDV Coding Categories and Definitions**:
  - Evidence of evaluative factor- Yes or no
  - **Accuracy**: Information is correct; information can be verified by another source
  - **Authority**: Author, publisher, sponsor
  - **Bias**: Whether information has a bias, purpose of information
  - **Currency**: Date of information
  - **Relevance**: Information is related to their topic (Information is appropriate for the assignment; information is about careers.)
  - **Reliability**: Information is trusted because it is a library database; information is trusted as it has citations/references (Reliability is coded if student identifies a particular resource such as OOH, Career Guide, or says library database.) If student says “The Library” or “The Librarian,” still code “Yes” for evaluative factor being used, but type VAGUE in Other column. (In analysis, “vague” was not captured as it told nothing about student learning.)
  - **I Don’t Know**: Student expresses “I don’t know.” (Not to be used if field is left blank)
  - **Other**: Enter the word “vague” when necessary (saying just “The Library or Librarian”), or additional notes (The Team will review these entries. The other category was eliminated during coding as “Vague” didn’t tell anything.)

- **ENG Coding Categories and Definitions**:
  - Evidence of using information ethically- Yes or no
Data Analysis SDV:

College-Wide Analysis:

When analyzing the results of the SDV assessment for the critical evaluation of resources, the findings showed from the pre and post-test results that there was an increase in the amount of factors used by students college-wide. Before instruction, LIT identified that 258 factors were applied by students for evaluating resources. For the post-test, 476 factors were identified showing an increase of 218 in the factors applied for evaluating information critically. The team was also able to match the number of evaluative factors used with pre and post responses based on the analysis that a student showed (yes or no) evidence of evaluating information.

By looking at the increase in individual factors on a college-wide scale, LIT was able to discern that there was a significant increase in the use of these factors: authority, currency, and bias. Relevancy and reliability also showed a promising increase in student usage. In the 2015 assessment cycle, there was an overwhelming use of authority for evaluation of critical information. However, the new survey design for 2016 showed a more varied and notable increase in areas that were not targeted last year, such as currency and bias. The data also showed a significant decrease in “I don’t know” responses from the pre to post-test, showing 49 responses to only 3 in that category. Also, represented on the chart is the percentage of growth per factor from before and after instruction.
Chesapeake Library:

In many aspects, the Chesapeake data was consistent with the college-wide results. There was a clear increase from 81 evaluative factors used in the pre-test to 139 factors used in the post-test. Following the results of the college-wide data, Chesapeake showed an increase in accuracy, authority, currency, relevancy, and bias. The three largest areas of improvement were authority, which rose from 11 students to 27; relevance, which increased from 8 students to 26; and bias, which 7 students used in the pre-test and 23 used in the post-test. There was a decrease in “I don’t know” responses by students from 3 to 0, and the largest increase of all the chosen factors was in the area of relevance. However, one major difference in the data was a slight decrease in the use of reliability as a factor. Many students began with this factor from the pre-test and then changed their answers by distributing their responses to the other factors, such as accuracy or relevance after information literacy instruction. This may be due to the fact that relevance was coded with more general types of student responses that tend to appear in pre-tests and that more specific post-test data lent itself to being coded in the other categories.
Norfolk Library:

The findings of the Norfolk Library assessment data also showed an increase in the count of factors. However, the increase was smaller from 22 factors used by students in the pre-test to 40 evaluative factors used in the post-test. The breakdown of individual factors showed a significant increase in the use of the factor currency from two to ten responses. Authority increased as well, along with relevance. In addition, “I don’t know” decreased from 1 student to 0. A look at the data across campuses, revealed that the sample size from the different campuses is not consistent. Chesapeake and Virginia Beach have a much larger sample size than Norfolk and Portsmouth. While a standard approach of assessing two classes per librarian was decided, LIT may propose to assess the first 100 students of a semester in the future to guarantee more accurate sample sizes.
Portsmouth Library:

Areas of the Portsmouth Library data that showed consistency with the other findings were an overall increase in evaluative factors from 24 to 39 factors used and an increase in authority, currency, relevance, reliability, and bias. The largest growth was in the evaluative factor reliability from 8 to 16 responses. There was also a significant decrease in “I don’t know” answers from 3 to 0, which correlated with the overall TCC Library response. However, the data showed that Portsmouth had the slight decrease of one student response in the use of accuracy from the pre-test.
Virginia Beach Joint-Use Library:

Virginia Beach had an increase in evaluative factor use of 129 during the assessment cycle. In the count of factors, 129 factors were applied for evaluation before instruction, and 258 factors were applied after instruction. The data showed an increase in all factors from the pre-test to the post-test, and the greatest increase was currency from 15 to 61 students. Unlike the assessment cycle last year, authority came in second with an increase from 41 to 82 student responses. Bias increased from 0 to 39 responses, and reliability increased from 22 to 56 students. Virginia Beach also showed the largest decrease in “I don’t know” responses out of all the four campuses, which included 42 pre-test responses and 0 for the post-test. The “I don’t know” response option was newly added this year and has been significant for gauging if students are not connecting with the assessment tool or if they do not really know the information.
Data Analysis, ENG:
College-Wide Analysis:

When gauging the process of evaluating information ethically with students, the Library Instruction Team decided to conduct the data analysis using the various levels agreed upon for showing evidence of avoiding plagiarism. These levels of competencies for using information ethically were carefully adapted from the General Education Assessment Rubric for Information Literacy. College-wide, 95% (240 students) of students gave evidence of knowing how to use information ethically in the pre-test, and 100% gave evidence in the post-test. Out of these 240 students, 192 showed evidence with citing, and 115 identified avoiding plagiarism with paraphrasing/don’t copy. After instruction, 251 students showed evidence of using information ethically by using citing, and 153 students selected using paraphrasing. After the information was scored, 126 of these students selected all correct responses for using information ethically, while 129 students had mixed results with their answers. In the post-test, 36 students college-wide selected incorrect answers.
Chesapeake Library Analysis:

Like the college-wide results, the Chesapeake campus showed a 95% rate of students displaying evidence of evaluating information ethically in the pre-test and 100% of students in the post-test. Out of the 39 students assessed in the pre-test and post-test, 30 students chose citing as evidence of using information ethically, and 18 students listed paraphrase/don’t copy. Only two students did not show evidence in the pre-test. In the post test, 39 students chose citing to support using information ethically, and 25 students chose paraphrasing. Three students had mixed results of correct and incorrect answers, and only five students had incorrect responses in the post-assessment. Overall, the results correlate with the college-wide responses and show a close relationship between the pre and post-test results.
Before: Evidence of using info ethically?

- 2 (5%) Evidence Yes
- 37 (95%) Evidence No

After: Evidence of using info ethically?

- 0 (0%) Evidence Yes
- 39 (100%) Evidence No
Before Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Yes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence No</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cite</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase/Don’t Copy</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i don’t know</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cite your sources properly and thoroughly</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraphrase using your own words</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write your paper first, then find sources</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use copy and paste to add information to your assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Write in responses</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Norfolk Library Analysis:

While the other campuses showed some difference in evidence provided for using information ethically between the pre and post-test results, Norfolk had the same evidence of 100% for both the pre and post-test. In the pre-test, 22 out of the 32 students assessed chose citing, and 13 students selected paraphrasing/don’t copy as evidence of using information ethically. In the post-results, 30 students selected citing, and 21 students selected paraphrasing. However, seven students had mixed results, and nine students selected incorrect answers.
After: Evidence of using info ethically?

Before Responses

- Evidence Yes: 32
- Evidence No: 0
- Cite: 22
- Paraphrase/Don't Copy: 13
- Other: 8
- I don't know: 0
Portsmouth Library Analysis:

For the Portsmouth campus, the results are not directly correlated with the college-wide results. Portsmouth displayed 98% evidence of evaluating information ethically in the pre-assessment. Out of the 44 assessed students, 1 student did not show evidence in the pre-assessment. However, the post-assessment results do align with the other results at 100%. Before instruction, 31 students chose citation as evidence of using information ethically, and 23 selected paraphrase/don’t copy. After instruction, 30 students selected paraphrasing, and 44 students chose citation. Consequently, there were five students with mixed results of correct and incorrect answers in the after scoring, and 7 students had incorrect answers.
Before Responses

- Evidence Yes: 43
- Evidence No: 1
- Cite: 31
- Paraphrase/Don't Copy: 23
- Other: 0
- I don't know: 0

After Responses

- Cite your sources properly and thoroughly: 44
- Paraphrase using your own words: 30
- Write your paper first, then find sources: 7
- Use copy and paste to add information to your assignment: 1
- Write in responses: 11
Virginia Beach Joint-Use Library Analysis:

At Virginia Beach, the results were the most correlated with the college-wide results. It is probable that this is due to the sample size Virginia Beach produced for the English assessment which was significantly larger than the other campuses. Virginia Beach assessed 138 students, and before instruction, 93% (128 students) showed evidence of using information ethically. After instruction, 100% of students showed evidence. In the pre-assessment, 109 students communicated citation as the way to use information ethically, and 61 students chose paraphrasing/don’t copy. For the post-assessment, 138 students chose citation, and an additional 77 students also selected paraphrasing. In the after scoring, 11 students had mixed results of correct and incorrect answers, and 15 students had incorrect responses.
After: Evidence of using info ethically?

- Evidence Yes: 138 (100%)
- Evidence No: 0%

Before Responses

- Evidence Yes: 128
- Evidence No: 9
- Cite: 109
- Paraphrase/Don't Copy: 61
- Other: 0
- I don't know: 1
After Responses

- 138: Cite your sources properly and thoroughly
- 77: Paraphrase using your own words
- 11: Write your paper first, then find sources
- 7: Use copy and paste to add information to your assignment
- 6: Write in responses

After Scoring

- 66: 100% Both correct answers + some incorrect
- 11: Cite but not Paraphrase
- 61: Paraphrase but not Cite
- 0: Any incorrect answers
- 15: Green bars
Section 1c: Instruction Assessment Improvements and Fall Recommendations for Instruction

New Focuses for Instruction (Fall 2016 recommendations):

During the course of the 2015-2016 academic year, TCC librarian instructors have strived to improve the focus of instruction with the data results from the last academic year. Given the SDV assessment data from last year, it was recommended to stress the factors currency and bias more in instruction and vary from stressing the factor authority. From the current assessment results, it is clear that instructors have succeeded in this task from the pre to post-test rise of 68 students using currency and 58 using bias/purpose for the critical evaluation of resources. The assessment tool was also improved from the previous year to avoid influencing students towards a particular factor. While there was a noticeable increase in all factors and a decrease in the “I don’t know” responses, the two lowest areas of increase were reliability and accuracy. TCC librarian instructors could stress the importance of these factors in future instruction.

When looking at the ENG/CST results, it is evident that if LIT wants to see how to specifically help students with using information ethically, more than just the concept of using information ethically needs to be assessed. The pre and post-assessment results from all campuses were very close, thus indicating that to truly gauge where students are with using information ethically, instructors will need to look more at the process students conduct when ethically using information.

Future Changes to the Spring 2017 Assessment Tool

Over the course of assessment at TCC, the design of the assessment tools has evolved based on the feedback the Library Instruction Team has received from students and from the advances in educational pedagogy. The team has used post-tests, pre and post-tests, assessment designs with screenshots, multiple choice formats, and open-answer responses. As this assessment process has improved, the number one element the team has kept in mind is that the assessment tool should engage students and be relevant to them so that a true picture of student learning is captured.

During the pre-test and post-test assessment and analysis period, LIT looked at the feedback from students and used the results to critically decide what improvements should be made for the upcoming fiscal year. It became evident when looking at the data that improvement from campus to campus depended greatly on the sample size that was assessed at each campus library. While LIT strived to have each instruction librarian assess two classes of SDV and two classes or ENG/CST, there were some discrepancies in the sample sizes. In the future, LIT will possibly consider having an ongoing spring or fall assessment that has every campus library assess the first 100 students of the semester. However, using a specific sample size or even assessing every class in a semester depends
on the nature of the new assessment tool and the analysis methods chosen for the upcoming assessment cycle.

In the data analysis process, LIT also carefully considered how some pre and post-test data was very close at certain campuses. When doing a pre and post-assessment, general knowledge of concepts is merely tested instead of the actual skill level and task performance of the student. Activities allow the instructor to really observe how a student is executing information and applying it appropriately.

With this information in mind, the LIT would like to advance the design of the assessment tool by creating an activity that the students will complete for assessment. An activity will offer a greater opportunity for student engagement and will also allow for better integration into lesson plans. Currently, the pre-test has often been integrated into lesson plans as a springboard for discussion and active learning activities. However, having an assessment activity that directly promotes active learning will allow the library instructors to have a greater chance of student involvement. It is proposed that the team experiment with using a tutorial program that will allow for the easy collection of data for analysis. The Library Instruction Team will look into using the tool LibWizard for creating the Spring 2017 assessment tool.

Section 2

Additional FY 2015-2016 Library Instruction Team Charges

**Narrative: Stephanie Fair, Norfolk Campus LIT Representative**

**LIT Charge:** Create an inventory of existing library instruction support for online courses. Explore effective models of library instruction support for online courses, and make recommendations for improving library instruction support for online courses.

**Reason for Charge:**

Tidewater Community College Library felt that an inventory of library instructional support for online learning would identify current strengths and weaknesses and would assist librarians in planning future support services. Due to the recent website changes and the new discovery tool (PRIMO), LIT felt a review of tutorials would be essential. When the tutorials were reviewed, it was obvious they contained outdated information. In addition to being outdated, they did not meet visual communication branding requirements. Along with investigating current tutorials, librarians who provide embedded services were asked to supply information about their classes and the level of time involvement for each instructor. LibGuides were also looked at to determine if support was being met for online learning.

**What has been completed:**

During the Fiscal Year 2015-2016, a best practice list was compiled for tutorials, visual requirements were reviewed, hybrid and online classes for fall were determined, and a list of needed tutorials were gathered among all the librarians at all campuses. A subcommittee for making pilot
tutorials was formed with Stephanie Fair, Joy Yaeger, Garrison Libby, Steve Roane, Alex Harrington, and Bethany Wright. This committee was charged with Guideline Creation, Technical Requirements/Recommendations, and creation of the first 5-6 tutorials to represent what standards the group was looking for.

1. Guideline Creation
   a. Written instructions for tutorial requirements including layout, design, and setup:
      i. Captions are required.
      ii. If using PowerPoint, download TCC Classic template. Within the PowerPoint slide, select “Blank Slide Layout-Dark and Teal.”
      iii. Font should be white. Hyperlink-Green (should be automatic). Bullet points should be white (automatic as well).
      iv. Length- 2-5 minutes
      v. CC-BY logo required @ end of last slide.

2. Technical Requirements/Resources
   a. TCC Resources for Visual Branding:
      i. https://web.tcc.edu/vc/standards/tutorials.html
      ii. https://web.tcc.edu/vc/standards/templates_powerpoint.html
   b. Technical Resources
      i. Camtasia (have OIS install), Powtoon, Wix, Libwizard, Guide On The side, Voice Thread (not an all-inclusive list of resources that can be used).

3. Tutorials
   a. Suggested lists:
      i. Popular vs scholarly- Bethany
      ii. How to search for articles
      iii. How to search for books
      iv. QuickSearch
      v. Academic Search Complete-Stephanie
      vi. Finding scholarly articles
      vii. Finding images
      viii. Citation
      ix. Nursing/Medical- Garrison
      x. Ebooks
      xi. About the library
      xii. How to use Research Guides
      xiii. Choosing a database- Joy

Tutorials will be reviewed by LIT on 6/7/16. Currently, three librarians are embedded into courses. Online and hybrid courses for Fall 2015 were compiled for review. English 112, English 125, CST 100, PSY 230, MTE 3, 4 & 5, ITE 115 had the most online classes offered in the Fall 2015 semester. MTE 2-5 had the most hybrid courses offered.

Recommendations:

LibGuides will need to be reviewed annually to determine if there is sufficient coverage for all courses/subjects and any new programs. Online and hybrid classes should be reviewed for the upcoming semester once the schedule is out to determine appropriate outreach for those classes.
Tutorials will be an ongoing project that will be presented as an option to librarians at the upcoming Library Enrichment Day in August 2016. There is currently a list of key topics for tutorials to be completed. This list could be completed by anyone (librarians or coordinators) at TCC, and guidelines will be distributed to the campuses. LIT recommends that embedded librarians or future embedded librarians discuss appropriate time spent on courses with their coordinator. LIT felt that it was important to encourage various levels of support for online classes.

**Levels of Support:**
- **Level one**- Librarian serves as a contact in the course. Their role is to support research needs and questions. A librarian may create LibGuide support, as needed.
- **Level two**- Librarian serves, in addition to level one, as a facilitator for discussion posts and provides resources.
- **Level three**- Librarian serves, in addition to level one and two, as a creator/grader of assignments, offers live webinars, creates mini-lectures, and carries out additional duties agreed upon between the librarian and the instructor.

**Narrative: Olivia Reinauer, Portsmouth Campus LIT Representative**

**Charge:**
Review data on library instruction at all campuses to identify underserved courses and disciplines. Make recommendations for improving library instruction support for underserved courses and disciplines.

**History:**
The Tidewater Community College Library tracks the total numbers of classes and students served by course each semester, but has not comprehensively examined underserved programs or courses at the college-wide level. Individual campuses may have used anecdotal or statistical information over the years to identify areas for outreach.

**Progress:**
The Library Instruction Team decided to examine the percentage (by number of sections) of what are considered the “core” courses for each campus that received library instruction, as well as the percentage of courses receiving instruction that list Information Literacy as a General Education competency. LIT also developed a curriculum map listing required courses for each program, which of those courses list Information Literacy as a Gen Ed competency, and which of those courses regularly receive library instruction.

The completed findings regarding the percent of SDV 100, ENG 111/112, and CST 100 courses receiving library instruction in 2015 at each campus are averaged in the accompanying bar chart and comprehensive table. The Library Instruction Team discovered that, in most cases, Tidewater Community College Library is not achieving 100 percent coverage, and often is not
even reaching 50% coverage. The greatest success in terms of reaching the highest number of sections per course is in SDV 100.

In examining the percent of courses receiving library instruction in 2015 that list Information Literacy as a Gen Ed competency, LIT discovered that 48% of the courses that librarians did provide library instruction for across all four campuses were courses listing Information Literacy as a Gen Ed competency. Across all courses (approximately 600 of them) listing Information Literacy as a Gen Ed competency, librarians only provided library instruction for about 5% of the total (32 courses).

**Recommendations:**

The Library Instruction Team’s first recommendation is to focus outreach toward instructors of SDV, ENG 111/112, and CST 100 who are not currently requesting library instruction. Librarians have already established successful relationships with their colleagues and may want to consider as a team an effective way to reach out to this group of instructors. After reviewing the instruction map, it became clear that ENG 111 is a particularly critical course that many students across a variety of programs must take.

The Library Instruction Team plans to use the data on the Information Literacy Gen Ed competency courses to identify courses for outreach, but also recognizes that many of these courses may not view information literacy in the same way that librarians do, and there might be additional work to do in the area of Gen Ed assessment in order to match the competency with courses that truly focus on these skills. After viewing the library instruction map, LIT members have identified the following programs at each campus as underserved: Portsmouth – smaller programs and/or Career Studies Certificates (Accounting Technician, Cloud Computing, Occupational Safety, Maritime Welding, Truck Driving, Pharmacy Technician); Chesapeake – many of the smaller programs (e.g. Kitchen & Bath, Theatre, Early Childhood, Automotive); Virginia Beach – History, Sciences, Engineering, IT; Norfolk – many of the Career Studies Certificate programs (e.g. Music, Cloud Computing, Catering, Classical Cooking, Child Development, Kitchen Management, Personal Training). The next step will be to develop a plan for outreach to these courses, and to engage in further discussion about how to support Career/Technical vs. Transfer programs, as well as certificate vs. associates degree programs.
2015 Average Course Coverage by Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
<th>Summer 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDV 100 P</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDV 100 N</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDV 100 CH</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDV 100 VB</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 111 P</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 111 N</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 111 CH</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 111 VB</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 112 P</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 112 N</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 112 CH</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 112 VB</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST 100 P</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST 100 N</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST 100 CH</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CST 100 VB</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Narrative: Heather Fitzgerald, Virginia Beach Campus

Charge

TCC Libraries provide instructional support for Dual Enrollment courses, explore and use effective models of library instruction, and make recommendations for improving support for Dual Enrollment courses.

History

Dual enrollment is available for eligible high school and homeschool students who wish to start earning college credits. These classes are taught both on campus and in the public schools by full-time and part-time TCC faculty. Often, these TCC faculty are public school teachers, as well. Courses taught at the public schools operate on an academic year of September through June. Librarians at each campus maintain communication with First Year Success coordinators, Dual Enrollment coordinators, and teaching faculty to provide access to library resources and information literacy instruction.

In the current public school academic year (Sep 2015- June 2016), four cities (Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Virginia Beach) participate in dual enrollment. A common course for all cities was English, which covers ENG 111 and ENG 112 in one academic year. Other dual courses include, but are not limited to the following: ENV 220 (C), ITN 106 (C), ITN 107 (C), MAR 160 (C), MAR 193 (C); ITE 115 (N); PLS 211 (P), PLS 212 (P); ETR (B), SDV 101-EGR (B).

Progress:

TCC Libraries provide instructional support for Dual Enrollment courses. Librarians explore and use effective models of library instruction and make recommendations for improving support for Dual Enrollment courses. During the Spring of 2016, the LIT gathered information on the ENG 111/ENG 112 dual courses. Librarian instructors also provide instructional support for dual enrollment instructors and students. In addition to conducting in-library instruction for these classes, Libraries provide 24/7 support through the library website (www.tcc.edu/library). In particular, librarians have created a LibGuide with resources for distance and dually enrolled students (http://libguides.tcc.edu/c.php?g=400416). There is a link to this guide on the library homepage, making it accessible to students and faculty. This guide also offers online library instruction modules to provide further support for students and faculty.

In addition to dual enrollment/distance focused guides, the Library website provides 24/7 access to additional research guides based on topic or course. Furthermore, the library’s physical collections and databases are accessible to dual enrolled students, as well. Dual enrollment students have established Blackboard accounts and can obtain student IDs, complete with standard 100 free prints during the coordinating TCC semester.
Recommendations:

The Library Instruction Team makes the below recommendations to continue progress with the dual enrollment charge:

- Do outreach to representatives to present the use of online tools and the benefits of students having their Blackboard login information for off-campus access to databases. Often public schools have strong restrictions on Internet resources, and it is possible that students will not be able to access all databases from a public school computer. Also, since many Dual Enrollment instructors have expressed they do not use Blackboard as an instructional tool, students are not provided with these logins.

- Create a flyer advertising library instruction and library resources. Mail or email this publication out at the beginning of each public school year (August) to give instructors time to schedule field trips to the library or customize content in an online format.

- Encourage field trips to campus to both get student IDs and receive library instruction.

- Provide training for Dual instructors so those instructors who cannot arrange a field trip to the library will know what to highlight for students.
SDV College-Wide Analysis
College-Wide Analysis:

When analyzing the results of the SDV assessment for the critical evaluation of resources, the findings showed from the pre and post-test results that there was an increase in the amount of factors used by students college-wide. Before instruction, LIT identified that 258 factors were applied by students for evaluating resources. For the post-test, 476 factors were identified showing an increase of 218 in the factors applied for evaluating information critically. The team was also able to match the number of evaluative factors used with pre and post responses based on the analysis that a student showed (yes or no) evidence of evaluating information.

By looking at the increase in individual factors on a college-wide scale, LIT was able to discern that there was a significant increase in the use of these factors: authority, currency, and bias. Relevancy and reliability also showed a promising increase in student usage. In the 2015 assessment cycle, there was an overwhelming use of authority for evaluation of critical information. However, the new survey design for 2016 showed a more varied and notable increase in areas that were not targeted last year, such as currency and bias. The data also showed a significant decrease in “I don’t know” responses from the pre to post-test, showing 49 responses to only 3 in that category.
ENG 111 College-Wide Analysis:

College-Wide Analysis:

When gauging the process of evaluating information ethically with students, the Library Instruction Team decided to conduct the data analysis using the various levels agreed upon for showing evidence of avoiding plagiarism. These levels of competencies for using information ethically were carefully adapted from the General Education Assessment Rubric for Information Literacy. College-wide, 95% (240 students) of students gave evidence of knowing how to use information ethically in the pre-test, and 100% gave evidence in the post-test. Out of these 240 students, 192 showed evidence with citing, and 115 identified avoiding plagiarism with paraphrasing/don’t copy. After instruction, 251 students showed evidence of using information ethically by using citing, and 153 students selected using paraphrasing. After the information was scored, 126 of these students selected all correct responses for using information ethically, while 129 students had mixed results with their answers. In the post-test, 36 students college-wide selected incorrect answers.
New Focuses for Instruction (Fall 2016 recommendations):

During the course of the 2015-2016 academic year, TCC Librarian instructors have strived to improve the focus of instruction with the data results from the last academic year. Given the SDV assessment data from last year, it was recommended to stress the factors currency and bias more in instruction and vary from stressing the factor authority. From the current assessment results, it is clear that instructors have succeeded in this task from the pre to post-test rise of 68 students using currency and 58 using bias/purpose for the critical evaluation of resources. The assessment tool was also improved from the previous year to avoid influencing students towards a particular factor. While there was a noticeable increase in all factors and a decrease in the “I don’t know” responses, the two lowest areas of increase were reliability and accuracy. TCC Librarian Instructors could stress the importance of these factors in future instruction.

When looking at the ENG/CST results, it is evident that if LIT wants to see how to specifically help students with using information ethically, more than just the concept of using information ethically needs to be assessed. The pre and post-assessment results from all campuses were very close, thus indicating that to truly gauge where students are with using information ethically, instructors will need to look more at the process students conduct when ethically using information.