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Traditional assessment is multi-dimensional.

Limited by:

- individual, course, department, institution level
- services, resources
- immediate learning or other outcomes

[certainly libraries attempt assessment in gathering data, much of which has nothing to do with learning]
This discussion

- library instruction or information literacy programs
- learning outcomes
- individual level

[Not outputs, inputs, etc.]
Donald Kirkpatrick

- Published series of articles on techniques to evaluate training programs in business
- 4 steps became 4 levels (Kirkpatrick’s 4 levels of evaluation)
- *Evaluating Training Programs*, with case studies, last version published 1998
Kirkpatrick
4 Levels of Evaluation

- **Reaction**: how did the participants *feel* about the instruction
- **Learning**: what knowledge or skills were acquired
- **Behavior**: did participants change their behavior
- **Results**: overall impact / effect on the individual / organization
Question:

If we used the 4 Levels as a rubric to sort how library instruction programs are evaluated, what percentage of programs would use Level 1, Level 2, etc.??
Approach / method

- Literature search 2002 to May 2009
- 130 case studies, etc. identified
- Screened for details on their methods, data collected
- 35 studies had necessary detail to analyze
## Approach / method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Method-Quant=QT Qual=QL</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
<th>Data Gathered / Sample size if available</th>
<th>K-level</th>
<th>Justification for K level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Learning outcomes, portfolios, and rubrics, Oh my! Authentic assessment of an information literacy program.</td>
<td>Diller and Phelps</td>
<td>QT / QL some judgment by assessor</td>
<td>Students develop portfolios with final projects in “learning goal” courses. Assessment by a campus committee</td>
<td>Portfolios with rubrics / (sample size=25)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Learning goal matrix (rubric). Rubric based on “evidence” artifacts in the portfolio based on learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Information literacy in the university curriculum: challenges for outcomes assessment.</td>
<td>O’Hanlon</td>
<td>QT</td>
<td>Instructors invited to complete survey and submit syllabi for review</td>
<td>Syllabus analysis and surveys of instructors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review of academic courses and programs for frequency of IL components. Indirect method; syllabus analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Usability testing and design of a library website: an iterative approach.</td>
<td>George, C.</td>
<td>QT survey reporting from 367 respondents Testing of prototype</td>
<td>User survey of needs usability testing</td>
<td>Survey responses, question responses, observational data</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>1-2 like it and learn from it (appeal and function n=367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Online searching skills: development of an inventory to assess self-efficacy.</td>
<td>Monoi, S. O’Hanlon, N. and Diaz, K.</td>
<td>QT 12 item self-rating scales</td>
<td>Measuring changes in self-reported self-efficacy in students completing an online searching skills class</td>
<td>An instrument measuring online search self-efficacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-perceptions; self inventory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Types of Assessment by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reaction or “did they like it?”</td>
<td>Learning or “did they learn from it?” (short term: associated with as single session)</td>
<td>Behavior - changes the behavior (longer term: associated with a course)</td>
<td>Results - Long-term changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment type</td>
<td>• User surveys</td>
<td>• Objective testing</td>
<td>• Observed behaviors in using website</td>
<td>• Review of essays and critical writing; quality of student research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Faculty surveys</td>
<td>• Pre and post tests, criterion</td>
<td>• Essay review (rubric)</td>
<td>• Portfolios of research assignments over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-reports about confidence and comprehension</td>
<td>• Citation use</td>
<td>• Citation analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Library Assessment by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Results - Long-term changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Compared to Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Reaction</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>Results - Long-term changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL / Library Instruction</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Evaluation Practices (Twitchell, 2000)</td>
<td>86-100%</td>
<td>71-90%</td>
<td>43-83%</td>
<td>21-49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Evaluation Practices (McMurrer, 2000)</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the Model (generally)

- has been adapted in a variety of settings, including other types of higher-education settings
- considered classic
- considered archaic
Using the Model (libraries)

- one way to ORGANIZE how we think about evaluation of instruction
- shows value of evaluation at all four levels
- suggests the value of building evaluation from Level 1 to Level 4
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