

ASSESSMENT MATRIX



PROGRAM OR SCHOOL	Master of Library and Information Science		
Assessment Coordinator for Program or School	Name: Martin Weiss	Email : mbw@pitt.edu	Phone: 4-9430
Program or School Mission Statement	The mission of the School of Information Sciences is to support and advance the broader education, research and service mission of the University by educating students, furthering knowledge, and contributing our expertise to advance humankind's progress through information.		
Program or School Goals	<p>The Library and Information Science Degree Program offers a professional degree at the master's level for students who have earned a baccalaureate-degree to enter the information professions as librarians or archivists. Upon completion of the degree, graduates will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draw upon the ethics, values and history of library and information science and other related disciplines. 2. Apply the principles of information management. 3. Advance the creative and ethical applications of information technologies. 4. Apply the principles of management to various functions in information environments. 5. Plan, implement, evaluate and advocate for information services to meet the needs of diverse users. 6. Promote intellectual freedom and equity of access to information. 7. Understand and apply research in library and information science. 8. Demonstrate a commitment to the advancement of the information professions through advocacy, continuing education and lifelong learning. <p>These eight outcomes for graduates will be discussed and revised in the Fall 2012 semester.</p>		
	<p>All students in the 36-credit MLIS program are required to complete two core courses: LIS 2000 Understanding Information and LIS 2600 Introduction to Information Technologies. Depending on which of the eight specializations the student has selected, the student takes other required courses and a choice of electives.</p> <p>The faculty continues to consider requiring that graduating students prepare a portfolio of their work demonstrating how they are meeting these eight outcomes. A Portfolio of Demonstrated Competencies and an electronic professional portfolio were required of each student completing the School Library Certification Program. Students in LIS 2330 Marketing prepared a portfolio of work samples. No further discussion on the use of portfolios took place in AY12.</p>		

Learning Outcomes <i>What will students know and be able to do when they graduate?</i>	Assessment Methods <i>How will the outcome be measured? Who will be assessed, when, and how often?</i>	Standards of Comparison <i>How well should students be able to do on the assessment?</i>	Interpretation of Results <i>What do the data show?</i>	Use of Results/Action Plan <i>Who reviewed the finding? What changes were made after reviewing the results?</i>
<p>First Student Learning Outcome</p> <p>Based on MLIS Student Outcome 7: Understand and apply research in library and information science.</p> <p>A student learning outcome in core course LIS 2000 Understanding Information maps to MLIS Student Outcome 7: Students will be able to write a comparative analysis of a publication from the professional or research literature on information and assess the author's findings by using supporting examples from the text.</p>	<p>Using a faculty-developed rubric, two faculty members who do not teach this course examine a representative sample of essays from students enrolled in LIS 2000 Understanding Information in which students wrote a 2,500-word comparative analysis of a document from the LIS professional literature or from the LIS research literature.</p> <p>The papers of approximately 20% of the students who completed the course were included in the assessment. (In Fall Term 2009, 209 students were registered; 20% = 42)</p> <p>Rubric used by assessors: Exceeds expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric = 3</p> <p>Meets expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric = 2</p> <p>Does not meet expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric = 1</p>	<p>85% of the sampled comparative analyses written by students in the Fall Term LIS 2000 course in odd numbered years will meet or exceed expectations identified in the rubric of demonstrating critical writing using a rubric rating of 2 or 3, understanding of research findings and using examples from the text to support critical opinion.</p>	<p>Assessment was made by two LIS faculty members who did not teach this course. These faculty members assessed 29 papers selected in a representative sample from among the 147 students who registered for and completed the course LIS 2000 in Fall Term 2011</p> <p>Of these 29 papers assessed, the two faculty found that:</p> <p>10 papers exceeded expectations (34%) 18 papers met expectations (62%) 1 papers did not meet expectations (3%)</p> <p>97% of the papers assessed met or exceeded the expectations, thus exceeding the standard of comparison set by the LIS faculty of 85%.</p>	<p>This assessment was reviewed by the Program Chair and will be used in the coming academic year as faculty review the MLIS learning outcomes in preparation for the ALA reaccreditation visit in Spring 2013.</p> <p>The high success rate in this assessment suggests that the faculty should consider their increasing expectations of students and provide them with more challenging assignments. This will be a component in the forthcoming curriculum review.</p>

Learning Outcomes <i>What will students know and be able to do when they graduate?</i>	Assessment Methods <i>How will the outcome be measured? Who will be assessed, when, and how often?</i>	Standards of Comparison <i>How well should students be able to do on the assessment?</i>	Interpretation of Results <i>What do the data show?</i>	Use of Results/Action Plan <i>Who reviewed the finding? What changes were made after reviewing the results?</i>
<p>Second Student Learning Outcome</p> <p>Based on MLIS Student Outcome 2: Apply the principles of the information life cycle (selection, organization, dissemination and preservation).</p> <p>This outcome was modified by the LIS faculty based on the 2010 assessment process to: Apply the principles of information management</p> <p>A student outcome in core course LIS 2600 Introduction to Information Technology maps to MLIS Student Outcome 2: The student will be able to use research, collaborative and social networking tools to generate and to share content electronically through his or her blogs.</p>	<p>Using a faculty-developed rubric, two faculty members will examine a representative sample of projects from students enrolled in LIS 2600 Introduction to Information Technologies in which students use research and collaborative tools Jing, Zotero, and RefWorks to produce a learning module delivered from a network-based service.</p> <p>Rubric used by assessors: Exceeds expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric Rubric = 3</p> <p>Meets expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric Rubric = 2</p> <p>Does not meet expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric Rubric = 1</p> <p>The projects of approximately 20% of the students who completed the course will be included in the assessment.</p>	<p>85% of the sampled projects produced by students in LIS 2600 will meet or exceed expectations to demonstrate using screen-capture software, configuring a Web browser and producing a learning module delivered from a network-based service.</p>	<p>Assessment was made by two LIS faculty members who did not teach this course. These faculty members assessed electronic demonstrations by ten students selected as a representative sample from among the 33 students who registered for and completed the course LIS 2600 in Fall Term 2011.</p> <p>Of these 10 demonstrations assessed, the two faculty found that: 2 demonstrations exceeded expectations (20%) 8 demonstrations met expectations (80%) 0 demonstrations did not meet expectations (0%)</p> <p>100% of the demonstrations assessed met or exceeded the expectations, thus exceeding the standard of comparison set by the LIS faculty of 85%.</p> <p>All of the student demonstrations met the technical requirements; the two demonstrations that exceeded expectations did so because of the clarity and simplicity of the directions provided and the effectiveness of the oral communication skills of those students.</p>	<p>This assessment was reviewed by the Program Chair and will be used in the coming academic year as faculty review the MLIS learning outcomes in preparation for the ALA reaccreditation visit in Spring 2013.</p> <p>The high success rate in this assessment suggests that the faculty should consider their increasing expectations of students and provide them with more challenging assignments. This will be a component in the forthcoming curriculum review.</p>

Learning Outcomes <i>What will students know and be able to do when they graduate?</i>	Assessment Methods <i>How will the outcome be measured? Who will be assessed, when, and how often?</i>	Standards of Comparison <i>How well should students be able to do on the assessment?</i>	Interpretation of Results <i>What do the data show?</i>	Use of Results/Action Plan <i>Who reviewed the finding? What changes were made after reviewing the results?</i>
<p>Third Student Learning Outcome</p> <p>Based on MLIS Outcome 3: Advance the intelligent and ethical applications of information technologies</p> <p>This outcome was modified by the LIS faculty based on the 2010 Assessment Matrix process, the LIS faculty revised this outcome to: Advance the creative and ethical applications of information technologies.</p> <p>A student outcome in core course LIS 2000 Understanding Information maps to MLIS Student Outcome 3: Students will be able to Identify and explain the concepts of open access to information that illustrate socio-economic aspects.</p>	<p>Using a faculty-developed rubric, two faculty members who do not teach this course examine a representative sample of essays from students enrolled in LIS 2000 Understanding Information in which students read Lawrence Lessig's <i>Remix</i>, Yochai Benkler's <i>The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets & Freedom</i>, and Jessica Litman's <i>Digital Copyright</i> and write a 2,500-word essay explaining the socio-economic aspects of open access.</p> <p>Rubric used by assessors: Exceeds expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric Rubric = 3</p> <p>Meets expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric Rubric = 2</p> <p>Does not meet expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric Rubric = 1</p>	<p>85% of the sampled essays written by students in LIS 2000 will meet or exceed expectations to demonstrate an understanding of open access as related to socio-economic aspects.</p>	<p>Assessment is made by two LIS faculty members who do not teach this course. These faculty members assessed essays by 42 students selected in a representative sample from among the 209 students who registered for and completed the course LIS 2000 in Fall Term 2009 (20%).</p> <p>Of these 42 essays assessed, the two faculty found that: 2 demonstrations exceeded expectations (29%) 5 demonstrations met expectations (71%) 0 demonstrations did not meet expectations (0%)</p> <p>100% of the demonstrated assessed met or exceeded the expectations, thus exceeding the standard of comparison set by the LIS faculty of 85%.</p>	<p>This outcome was not assessed in 2012</p>

Learning Outcomes <i>What will students know and be able to do when they graduate?</i>	Assessment Methods <i>How will the outcome be measured? Who will be assessed, when, and how often?</i>	Standards of Comparison <i>How well should students be able to do on the assessment?</i>	Interpretation of Results <i>What do the data show?</i>	Use of Results/Action Plan <i>Who reviewed the finding? What changes were made after reviewing the results?</i>
<p>Fourth Student Learning Outcome</p> <p>This is a developing student learning outcome based on “Section 1: Student Elements of Global Competence” in the document <i>University of Pittsburgh International Plan</i>, 2009, p. 8.</p> <p>University Goal for Student Learning Outcome: “Understand the international dimensions of the discipline.”</p> <p>The LIS faculty needs to adapt its “Goals for Graduates of the MLIS Program” to reflect explicitly the global aspects of the information field. LIS by its nature is global and implicit in each goal for MLIS graduates is the understanding that these outcomes be applied in a global context.</p> <p>A student learning outcome In LIS 2000 Understanding Information maps to this goal:</p> <p>Students will be able to explain the international aspects of scholarly communication.</p>	<p>Using a faculty-developed rubric, two faculty members examined a representative sample of 1,500-word essays on the challenges of scholarly communication based on their reading of three books: Albert-Laszlo Barabasi’s <i>Linked: How Everything Is Connected to Everything Else and What It Means</i>; Christine Borgman’s <i>Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, Infrastructure, and the Internet</i>; and David Weinberger’s <i>Everything Is Miscellaneous: the Power of the New Digital Disorder</i>.</p> <p>The papers of approximately 20% of the students who complete the course were included in the assessment. (In Fall Term 2010, 167 students were registered; 20% = 34)</p> <p>Rubric used by assessors: Exceeds expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric Rubric = 3</p> <p>Meets expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric Rubric = 2</p> <p>Does not meet expectations as set forth in the instructor rubric Rubric = 1</p>	<p>85% of the sampled essays written by students in LIS 2000 will meet or exceed expectations to demonstrate an understanding of the international aspects of scholarly communication.</p>	<p>Assessment was made by two LIS faculty members who do not teach this course. These faculty members assessed essays by 37 students selected in a representative sample from among the 167 students who registered for and completed the course LIS 2000 in Fall Term 2010 (20%). In this case, the rubric focused solely on the student explaining international aspects of scholarly communication.</p> <p>Of these 37 essays assessed, the two faculty found that: 7 demonstrations exceeded expectations (19%) 13 demonstrations met expectations (35%) 17 demonstrations did not meet expectations of a global perspective (46%)</p> <p>54% of the demonstrated assessed met or exceeded the expectations, thus not meeting the standard of comparison set by the LIS faculty of 85%.</p>	<p>This outcome was not assessed in 2012</p>