

# One Librarian's Trash is Another's ...Artifact?: Methods for Assessing Instructional Design Performance

**Steven Hoover - Senior Assistant Librarian - Syracuse University Libraries**

## Purpose:

**Assessing instructional design artifacts can provide librarians with insight as to how to improve their instruction, identify areas of need for further professional development or training, and ultimately enhance the impact of their teaching on student learning. In order to provide substantive feedback regarding instructional design performance in the context of an instruction-focused internship program for LIS graduate students, a variety of methodologies and tools were employed. While interns were the target population for this assessment effort, instruction librarians and coordinators should find that the methods and tools have direct applicability in professional practice.**

## Design/Methodology/Approach:

**First, instructional design criteria of interest were identified, including among others:**

- the assessability, developmental appropriateness, and transferability of learning outcomes for the session
- the degree of fidelity between the learning outcomes and the formative assessments
- the feasibility of the instructional strategies identified
- the clarity of links made between session learning outcomes and programmatic outcomes or goals

**A three-column rubric was created as well as a small set of other quantitative measures to be taken. Next, instructional design artifacts of potential value were identified. As part of the process of identifying artifacts, a previously-existing lesson plan template was modified and distributed to interns in order to facilitate the collection of the most important data. Then, the lesson plan templates and other related artifacts were collected before and/or after instruction sessions took place over the course of the semester. Finally, data was extracted from the artifacts and analyzed in order provide educative feedback and make improvements to both the assessment and training processes. The assessment cycle has been completed twice as of this writing.**

## Findings:

- Data collection and analysis has taken place for two cohorts of interns. The results have enabled several positive outcomes for the interns and the internship program as a whole, including:**
- opportunities to provide robust educative feedback to the interns at point of need
  - improvements to the instructional design and assessment training provided
  - the establishment of clearly defined categories of performance that can serve as teaching tools
  - two detailed assessment reports for campus stakeholders regarding student performance against key programmatic learning outcomes

## Practical Implications/Value:

**All instruction librarians and coordinators can use the methods and tools as described or easily adapt them to meet local needs. For those responsible for programmatic oversight or the provision of professional development to librarians who teach, the methods and materials outlined will be useful as both evaluative and teaching tools.**

Section 4: Rubric Assessment of Intern-Generated Learning Outcomes (N = 13)

|                             | Proficient  | Beginning  | Developing  |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Assessability               | LO describes a distinct action or behavior that is directly observable and/or measurable  | LO describes action that is observable and/or measurable but is a compound outcome (describes a combination of actions and behaviors) or would be difficult to measure directly          | LO describes action that is not directly measurable and observable  |
| Assessment Identified       | Ties the LO to an assessment that is a reasonable measure/opportunity for demonstration and is feasible for the situation in question | Ties the LO to an assessment but the assessment may either not be feasible in the context/situation or the assessment does not adequately measure or address the LO                      | No assessment identified  |
| Mapping                     | N ≤ 5 items mapped. All linkages clear to reader.   | N ≤ 5 items mapped. Majority of linkages clear to reader, but some unclear.  | N > 5 items mapped (rendering the linkages unclear by virtue of sheer volume). OR Majority of linkages (N ≤ 5) unclear to reader.   |
| Developmentally Appropriate | It is reasonable to expect the subject to be able to fulfill the outcome at this point in their development                           | Aspects of the learning outcome are not reasonable to expect given the current level of subject development (scale or scope inappropriate as written, but behavior itself is reasonable) | It is unreasonable to expect the subject to be able to fulfill the outcome at this point in their development or the outcome is overly simplistic and therefore inappropriate |
| Transferability             | The LO describes actions or behaviors that are applicable outside of a library-centric context  | The LO describes actions or behaviors that are transferable outside of the internship, but not outside of a library-centric context  | The LO describes actions or behaviors in terms of the situation at hand or including specific constraints   |

Section 5: Rubric Assessment of Intern-Generated Lesson Plans for Instruction Sessions

|   | Proficient  | Beginning  | Developing  |
|---|---|--|---|
| Assessability (Per LO)  | LO describes a distinct action or behavior that is directly observable and/or measurable  | LO describes action that is observable and/or measurable but is a compound outcome (describes a combination of actions and behaviors) or would be difficult to measure directly  | LO describes action that is not directly measurable and observable  |
| Assessment Identified (Per LO)  | Ties the LO to an assessment that is a reasonable measure/opportunity for demonstration and is feasible for the situation in question   | Ties the LO to an assessment but the assessment may either not be feasible in the context/situation or the assessment does not adequately measure or address the LO  | No assessment identified  |
| Instructional Strategy Identified (Per LO)  | Ties the LO to an instructional strategy that adequately addresses the outcome (taking the nature of the LO into account) and is feasible for the instructional situation in question | Ties the LO to an instructional strategy but the strategy may either not be feasible in the instructional context/situation or the strategy does not adequately address the LO   | No instructional strategy identified  |
| Developmentally Appropriate? (Per LO)   | It is reasonable to expect the subject to be able to fulfill the outcome at this point in their development   | Aspects of the learning outcome are not reasonable to expect given the current level of subject development (scale or scope inappropriate as written, but behavior itself is reasonable)   | It is unreasonable to expect the subject to be able to fulfill the outcome at this point in their development or the outcome is overly simplistic and therefore inappropriate |
| Transferability? (Per LO)   | The LO describes transferable actions or behaviors that are applicable outside of a library-centric context   | The LO describes actions or behaviors that are transferable outside of the situation or assignment at hand, but not outside of a library-centric context   | The LO describes actions or behaviors in terms of the situation or assignment at hand or including specific constraints   |
| Timing (Per Section)  | Adequate time allotted for section in question based on description of teaching activity or assessment (neither too much nor too little time)   | Too much or too little time allotted for the given activity or assessment as described (obvious level of discrepancy)  | No time allotment indicated for the section   |
| Structure (Once Per Plan) (This may be compound in current form)                          | Includes introductions, transitions throughout, and closings to guide learners. Obvious evidence of logical structure.  | May include some examples of introductions, transitions, and closings, but not used consistently throughout. Evidence of structure, but progression is difficult to follow or understand from POV of reviewer  | No introductions, transitions, or closings. No obvious or identifiable structure  |
| Relevance (Per LO) (Ties to idea from LRB, did the most crucial LOs make F2F class time?) | Students will need to be able demonstrate LO to be successful in a key area of the assignment or situation in question  | LO describes student action that is of possible relevance to the assignment or situation in question, but not the key aspects or areas of the assignment or situation. (The information that is nice to know, but not absolutely crucial for success.) | LO irrelevant in assignment or situation in question (can still have value in a larger context, but LO is superfluous)  |
| Mapping   | N ≤ 5 items mapped. All linkages clear to reader.   | N ≤ 5 items mapped. Majority of linkages clear to reader, but some unclear.  | N > 5 items mapped (rendering the linkages unclear by virtue of sheer volume). OR Majority of linkages (N ≤ 5) unclear to reader.   |

