

Weber State University
Biennial Report on Assessment of Student Learning

Cover Page

Department/Program: Teaching and Information Services Department
Academic Year of Report: 2020/21 (covering Summer 2019 through Spring 2021)
Date Submitted: Nov. 15, 2021
Report author: Nicole Beatty, Chair of Teaching and Information Services

Contact Information:

Phone: 801-626-7034

Email: nicolebeatty@weber.edu

We have updated the Institutional Effectiveness website, which includes an update for each program page. All Biennial Assessment and Program Review reports will now be available on a single page. Please review your page for completeness and accuracy, and indicate on the list below the changes that need to be made. Access your program page from the top-level [results](#) page. Select the appropriate college and then your program from the subsequent page.

A. Mission Statement

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

The Teaching and Information Services Department is central to Weber State University's educational mission. We provide research services and information literacy instruction to support the lifelong learning goals of students, faculty, staff, and the wider local community. Opportunities for engagement with information literacy are available through research consultations, research help, course-integrated library instruction sessions, and teaching information literacy courses. Each of these services promote equity, diversity, inclusion, and empowerment through access to information.

B. Student Learning Outcomes

(please note the addition of certificate and associate credential learning outcomes)

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

C. Curriculum (please note, we are using Google Sheets for this section so that updates are easier to make)

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current (you may request access to the Google Sheet if that is easiest, or we can make the updates):

D. Program and Contact Information

Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

Contact Information for the Teaching and Information Services Department:

Nicole Beatty, Chair of Teaching and Information Services

Stewart Library, 226

801-626-7034

E. Assessment Plan

We have traditionally asked programs to report on outcome achievement by students at the course level. We are encouraging programs to consider alternative assessment approaches and plans that are outcome-based as opposed to course-based, though course-based assessment can continue to be used. A complete assessment plan will include a timeline (which courses or which outcomes will be assessed each year), an overall assessment strategy (course-based, outcome-based, reviewed juries, ePortfolio, field tests, etc.), information about how you will collect and review data, and information about how the department/program faculty are engaged in the assessment review.

 Information is current; no changes required.

Update if not current:

The Teaching and Information Services Department is in the process of trying to formulate a course-based assessment plan that investigates the learning outcomes at the assignment level. In 2021, we implemented using the EOL grid to do assignment based assessment. You will see how we approached it in this report. We are hoping that by the Spring of 2022, each instructor will incorporate rubrics that are connected to outcomes for each assignment in their courses so that each course can be assessed at the assignment level and we can make adjustments based on findings. The learning outcomes for the following courses will be assessed every year in September. The courses include LIBS 1704, LIBS 2604/EDUC 2604, LIBS 2804, and LIBS 2904/HTHS 2904. In this report, the integrated LIBS 1704/ENGL 2010 pilot courses were also assessed the same way. In the fall of 2021, this course became ENGL 2015 and now has integrated learning outcomes. Going forward, the Teaching and Information Services Department will work with the Department of English to set up an assessment plan for the new learning outcomes. We have four overarching learning goals, each with measurable learning outcomes. The targeted performance for each of the measurable learning outcomes is 73% or higher. Please see our goals and outcomes:

LEARNING GOAL OUTCOME 1: RESEARCH AS AN EXPLORATORY PROCESS: Students will use tools and techniques to address information needs while understanding that the research process is often iterative and nonlinear.

1. Learning outcome: Understand information needs and formulate focused research questions or thesis statements based on the scope of the project.
2. Learning outcome: Use and refine different search techniques appropriately, matching information needs and search strategies to appropriate search tools.
3. Learning outcome 3: Understand that the research process is often iterative and non-linear.

LEARNING GOAL OUTCOME 2: SCHOLARSHIP AS COMMUNICATION: Students will understand that scholarly communication is a conversation between creators of information with a variety of backgrounds and perspectives.

1. Learning outcome: Identify and describe various resource types and formats, recognizing their value and contribution to scholarly communication.
2. Learning outcome: Recognize that a given scholarly work may not represent the only or even the majority perspective on an issue.
3. Learning outcome 3: Recognize the value of information literacy outside the academic setting.

LEARNING GOAL OUTCOME 3: CRITICALLY EVALUATE INFORMATION: It is important to evaluate the quality of all information based on its context.

1. Learning outcome 1: Define different types of authority, such as subject expertise or special experience, and use research tools and indicators to evaluate the credibility of authors and sources.
2. Learning outcome 2: Recognize that authoritative content may be packaged formally or informally and may include sources of all media types, and that information may be perceived differently based on the format in which it is packaged, but all sources should be critically evaluated.

LEARNING GOAL OUTCOME 4: ETHICAL USE OF INFORMATION: Students will understand that legal and ethical standards are important to the dissemination, retention, and study of information sources.

1. Learning outcome: Avoid plagiarism by identifying the different types and by giving credit to the original ideas of others through proper attribution and citation.
2. Learning outcome: Articulate the purpose and characteristics of ethical and legal issues surrounding the use of information, such as copyright, fair use, open access, Creative Commons, and the public domain.

F. Student Achievement

- i. Percent of students completing degrees after 90 credit hours within 2 years and a reflection on that metric (this information can be accessed on the Program Review Undergraduate dashboard – tab labeled, “Time to Grad from 90CH – please reach out to oi@weber.edu if you need help with this metric). What department initiatives are in place to address this?

Currently, we do not have a degree program.

Evidence of Learning

Since our classes are general education courses, assessment needs to continue to be reported at the course level and we will be using the more narrative based format supported by evidence of learning grids for each course being assessed.

Name: Teaching and Information Services Department, Stewart Library

Student Learning Outcomes being assessed:

LEARNING GOAL OUTCOME 1: RESEARCH AS AN EXPLORATORY PROCESS: Students will use tools and techniques to address information needs while understanding that the research process is often iterative and nonlinear.

1. Learning outcome: Understand information needs and formulate focused research questions or thesis statements based on the scope of the project.
2. Learning outcome: Use and refine different search techniques appropriately, matching information needs and search strategies to appropriate search tools.
3. Learning outcome 3: Understand that the research process is often iterative and non-linear.

LEARNING GOAL OUTCOME 2: SCHOLARSHIP AS COMMUNICATION: Students will understand that scholarly communication is a conversation between creators of information with a variety of backgrounds and perspectives.

1. Learning outcome: Identify and describe various resource types and formats, recognizing their value and contribution to scholarly communication.
2. Learning outcome: Recognize that a given scholarly work may not represent the only or even the majority perspective on an issue.
3. Learning outcome 3: Recognize the value of information literacy outside the academic setting.

LEARNING GOAL OUTCOME 3: CRITICALLY EVALUATE INFORMATION: It is important to evaluate the quality of all information based on its context.

1. Learning outcome 1: Define different types of authority, such as subject expertise or special experience, and use research tools and indicators to evaluate the credibility of authors and sources.
2. Learning outcome 2: Recognize that authoritative content may be packaged formally or informally and may include sources of all media types, and that information may be perceived differently based on the format in which it is packaged, but all sources should be critically evaluated.

LEARNING GOAL OUTCOME 4: ETHICAL USE OF INFORMATION: Students will understand that legal and ethical standards are important to the dissemination, retention, and study of information sources.

1. Learning outcome: Avoid plagiarism by identifying the different types and by giving credit to the original ideas of others through proper attribution and citation.
2. Learning outcome: Articulate the purpose and characteristics of ethical and legal issues surrounding the use of information, such as copyright, fair use, open access, Creative Commons, and the public domain.

Courses addressing these outcomes from which student data will be gathered. For each course, indicate the level to which the outcome is addressed in the courses (introduced, developed, applied, mastered/assessed) – we suggest identifying at least two, but no more than four courses for this report:

Summer 2019:

LIBS 1704 CRN 11825

LIBS 1704 CRN 11826

Fall 2019:

LIBS 1704 CRN 23861

LIBS 1704 CRN 24235/ENGL 2010 CRN 21758 (course housed under CRN 21758)

Spring 2020:

LIBS 1704 33347/ENGL 2010 CRN 32478 (The Canvas course can be found under CRN 32478)

LIBS 2904/HTHS 2904 CRN 33560

Summer 2020:

LIBS 1704 CRN 11270

LIBS 2904/HTHS 2904 CRN 11523

Fall 2020:

LIBS 2604/EDUC 2604 CRN 22414

LIBS 2804 CRN 21593

Spring 2021:

LIBS 1704 2804 CRN 34304

LIBS 2604/EDUC 2604 CRN 33752

Primary method(s) of measurement being used in each course with a description about why that measurement was selected:

Summer 2019:

LIBS 1704 CRN 11826

The primary method of measurements for this course were quizzes over course material and assignments that created each part of the signature assignment. This method was chosen because each assignment and quiz covers different learning outcomes.

LIBS 1704 CRN 11833

The primary methods of measurements for this course were assignments, quizzes, discussions, and the signature assignment. These methods were chosen because each learning goal and outcome are scaffolded and addressed throughout the course.

Fall 2019:

LIBS 1704 CRN 23861

The primary method of measurements for this course were quizzes over course material and assignments that created each part of the signature assignment. This method was chosen because each assignment and quiz covers different learning outcomes.

LIBS 1704 CRN 24235/ENGL 2010 CRN 21758 (course housed under CRN 21578)

The primary method of measurements for the LIBS 1704 portion of the course assignments and the signature assignment. These measurements were chosen because the assignments were scaffolded to lead up to the signature assignment, which was a research paper.

Spring 2020:

LIBS 1704 33347/ENGL 2010 CRN 32478 (the Canvas course can be found under CRN 32478)

The primary measurements for this course include assignments, research paper 1, research paper 2, and the signature assignment. These measurements were chosen because each LIBS 1704 assignment demonstrates the learning outcomes and were applied to research paper 1, research paper 2, and the signature assignment.

LIBS 2904/HTHS 2904 CRN 33560

The primary measurements for this course include assignments and a reflective essay that is the signature assignment. These methods were chosen because each assignment corresponds to different learning outcomes which build up to the signature assignment.

Summer 2020:

LIBS 1704 CRN 11270

The primary measurements for this course were assignments and the signature assignment which was an annotated bibliography. These methods were chosen because each assignment is connected to different learning outcomes and are scaffolded to lead up to the signature assignment.

LIBS 2904/HTHS 2904 CRN 11523

The primary measurements for this course include assignments and a reflective essay that is the signature assignment. These measurements were chosen because each assignment corresponds to different learning outcomes which build up to the signature assignment.

Fall 2020:

LIBS 2604/EDUC 2604 CRN 22414

The primary methods of measurement were quizzes, assignments, and the signature assignment. These were chosen because different quizzes and assignments are connected to different learning outcomes which build up to the signature assignment.

LIBS 2804 CRN 21593

The primary methods of measurement were quizzes, course assignments, and the signature assignment. These were chosen because different quizzes and assignments are connected to different learning outcomes which build up to the signature assignment.

Spring 2021:

LIBS 2804 CRN 34304

The primary methods of measurement were quizzes, course assignments, and the signature assignment. These were chosen because different quizzes and assignments are connected to different learning outcomes which build up to the signature assignment.

LIBS 2604/EDUC 2604 CRN 33752

The primary methods of measurement were quizzes, assignments, and the signature assignment. These were chosen because different quizzes and assignments are connected to different learning outcomes which build up to the signature assignment.

Target performance for each measure (please provide the reasoning for the identified target):

Each measurable learning outcome has a targeted performance of 73% or higher. This target was chosen because students must earn a grade of 73% to get the information literacy credit required for graduation. This is consistent among all of our courses.

Actual performance on each measure:

This report measures twelve courses in total, all of which had the same learning goals and outcomes. The courses include LIBS 1704, LIBS 1704/ENGL 2010 (integrated courses before they became ENGL 2015), LIBS 2905/HTHS 2904, LIBS 2604/EDUC 2604, and LIBS 2804. A chart was made to show each learning goal and the learning outcomes as well as the actual performance on each learning outcome (see Appendix A).

For all courses, in Learning Goal 1(LG1), Learning outcome 1(LO1), scores exceeded the 73% target and ranged from 79%-100%. In LG 1, LO2 scores exceeded 73% target and ranged from 80%-100%. In LG1, LO3 scores ranged from 31%-100% (the lowest score was on a pre-test for LIBS 2604/EDUC 2604 and the post-test score was 72% which fell below the target. This will be discussed in the interpretation of the findings). In LG 2, LO1 scores ranged from 80%-100%, exceeding the target. In LG2, LO2 scores ranged from 80%-100%, also exceeding the target. In LG2, LO3 the scores ranged from 71% (an average score on a quiz that did not meet the 73% target)-96%. In LG3, LO1 scores exceeded the target and ranged from 80.74%-99%. In LG3, LO2 scores ranged from 83%-100%, which exceeds the target. In LG4, LO1 scores ranged from 72% (a score that is just shy of the target on a quiz, where scores later improved in the course),-96.97%. In LG4, LO2 scores ranged from 0% (stemming from one class not measuring the outcome)-97%.

For more information please see the Evidence of Learning Grids submitted by the instructors (Appendix B).

Interpretation and/or reflection on findings:

This can be a holistic narrative, considering the outcomes across courses collectively. What did you learn from the evaluation? Are you satisfied with the measurements? With student performance? Are your targets reasonable, or too high/too low?

In reflecting upon this evaluation, one of the things that stands out is that most instructors take a holistic approach to teaching the learning outcomes and that each outcome is scaffolded into the courses through quizzes and/or assignments and demonstrated in the signature assignment. What is interesting to me is the variation in how many assignments include different outcomes. Some instructors have one measure while others have four measures. As a department, I wonder if we need to discuss how much or how little each outcome is measured? Another thing I noticed is that while we all tried to do percentages for the evidence of learning grids, not all of us did this the same way. Some people did this by average score on assignments and some people gave percentages of students who met, exceeded, or did not meet the 73% target for the outcomes. Since this is our first attempt at filling out the grid, it makes sense that we might do it differently but as a department, we need to know what we are measuring.

Consistency will help ensure that we get more useful data. I am satisfied with the measures being used and I am happy to see that the learning outcomes are covered in almost all of the courses. However, LIBS 1704 CRN 11270 did not cover LG, LO2 but the instructor has remedied this situation by adding an assignment. I think the target of 73% is reasonable as a C should earn the graduation requirement. In terms of student performance, most of what we are doing appears to be working but there are some areas of concern. These include lower scores on the signature assignment than the assignments leading up to them. This was the case with parts of the signature assignments in LIBS 1704 CRN 11826, LIBS 1704 CRN 24235/ENGL 2010 CRN 21758, and LIBS 2904/HTHS 2094 CRN 33560. In CRN 11826, this is attributed to unclear directions in the signature assignment and students using natural language searching rather than employing the search techniques taught in the course readings. With LIBS 1704 CRN 24235/ENGL 2010 CRN 21758, this was one of the first integrated courses piloted and the instructor believes that the integration was not there, yet. Students may have been confused about how to apply the information literacy skills to the research paper. Since this course was taught, assignments have been better integrated with ways for the students to apply the assignments to all of their research papers. With better integration and students applying information literacy skills earlier on with research paper 1, LIBS 1704 33347/ENGL 2010 CRN 32478 yielded better results on the signature assignment. In LIBS 2904/HTHS 2094 CRN 33560, the second part of the reflective essay which is the signature assignment required students to write about fair use and creative commons. The instructor felt that they may have been unprepared to do so with just the course readings. They added a quiz to help the students go through this section of the reading and be able to better apply it to the signature assignment. In both LIBS 2804 courses, student scores consistently improved from quizzes over the reading to doing the assignments. This seems to have resulted in the learning outcomes being better grasped by the time the students got to the signature assignment. With LIBS 2604/EDUC 2604, the instructor would like to revise a particular part of the textbook to provide more examples for students to learn how to construct search statements as well as an instructional video.

While we have some work to do as a department to construct a consistent assessment tool, I think the evidence of learning grid is a good tool and would like to use it again after we talk about what we actually want to measure. I think this will help instructors think about the measurements and assignments used in their courses and help inform them on how to make effective changes.

Using the results – what’s next?

Given what you have learned from this evaluation, what are your next steps? Are there additional data that should be considered along with student results, such as accreditation/professional updates, or feedback from the program's advisory group?

The next steps are for us to clarify what we are measuring with the Evidence of Learning Grids. Some of us measured average scores and some of us measured % of students and the data would be a lot more clear if we were measuring the same thing department wide. Additionally, we need to work on setting up rubrics that are tied to the course outcomes in our classes. Some members of the department have done this while others have not. This will help us start to develop a formal assessment program. We will continue to involve the Office of Institutional Effectiveness with our efforts and seek out advice as needed.

How will changes be evaluated? How will you close-the-loop to ensure changes have the desired impact?

Changes will be evaluated by using the evidence of learning grids which track specific issues in courses. Additionally, as a department, we need to put a formal assessment plan in place which will also help us determine how our courses are impacting student success. We are also asking for data on race and gender regarding our courses to see if they pose barriers to completion for students. All of these measures will help us track changes that need to be made in our courses and help us ensure that the students are getting the best possible information literacy education.

Appendix A:

Actual Performance on Learning Goals and Learning Outcomes by Course:

Class	Semester/Year	LG1/LO 1	LG1/LO 2	LG1/LO 3	LG2/LO 1	LG2/LO 2	LG2/LO 3	LG3/LO 1	LG3/LO 2	LG4/LO1	LG4/LO2
LIBS 1704 CRN 11826	Summer 2019	98%	98%	100%	94%	94%	93%	84%	84%	99%	99%
		93%	93%		93%	93%	95%	93%	93%	88%	88%
		88%	84%		92%	84%	99%	95%	95%		
			92%		95%	95%		99%	99%		
LIBS 1704 CRN 11833	Summer 2019	95%	87%	88%	88%	83%	88%	83%	83%	78%	88%
		94%	80%		80%			93%	93%	97%	97%
											73%
LIBS 1704 CRN 23861	Fall 2019	98%	98%	100%	95%	95%	94%	85%	85%	99%	99%
											88%

		97%	97%			97%				88%	
		91%	85%			97%	85%	95%	94%	94%	
			94%			94%	95%	98%	95%	95%	
						95%	98%		98%	98%	
LIBS 1704 CRN 24235/ENGL 2010 CRN 21758 (course housed under CRN 21758)	Fall 2019	95% 79%	84% 82% 93%	84% 82% 93%	84% 82% 93%	93% 79%	79%	84% 82% 93%	84% 82% 93%	87% 79%	87%
LIBS 1704 33347/ENGL 2010 CRN 32478	Spring 2020	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%	86%
LIBS 2904/HTHS 2904 CRN 33560	Spring 2020	100%	90.5% 85.3%	91%	85.5% 100%	85.5% 100%	92% 91%	90% 83.8%	88.5%	85.0% 79.38 91.11%	62.22%
LIBS 2904/HTHS 2094 CRN 11523	Summer 2020	100%	84.8% 94.29%	94.29%	90.48% 100%	90.48% 100%	95% 94.29%	80.74% 94.29%	100%	86.67% 96.97% 95%	95%
LIBS 1704 CRN 11270	Summer 2020	91% 88%	90% 91%	95%	98% 91%	85% 91%	85% 91%	85% 91%	85% 91%	85% 91%	0%

LIBS 2804 CRN 21593	Fall 2020	82% 86% 96%	82% 96%	71% 96%	82% 96%	71% 96%	71% 96%	84% 87% 96% 92%	84% 87% 96%	72% 93% 92%	72% 93%
LIBS 2604/EDUC 2604 CRN 22414	Fal 2020	100%	84%	94%	92%	97%	92%	92%	94%	94%	94%
LIBS 2804 CRN 34304	Spring 2021	87% 93% 88%	87% 88%	75% 96%	87% 88%	75% 88%	75% 88%	87% 91% 82% 88% 90%	87% 91% 82% 88%	85% 88% 90%	85% 88%
LIBD 2604/EDUC 2604 CRN 33752 & 33753	Spring 2021	100%	87% 80% 92% 100%	31% 72%	92% 96%	85%	89%	92% 89% 92% 100% 92% 92%	96% 87% 83%	81% 84%	94% 91%

Appendix B: Evidence of Learning Grids Submitted by Instructors:

[Evidence of Learning Grids Folder](#)

Additional narrative (optional – use as much space as needed):

Report due 11/15/2021

Appendix C.

Most departments or programs receive a number of recommendations from their Five/Seven-Year Program Review processes. This page provides a means of updating progress towards the recommendations the department/program is enacting.

Date of Program Review: 2019/2020	Recommendation	Progress Description
Recommendation 1	Text of recommendation	#### +1 progress
Create a mission	Establish a mission for the program. Clarify your goals/mission in regards to general education and subject areas with a mind towards sustainability and equity across both.	2021, The Teaching and Information Services Mission Statement is as follows: The Teaching and Information Services Department is central to Weber State University's educational mission. We provide research services and information literacy instruction to support the lifelong learning goals of students, faculty, staff, and the wider local community. Opportunities for engagement with information literacy are available through research consultations, research help, course-integrated library instruction sessions, and teaching information literacy courses. Each of these services promote equity, diversity, inclusion, and empowerment through access to information.
Recommendation 2	Text of recommendation	Progress/Description
Look for funding to support the collaboration with English for integrating LIBS content.	Look for sources of funding (such as RSPG) to support the collaboration with English for integrating LIBS content	2021, While we have not sought out RSPG funding, we began having regular training sessions for faculty teaching the integrated courses which help support the course. These sessions go over the course shell and the learning outcomes. The training also allows the librarians and the English faculty time to sit down and discuss how they want to plan their courses. The

		training has been a huge help in eliminating some of the anxieties about partnering because both parties have a designated time to discuss the course content.
		2021, in collaboration with the Department of English, we worked to schedule the integrated course, now called, ENGL 2015, with the same pairs for both fall and spring semesters. This also relieves some of the anxieties about having time to prepare our courses because we can work with the same people for two semesters.
Recommendation 3	Text of recommendation	Progress/Description
Scaffold the integrated course.	Build a scaffold to make the English integration easier so each and every partnership is not starting from scratch	2021, in working with the Department of English, we now have a course shell which allows faculty teaching the integrated course to have a place to find all of the ENGL 2010 and all of the LIBS 1704 content. Partners can still set up their courses in the order they prefer but it is definitely helpful to have the content all in one place. Now we are working on refining the course shell so there is an example of how to teach the course from beginning to end which will help new instructors be able to adopt the course more easily.
Recommendation 4	Text of recommendation	
	Librarians and instructors could consider partnering more, sharing expertise, rather than owning information literacy	2020-2021, in the last year, we have been working to better communicate with the Department of English on the integrated course. We have also been looking at our general instruction program, which involves teaching one-shot library

		instruction sessions for ENGL 2010 courses, ENGL 1010 courses, and FYE courses. We are in the process of training our student research consultants to teach FYE courses which helps us be able to share our expertise as well as share information literacy. The chair of our department has set up a meeting with the Director of Composition to discuss the needs of ENGL 1010 since the English Department is currently developing a new curriculum for that course. With the growth of the integrated course, we are also partnering more and sharing information literacy. This is ongoing work.
Recommendation 5	Text of recommendation	Progress/Description
Make work sustainable.	Explore what librarians will give up	This is an ongoing process. We are working to give-up teaching some of the general instruction sessions. This will be done by having the student research consultants teach library instruction sessions for FYE. We are teaching less than half of the amount of library instruction sessions for ENGL 2010, due to the integrated course. However, we still have work to do.
Recommendation 6	Text of recommendation	Progress/Description
Re-envision the roles of librarians with the integrated course and let go of the ownership of the credit.	Consider re-visualizing librarian's roles in the library integration with English 2010; focused sessions with librarians, high collaboration at curricular level, perhaps less "ownership" of the credit (seems unsustainable).	In 2021, we have worked hard to ensure that the integrated course instructors are better supported and provided partners with more training and time to get together to plan their courses. The Department of English now houses the integrated course (ENGL 2015) so they technically "own" the credit for the course.

Recommendation 7	Text of recommendation	Progress/Description
Work on personal and group identity.	Move slowly. Discuss personal and group identity. If you shift away from sole ownership of for-credit IL, what does this allow you to do instead? What support do you need to do that?	2020-2021, this is an ongoing process and we are moving slowly. We have had several group conversations about teaching information literacy and our current practices. We have discussed whether ENGL 2015 is a better experience for the students than taking a stand alone LIBS 1704 course. Our next department meeting is going to focus on thinking more about LIBS 1704 being a bottleneck course and what we might do if we focused more on ENGL 2015.

Appendix D.

Please provide the following information about the full-time *and adjunct faculty* contracted by your department during the last academic year (summer through spring). Gathering this information each year will help with the headcount reporting that must be done for the final Five Year Program Review document that is shared with the State Board of Regents.

Faculty Headcount	2018-18	2019-20	2020-21
With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution)			
Full-time Tenured	2	3	4
Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track)	8	7	6
Part-time and adjunct	8	8	8
With Master's Degrees			
Full-time Tenured	2	3	4
Full-time Non-Tenured	8	7	6
Part-time and adjunct	8	8	8
With Bachelor's Degrees			
Full-time Tenured	2	3	4
Full-time Non-tenured	8	7	6
Part-time and adjunct	8	8	8
Other			
Full-time Tenured	N/A	N/A	N/A
Full-time Non-tenured	N/A	N/A	N/A
Part-time	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Headcount Faculty			
Full-time Tenured	3	4	4
Full-time Non-tenured	8	7	6
Part-time	9	8	8

Please respond to the following questions.

- 1) Review and comment on the trend of minority students enrolling in your classes (particularly lower-division, GEN Ed) and in your programs.
While we know that students of color enroll in our courses, we have never collected data on this particular demographic. We are in the process of working with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to get data regarding our courses which will include data on race and gender. We may have more to say in the next report.
- 2) What support (from enrollment services, advising, first-year transition office, access & diversity, etc.) do you need to help you recruit and retain students?
While we don't have a program to recruit students for, we could use help from all of the offices to let students know about the information literacy credit and the different ways to satisfy the graduation requirement. It would be great if the students could get into our classes earlier in their educational careers. The integrated course has helped with this some and will continue to do so if we can teach more classes.
- 3) We have invited you to re-think your program assessment. What strategies are you considering? What support or help would you like?
The Teaching and Information Services Department is considering linking our rubrics for our assignments to our outcomes so it will be easier to get the data at a course/assignment level. We also need to clarify the Evidence of Learning Grid as instructors interpreted how to fill it out differently and data collection would be easier if we made this more consistent. However, we need to talk more with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to make sure we are doing this correctly.
- 4) Finally, we are supporting our Concurrent Enrollment accreditation process. Does your program offer concurrent enrollment classes? If so, have you been able to submit the information requested from the Concurrent Enrollment office? Staff from OIE will reach out to you in the next few months to assist in finalizing that data submission as well as gather information for concurrent Gen Ed assessment.
We offer Concurrent Enrollment Courses. They have all been integrated courses and this year, they are now called ENGL 2015. We were approached by the Concurrent Enrollment Office in August to send them information on the training sessions we have been doing for the integrated courses and what is now ENGL 2015. We sent them the information.