DePaul University

Annual Assessment Report: Learning
Academic Year: 2018-2019

Date of Report Submission: July 8, 2019, revised September 13, 2019
Name of Department / Unit: University Library
Name of Contact Person: Morgen MacIntosh Hodgetts
Name of Person(s) completing report or contributing to the project: Morgen MacIntosh Hodgetts, Jennifer Schwartz, Ashley McMullin

Part I: Follow-Up on Last Year's Assessment Report Recommendations

During the 2017-2018 academic year, the library, along with departments across the university, revised our programmatic learning outcomes. For this reason, Part I of this report will focus on the 2016-2017 assessment report.

The 2016-2017 assessment project analyzed whether or not First Year Writing students were meeting the library learning outcome of "Strategize," which addresses the skills students need at the beginning stages of a research project. The recommendations from that project included: 1) revising the library worksheet to better assist students with their research questions at the early stages of research, when we encounter them in the library; 2) sharing our results with the First Year Writing faculty and with the instruction librarians; 3) launching an ongoing assessment of our WRD 104/HON 100 instruction program; and 4) potentially mining the data collected from this assessment project for further insights into student topics, research questions, and knowledge gaps.

Immediately following the completion of our project, we changed the library instruction worksheet, based on the findings of the assessment project, to better meet the needs of our students, and to better assist them at the early stages of their research. This included adding a new question to the worksheet: "What do you need to learn more about in order to answer your research question?" We also reordered the questions and asked students to identify gaps in their knowledge immediately following the topic exploration activity. Our final question now asks students to incorporate ideas from the exploration activity and develop two to three possible research questions they could investigate (instead of articulating a single preliminary research question). Our report also recommended considering the removal of the Free Writing technique from the worksheet, and creating easier ways for students to use Mind Mapping, but we have not implemented this change due to the subsequent requirement to update our online tutorials. We may revisit this in the future.

Second, we shared our results with the First Year Writing faculty as well as with the instruction librarians. We then shared our results more widely with interested faculty and librarians at the

2018 DePaul Teaching and Learning Conference as well as the 2018 Illinois Information Literacy Conference.

Third, we were able to continue our assessment of our WRD 104 / HON 100 instruction by analyzing the results of a student survey that asked students to self-report on what they had learned during our library workshops and what they still had questions about. This survey was piloted in fall 2017 and officially launched in winter and spring 2018. The results from this survey were very positive. Students' self-reported learning aligned with our course level learning outcomes. We will continue to assess and improve our WRD 104 / HON 100 instruction program with leadership from our Instruction Working Group and Instructional Services Librarian.

We have not yet acted on the last recommendation, which was to mine the collected worksheets for data that could continue to improve our instruction practices. However, this is still a possibility for future analysis.

Part II: Report on This Year's Assessment Project

I.   Abstract

This project, designed to identify what students are learning, examined how students navigate the information landscape of repositories that collect and make accessible rare and unique materials required for primary source research. Investigators created two surveys to measure what students learned from the instruction session and to determine if students were able to apply that information to their own research. Investigators learned that students who visit repositories in person, use archival finding aids, and engage with librarians and archivists are better able to explain the socio-political information landscape as defined for this project. However, the findings revealed that only a small number of students chose these methods. Most students found primary sources online and many struggled to understand the context of those sources. Meetings will occur in fall quarter 2019 with history faculty to review the instruction curriculum which currently does not address online primary sources.

II.   Assessment Question

This year's assessment project asked the following question: Does the DePaul University Special Collections and Archives (SPCA) instruction session designed for HST 299 classes contribute to the student's ability to: explain the socio-political landscape of information, including who creates it, who controls it and where to find it. Students should be able to:

- identify repositories that may have collections that are appropriate to their particular research interest (who controls it and where to find it),
- use tools that librarians and archivists create to describe those collections (where to find it),
- explain the principle of provenance (information regarding the origins, custody, and ownership of an item or collection) as it relates to archives (who controls it and who creates it,
- and, successfully identify the creator of a primary source (who creates it).

III.   Introduction & Context

Project Overview

The library's 2018-2019 assessment project surveyed 41 students enrolled in HST 299 during winter and spring quarters. All students attended two SPCA instruction sessions and completed an activity designed to familiarize them with the unique collections of DePaul's SPCA and give them an opportunity develop transferable primary source research skills. The investigators surveyed the students to measure how students applied what they learned after the session and again after they completed an assignment given by the professor.

Learning Outcomes Assessed

The assessment question addresses the following learning outcome: Students will be able to explain the socio-political landscape of information, including who creates it, who controls it and where to find it.

Context for This Year's Report

The DePaul University Library instruction program supports the university's strategic plan: Grounded in Mission: The Plan for DePaul 2024 Goal 3.1: "Ensure that DePaul prepares undergraduate students to be well-rounded critical thinkers and lifelong learners." SPCA librarians and archivists collaborate with faculty to create instruction sessions that teach information literacy, specifically primary source literacy, and research skills.

The purpose of the HST 299 instruction session and activity is to introduce students to the unique collections of DePaul's SPCA, how archival collections are arranged, described, and accessed; and the level of engagement required by students to navigate this specific information landscape. The goal is to provide students with an understanding of the process of finding and using primary sources and to familiarize them with policies and procedures that are similar across repositories. The instruction session teaches students to find and request primary sources using the discovery tools (bibliographies and finding aids) on the SPCA website. Students then analyze and evaluate the materials they requested during a session in the SPCA classroom. Following the activity, students do not have to use primary sources held by SPCA for their final research paper. Informal comments from faculty indicate that this activity gives students the confidence to search for and use primary sources in libraries and archives around the city. In the words of one faculty member, "[students] get over the hurdle and feel like they belong, like they have a seat at the table." Another professor shared that she has received fewer questions about how to use other repositories from her students. Since January 2011, 38 HST 299 classes have incorporated the SPCA component designed for the HST 299 students. We selected the HST 299 instruction session because of its strong alignment with the learning outcome selected for the library's 2018-2019 assessment project.

The socio-political information landscape
In order to apply this programmatic library learning outcome to the work in SPCA, the investigators drew from the 2018 Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy.

> "Theoretical concepts such as evidence, authority, power, authenticity, context, materiality, historical empathy, agency, value, absences, and privilege underpin the collection, arrangements, and presentation of primary sources. Collections in cultural heritage institutions reflect and reinforce societal power structures. Users must seek to understand resulting silences and absences by critically considering what sources were never created, what sources may no longer exist, and what sources are collected, as well as communities' abilities to engage with these activities...Collections and databases are always mediated in some way, and exhibits, digital collections, and guides, and other access tools reflect the selection, reproduction, and representation decision of many individuals -- decisions that may not be self-evident."[1]

Understanding how a repository's mission, geographic location, and existing subject strengths influences its collection holdings is a skill that researchers use to navigate the socio-political information landscape of special collections and archives.

...who creates it

Fundamental to primary source research is the ability to read and understand key pieces of information contained in the source such as who created it, when it was created, how, and why. Following their initial reading of the source, students who have received instruction or have prior experience can shift into deeper interpretation and analysis. Specifically, according to the Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy:

"A person knowledgeable in the use of primary sources can:
- Critically evaluate the perspective of the creator(s) of a primary source, including tone, subjectivity, and biases, and consider how these relate to the original purpose(s) and audience(s) of the source.
- Situate a primary source in context by applying knowledge about the time and culture in which it was created; the author or creator; its format, genre, publication history; or related materials in a collection."[2]

...who controls it

Repositories use a series of policies and procedures to control what collections they accept or acquire. Repositories also balance preservation needs with researcher access using established professional standards and best practices. The Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy's definition of the term "repository" is central to our assessment project (emphasis added).

> "Repository: umbrella term referring to a cultural heritage organization that collects, preserves, and makes collections accessible, generally for research. Could refer to museums, libraries, archives, historical societies, research centers, or other types of institutions. A repository may be independent or part of a larger organization. *For those seeking to use primary sources effectively, having knowledge of the types of repositories and their various reasons and methods for collecting, preserving, and providing access,*

---

[1] ACRL-RBMS-SAA Joint Task Force. Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy, 2018, 3-4.

[2] ACRL-RBMS-SAA Joint Task Force. Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy, 2018, 5.

including the limits to each, is important for successfully identifying and using those collections."[3]

...where to find it
In 2016, Peter Carini, Dartmouth College Archivist and a leading expert in designing active learning instruction for special collections librarians and archivists, identified the need for literacy outcomes specific to teaching with primary sources. His proposed standards included the skill, **evaluate**. "When students learn how to *evaluate* in an archival context, they understand the archival principle of provenance – that is, the history of the item and its ownership – and how it relates to finding appropriate repositories, collections, and documents appropriate to a particular research topic."[4]

IV.   Data Collection & Methodology
Population and Sample

The investigators collected data from students enrolled in HST 299 during winter and spring quarters 2019. All history majors are required to take two introductory core history courses, HST 298 and HST 299. HST 298, Introduction to Historical Sources and Methods, is a pre-requisite for HST 299, Craft of History.   History minors and education majors with a concentration in history are not required to take HST 299 but some do elect to take the course. As per the HST 299 course description, all students in this course are required to find, obtain, and evaluate primary sources to complete a "substantial research paper." Most students in HST 299 are upper level undergraduates. SPCA librarians and archivists have a longstanding collaborative relationship with faculty in the history department and have worked together to integrate the rare and unique library materials into the curriculum for these two courses.

All students enrolled in HST 299 during the winter and spring quarters were invited to participate in the assessment project. There were three total sections of HST 299 during this study: two in the winter and one in the spring. In the winter, one section started the quarter with 12 students enrolled; the other section started the quarter with 15 enrolled. In the spring, 14 students were enrolled at the start of the quarter. All 41 enrolled students were included in the sample and were invited to participate in the study. Demographic information, including the students' academic status was not collected.

Data Collection

Two surveys were used to collect the data (Appendix A). The surveys were administered through Qualtrics. Both surveys were designed specifically for this assessment project by the team of investigators in collaboration with Jen Sweet, DePaul's Director for Assessment in the Center for Teaching and Learning.

---

[3] ACRL-RBMS-SAA Joint Task Force. Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy, 2018, 12.

[4] Carini, Peter. "Information Literacy for Archives and Special Collections: Defining Outcomes," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 16, no. 1 (2016): 198-199.

The surveys were designed to determine whether students retained the concepts taught during the SPCA instruction session, as well as to measure the students' ability to apply those concepts to their own research. The first survey included three short answer questions: List two factors that influence the sources a repository collects, preserves, and makes accessible to researchers; What can a finding aid tell you about an archival collection?; What is provenance?

The second survey asked students to upload a copy of a primary source they used for their HST 299 research assignment. The following questions were posed about the primary source: Who is the creator of the primary source? What is the name of the repository that collected and made the primary source accessible? Why does that repository have this particular primary source? How did you find that primary source? Is that primary source part of an archival collection? If it is part of an archival collection, what is the provenance?

The first survey (Survey 1) was distributed during the first week of the quarter. Time was provided for students to complete the survey at the end of the SPCA instruction session. The second survey was distributed after the students had completed a specific assignment for their class using a primary source. The distribution of the second survey (Survey 2) varied depending on the due-date of that assignment, which was set by the faculty member, occurring at week 3, week 4 and week 9.

Data Analysis

The investigators received 41 completed surveys from Survey 1 and 25 completed surveys from Survey 2. We created an original rubric to score both Survey 1 and Survey 2 (Appendix B). Not all of the questions asked needed to be scored, but for those questions that could be graded on a numerical scale, the questions were scored using a 4 point scale (0=Not Answered or Extremely Poor, 1=Fair, 2=Good, 3=Excellent). Investigators averaged the scores for each graded question on both surveys, and also calculated the percentage of students who scored a 2 or 3 on each question, achieving a score of "Good" or better. The two investigators worked through the 66 total survey responses as a team and scored them as a team.

The investigators determined that questions 3, 4, and 5 from Survey 2 would provide the basis for calculating the number of students who meet or exceed the learning outcome. While Survey 1 collected information that showed what students had learned from the session with the SPCA Instruction Librarian, Survey 2 determined if students were able to apply that information to their own primary source research. Questions 3, 4, and 5 address the most salient portions of the learning outcome, asking students to identify the creator of a primary source, identify the repository that collects that source, and explain why that source is available in that repository. The investigators averaged the scores for these three questions. Students who averaged a score of 2 (Good) or 3 (Excellent) across all 3 questions, achieving an additive score of at least 6, were considered to successfully meet our learning outcome.

Participant Consent

Permission to use class time for the assessment project was requested from the faculty members teaching HST 299. Personal conversations were followed by an email to each participating professor describing the project's rationale, links to the two surveys, and the approximate time needed for the students to complete the surveys. Attached to the email was a document titled, "Primary Source Literacy Context" (Appendix C) designed to highlight the framework and theories that informed the library's 2018-2019 assessment project.

Students learned about the assessment project during their instruction session. Librarians explained that the surveys were anonymous and would not impact or influence their grades in the class. Students also learned that their participation in the assessment project would help the librarians improve the instruction program. Students were not required to complete the surveys, but faculty encouraged their participation.

V.   Data & Findings -
Response Rate and Demographics

There were a total of 41 students enrolled in the three sections at the start of the quarter. 41 students were given Survey 1 and 41 completed responses were gathered, for a 100% response rate. Six students dropped the course before the second survey was distributed. Survey 2 was sent to all remaining 35 students. 25 completed responses were received, for a 71% response rate.

During the winter quarter, students were emailed Survey 2 and were asked to complete it on their own, outside of class time. 15 completed surveys were returned from 23 possible students, for a response rate of 65%. To increase our response rate, during spring quarter we asked faculty to allow students to complete Survey 2 during class. 10 completed surveys were received from 12 students for a much improved 83% response rate.

Key Findings

Findings for Survey 1:

Survey 1 posed the following short-answer questions: Q1 List two factors that influence the sources a repository collects, preserves, and makes accessible to researchers [repository]. Q2 What can a finding aid tell you about an archival collection [finding aid]? Q3 What is provenance [provenance]?

Investigators used an average score of 2 (defined in the rubric as "Good") as the threshold for defining acceptable performance. 14 of 41 (34%) students achieved acceptable performance in Survey 1 scoring a total of 6 or more (out of 9 possible points). 27 (66%) students did not meet this threshold in Survey 1.

For each of the three questions, the average score was below 2. (Appendix D, Table 1) The average score for students was the highest (1.63) on Q2 [finding aid] with 48.8% of students achieving an acceptable score of 2 or more. However, more students (23, 56.1%) achieved an acceptable score of 2 or more for Q1 [repository]. (Appendix D, Table 2). Students struggled the most with Q3 [provenance]. The average score for Q3 [provenance] was the lowest (1.34), and only 19 out of 41 (46.3%) students scored 2 or better.

Findings for Survey 2:

Survey 2 asked students to apply their understanding of the concepts and strategies taught during the SPCA instruction session. They were first instructed to upload a copy of a primary source they used for their HST 299 research assignment. The following short-answer questions were posed about the primary source: Q3 Who is the creator of the primary source [creator]? Q4 What is the name of the repository that collected and made the primary source accessible [repository]? Q5 Why does that repository have this particular primary source [mission]? Q6 How did you find that primary source [method]? Q7 If you selected "Other" in Question 6, please explain how you found the primary source in the repository you identified in Question 4. Q8 Is that primary source part of an archival collection [archival collection]? Q9 If it is part of an archival collection, what is the provenance [provenance]?

Using the same standard, recognizing a score of 2 or more as the threshold for defining acceptable performance, 84% of students (21 out of 25) met that standard for Q4 [repository], more than for any of the other questions in Survey 2 (Appendix D, Table 3). 19 out of 25 (76%) were able to meet that standard when identifying the creator of the source in Q3 [creator]. Just over half of the students were able to achieve a score of "Good" or better when asked to explain why the repository would have that item (56%), and less than half were able to determine if the item was part of an archival collection 48%.

Analyzing the results by average score (Appendix D, Table 4), students performed better on Q3 [creator] and Q4 [repository] than on the other questions. They performed best on Q3 [creator], with an average score of 2.17 and worst on Q8 [archival collection] with an average score of 1.4.

When the results were sorted by where the student located the primary source (Appendix D, Table 5), certain groups were clearly more successful. Students who found their source through a visit to an archive scored the highest average across four questions (9.4 out of a possible 12), while students who found their source online – but not using the library subscriptions or other well-defined online library collections – performed more poorly (6.5).

Sorting the results by the method used to find the primary source (Appendix D, Table 6), also reveals some interesting patterns. The student who responded that they used a finding aid achieved a perfect score (12). Those who consulted an archivist/librarian or their professor also scored well (9.75 and 8.5 respectively). The largest group of students reported using Google to find their sources (n=8), accounting for 32% of the responses, and scoring 7.75.

Four students reported using the library catalog to find their sources and they performed the poorest (3.25). Two of these students found secondary sources, rather than the primary sources

that were required by the course assignment. Responses for the two students who found secondary sources scored 0 across Q3-5, pulling down the average for this group.

Overall Findings

Investigators used the results from Survey 2, specifically the responses to Questions 3, 4, and 5 to determine how many students achieved acceptable or better performance in meeting the program level learning outcome. While the results from Survey 1 provided information about the retention of concepts taught in the SPCA instruction session, Survey 2 asked students to apply this information to their own research. Evidence of this deeper level of understanding provides a more meaningful measure for determining how many students have met the learning outcome.

Program Level Learning Outcome	Number of Students Assessed	Number of Students with Acceptable or Better Performance
Students will be able to explain the socio-political landscape of information, including who creates it, who controls it and where to find it.	25	15

Students who scored 6 or more points (out of a possible 9) as an additive score on Survey 2 questions 3, 4, and 5 met the acceptable or better performance criteria established by the investigators. A score of 8 represents an average score of 2 ("Good") across four questions.

VI. Discussion & Interpretation of Findings

- Overall, the findings from Survey 1 show that many of the students struggled with the terminology (finding aid, provenance, repository) presented during the HST 299 SPCA instruction session. This indicates that students are most likely learning archival jargon and applying those concepts and terms to their own research for the first time.

- The results of Survey 2 reveal that SPCA HST 299 instruction curriculum has a positive impact when students apply the information learned and visit repositories in person, use archival finding aids, and engage with librarians and archivists. Students who follow these methods and techniques can explain the socio-political landscape of information, including who controls, who creates, and how to find it when they encountered it in repositories that have collections of rare and unique materials.

- The majority of students surveyed found their primary sources online, which reveals a gap in the SPCA instruction curriculum for HST 299 students.

- The investigators noted in Survey 2 that two students (both used the library catalog) incorrectly identified secondary sources as primary sources. This is surprising because identifying and analyzing primary sources and learning how to distinguish them from secondary sources is a skill that is taught and practiced during HST 298, a prerequisite for HST 299. This finding reminds the investigators that some students who are enrolled in HST 299 will still be developing fundamental primary research skills, such as document analysis.

- The findings from Survey 2 reveal that the majority of students correctly identified the creator of the primary source, which is a fundamental document analysis skill practiced during their prerequisite HST 298 course.

- The results also show that the majority of students struggled when asked if the primary source was part of an archival collection. This indicates that students who provided an incorrect response most likely do not understand the terms librarians and archivists use to describe collections of rare and unique materials. Investigators were not surprised by this result because the students are most likely undertaking primary source research for the first time and students are not required to use primary sources from archival collections for their research assignment.

VII.   Recommendations and Plans for Action

Recommendations

Based on the findings from this assessment project, the investigators are recommending action items both within the SPCA unit and more generally for the library instruction program.

- Review SPCA component of HST 299. The investigators found that students who chose to visit a repository to find their primary source document were able to understand that document's place within the socio-political information landscape. However, most students do not visit a repository to find their source document for the HST 299 assignment. At this point, the SPCA Instruction Librarian should review the instruction curriculum, in collaboration with the HST faculty, to see if it is still meeting the needs of our current/future student population and the learning goals of the course.
- Collaborate with other DePaul instruction librarians. The results from this study make clear that students do not always understand the context of source material they find online. Since this is a larger issue than can be addressed in the context of HST 299, the investigators on this project should work with the rest of the library instruction team to ensure that these skills are addressed in other instruction venues. The library's First Year programmatic instruction with the Writing and Rhetoric Department might be an appropriate place for this instruction.

Action Plan

In Fall 2019, the SPCA Instruction Librarian will set up a meeting with HST 299 faculty, including those who taught the course in 2018-2019 and those who will teach the course in 2019-

2020, in order to share the results of this project. Implementation of any changes in the curriculum will depend on the conversations resulting from these meetings. As the instruction is a collaborative effort, all parties should be in agreement as to the focus of the SPCA curriculum in this class. Some ideas include encouraging students to find and request boxes from an archival collection rather than rare books, requiring students to schedule a research consultation with a librarian, or creating a worksheet designed for students who need help evaluating online primary sources.

In September, the investigators will share the results of this assessment project with the library's Instruction Working Group (IWG), during a regularly scheduled monthly meeting. In conversation with this group, librarians will determine how to best address the knowledge gap of the students. Recommendations might include changes to the WRD 104 library workshop, creation of an online tutorial or webpage, or other innovative ideas.

Sharing the results

In order to derive the greatest benefits from this assessment project, it is important to share the results with all interested parties.

During the fall quarter the investigators intend to share the results with the Head of SPCA, and then with the staff of that unit. This presentation will occur at a regular department meeting of SPCA.

As detailed in the recommendations, the results will also be shared with the appropriate faculty in the history department, and then with the library's Instruction Working Group during the fall quarter. After these discussions, and after determining if there may be changes to the curriculum in SPCA and/or in the larger library instruction program, a presentation will be scheduled for the winter Library Instruction Workshop, whose audience would include all of the instruction librarians and any other interested library staff. The winter Instruction Workshop is generally held in November or December each year. And finally, the students who participated in this assessment project will also be informed of the results of the assessment project. The investigators will write a short overview of the project for the students, and will include the ways that their participation has helped make the library instruction program better.

Appendix A: Surveys

2018-2019 Library Assessment Project Survey One

Intro Your class has been chosen to participate in the Library's 2018-2019 assessment project. The purpose of the project is to improve the Library's instruction program. Your responses are anonymous and will not influence your course grade.

This survey includes three short answer questions.

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Repository

Note The following definition is provided as a reminder of our earlier conversation about special collections and archives repositories.

Librarians and archivists define a repository as a cultural heritage organization that collects, preserves, and makes collections accessible, generally for research. A repository may be independent or part of a larger organization including businesses, institutions, governments, libraries, museums, and historical societies.

Q1 List two factors that influence which materials a repository collects, preserves, and makes accessible to researchers.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q2 What can a finding aid tell you about a collection?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q3 What is provenance?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2018-2019 Library Assessment Project Survey Two

Introduction Your class has been chosen to participate in the Library's 2018-2019 assessment project. The purpose of the project is to improve the Library's instruction program. Your responses will not influence your course grade.

For all the subsequent questions/tasks, refer to the primary source you choose to upload in response to Question 1.

Q1 Please upload a jpg or pdf of one of primary sources you are using for your HST 299 paper. If the source is a book or other published item, only provide images of the title and copyright pages. If your source is online, move on to Question 2.

Q2 If your primary source is available via an online repository, please provide the link.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q3 Who is the creator of the primary source?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Note The following definition is provided as a reminder of our earlier conversation about special collections and archives repositories.

Librarians and archivists define a repository as a cultural heritage organization that collects, preserves, and makes collections accessible, generally for research. A repository may be independent or part of a larger organization including businesses, institutions, governments, libraries, museums, and historical societies.

Q4 What is the name of the repository that collected and made accessible the primary source?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q5 Think about the mission of the repository you named in Question 4. Explain why the repository has this particular primary source.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q6 How did you find the primary source within that repository? Select all that apply.

☐ Chicago Collections search (1)

☐ DePaul Library catalog search (WorldCat Discovery or VuFind) (2)

☐ Finding aid (3)

☐ Google search (4)

☐ I received help from a librarian/archivist. (5)

☐ I received help from my professor. (6)

☐ Other (7)

Q7 If you selected "Other" in Question 6, please explain how you found the primary source in the repository you identified in Question 4.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Q8 Is the primary source part of an archival collection?

○ Yes (1)

○ No (2)

○ Unsure (3)

Skip To: End of Survey If Is the primary source part of an archival collection? = No
Skip To: End of Survey If Is the primary source part of an archival collection? = Unsure

Q9 What is the provenance of the archival collection?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

End of Block: Block 1

Appendix B: Rubrics

Survey One	None	Fair	Good	Excellent
	0	1	2	3
Q 1: List two factors that influence the sources a repository collects, preserves, and makes accessible to researchers.	Left blank, incorrect, or extremely vague	Shows a basic awareness of the concept. • Reference to historical value (old; age; the past) • Physical condition	Provides at least one factor: Acceptable responses: • institutional mission • geographic location (local community) • subjects/topics/relevance • gaps in the documentary record	Provides two or more Acceptable responses: • institutional mission • geographic location (local community) • subjects/topics/relevance • gaps in the documentary record
Q 2: What can a finding aid tell you about an archival collection?	Left blank, incorrect, or extremely vague Examples of responses that are unacceptable include: • "finding materials on a topic" • "shows exact location of a topic" • "helps with research"	Provides a brief and cursory explanation that includes the following terms and concepts: • table of contents for a collection • refers to a box listing	Provides an explanation that includes the following terms and concepts: • overview, description, summary, abstract of an archives collection and • refers to box listing or subject/topic; date of materials	Provides a deeper explanation that includes two or more of the following concepts: • description of archives collection that provides information about the materials • historical and biographical background about the creator • summary of the contents of a collection • arrangement and organization of a collection • extent/quantity (linear feet, number of boxes)
Q3: What is provenance?	Left blank, incorrect or vague	Poorly worded explanation	Explanation is vague but includes/refers to appropriate terms	Provides the correct definition and articulates the response clearly.

Survey One	None	Fair	Good	Excellent
	0	1	2	3
	Examples of responses that are unacceptable include: • "Provenance is how authentic a piece is" • "Earliest history of something" • Quality/importance of item/collection	Refers to donor or author rather than the collection's creator. Explanation only includes a reference to "origin" Examples: • "Provenance refers to the creation of the source material." • "the person who donated the collection" • "author of the collection" • "how the repository acquired the collection" • "Where something originates from."	Examples: • "Relating to ownership/production/creation of the collection " • "The chain of ownership of a collection" • "Provenance is the information of the objects history, from location to who owned it. • "the path or different hands and institutions a certain collection or piece goes through. its brief history."	Includes a definition that refers to the creator of the collection or the individual, family, or organization who created the items in the collection. Examples: • "Provenance is like the creator of the collection. It answers the question of who put the collection together." • "provenance is where the collection or works came from; who made it originally, who curated the collection/created it initially, and where it came from."

Survey Two	None	Fair	Good	Excellent
	0	1	2	3
Q3: Who is the creator of the primary source?	Blank or wildly off-base	Did not provide link/file of primary source; only provided collection information or link to finding aid	Publisher instead of author; person vs. organization or vice versa (shows thought and reading of document but not quite right)	Correct answer
Q4: What is the name of the repository that collected and made accessible the primary source?	Blank	Generic response	Provides an answer that is close but not correct.	Correct answer – provides name of repository
Q5: Explain why the repository has this particular primary source.	Answer is very general, doesn't mention the specific repository	Answer states that the repository collects material that is: • Historic/old/special	Provides additional information about the document. Attempts to interpret the reason the repository has the document but is incorrect.	Answer includes one of the following: • Topic/subject matter; geographic location; relationship to institution
Q8: Is the primary source part of an archival collection?	Incorrect	N/A	N/A	Correct
Q9: What is the provenance of the archival collection? *Not graded if primary source was not part of an archival collection.*	Left blank, incorrect or vague Examples: • "Provenance is how authentic a piece is" • "Earliest history of something" • Quality/importance of item/collection	Poorly worded explanation. Refers to donor or author rather than the collection's creator. Explanation only includes a reference to "origin" Examples: • "Provenance refers to the creation of the source material." • "the person who donated the collection" • "author of the collection" • "how the repository acquired the collection"	Demonstrates reading of collection level information but leaves out specific details about creator/acquisition that were described in the finding aid/collection overview	Correct

Survey Two	None	Fair	Good	Excellent
	0	1	2	3
		• "Where something originates from."		

Appendix C: Participation Consent: Email to Faculty

From: MacIntosh Hodgetts, Morgen
To: Tikoff, Valentina
Subject: Library Assessment Project: permission to work with you and your HST 299 students
Date: Tuesday, December 18, 2018 12:04:00 PM
Attachments: PrimarySourceLiteracy_Context.docx

Dear Valentina,

Thank you so much for meeting with me this summer as I was in the early stages of developing the Library's 2018-2019 assessment project.

Below is an overview of the project (it has changed significantly since I met with you!) that I would like to share with you. Once you have reviewed our plans, can you confirm that you are willing to participate?

Special Collections and Archives (SPCA) would like to dedicate a small amount of class time in your HST 299 SPCA for assessment activities tied to the DePaul University Library learning outcomes.

My colleagues on the Library's 2018-2019 assessment team are Jennifer Schwartz (Reference, Instruction and Academic Engagement), and Ashley McMullin (Marketing and Assessment). We are measuring the following Library learning outcome: Students will be able to explain the socio-political landscape of information, including who creates it, who controls it and where to find it.

Our specific assessment question as it relates to this learning outcome is as follows:
Does the SPCA activity and instruction session designed for HST 299 classes contribute to the student's ability to:
- identify repositories that may have collections that are appropriate to their particular research interest [who controls it & where to find it]
- use tools that librarians and archivists create to describe those collections [who controls it & where to find it]
- and, explain the principle of provenance as it relates to archives [who creates it]?

This project will gather data for the Library's annual assessment report which we will submit to the Center for Teaching and Learning and will be used internally to improve our primary source instruction program. We've designed two surveys using Qualtrics to collect data from the students.

With your permission I would like to administer the first survey during the instruction session in Special Collections on January 16, 2019. This survey consists of three short answer questions that will take approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete. I will provide laptops for the students to access the Qualtrics survey. Survey 2 is designed to be administered after the students turn in their "Primary Sources Assignment" that you designed. If you could reserve class time (no more than 15 minutes) for this survey, our response rate will be higher and our results more meaningful than if we only send the survey to the students via email. As part of this survey, students will be prompted to upload a jpg or pdf of one of their primary sources. If the source is a book or other published item, the student will be asked to provide images of only the title and copyright pages.

You can review the surveys in advance of the class session by using the links provided below.
Survey One: http://depaul.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_d4FRxosqdCKxXa5
Survey Two: http://depaul.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_d52VPFNWDIW5BuB

I've attached additional information about primary source literacy which informs our instruction program.

And, please know that I am happy to share our findings with you once we have analyzed the date and turned in our final report.

Feel free to ask me any questions or send me any concerns that you may have.
Thank you so much for your support. I really appreciate it!

2018-2019 Library Assessment Project Primary Source Literacy Context

ACRL-RBMS-SAA Joint Task Force. 2018 Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy.

"Theoretical concepts such as evidence, authority, power, authenticity, context, materiality, historical empathy, agency, value, absences, and privilege underpin the collection, arrangements, and presentation of primary sources. Collections in cultural heritage institutions reflect and reinforce societal power structures. Users must seek to understand resulting silences and absences by critically considering what sources were never created, what sources may no longer exist, and what sources are collected, as well as a communities' abilities to engage with these activities. The iterative nature of research and the interplay between primary and secondary sources must also be considered throughout the research and production process as users seek to contextualize and understand their sources. Collections and databases are always mediated in some way, and exhibits, digital collections, and guides, and other access tools reflect the selection, reproduction, and representation decision of many individuals -- decisions that may not be self-evident" (Guidelines, 3-4).

Yakel, Elizabeth and Deborah Torres. "AI: Archival Intelligence and User Experience," *The American Archivist* **66 (2003): 51-78.**

Yakel and Torres define archival intelligence as "a researcher's knowledge of archival principles, practices, and institutions, such as the reasons underlying archival rules and procedures, how to develop search strategies to explore research questions and an understanding of the relationship between primary sources and their surrogates." (Yakel and Torres, 52).

Carini, Peter. "Information Literacy for Archives and Special Collections: Defining Outcomes," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* **16, no. 1 (2016): 191-206.**

Carini identified the need for a set of standards for primary source literacy and proposed six outcomes. Two standards quoted in their entirety from Carini's article, directly inform our assessment project. "Teaching students to "Interpret" provides them with the tools and specific skills they need to extract understand, and interpret the information in a variety of primary sources. It also teaches students the importance of chronology and context in the formation of a narrative, as well as advanced skills surrounding the interpretation of silences or gaps in the archives and issues related to underrepresented groups. "Evaluate" is where we start to delve more deeply into archival intelligences. To evaluate, in the archival context, encompasses understanding the archival principle of provenance – that is, the history of the item and its ownership – and how it relates to finding appropriate repositories, collections, and documents..." (Carini, 198-199).

Appendix D: Tables

Survey 1 Questions	Average Score (out of 3)
Q1 [repository] **List two factors that influence which materials a repository collects, preserves, and makes accessible to researchers.**	1.54
Q2 [finding aid] **What can a finding aid tell you about a collection?**	1.63
Q3 [provenance] **What is provenance?**	1.34

Table 1: Survey 1: Average Scores

Survey 1 Questions	Number of Students Achieving Acceptable Score (2 or more out of 3 possible points) (n=41)	% of Students Achieving Acceptable Score (2 or more out of 3 possible points) (n=41)
Q1 [repository] **List two factors that influence which materials a repository collects, preserves, and makes accessible to researchers.**	23	56.1%
Q2 [finding aid] **What can a finding aid tell you about a collection?**	20	48.8%
Q3 [provenance] **What is provenance?**	19	46.3%

Table 2: Survey 1: Total Number of Students achieving Acceptable Performance by Question

Survey 2 Questions	Number of Students Achieving Acceptable Score (2 or more out of 3 possible points (n=25)	% of Students Achieving Acceptable Score (2 or more out of 3 possible points (n=25)
Q3 [creator] **Who is the creator of the primary source?**	19	76%
Q4 [repository] **What is the name of the repository that collected and made accessible the primary source?**	21	84%
Q5 [mission] **Explain why the repository has this particular primary source.**	14	56%
Q8 [archival collection] **Is the primary source part of an archival collection?**	12	48%

Table 3: Survey 2: Total Number of Students achieving Acceptable Performance by Question

Survey 2 Questions	Average Score (out of 3)
Q3 [creator] **Who is the creator of the primary source?**	2.17
Q4 [repository] **What is the name of the repository that collected and made accessible the primary source?**	2.12
Q5 [mission] **Explain why the repository has this particular primary source.**	1.68
Q8 [archival collection] **Is the primary source part of an archival collection?**	1.4

Table 4: Survey 2: Overall Average Score

Survey 2 Questions (Average Score out of 3)	Source from a visit to an archive (n=7)	Source from an online library collection (n=7)	Source from an online newspaper (DPU subscriptions) (n=5)	Source from other online location (n=4)	Not a primary source (n=2)
Q3 [creator] Who is the creator of the primary source?	2.5	2.1	2.8	2	0
Q4 [repository] What is the name of the repository that collected and made accessible the primary source?	2.6	2.7	2	1.5	0
Q5 [mission] Explain why the repository has this particular primary source.	2.1	1.7	1.8	1.5	0
Q8 [archival collection] Is the primary source part of an archival collection?	2.6	1.1	0	1.5	1.5
Total Average (Average Score out of 12)	9.4	7.7	6.6	6.5	1.5

Table 5: Survey 2: Where the Source Was Located

Survey 2 Questions (Average Score out of 3)	Finding Aid (n=1)	Librarian/ Archivist (n=4)	Professor (n=2)	Google Search (n=-8)	Other (n=2)	Multiple Sources (n=3)	Chicago Collections (n=1)	Catalog (n=4)
Q3 [creator] Who is the creator of the primary source? (Average Score out of 3)	3	2.75	3	2.25	3	1.5	0	1.25
Q4 [repository] What is the name of the repository that collected and made accessible the primary source?	3	2.5	2.5	2.5	2	1.67	2	1
Q5 [mission] Explain why the repository has this particular primary source.	3	3	1.5	1.63	2.5	1.67	0	0.25
Q8 [archival collection] Is the primary source part of an archival collection?	3	1.5	1.5	1.38	0	2	3	0.75
Total Average (Average Score out of 12)	12	9.75	8.5	7.75	7.5	6.33	5	3.25

Table 6: Survey 2: Group by method used to locate the primary source

Appendix E: Works Cited

ACRL-RBMS-SAA Joint Task Force. *Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy* (2018)
        <https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/Guidelines%20for%20Primary%20Souce%20
        Literacy_AsApproved062018_1.pdf>.

Carini, Peter. "Information Literacy for Archives and Special Collections: Defining Outcomes,"
        portal: Libraries and the Academy 16, no. 1 (2016): 191-206.

Yakel, Elizabeth and Deborah Torres. "AI: Archival Intelligence and User Experience," *The
        American Archivist* 66 (2003): 51-78.