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- Assessment measures
- Selected changes made in IRDL based on assessment results
- Changes for IRDL-2 (2017-2019) based on results from IRDL
Background on IRDL

- **Goal:** Increase the number of academic librarians with specific research skills in conducting and disseminating the results of research
- **Result:** Research-based continuing education program for academic librarians
- **Components:** Nine-day research workshop in the summer, with instructors to provide the research curriculum and one-on-one consultation; pre-Institute activities and ongoing support for the year
Addressing Scholars’ Needs

- Collegiality and support in the research process
- Instruction in areas needed to revise proposal and conduct study; but also prepare Scholars for future studies
- Encourage dissemination of findings through publication or presentation
- Instill research confidence in Institute Scholars through instruction and feedback
IRDL Scholars

• More than 250 applicants for approximately 60 spaces – 20 each year – from all over the U.S. and all types of academic libraries

• Applicants submitted a cover letter, research proposal, and letter of support from library dean or director

• Each application evaluated by two Advisory Board members, plus both co-directors of IRDL

• Focus on all forms of diversity, with an emphasis on ethnic and racial diversity; exceeded our goal of 30 percent
Grant Funding

• Funded for three years by IMLS (2013-2016)

• First cohort summer 2014; preliminary results reported at Assessment Conference in fall 2014

• Applied for additional funding, focused on sustainability issues, in 2016

• Funded by IMLS (2016-2019) for IRDL-2
  ◦ Shorter summer workshop
  ◦ Formal mentoring
Research Questions

- Is the curriculum effective in increasing research confidence? (An established predictor of research success)
- Is the balance between classroom instruction and time to write and consult with instructors and others appropriate?
- What else could we do to increase the probability that an IRDL Scholar will complete the proposed research project?
Assessment Measures

- Two areas of interest:
  - Participant outcomes
  - Scholar feedback on the program, including summer workshop and follow-up activities

- Primary outcome: To complete a research project during one calendar year
  - Success defined as completing data collection and analysis
  - Presentation or publication desired

- Long-term goal: To launch librarians on a career that includes high-quality research
Multiple Measures

- Pre- and post-tests of research confidence
- Pre- and post-tests on mastery of workshop content in two of three years
- Ego-centric network study of participants
- Scoring of pre- and post-workshop proposals in two of three years
- Post-workshop survey of participants
- Summative survey of participants at end of IRDL year
- External evaluators in Years 1 and 2
Highlight Three Measures

- Pre- and post-workshop proposals
- Post-workshop survey
  - Sent to all Scholars shortly after the conclusion of the summer workshop
  - Includes questions about all aspects, including curriculum, schedule, food and accommodations
- Summative survey
  - Sent to all Scholars after completion of the IRDL year
  - Focuses on completion of the research project and thoughts upon finishing the year
  - Unexpected benefits/disadvantages of the experience
### PRE- AND POST-WORKSHOP PROPOSALS

Scored with a rubric. 4: Exemplary; 3: Accomplished; 2: Developing; 1: Beginning.  **Items with shadow text:** Significant at the .05 level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion/Section of the Proposal</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
<th>t-test</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope: Appropriate design</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-.810</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance and purpose</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research question/Hypothesis</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>-2.447</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review: Organization</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review: Explanation</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>-2.320</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods: Research design</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>-2.137</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods: Context, population, and sampling</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>-2.329</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods: Procedures</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>-2.137</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods: Instrument</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-1.625</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## USE OF POST-WORKSHOP SURVEY RESULTS

### EXAMPLE 1/4

Year 1: Create a Twitter account; put proposal in APA format; three readings; complete IRB training; and participate in two surveys.
Beginning Year 2: Asked to submit proposal in APA format.
Year 2 and Year 3: Added readings from the textbooks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of pre-Institute activities</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There were too few pre-Institute activities.</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of required pre-Institute activities was appropriate.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were too many required pre-Institute activities.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adjusted this element each year. Year 2 increased consultation time from once to twice per day and added our evaluator as a consultant. Year 3 added ourselves as consultants. Asked about this on the 2016 survey; all respondents found this useful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of time devoted each day for consultation with instructors</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t have enough consultation time.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had enough consultation time.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had too much consultation time.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Use of Post-Workshop Survey Results

#### Examples 3 and 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How easy/difficult to be away from work for two weeks</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very difficult</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very easy</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of workshop</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nine days was too long</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine days appropriate</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine days was too short</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summative Survey

- Primary purpose: Determine where Scholars are in completing their proposed research study. Also wanted Scholars feedback on IRDL.
- In retrospect, what were most helpful aspects of the IRDL experience?
- Suggestions for improvement?
- Unintended benefits or disadvantages?

Used comments from 2014 feedback for 2016 summer workshop.

Used 2014 and 2015 results in IMLS proposal.
**SUMMATIVE SURVEY EXAMPLE**

**Scale.** 1: Not at all important; 2: A little important; 3: Somewhat important; 4: Very important; 5: Extremely important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of various components of IRDL on research activities during past year</th>
<th>2014 (Mean)</th>
<th>2015 (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer workshop content</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly check-in sessions online</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional communication with other IRDL Scholars</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networking through Facebook and/or Twitter</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with the IRDL instructors and/or project directors</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of Comments

- Many opportunities for feedback throughout the two week workshop
- More opportunities for anonymous feedback in surveys
- Post-workshop survey especially helpful for improving the workshop’s effectiveness
  - Specific recommendations regarding reading before the workshop
  - Value of hands-on activities – flipped classroom
- Summative survey valuable in planning IRDL-2 and considering sustainability issues
• Changes based on a variety of inputs
  ◦ Pre- and post-workshop confidence data
  ◦ Scholars’ comments
  ◦ Our observations
  ◦ Grant proposal reviewers’ comments
• Shortened length of summer workshop to one week away – rather than two
  ◦ Decreasing days of instruction by two
  ◦ Previous Scholars did not recommend this change but will decrease costs and time away from home and work
  ◦ Emphasis on most critical content and on hands-on learning – rely heavily on flipped classroom
Rationale for formal mentoring program
- Cohort 1 Scholars offered to mentor Cohorts 2 and 3
- Research shows that mentoring can be powerful success factor among novice researchers
- More frequently studied outside LIS than within

- Each mentor will work with two Scholars
- Mentors will receive training
- Adding former IRDL Scholars to Advisory Board
Conclusion

- Convinced that IRDL increases research confidence and provides novice researchers with needed knowledge and support for success.
- Ample evidence of IRDL Scholars’ research success – well beyond IRDL research project.
- Looking for a sustainable model for a reasonably-priced fee-based experience.
- By documenting the success of IRDL Scholars hope to convince institutions to support their librarians’ participation.
- Committed to the development of next generation of academic librarians.
Thanks to our partners and funder...
Questions, comments, suggestions?

- For additional information about IRDL:
  - [http://irdlonline.org](http://irdlonline.org)

- Output of IRDL Scholars:
  - [http://irdlonline.org/project-info/irdl-scholar-works-completed/](http://irdlonline.org/project-info/irdl-scholar-works-completed/)

- Contact us:
  - Kristine Brancolini ([brancoli@lmu.edu](mailto:brancoli@lmu.edu))
  - Marie Kennedy ([marie.kennedy@lmu.edu](mailto:marie.kennedy@lmu.edu))