Review of Shaping the Campus Conversation on Student Learning and Experience: Activating the Results of Assessment in Action

Eileen H. Kramer

Clarkston/Perimeter College, Georgia State University


Keywords: library assessment, student learning outcomes, student success

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.
Karen Brown and a host of others created *Shaping the Campus Conversation on Student Learning and Experience: Activating the Results of Assessment in Action* with two aims: First they encourage libraries to partner with other departments to assess their library's services in a way that aligns institutional goals. Through the ACRL's Assessment in Action initiative (2013-2016), 188 librarian-led teams sharpened their assessment and research skills; produced posters, book chapters, and articles; and increased their libraries' social capital and visibility. This makes *Shaping the Campus Conversation* part guidebook and part encouragement source for: academic librarians new to assessment, academic librarians ready to increase their evaluation repertoire, and campus officials and administrators (Brown et. al., 2018, p. ix). *Shaping the Campus Conversation* also "provides, in a single and comprehensive work, the story of AiA [Assessment in Action] -- the context surrounding its development, findings of team-based assessment projects, insights about the program results, reflection about its impact, and recommendation for future directions," (Brown et. al., 2018, p.vii) leaving a record that is immune to link rot, and blazing a paper trail that library school students can follow.

For librarians considering assessment partnerships outside the silo, *Shaping the Campus Conversation*’s Chapters 7-15 and 18 (Sections 2 and 3) shine. Brown et. al.(2018) chose nine of the 188 teams that completed Assessment in Action, and the team leaders tell their stories. The variety of voices, often a bug in edited works, is a feature as is the diversity of library services in the spotlight. Librarians partnered with offices that help disadvantaged populations (Brown et. al., 2018, pp.185-192; chapter13), leaders of a first year research course program (Brown et. al., 2018, pp.147-153; chapter 8), an Aboriginal and international student support office (Brown et. al., 2018, pp.169-176; chapter 11), as well as institutional research departments (Brown et. al., 2018, ;chapter 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15). AiA team
leaders’ reflections cover everything from: roving reference outside the library (Brown et. al., 2018, pp. 185-192; chapter 13), to pop-up/drop-in tutoring (Brown et. al., 2018, pp. 155-160; chapter 9), to instruction in first year experience courses (Brown et. al., 2018, pp. 147-153; chapter 8). Team leaders frequently used their AiA projects to springboard increased assessment (Brown et. al., 2018; chapters 7, 8, 14, and 15), temporarily expand drop-in tutoring services (Brown et.al., 2018, p.158; chapter 9), train English faculty to teach information literacy (Brown et. al., 2018, pp.203-205; chapter 15), and even hire a part time statistician (Brown et. al., 2018, pp.194-195; chapter 14).

Authentic success stories and enthusiasm, however, are not enough for librarians considering assessment alliances. Helpful guidance begins with linguistic honesty. Brown, her colleagues, and the team leaders that wrote Chapters 7-15 transform stakeholder into a euphemism. One might believe that in higher education stakeholders include tuition-paying students and employees, who keep an institution operating. This is not Brown et. al.’s definition. Of Assessment in Action’s 188 teams, over fifty, thirty-one percent, lacked an additional librarian besides the leader (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2016). Of the teams with reflections in Chapters 7-15, four out of nine, forty-four percent, lacked additional librarians, and no Action in Assessment team included paraprofessionals or students (Brown et. al., 2018). Clearly Brown et. al’s stakeholders are only those who run programs or control purse strings. *Shaping the Campus Conversation’s* stakeholder means hierarchy or chain of command.

In this context, stakeholder, becomes a linguistic weapon. *The Power Thesaurus* ("Stakeholder" [Antonyms]", 2018) lists the term’s antonyms as an array of neutrals, disinterested parties, and outsiders. A hierarchy, by contrast, includes both superiors and subordinates. Moreover, administrators are themselves often subordinate to state legislatures and/or boards of trustees.
Acknowledging power’s extent and limits can be more inclusive than courting the powerful and excluding everyone else.

Brown et. al. never ask how far the benefits of working with the hierarchy extend. Stephanie Bush (Brown et al., 2018, p.158), who wrote Chapter Nine, failed to restart a stalled renovation project despite her team’s glowing assessment of drop-in tutoring. And Brown and colleagues (2018) have the sense not to even suggest that a library’s newfound, social capital can unfreeze positions; keep a collection budget from plummeting to zero; or protect a just-in-case resource, books for browsing, or a technical services department.

Brown et. al. (2018), and the nine AiA team leaders, neither explain why they did not choose certain potential team members, nor discuss how to make sure superiors are safe, beneficial, or available partners. Katie Bishop watched a dean, associate dean, and two directors breeze through her library’s revolving door (Brown et al., 2018, p.185; chapter 13). When this reviewer’s library could have applied for the 2013-2014 Assessment in Action cycle, her institution was recovering from a twenty-five-million dollar shortfall due to less than careful accounting (“Budget”, 2012-2016). Administration eventually laid off over 250 employees, and there were no travel funds available for "Jam Sessions" or ALA poster presentations (“Budget", 2012-2016)(Brown et al., 2018, pp.311-318; Appendix F).

Librarians need trustworthy partners in power because assessment can include mistakes and bears bad news. Adam Brennan and Lisa Haldeman (Brown et al., 2018, p.148; chapter 8) confess to three unclear questions that blighted a portion of their evaluation tests. Mary O’Kelly’s (Brown et. al., 2018, p. 142; chapter 7) Knowledge Market did not increase students’ GPA, and Stephanie Bush’s (Brown et. al., 2018, p.158; chapter 9) drop-in tutoring boosted retention by 1.2%.
More generally, a trustworthy chain of command is necessary because assessment cultures can turn toxic. The *Oxford English Dictionary* (”Assessment, n.”, 2018), gives evaluation as a synonym/definition for assessment. Evaluation, especially individual performance ratings, is sometimes less than fair. Human resource professionals (Highhouse, Guion, & Doverspike, 2015, pp. 263-284) (Djurdevic & Wheeler, 2014, pp.147-176) admit that politics pollutes performance evaluations in the business world. Numerous boards of education have applied summative assessment of student performance, often called Value Added, to merit pay, retention, and dismissal decisions (Collins, 2014, pp.1-28) (Shen, Simon & Kelcey, 2016, pp.1-12). In Atlanta, pressure to produce high test scores and the fear of retaliation for not meeting the mark fomented a monumental cheating scandal (Aronson, Murphy & Salutz, 2016, pp.1-26). And in higher education high stakes evaluations of teaching faculty can be: biased (Boring, Ottoboni, & Stark, 2016, pp.1-11), less than reliable (Clayson, 2018, pp.666-681), and may not measure deep learning at all (Carrell & West, 2010, pp.409-433), yet teaching evaluations determine both promotion and retention. Alas, Brown and colleagues (2018), including the team leaders in Chapters 7-15, offer no suggestions for keeping assessment beneficial and benign.

As a record of the Assessment in Action program, *Shaping the Campus Conversation* also falls short. Brown et. al. (2018) admit that Chapters 3-6, 16, and Appendix B "were first published elsewhere." (p. ix) Actually, eighteen of *Shaping the Campus Conversation*’s twenty-nine chapters and appendices are freely available online.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter #</th>
<th>Where available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acrl.ala.org/value">http://www.acrl.ala.org/value</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acrl.ala.org/value">http://www.acrl.ala.org/value</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acrl.ala.org/value">http://www.acrl.ala.org/value</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. URLs for chapter content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ala.org/acrl/AIA#cycle">http://www.ala.org/acrl/AIA#cycle</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/AIA%20interim%20report%20to%20IMLS%20FINAL%20no%20cover.pdf">http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/AIA%20interim%20report%20to%20IMLS%20FINAL%20no%20cover.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/AIA%20interim%20report%20to%20IMLS%202014%20FINAL%20no%20cover.pdf">http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/AIA%20interim%20report%20to%20IMLS%202014%20FINAL%20no%20cover.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td><a href="https://www.acrl.ala.org/value/?page_id=980">https://www.acrl.ala.org/value/?page_id=980</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Extent of web-duplicated material
This much duplication weakens the case for purchasing a seventy-dollar book.


The primary documents in *Shaping the Campus Conversation* are confusingly arranged. The Yearly Reports comprise Chapters 3, 4, and 5 of the first section (Results), while Interim Narrative Reports lie buried in Appendices D, E, and F. These reports come with appendices of their own. The original application for the Assessment in Action is Appendix C (Brown et. al., 2018, pp. 269-286). The fact that the Assessment in Action ran out of money and created less than two thirds of its projected number of librarian-led teams are buried deep in Appendix F (Brown et. al., 2018, p.313).

Worst of all, Lisa J. Hinchcliffe’s article "Professional Development for Assessment," remains as it was when printed straight from Elsevier’s database -- in unreadable, six-point type! (Brown et. al., 2018. pp.207-211; chapter 16).

No doubt, ACRL’s Action in Assessment deserves the preservation of ink and paper. Likewise, some libraries can benefit from mission-aligned assessment with a supportive, honest, and competent superiors. For librarians looking to learn more about including their chain of command in assessment efforts, *Shaping the Campus Conversation on Student Learning and Experience*, however, offers little beyond primary literature and nine enthusiastic accounts. There is no advice for preventing toxic evaluation or securing trustworthy partners. For library school students and scholars interested in the
assessment movement's roots, this book is complete, but also needlessly difficult. Given its flaws and omissions, librarians should spend a limited, professional material budget elsewhere.

References


