

 Evaluates Sources (SLO 3)

**Program and Number** Lib-03

**(Chem-01):**

**Short Description and (UMD SLO #):** Evaluates Sources (SLO 3)

**Long Description (Also post to your program website):** Students will be able to evaluate sources based on information need and the context in which the information will be used.

**Is this program outcome posted to your program website?:** Yes

**Starting date of Analysis:** 7/1/2016

**Ending date of Analysis:** 6/30/2017

**Annual Report Progress:** Completed

**Providing Department:** AR- Library

**Budget Request(s):**

Description	Amount	Budget Account	GL Code	Status
-------------	--------	----------------	---------	--------

No budget requests have been made.

**Responsible Roles:**

Program Assessment Liaison (Kim Pittman)

**Data from Baseline:**

Name	Source
------	--------

No items to display.

**Which ONE UMD SLO outcome most closely aligns with this program outcome? Why did you choose this SLO? :**

This outcome most closely aligns with UMD SLO #3, because it involves thinking critically about sources.

**Describe how this program outcome will be measured over the three-year cycle.:**

This outcome will be measured by evaluating students' annotated bibliographies and in-class worksheets from source evaluation activities completed in library instruction sessions.

**For Education programs only:**

**In which courses or at which point in the program will this outcome be measured in the three-year cycle? :**

This outcome will be assessed in first-year writing courses and upper-division courses within a range of disciplines.

**What type of measurement will be used?:**

Internally developed, NOT required for accreditation

**Items below this point are for the annual report, so stop here if completing only the three-year plan.:**

**Student Learning Data (Annual Report):**

Librarians collected annotated bibliographies from four Advanced Writing course sections, two WRIT 3140: Advanced Writing for Human Service Professions sections, one WRIT 3110: Advanced Writing for Arts & Letters, and one WRIT 3160: Advanced Writing for Social Sciences. Librarians scored students' source evaluation skills using a rubric. A score of proficient or higher was considered satisfactory. See the attached rubric for a definition of each rubric level.

 Evaluating sources assessment rubric

**Analysis (Annual Report):**

For this outcome, scores from two of the three rubric domains (criteria and source types) were used. 77% of students scored as proficient or higher on the criteria domain. 79% of students scored as proficient or higher on the source types domain.

**Quantitative Data:** 53

**Sample Size:**

**Quantitative Data:** 43

**Met Satisfactory Performance:**

**Faculty/Staff/Student Involvement (Annual**

A working group of three librarians developed and normed the rubric together and scored the bibliographies. Results were discussed at the library's Research & Learning departmental meeting and will be shared and discussed at a library

**Report):** all-staff meeting. Results will also be shared with writing instructors.  
**Program Librarians** would like to see students demonstrate a higher level of skill in source evaluation, especially considering that all of the work scored for this outcome came from students in upper-division courses. Working through this process allowed us to identify common pitfalls and mistaken assumptions when evaluating source quality. For example, many students accepted sources from familiar publication types as credible without engaging in any further critical analysis. We can address and discuss these common problems when we discuss source evaluation in library sessions. This process also allowed us to identify a few examples of student work that demonstrated a higher level of skill and understanding. These examples will allow us to more clearly define what we're hoping students will achieve, and help us develop teaching strategies to help students enhance their skills.

These results will also help us re-evaluate what we emphasize in library sessions. In library sessions taught for each of the courses that provided annotated bibliographies, source evaluation was a small component of library instruction for the course. Based on students' performance, we can see that we should spend more time discussing how and why to evaluate source quality. We also noted that only a few students scored at the advanced level of our rubric (four for criteria and two for source types). This makes it clear that we should spend time in library sessions discussing why students should acknowledge how context impacts their evaluation and look beyond surface characteristics when evaluating sources.

**Resources needed (Annual Report):**

**How do these data compare to the first time THIS outcome was assessed? :** This is an updated outcome, so no previous data is available to compare.

**What changes have you made to your program since you last reported on THIS outcome? :** N/A

**Have these changes had an impact on student learning? :** N/A

**CLOSING THE ASSESSMENT LOOP:**

**Recommendations made to address the above outcome(s) (Paste content from the Program Development section of this report.) :** Librarians would like to see students demonstrate a higher level of skill in source evaluation, especially considering that all of the work scored for this outcome came from students in an upper-division course. Working through this process allowed us to identify common pitfalls and mistaken assumptions when evaluating source quality. For example, many students accepted sources from familiar publication types as credible without engaging in any further critical analysis. We can address and discuss these common problems when we discuss source evaluation in library sessions. This process also allowed us to identify a few examples of student work that demonstrated a higher level of skill and understanding. These examples will allow us to more clearly define what we're hoping students will achieve, and help us develop teaching strategies to help students better develop their skills. These scores will also help us re-evaluate what we emphasize in library sessions. In library sessions taught for each of the courses that provided annotated bibliographies, source evaluation was a small component of library instruction for the course. Based on students' performance, we can see that we should spend more time discussing how and why to evaluate source quality.

**How were recommendations implemented?: Which recommendations were not implemented and why?:**

Items This Program Learning Outcome Supports

Type	Number	Name	Start Date	End Date	Provider	Progress
Student Learning Outcome	<a href="#">UMD 3</a>	<a href="#">Think critically and creatively in seeking solutions to practical and theoretical problems.</a>	07/01/2012	06/30/2020	University of Minnesota Duluth	

Last modified 10/2/2017 at 7:12 PM by [Kim Pittman](#)  
 Created 10/28/2016 at 3:59 PM by [Kim Pittman](#)