Multiple Perspectives (SLO 3)

Program and Number (Chem-01):
Lib-04

Short Description and (UMD SLO #):
Multiple Perspectives (SLO 3)

Long Description (Also post to your program website):
Students will be able to identify multiple perspectives on a scholarly topic.

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

Responsible Roles: Program Assessment Liaison (Kim Pittman)

Data from Baseline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No items to display.

Which ONE UMD SLO outcome most closely aligns with this program outcome?
This outcome most closely aligns with UMD SLO #3, because it relates to thinking critically about information.

Why did you choose this SLO?:

Describe how this program outcome will be measured over the three-year cycle.:
This outcome will be measured by analyzing student annotated bibliographies and in-class worksheets from source evaluation activities completed in library instruction sessions.

In which courses or at which point in the program will this outcome be measured in the three-year cycle?:
This outcome will be measured in first-year writing classes and in upper-division courses from a range of disciplines.

What type of measurement will be used?: Internally developed, NOT required for accreditation

Budget Request(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Budget Account</th>
<th>GL Code</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No budget requests have been made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty/Staff/Student Involvement (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’ ability to identify multiple perspectives on a research topic using a rubric. A score of proficient or higher was considered satisfactory. See the attached rubric for a definition of each rubric level.

Analysis (Annual Report):

For this outcome, scores from the multiple perspectives domain of the rubric were analyzed. 81% of students scored as proficient for this rubric domain. No students scored at the advanced level of the rubric.

43

Quantitative Data:

Sample Size: 53

Met Satisfactory Performance:

Evaluating sources assessment rubric

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...
While we were encouraged to see a high percentage of students scoring as proficient, it was discouraging that no students in these Advanced Writing courses scored at the advanced level. One consideration is that we based our scores on annotated bibliographies that were completed before students' final papers. While most students omitted some perspectives that may have strengthened their arguments in their annotated bibliographies, it's possible that additional perspectives were included in their final papers. Based on this, we will consider looking at a different type of student work next time we assess this outcome.

Resources needed (Annual Report):

How do these data compare to the first time THIS outcome was assessed?:
N/A

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.):

While we were encouraged to see a high percentage of students scoring as proficient, it was discouraging that no students in these Advanced Writing courses scored at the advanced level. One consideration is that we based our scores on annotated bibliographies that were completed before students' final papers. While most students omitted some perspectives that may have strengthened their arguments in their annotated bibliographies, it's possible that additional perspectives were included in their final papers. Based on this, we will consider looking at a different type of student work next time we assess this outcome.

How were recommendations implemented?:

Which recommendations were not implemented and why?:

Items This Program Learning Outcome Supports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>End Date</th>
<th>Provider</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcome</td>
<td>UMD 3</td>
<td>Think critically and creatively in seeking solutions to practical and theoretical problems.</td>
<td>07/01/2012</td>
<td>06/30/2020</td>
<td>University of Minnesota Duluth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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