

Student Learning Outcomes
Library: Program SLO
Fall 2010
December 16, 2010

Program Learning Outcome: Instruction Library will support Instruction and Critical & Creative Thinking: Select, evaluate, and use information to solve problems, investigate a point of view, support a conclusion, or engage in creative expression.

Question: This semester, we wanted to examine learning outcomes related to our library orientations. Specifically we wanted to know if students were able to:

Select, evaluate, and use information to solve problems, investigate a point of view, support a conclusion, or engage in creative expression. Find, incorporate, and properly document high quality sources of information into their essays and other research projects.

Results: Librarian David Patterson gave three orientations to English instructor Elizabeth Terzakis' ENGL 100 class, then Dave and Elizabeth looked at three essays written by the students. We preferred going into some depth with three essays written by strong, medium and weak students rather than looking superficially at a larger sample. Based on our analysis of three essays we find a mix of outcomes:

1. Students are not incorporating outside sources very successfully.
2. Elizabeth is doing a good deal of information literacy instruction outside of the library.
3. Students are probably overwhelmed by the many balls they are trying to juggle when writing an essay.
4. One student found an article that is high quality *through* other sources with the help of Elizabeth. See below
5. Next time, we need to spend a LOT more time on synthesis and maybe offer examples of good and bad synthesis. We immediately used the metaphor of "stirring" in the next orientation to talk about synthesis.

Comments:

1. Many students did not turn in papers on time. Only 16 out of 28 papers were turned in on time, 2 were turned in later that day, and 5 students requested extensions
2. One strong ELL student found a source from Opposing Viewpoints. The instructor posted a notice about it on WebAccess. (See below)
3. All three of the students below came to office hours
4. Collaboration between the librarian and English instructor made the evaluation of the essays more fun and more insightful

R* is the advanced student

1. In the bibliography the strong student (R*) got it right
2. The strong student (R*) is trying to sound academic and it doesn't make sense.
3. The strong student (R*) gets the MLA mechanics right, although there are flaws.
4. R* gets the ingredients right but he hasn't stirred them!
5. Doesn't process the info completely, even in the Schlosser

6. Also, he doesn't relate the outside quote to Schlosser
7. One quote from Brinker in Schlosser is poorly contextualized
8. Long quote is basically a list; quote needs to be paraphrased or blocked
9. It's a composition problem
10. Were the demands of the assignment too specific? It was a comparison of the two authors.
11. Works Cited turned in

Hello R*. Thank you so much for posting your outline and your source. I have read through the essay and agree with you that it is not an appropriate source to use for your essay. However, it does point you to a better source: The article by Brownell and Warner, which the author quotes and which can be found at

http://vancouver.ca/parks//activecommunity/pdf/FoodTobacco_YaleUni.pdf

The article is on the long side (36 pages) but looks very credible and seems to be full of information that is pertinent to your topic.

I know that it contains information that you can use by reading the first few pages, which include an "abstract" or summary of the article. The two most relevant sections are "Methods" and "Findings"; I have highlighted the words that lead me to believe that you will find useful information on your topic in this article:

Methods: A review and analysis of empirical and historical evidence pertaining to tobacco and food industry practices, messages, and strategies to **influence public opinion, legislation and regulation, litigation**, and the conduct of science.

Findings: The tobacco industry had a playbook, a script, that emphasized personal responsibility, paying scientists who delivered research that instilled doubt, criticizing the "junk" science that found harms associated with smoking, **making self-regulatory pledges, lobbying with massive resources to stifle government action**, introducing "safer" products, and simultaneously manipulating and denying both the addictive nature of their products and their marketing to children. **The script of the food industry is both similar to and different from the tobacco industry script.**

What's more: it is actually Brownell and Warner that you quote in your outline, not Sirico; the block formatting of that passage is meant to signal to you that Sirico is quoting; the surrounding context let you know that he is quoting the same study he was discussing in

the previous paragraph.

Finally, everybody should read Sirico's essay because his quoting of Brownell and Warner is a perfect example of a concession paragraph, which we discussed in class today.

I hope this is helpful. Please let me know if you have any other questions.

J*, former 826 and 836, is the second student

1. Simple formatting and accuracy issues, such as misquoting.
2. "Talks about" instead of "asserts" or "discusses"; Diana Hacker list on p. 408 could be a poster; HOWEVER R*'s unnatural incomprehensible words might be coming from this instruction strategy
3. Does use "demonstrate" in next sentence
4. Again, Simon, secondary source, is mentioned in first paragraph, a requirement of the instructor
5. Drop quote; a good mix of signal phrases and drop quote; Dave learned a new term: "drop quote" (a quote with no signal phrase; in other words a quote without student lead in, such as "According to Miller:") and he also learned that it is permitted in the instructor's class.
6. Uses the secondary source logically, but doesn't integrate the ideas completely; didn't stir the ingredients
7. Needs more corroborating material from Simon
8. On-going problem: students do not take editing tips.
9. The instructor thinks the answer is that their vocab is so small and critical thinking skills are so weak, they just get frustrated! Or she might have forgotten!
10. Some good stuff. All points need more development. Seems like the student is thinking, "It's so hard; I just want to get it done."
11. She did use a sentence that the instructor gave to her
12. Great quotes, but they need to be further interpret and explained
13. Internal quotes are wrong " " " "
14. J* strung quotes together without putting a sentence of her own in between
15. Sloppy mis-quotes; the instructor "She's tired!"
16. No works cited page; cost-benefit analysis (they are not graded on it; frustrating)
17. How did she find the Simon piece? She didn't have trouble finding the source
18. Refuse to learn from classmates in the peer review process. She was in a group with strong thinkers but with grammatical problems

A*, weak student

1. Simple formatting issues such as heading and use of Acronyms were problematic, even after ample instruction and direct help and correction from instructor
2. Student made an overreaching claim about OSHA, the instructor discussed it with her, but she didn't change
3. Works Cited page is average
4. Evidence that the student read instructor's comments and tried to respond

5. Sophisticated use of two different Schlosser quotes from the same place to support her point
6. Student is explicit about the source of the NYT article: a journalist